
Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Neighbourhood Plan

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

April 2026

Prepared by: Neighbourhood Plan Working Group, on behalf of Bradford Abbas Parish Council

This Consultation Statement summarises all the statutory and non-statutory consultation that has been undertaken with the community and other relevant statutory bodies and stakeholders in developing the Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Neighbourhood Plan (NP). It describes how concerns have been addressed and what changes have been made to the final Plan as a result of the pre-submission consultation.

The purpose of this document is to demonstrate that the Neighbourhood Plan has been developed on the basis of wide and thorough community engagement. More specifically, the neighbourhood planning regulations require a consultation statement to be produced which—

(a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan or neighbourhood development plan as proposed to be modified;

(b) explains how they were consulted;

(c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and

(d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan or neighbourhood development plan as proposed to be modified.

The working group is satisfied that this Consultation Statement demonstrates that a genuine and committed effort has been made to engage with those who live, work or have a business interest in the Neighbourhood Plan Area, and has provided them with every opportunity to influence the content of the Plan throughout its preparation.

CONTENTS

Overview	1
1 Initial Stages.....	3
2 Community Engagement	4
3 Consultation with Local Businesses, Services and Landowners	6
4 Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation	8
5 Proposed Local Green Spaces – Landowner Consultation	19

Included as separate documents:

Appendix 1: Consultation Documentation Associated with the Initial Stages of the Plan (Stage 1)

Appendix 2: Consultation Documentation Associated with the Community Engagement Phase (Stage 2)

Appendix 3: Consultation Documentation Associated with the Consultation of Local Business, Services & Landowners (Stage 3)

Appendix 4: Consultation Documentation Associated with the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation (Stage 4) including separately attached Survey Monkey summary of responses

Appendix 5: Consultation Documentation Associated with the Proposed Local Green Spaces Landowners (Stage 5)

Overview

A brief chronological log of the statutory and non-statutory consultations undertaken to date in the production of the Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Neighbourhood Plan is produced below.

Date	Action/Event	Appendix Documents
Stage 1. Initial Stages – see Appendix 1 for documentation		
16 November 2021	Inaugural meeting for the NP with residents in Village hall	Poster Pennant advert
1 February 2022	Bradford Abbas PC meeting in village hall agreed to proceed with NP	
23 April 2021	NP public meeting in village hall to allocate roles and responsibilities	
6 June 2022	Open meeting in village hall for residents of Clifton Maybank	Invite Flyer Flyer informing CM residents of outcome
11 July 2022	Application to Dorset Council for the designation of the NP area	Letter of application 11.07.22 2 x DC letters confirming NP Area 23.9.22
Stage 2. Community Engagement - see Appendix 2 for documentation		
3 November 2022	Public meeting in the village hall to collect the views of the public	Poster Pennant adverts (Oct & Nov '22) Facebook post 24.10.22 Photos of event
March 2023	Residents householder survey	Questionnaire form - attached Pennant advert March '23 Survey results report May '23 - attached Pennant advert – thanks April '23
Stage 3. Consultation with Local Businesses, Services and Landowners – see Appendix 3		
5 May 2024	Letters sent to all local businesses, services & Landowners	Template letter with list of recipients 5.05.24
Stage 4. Reg 14 Consultation – see Appendix 4 for documentation		
23 Sept – 1 Dec 2025	Reg 14 Consultation period	Pennant advert Sept '25 Response form Poster & Photo BAPC home page 25.09.25 Facebook screen shot 25.09.25 Facebook 'event' created 29.09.25
30 Sept 2025	Launch of consultation public meeting in the village hall at 7.00pm	Photos of public meeting
30 Sept 2025	Emails sent to statutory consultees and local organisations	Example email 30.09.25 List of consultees Example reminder email 17.11.25

Date	Action/Event	Appendix Documents
11 Oct 2025 (Saturday)	Drop-in session at St Mary's Church, 10.30am – 11.30am	Pennant advert Oct 2025 Poster Photo
12 Oct 2025 (Sunday)	Drop-in session at the Sports Club, 3.00pm – 4.00pm	Photo
Nov 2025	Reminder of deadline in Pennant & on Facebook	Pennant Nov 2025 Facebook screenshot 29.11.25
Dec 2025	Analysis of results	Survey Monkey Report Output
Stage 5. Proposed Local Green Spaces – Landowner Consultation – see Appendix 5		
15 Mar – 2 Apr 2026	Letters posted and delivered to landowners of the proposed LGSs	Letter template

1 Initial Stages

Appendix 1 provides copies of the documents referred to below.

