

Alderholt Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of responses to the Regulation 16 consultation

11 October 2024

The Regulation 16 consultation was held between 15 May and 25 June 2024 (6 weeks). Thirty-two responses were received during this time, as listed in the table below.

No.	Name	Organisation	Date submitted
1		Sport England	24 May 2024
2	D Stuart	Historic England	2 June 2024
3	G Gallacher	National Highways	5 June 2024
4	R Burden	Cranborne Chase National Landscape	18 June 2024
5	B Sherrard	Environment Agency	21 June 2024
6	R Tuck	Natural England	24 June 2024
7	S Croft	South West Water	24 June 2024
8	D Brooks	Resident	15 May 2024
9	S Hilton	Resident	16 May 2024
10	F Brown	Resident	17 May 2024
11	S Shailer	Resident	17 May 2024
12	M Smethers	Resident	17 May 2024
13	C Walker	Resident	17 May 2024
14	L Fish	Resident	20 May 2024
15	M Hardgrave	Property owner	3 June 2024
16	C Hibberd	Property owner	5 June 2024
17	S Trueick	Intelligent Land, on behalf of Dudsbury Homes	14 June 2024
18	T Lawton	Resident	15 June 2024
19	P Atfield	Goadsby, on behalf of Mr & Mrs M Stevens	17 June 2024
20	M Huzzey	Resident	17 June 2024
21	N J Thorne (a)	Landowner	18 June 2024
22	N J Thorne (b)	Landowner	20 June 2024
23	V Huzzey	Resident	21 June 2024

24	J Barnaby	Resident	21 June 2024
25	J Marlow	Resident	23 June 2024
26	R Lofthouse	Pennyfarthing Homes	25 June 2024
27	N Moore	Resident	25 June 2024
28	C Gould	Nova Planning, on behalf of Macra Limited	25 June 2024
29	S Bates	Feltham Properties	25 June 2024
30	M Hawthorne	Highwood	25 June 2024
31	A Bennett	Ken Parke Planning Consultants Ltd, on behalf of Commercial Freeholds Limited	25 June 2024
32	P Reese	Dorset Council	25 June 2024

Summary of responses

Person / organisation	Summary of comments
1. Sport England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is essential that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 102 and 103. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in the Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.
2. Historic England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In our response to the Regulation 14 consultation we drew attention to the need to ensure that potential impacts on heritage assets arising from proposed site allocations were properly identified and avoided or minimised in accordance with best practice and national and local policy for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment. We advised the community to liaise with your authority's heritage team on this matter. This may already have taken place, but if not we would take this opportunity to reiterate our advice and assume that any issues identified can or have been satisfactorily resolved.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no other issues associated with the Plan upon which we wish to comment.
3. National Highways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Highways is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this case comprises the A31 trunk road which passes approximately 9.5km to the south of plan area. A connection to the SRN is provided via the Alderholt Road to the B3081 Verwood Road/Hurn Lane/A31 junction, which can experience congestion during the network peak hours. • Having reviewed the plan's proposed policies, we consider that these are unlikely to lead to a scale of development that would adversely impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. • We therefore have no specific comments to offer on the policies within the plan.
4. Cranborne Chase National Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document includes reference to the revised s.85 duty of CRow Act 2000, flowing from LURA 2023, that applies to 'relevant authorities'. It appears, therefore, to be fully up to date with regard to National Landscape legislation. • It seems strange that new dwellings would be required to make payments towards the New Forest Recreational Management Plan – relating to an area some miles away – whereas there are no payments proposed for the management of the Cranborne Chase National Landscape – an equally important area nationally - that adjoins the Neighbourhood Plan Area.
5. Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pleased to see that previous comments have been taken on board. • We have no further detailed comments to make.
6. Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments on this neighbourhood plan.
7. South West Water	<p>Support for Water Efficiency and Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water efficiency is important due to hotter, drier summers and wetter winters. • Support for Policy 5, which promotes water efficiency and the reuse of surface water through rainwater harvesting systems. • Advocates specific water efficiency standards in new developments, similar to those in the East Dorset Local Plan and the Draft Wiltshire