- 1.1 Work on the Neighbourhood Plan for Bradford Abbas began with an inaugural meeting with village residents on 16 November 2021, which introduced the concept of neighbourhood planning and explored the community's interest in developing a Neighbourhood Plan. The meeting was advertised in the community via The Pennant monthly newsletter distributed free of charge to every household in the parish, and by posters displayed around Bradford Abbas village. An estimated 70 residents attended.
- 1.2 At their meeting on 1 February 2022, and in the light of the interest and enthusiasm of residents attending the public meeting on 16 November 2021, Bradford Abbas Parish Council (the qualifying body) agreed to proceed with a Neighbourhood Plan. A working group was formally established to lead the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. Roles and responsibilities within the group were agreed at a Neighbourhood Plan meeting on 23 April 2022, enabling the group to begin coordinating engagement activities and developing the scope of the plan.
- 1.3 As discussions progressed, the working group explored the potential for preparing the Plan in partnership with the rural adjoining parish of Clifton Maybank which operates as a 'parish meeting' rather than a formal parish council. To inform residents of this possibility, a flyer was distributed to all 23 households in Clifton Maybank on 31 May 2022, inviting them to participate in the process. An informal consultation meeting was subsequently held on 6 June 2022 at Bradford Abbas & Clifton Maybank Village Hall, providing residents with the opportunity to learn more about the Neighbourhood Plan and to join the working group. There are only about 40 residents in Clifton Maybank parish, but nevertheless 11 residents attended the meeting, and overall 16 Clifton Maybank residents responded positively to the consultation, and 2 negatively. It was therefore resolved to proceed to prepare a joint Plan covering the parishes of Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank.
- 1.4 An application to apply for the designation of a Neighbourhood Plan Area covering both parishes was submitted to Dorset Council on 11 July 2022. As Clifton Maybank is administered by a Parish Meeting, Dorset Council carried out a consultation between 5 August and 16 September 2022 to provide the opportunity for anyone who lives, works or carries out a business in the area to make comments. No objections to the proposal were received so Dorset Council confirmed to both Bradford Abbas Parish Council and Clifton Maybank Parish Meeting that the Neighbourhood Plan Area as submitted was designated on 20 September 2022.

2 Community Engagement

Appendix 2 provides copies of the documents referred to below.

- 2.1 Community engagement continued through a range of communication channels, particularly monthly updates in the Pennant newsletter (delivered in paper form to every household in the two parishes as well available online via the Bradford Abbas Parish Council website), and monthly neighbourhood plan meetings were held in the village hall which were open to all residents to attend. An update on progress was published in the October and November 2022 editions of the Pennant parish newsletter.
- 2.2 These posts in the Pennant newsletter also invited residents to attend a public consultation event on 3 November 2022 in the village hall. Posters advertising the event were displayed around the parishes, and a message posted on The Pennant FaceBook page. The event was very successful, with 70 – 100 residents attending, who were invited to discuss key issues facing the parishes and to contribute ideas that could inform the emerging vision and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan. Tables were set up around the hall focusing on the following issues where residents could engage with members of the working group: the environment, climate change and water management, community services, housing, business services and the economy, traffic, road safety and transport, and other issues.
- 2.3 The report was analysed and reviewed by the working group on 19 January 2023. The issues and concerns raised by the residents who attended the event were then used to inform the preparation of the subsequent household survey, which would enable all residents in the Plan area to provide their views on the future of the parishes.
- 2.4 The ‘Residents Household Survey’ was carried out in March 2023 (Survey form appended) and enabled all households in the Plan Area to participate. A paper questionnaire was included within the March 2023 edition of The Pennant newsletter distributed to every household in the two parishes, but residents were also encouraged to complete the questionnaire online (a link was provided). Completed paper questionnaires could be returned to several easily accessed locations around the two parishes, and if anyone required assistance or clarification on completing the form, a name and telephone number was provided. Households were asked to complete one form per household finding a consensus between household occupants if necessary.
- 2.5 Residents responded well to the survey with 111 questionnaires completed representing about 25% of the total households in the two parishes. 39 paper forms were received and 72 online. 7 responses were received from households in Clifton Maybank. A report summarising the results was produced (appended) which assisted in helping to inform the development of the Plan’s vision, objectives and policy areas.
- 2.6 The responses provided important evidence to shape the developing vision, objectives and policy areas for the Neighbourhood Plan. In April 2023 a post in the Pennant thanked everyone for responding to the Residents Household Survey, and encouraged people to come forward and help with specific tasks in the following policy areas: community, climate change and water management, business services and economy, housing and planning, traffic, road safety and transport, the environment.
- 2.7 A summary of the main issues raised is set out in the table on the following page.

<i>Environment and Heritage</i> Residents emphasised the importance of protecting the rural character and landscape setting of Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank. Particular concern was expressed regarding the potential impact of development on the surrounding countryside, wildlife habitats and biodiversity. The protection of trees, hedgerows, green spaces and valued views was highlighted as a priority. Respondents also emphasised the importance of safeguarding the historic character of the village, including traditional buildings, heritage assets and the overall settlement pattern, to ensure that future development respects the distinctive character of the area.
<i>Climate Change – Renewable Energy and Flood Risk</i> Residents recognised the importance of addressing climate change and environmental sustainability within the Neighbourhood Plan. There was support for measures that could help reduce carbon emissions and improve environmental performance. Flood risk was also raised as a concern by some residents, particularly in relation to the management of surface water and the potential impact of development on drainage. There was support for ensuring that new development incorporates appropriate drainage measures and sustainable design, and that opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficiency are considered where appropriate.
<i>Community Services & Facilities</i> Residents highlighted the value of existing community services and facilities, including meeting spaces, recreational areas and local amenities, and emphasised the importance of protecting and supporting these facilities. Some respondents suggested that the parishes could benefit from additional community or recreational facilities, particularly those that would support younger residents and families. Concerns were also raised regarding access to healthcare services, school capacity and the reliability of digital infrastructure, including broadband connectivity.
<i>Housing</i> Concerns were raised regarding the scale, type and location of future housing development within the parishes. Residents generally supported development that is small-scale and proportionate to the size and character of Bradford Abbas, ensuring that it integrates well with the existing built form. There was also strong support for ensuring that new housing meets local needs, particularly through the provision of homes that are genuinely affordable for local people, including younger residents and those wishing to remain within the community.
<i>Business Services and the Economy</i> Residents recognised the importance of supporting the local rural economy, including local businesses, farms and small enterprises operating within the parishes. Maintaining opportunities for local employment and small-scale business activity was considered important to the sustainability of the community. The role of digital infrastructure, particularly reliable broadband, was also highlighted as an important factor in supporting local businesses, home working and economic resilience.
<i>Traffic, Road Safety and Transport</i> Transport-related issues were frequently raised during the consultation. Residents expressed concerns regarding traffic volumes, speeding vehicles and road safety, particularly along rural lanes and through Bradford Abbas village. There was recognition that car travel remains the primary means of transport, due to the limited availability of alternatives. However, residents expressed support for improvements that could encourage walking and cycling, as well as improvements to public transport services, where possible.

3 Consultation with Local Businesses, Services and Landowners

Appendix 3 provides copies of the documents referred to below.

- 3.1 In early 2024, the working group focused on identifying and assessing any potential future plans of local services and businesses. Individual members of the working group set up meetings with the local services (Trustees of the village hall, the Parochial Church Council, Trustees of the Bradford Abbas Sports and Recreational Club, the Head Teacher of St Mary's Primary School, and the managers of the Rose and Crown Public House). One member of the working party also had meetings with local farmers.
- 3.2 A list of all identified businesses in the Plan area was drawn up and letters sent to them on 5 May 2024 asking if they had any specific needs or development plans (eg. building works, land to extend, etc) that should be considered for inclusion in the Plan, or any information that would be helpful in progressing the Plan.