	<p>Council Local Plan.</p> <p>Infrastructure and Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current water supply network can accommodate proposed development allocations. • Additional infrastructure evaluations and potential upgrades may be needed for non-allocated developments, especially large-scale proposals like the Land South of Ringwood Road. <p>Environmental Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for Policy 6, promoting green spaces and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to enhance drought resiliency and sustainable water consumption. • Support for Policy 7, aiming to mitigate nutrient load on aquatic environments, improving water quality and ecological value.
8. D Brook (resident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully in support of the plan in its current state as it acknowledges the need to provide some new housing but doesn't threaten the current rural nature of the village.
9. S Hilton (resident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadly agreement with the plan. • On page 49, site 009, cannot support the main vehicular access to this site being via Blackwater Grove and Blackwater Close. • The amount of vehicles during development would be horrendous. • Although we do not object to the land being developed, this single access through a quiet cul-de-sac is not acceptable. • Consider other means of access.
10. F Brown (resident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 009 – has an abundance of wildlife – building on it would be an ecological disaster! • Not true that Attwood close can give an extra access point to development. It is a small, single lane cul-de-sac and is a brick road not tarmac. • One of the only proper brick roads in Alderholt and should not be given up for yet another development. • Other sites would be more appropriate.
11. S Shailer (resident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several reasons for objecting to the development of this land. • It has a vast selection of wildlife that have lived undisturbed for many

	<p>years, e.g. slow worms, newts, foxes and owls.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roads leading to the land via Blackwater Grove and Blackwater Close are narrow and difficult to manoeuvre large vehicles without damage to neighbouring properties or vehicles. • This is not the first time that an application has been made, they have all been turned down previously and so should this be.
12. M Smethers (resident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting
13. C Walker (resident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entire document meets with my approval
14. L Fish (resident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am objecting the inclusion of site 009 on page 49 of the plan. • This site is outside the village plan. • The wildlife will be destroyed if it hasn't already. • Many wildlife habitats of protected species such as bats and lizards plus slowworms, hedgehog, snake, mice, birds eggs, etc were destroyed when this "survey" was conducted. • The variety of birds there has been recorded and is vast. • Concerns about the flood effect of cutting down hundreds of trees and replacing them with bricks and concrete. • The only access, via the residential areas of Blackwater Close and Blackwater Grove, is totally unsuitable.
15. M Hardgrave (property owner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I fully support the plan.
16. C Hibberd (property owner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the plan – meets the basic conditions.
17. Intelligent Land on behalf of Dudsbury Homes	<p>Objections to the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-compliance with Basic Conditions: because the plan fails to achieve sustainable development and lacks conformity with strategic policies. • Sustainable Development: The plan's vision and objectives aim to enhance village amenities and facilities but propose only modest growth (50 additional dwellings), which is insufficient to meet these goals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement Issues: Dudsbury Homes claims there was no engagement from the Steering Group to discuss their responses. <p>Detailed Objections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failure to Achieve Sustainable Development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The plan’s modest growth strategy does not align with its vision of enhancing local services and facilities. ○ The proposed development strategy is seen as inadequate to support the village’s needs and aspirations. 2. Conformity with the Development Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The plan conflicts with the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy, which designates Alderholt as a rural service centre. ○ The plan’s minimal development approach does not support Alderholt’s role as a provider of community, leisure, and retail facilities. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan perpetuates a pattern of inadequate development and declining services. • The Examiner should find the plan unsound and reconsider more appropriate growth options to sustain Alderholt as a rural service centre.
18. T Lawton (resident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan is detached from the demand for new homes, economic reality, and the needs of Alderholt residents, especially the younger generation. • The country faces a population increase due to significant immigration, driving demand for affordable housing. • The plan proposes only 50 new homes over 12 years, which is insufficient to achieve sustainable development. • This approach mirrors past ad-hoc infill development in Verwood, lacking prospects for improved community amenities, employment, or affordable housing. • Small-scale developments of 15-20 homes per site are not economically viable for achieving 35%-50% affordable housing. • Developers are unlikely to find it commercially attractive to mix high-priced homes with a large percentage of affordable homes.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The First Homes scheme caps prices at £250,000, but this does not align with local earning levels, making it unaffordable for the younger generation in need of housing. • The plan’s vision of creating a village high street through infill development is unrealistic due to the lack of viable sites. • Small infill developments will not provide the necessary local shops, amenities, or employment opportunities. • Alderholt requires significant growth to fund infrastructure improvements, local services, and affordable housing. • The current plan lacks a realistic financial and viability assessment. • The plan should be reviewed, and residents should be made aware of the sparse number of affordable homes included in the plan.
<p>19. Goadsby on behalf of Mr & Mrs Stevens (residents)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We seek an amendment to the Alderholt settlement boundary to include our land, allowing it to be used for residential development. • The target of 50 additional dwellings is too low and not based on public consultation. • The plan lacks a policy commitment to achieving this target, which may fail to meet future housing needs, especially for affordable housing. • Recent evidence shows that affordable housing delivery has been impaired by viability issues. <p>Proposed Allocated Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East of Ringwood Road: Development may be delayed due to the need to acquire rights across third-party land. • South of Daggons Road: Viability of developing employment land is questionable. • South of Blackwater Grove: Constrained vehicular access and potential impact on residents’ quiet amenity. <p>Proposed New Site Allocation: North of Blackwater Grove (Blackwater House and Associated Land):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has been positively assessed in various consultations and is suitable for residential development. • It scored highly in the AECOM assessment and should be included as a residential development allocation.