- 3.3 The outcome of this consultation was as follows:

Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Hall

- 3.4 Issues that are pertinent to the village hall are:

- Possibility of lessening the heating costs with potential of solar panels
- If land become available adjacent to the village hall, they would like priority to potentially purchased said land.

Bradford Abbas Sports and Recreational Club

- 3.5 Return received – item intended to be discussed and considered at the next Sports Club meeting. Noted that the Deed states that it must remain a green recreational space for the benefit of the village.

St Mary's CE Primary School

- 3.6 Issues that are pertinent to the school are:

- *Affordable and available housing for new families.* The school has a falling role - this was always predicted after new schools were built in neighbouring Yeovil as we used to attract more pupils from the bottom end of town. However, in ten years, there is a real risk that a school in Bradford Abbas will not be viable and that would be a great loss.
- *Pathway to our school field from the road.* At times the pathway is overgrown and difficult to access and also covered with dog faeces. I am not sure whose responsibility it is to manage it, but it is difficult for access, particularly for wheelchair users to the field.
- *Village hall access.* The issues of the shared use and responsibility of the playground and access to the pre-school storage needs to be revisited. The licence for shared use of the playground is now not valid due to changes in school leadership and management and only still exists through a soft agreement. There have been times when the village hall has arranged for contractors to visit the hall and expect to be able to use our grounds to do work during the school day. Under current safeguarding rules for educational establishments, this cannot happen - there needs to be a shared understanding/acknowledgement of this. It also takes too long for the village hall to do any remedial repairs to damaged fences, for example, which could cause an injury to a child.
- *The lack of pavements near the school* is a concern for safety reasons however I understand there is very little that can be done about that.
- *Shop.* It is a pressing need for families with children and elderly residents to be able to access a shop.

Coleridge Farm

3.7 Return received: noted failed sale of houses 3 times, land available to be included in NP.

Manor Farm

3.8 Return received – confirmed no plans at that time to develop.

Mellish's (both farms)

3.9 Return received: no plans at present for planning but might do in the future.

3.10 No response was received from the following organisations:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| ▪ Allotments society | ▪ Noor farm |
| ▪ Car showroom | ▪ NPB utilities |
| ▪ Computer repairs | ▪ Peel Centre |
| ▪ CS Gardening & other garden operators in the area | ▪ Rose & Crown |
| ▪ French's | ▪ Sherborne Estates |
| ▪ Golf club | ▪ St Mary's Parish Church |
| ▪ Heatwave | ▪ The Locke's |
| ▪ Mill Farm | ▪ The Loxtons |
| | ▪ Winchester Estates |

- 3.11 The lack of engagement with this consultation was disappointing, especially from the larger commercial firms. Nevertheless, the contribution they make to the area is recognised and 'Policy 10 Local employment opportunities' was drafted to support the expansion of existing businesses as well as new businesses, subject to meeting a number of requirements in order to comply with the overall strategy of the Plan.
- 3.12 Many of the issues raised, especially by St Mary's Primary School, were operational matters not relevant to the Plan, and need to be pursued with Dorset Council directly. However, the important issue of the provision of 'affordable and available housing for new families' was of concern especially if any lack of provision was to impact on the viability of the village school. Careful consideration was given to this issue, and in the light of the Household Survey (March 2023) which identified that the majority of local residents would support a modest level of housing to assist with the viability of local community services. The Plan highlights the need to focus new housing on providing smaller homes suitable for young families, as well as first time buyers and people looking to down-size. A Community Land Trust has also been set up to consider the possibility of providing a site for affordable housing with a local landowner.
- 3.13 The closure of the shop is an issue that has been raised throughout the consultation process, and the Plan therefore supports proposals for new community facilities, or the modernization and adaptation of existing facilities to meet local needs.
- 3.14 The owners of Coleridge Farm have offered their redundant farm buildings for a housing site, but it is remote from the settlement of Bradford Abbas, and has been assessed as unsuitable for residential development by Dorset Council in the past. However, the site is identified under 'Section 6 Business Services and the Economy' of the Neighbourhood Plan as a potential site for employment use under Policy 10.