	<p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land at Blackwater House should be added to the list of residential site allocations in the Alderholt Neighbourhood Plan. • This would positively contribute to fulfilling Alderholt’s future housing needs, providing 40 dwellings and enhancing local amenities.
<p>20. M Huzzey (resident)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan is hoping to build on ground that is woodland or very wet – not suitable as drainage is bad. • It is far too small to enable any improvement to village, i.e. shops, buses, schools, etc. • It's a long way away from the recreation ground forcing people to drive – not good for the environment. • The SANG does not meet national requirements.
<p>21. N J Thorne (landowner)</p>	<p>Objection to Local Green Space Designation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We own Crossroads Plantation, which is being considered for Local Green Space (LGS) designation (ref LGS10). 2. The land was part of a planning application by Dudsbury Homes Ltd, which was refused. It is also being promoted in the emerging Dorset Local Plan as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). 3. We have not proposed the land for LGS designation. It still forms part of a strategic approach to the future growth of Alderholt. 4. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that LGS designation should be consistent with sustainable development and complement investment in homes, jobs, and services. 5. Green spaces should be part of a comprehensive planning approach, not ad hoc designations. 6. The land meets proximity and non-extensive tract tests but fails the test of being demonstrably special to the local community. 7. There is no clear rationale or evidence for the LGS designation. The consultation process was insufficient and lacked a sound evidence base. 8. The land is used for grazing and commercial forestry, with no public access, special beauty, historic significance, recreational value, or rich wildlife.

	<p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly object to the LGS designation – it serves no planning purpose and lacks justification. • The land could serve as valuable public open space as part of a comprehensive development strategy.
<p>22. N J Thorne (landowner)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have previously submitted land parcels for consideration in various consultations and call for sites by Dorset Council. • The sites are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pugs Field: Located off Daggons Road, Alderholt. ○ Crossroads: Located adjacent to Blackwater Grove, Alderholt. <p>Arguments for Inclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Both parcels abut the village envelope and would strengthen the village by providing residential and amenity sites. 2. The land is of low agricultural quality and its development would not impact the agricultural economy. 3. The sites are more than 400m from any Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), minimizing environmental impact. 4. Up to 10 acres of adjacent woodland could be used as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). 5. Each site can be developed independently or combined for a larger scheme. 6. Development would not adversely affect local utilities and services. 7. Development would not significantly increase local traffic or pose hazards. 8. Additional housing would support local amenities, schools, and the local economy. 9. Public services and utilities are nearby, facilitating easy connection. 10. The sites are under option agreements with reputable developers, ensuring timely development. 11. The development would help meet the local authority's housing allocation needs. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sites are deliverable with good access and minimal disruption. • Development would benefit the local economy and assist in meeting

	<p>housing requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For these reasons, the sites should be included in the Alderholt Neighbourhood Plan.
23. V Huzzey (resident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the Dudsbury plan because Alderholt lacks services, and the parish council's proposals are unlikely to change this. Smaller developments fail to provide adequate Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), as seen with the Penny Farthing site. • The idea of a high street along Station Road is unrealistic, and if people ever use these shops it will be by car. • Without an increase in population, a doctor's surgery is unlikely to be established in the village. Additionally, the local school is under-subscribed, and losing it would be detrimental to the community.
24. J Barnaby (resident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the Dudsbury plan because it will make a much better village. • We need housing to retain young people who want to stay. • The parish council have rushed through a plan to try to stop the development.
25. J Marlow (resident)	<p>Future Housing Developments (Policy 7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not address the national housing shortage or the need for affordable and rentable Housing Association accommodation. • Limiting to 50 additional homes over 10 years (5 per year) is insufficient and will make the village stagnant, discouraging young people from living there. • New homes would be energy-efficient and provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), offering accessible open spaces. <p>Employment (Policy 10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The village lacks employment opportunities, having transitioned from a farming community. • New homes would create jobs for tradesmen and boost local businesses (hairdressers, beauticians, etc.), contributing to the economy and council tax revenue. <p>Green Space and Landscaping (Policies 6 and 16)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many open spaces are overgrown and poorly managed. The