4 Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation

Appendix 5 provides copies of the documents referred to below.

- 4.1 The Regulation 14 Pre-Submission consultation on the draft Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Neighbourhood Plan was publicised and undertaken between 23 September and 1 December 2025. The consultation period was announced in the September and October editions of The Pennant, the monthly parish newsletter delivered to all households in Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank. The draft Plan was also available online via the Parish Council website. Numerous laminated posters promoting the consultation were displayed prominently within the parishes on 10 September, and printed hard copies of the draft Plan were made available on 23 September in the Church, Rose & Crown PH, Sports Club, telephone box, and Village Hall. Members of the public could also request hard copies by phone.
- 4.2 Some technical issues with the Parish Council's website resulted in a 2 day delay for the draft Plan to be available to download, so the consultation period was extended until 1 December 2025. Appendix 5 shows the homepage of the Bradford Abbas PC website promoting the consultation, and providing links to the draft Plan and the response form to complete online.
- 4.3 Notices in The Pennant, posters, and a message on Facebook continued to promote the consultation, the launch event on 30 September 2025, and the two drop-in sessions on 11 & 12 October. An event reminder was also set up on Facebook on 29 September.
- 4.4 Emails were prepared and sent on 30 September 2025 to 15 statutory consultees whose interests may be affected by the proposals in the Plan. A hard copy of the Plan was sent to Dorset Council. 7 other local organisations were also emailed directly on 30 September. These emails provided details of the consultation, attached a digital copy of the draft Plan, and a link to the online response form.
- 4.5 Statutory consultees and local organisations contacted on 30 September 2025 were as follows:
 - Dorset Council
 - Somerset Council
 - Yetminster Parish Council
 - Yeohead Parish Council
 - Thornhackett Parish Council
 - Queenthorne Parish Council
 - Barwick and Stoford Parish Council
 - Yeovil Town Council
 - Natural England
 - Environment Agency
 - Historic England
 - Wessex Water
 - Network Rail
 - Highways England
 - Scottish and Southern Electricity
- 4.6 In addition the following local organisations were specifically contacted:
 - Bradford Abbas Community Land Trust
 - St Mary's CE Primary School
 - Bradford Abbas Preschool
 - Bradford Abbas Sports & Recreational Club

-
- Bradford Abbas & Clifton Maybank Village Hall Committee
 - St Mary's Church PCC
 - Rose & Crown PH
- 4.7 The launch event, held on 30 September 2025 at Bradford Abbas & Clifton Maybank Village Hall, was attended by 37 local residents, as well as Parish Councillors and members of the working group (see Appendix 5 for photographs). Presentations were delivered by the Chair of the Parish Council, the Leader of the Plan's working group, and the Chair of the Bradford Abbas Community Land Trust. Members of the public were able to discuss key topics of the Neighbourhood Plan, and were encouraged to make their comments.
- 4.8 Two drop-in consultation sessions were also held on 11 and 12 October 2025 at St Mary's Church (22 attendees) and the Sports and Social Club (14 attendees), with members of the working group present to discuss issues and answer questions, and again, encourage people to submit their comments.
- 4.9 Regular reminders of the consultation and the deadline for submitting comments were issued through The Pennant (October and November editions), the Parish Council Facebook page (29 November), and via emails to consultees (17 November). The consultation period formally closed on 1 December 2025.
- 4.10 Responses were received from local residents through completed questionnaires, in person at consultation events, and via emails. Statutory consultees, local businesses, and community organisations also provided feedback via a dedicated consultation email. All responses were collated, reviewed, and recorded into a report (see document), and considered at a meeting of the working group on 11 December 2025. Subsequently, minor amendments and additions were made to the text, and the main comments made (as relevant to the plan or process) were summarised in a table including the agreed actions (attached document). Every effort was made to try to summarise remarks clearly.