	<p>Alderholt Recreation and Play Area needs drainage work to be usable year-round.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New homes would bring new trees and plants, encouraging wildlife. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds from new homes could improve local amenities and footpaths. <p>Alderholt Nurseries 002</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 homes on this site are considered excessive. Concerns about a proposed footpath to Parish Council land, which was not granted for another site. <p>Transport Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better communication between Dorset CC and Hampshire CC is needed to improve Somerly Road, discouraging use of narrow Kent Lane. • Suggestions include installing pinch points, traffic lights, one-way systems, and reducing speed limits. • Limiting new homes may affect the viability of the local primary school. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does little to encourage young people to buy homes or provide amenities for children and youth. • The village should be accessible and enjoyable for new residents and future generations.
<p>26. Penny Farthing Homes</p>	<p>Highwood SANG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pennyfarthing Homes delivered a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) at Highwood to mitigate the impact of new residents on protected Dorset Heaths. • The SANG has capacity for more than the 38 homes mentioned in the NP, but Dorset Council has not facilitated the assignment of this capacity to third parties. <p>Affordable Housing (Policy 7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NP suggests a 50:50 split between affordable home ownership and affordable rent, which does not align with the Local Plan policy. Flexibility is essential from our experience. • At Oakwood Grove, the affordable housing provision was reduced

	<p>from 50% to 15% due to viability issues, with all affordable homes being First Homes due to the lack of interest from Registered Providers.</p> <p>Alderholt Nursery (Policy 12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NP suggests pedestrian access from the Nursery site to Oakwood Grove and the Parish Council recreation ground. However, there is no current agreement for such access, though Pennyfarthing Homes is open to negotiation.
<p>27. N Moore (resident)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan identifies only offers piecemeal additions to the housing in Alderholt and is not of the scale required to enable additional infrastructure and facilities to be built meaning that residents will still have to travel to access these services and the status quo will remain. The SANG proposed on Blackwater Grove will increase pressure on the Dorset Heathlands RAMSAR with additional pedestrian access.
<p>28. Nova Planning on behalf of Macra Ltd</p>	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Macra is promoting land south of Daggons Road, Alderholt, for a mixed-use development of about 15 dwellings and 0.2ha of employment land. The site is a 1ha paddock used for horse grazing, located at the western end of Alderholt, with existing trees and hedgerows along its boundaries. <p>Draft Policy 13: Paddock South of Daggons Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy to say that the site can support 15-20 dwellings. Supporting documents include site access plans, a tree constraints plan, and a flood risk note. A proposed T-junction access from Daggons Road with appropriate visibility splays and space for large vehicles. Potential pedestrian links to the northern boundary and towards the disused railway line to the south. The development will retain most trees, removing only one Category C tree. Suggests flexibility in the location of employment land, proposing it be adjacent to the existing garage site to preserve the character of

	<p>the village entrance.</p> <p>Comments on Other Draft Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 7: Meeting Local Needs – Housing: Supports the provision of affordable housing and a mix of dwelling sizes, with a realistic target of 35% affordable housing. • Policy 8: The Village “High Street”: Suggests flexibility in applying design principles to sites fronting the “High Street,” particularly for sites at the village entrance. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for Allocation: Macra supports the allocation of their site under Draft Policy 13, with suggested amendments to accommodate 15-20 dwellings. • Flexibility in Policies: Recommends flexibility to Policy 8 as it may not be appropriate to apply all the design principles to every site fronting the High Street in Alderholt.
<p>29. Feltham Properties</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NP is considered unsound as it fails to meet the basic conditions. Specifically, it does not align with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area. • The NP’s housing requirement of 192 homes is based on the Dorset Council Local Plan January 2021 Consultation, which was abandoned early and not fully tested. Therefore, it cannot be relied upon as a basis for the NP. • The NP has been produced in a policy vacuum, as there is no current or emerging Local Plan for the area. The East Dorset and Christchurch Core Strategy 2014 is the only vaguely relevant plan, but it is outdated. • The NP is premature as it is being developed without an up-to-date Local Plan. The local planning authority should work with the NP body to ensure complementary policies and minimize conflicts. • Dorset Council should pause further consideration of the Alderholt NP until its own Local Plan has made sufficient progress to ensure coherence between the two plans.
<p>30. Highwood</p>	<p>Background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highwood is promoting land at Cross Farm, Station Road, Alderholt,

	<p>for a mixed-use development including housing, employment, public open space, SANGs, and a section of the Alderholt to Fordingbridge Trailway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highwood has previously engaged with Parish Councillors and submitted a Vision Document, but the site was not included in the ANP. <p>Basic Conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ANP must meet the Basic Conditions, particularly having regard to national policies and being in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the area. • The current development plan is outdated, based on a 2012 SHMA, and does not comply with current national policy. • The ANP’s housing target of 192 dwellings is based on outdated and untested data. This is insufficient to meet local needs and the Basic Conditions. <p>Vision and Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for affordable housing should be prominently included in the ANP’s objectives. <p>Policy 7 – Meeting Local Needs – Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ANP’s target of 192 dwellings, with only 50 new dwellings planned, is insufficient. Highwood suggests a higher target to meet local needs and avoid a housing moratorium on other suitable development within 5 years of adoptions of the NP. • Existing commitments will deliver only 7 affordable homes, far below the required 50% (or 35% under emerging policies). Highwood’s site can help address this shortfall. <p>Policy 9 – The Trailway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highwood supports the Trailway policy and can deliver the first section of the Trailway through their site. <p>Site Selection (Policies 12-14)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highwood is disappointed that Cross Farm was not included in the ANP despite positive assessments. They argue it is a more sustainable option compared to other allocated sites.
31. Ken Parke	Support and General Comments

<p>Planning on behalf of Commercial Freeholds Ltd</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the overall spatial strategy and the need for additional housing in Alderholt. • Support Policy 14, which allocates Land South of Blackwater Grove for housing and accessible greenspace but suggest increasing the housing allocation to 40-50 units. <p>Legal Compliance and Basic Conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ANP has been prepared in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and other relevant legislation. • The ANP aligns with the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). <p>Housing Allocation and Density</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land south of Blackwater Grove (Policy 14) can support 40-50 units, making better use of the land and supporting Alderholt’s role as a Rural Service Centre. • There is a need for efficient land use; the current proposed density is too low and inconsistent with surrounding developments. <p>Policy 7 – Meeting Local Needs – Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for ANP’s approach to affordable housing, but suggest flexibility in housing mix to adapt to changing needs and economic conditions. <p>Technical Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy confirm the site is at low risk of flooding and suitable for development. • A Transport Statement indicates that the existing road network can accommodate the proposed development, with minimal impact on traffic. <p>Proposed Amendments to Policy 14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propose rewording Policy 14 to allocate 40-50 dwellings, focus development towards the eastern end of the site, and to confirm that vehicular access should be from Blackwater Close.
<p>32. Dorset Council</p>	<p>Para 1.3.8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refers to the future SFRA – it has now been published. <p>Map 3</p>

- The hatching makes it difficult to identify streets, and therefore it's difficult to establish where one area finishes and another starts. Suggest areas aren't hatched or at least not hatched as heavily.

Para 3.4.4

- For clarity, suggest that reference to solar panels should be deleted from the first sentence.

Para 4.1.6

- States that affordable housing "should be of poor quality in terms of their general appearance and location from open market housing" – this appears to be a mistake.

Policy 8

- The requirement for new buildings to be readily convertible to retail or other non-residential is unusual. We're unsure how this policy will be implemented in practice.
- Such a policy might be justified if it might result in the creation or strengthening of a 'town centre'. However, the length of the 'High Street' is approximately 1.5km with a scattering of commercial properties. As such, the justification for this policy seems limited.
- Given the above, we feel unable to support it.

Policy 13

- Para 4.2.15 notes that this site forms a visual entrance to the village. We therefore question whether requiring employment areas to front the 'High Street' is appropriate, bearing in mind that this could include workshop type buildings. For visual amenity reasons, it might be better to locate such uses to the rear of the site.

Para 4.2.20

- There is no address registered as "9 Blackwater Close". Should refer to the land to the rear of "9 Blackwater Grove".

Page 69

- Typo "tuns through the site" -> "runs through the site"