Summary of main issues raised through the consultation

- 4.11 Overall, the consultation showed strong engagement and broad support for the Plan. Many respondents agreed with the majority of policies, particularly those relating to environmental protection, heritage, and housing that meets local needs. Some areas received mixed responses:
- i) Local Green Spaces: Most identified sites were supported, although an objection was raised by a landowner regarding inclusion of land within the NP. However it meets the criteria for LGSs and residents supported its inclusion, and therefore the site remains within the plan (see following Stage 5).
 - ii) Housing Development: Residents generally supported small-scale, locally appropriate housing, with an emphasis on social housing, but some concerns were raised over overdevelopment, site selection, and traffic impacts.
 - iii) Flooding and Infrastructure: Comments highlighted ongoing local flood risks and the need for improvements to drainage and road safety, including better signage and traffic management.
 - iv) Community Projects: Respondents provided suggestions for project locations (e.g., community shop at Sports Club), renewable energy feasibility, and recreational route improvements.

All comments made as part of the Regulation 14 consultation were read and considered, and the main comments made (as relevant to the plan or process) have been summarised here. In some cases where the comment may have been input against one area but is more applicable to another policy / part of the plan, the latter has been used. Every effort has been made to try to summarise remarks clearly, although there may be minor errors due to the wide-ranging nature of the comments received.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Historic England	-	General	Confirms that there are no specific matters associated with the Plan upon which they would wish to comment in detail. Generally support the suite of policies proposed which should assist in the preservation and enhancement of the area's distinctive historic character, and the locally informed heritage evidence upon which they are based. Congratulates the community on its progress to date and wish it well in the making of its Plan	Noted.
National Highways	-	General	Considers that the Plan's policies are unlikely to lead to a scale of development which would adversely impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. No specific comments to make.	Noted.
Natural England	-	General	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	Noted.
Queen Thorne Parish Council	-	General	The council sees nothing in the plan that would negatively affect Queen Thorne or the locality and is therefore supportive of the plan as laid out in this draft.	Noted.
Somerset Council	-	General	No comments to make at this stage	Noted.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Dorset Council	1	1.1.5	Paragraph 1.1.5 suggests the Plan would run to 2039, however it does not specify the Plan start date. The Plan period should also appear on the front cover.	Agreed <i>Amend front cover and Section 1 to refer to the plan period 2024-2039.</i>
Local residents (2)	2	2.4	Could more be done to encourage village householders to reduce existing pollution – e.g. setting security lights to avoid being triggered unnecessarily (eg from people walking past in the road).	Whilst not an issue for policy, this could be mentioned in the supporting text. <i>Amend section 2.4 to highlight the issue of the nuisance caused by poorly adjusted security lights.</i>
Dorset Council	2	Policy 5	The Conservation Officer suggested a number of areas in which the policy could be strengthened, such as the inclusion of statements regarding: - the conversion and adaptive reuse of designated and non-designated heritage assets and the protection of historic fabric and special architectural character and appearance, - supporting a commitment to sustainable measures in maintaining designated and non-designated assets within the context of addressing the challenges of climate change - supporting a commitment to the long-term, sustainable protection of historic buildings, sites, and structures from harm. - a commitment toward heritage-led development / regeneration and questioned whether “Proposals which enhance or would lead to a better appreciation of these assets will be looked on favourably” is necessary or should be	It was not clear whether these amendments were necessary to meet the basic conditions, and further advice was sought from Dorset Council. As a result, it has been suggested that the aspiration in 2.1.3 to retain the historic and rural character of the village could be expressed more explicitly through an overarching vision statement. Paragraph 2.6.1 lists the key features and influences that shape the character of the place, but could usefully be extended to clearly articulate what is distinctive and special about the village, and those points incorporated into the final line of Policy 5. Having review the vision statement in section 1.3. this already makes explicit reference to the importance of the historic and rural setting and distinctive character of the area, and it does not appear to need to be strengthened on these points. The factors that are distinctive and special about the village and wider area are set out both in section 2.6. However it

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			strengthened.	is noted that the Gardens and Designed Landscapes of Clifton Maybank House have been added to Dorset Council's Local List, and as such should be referenced here. It would also be appropriate to expand Policy 5 to list (in summary) the main points noted in section 2.6. Regarding the final sentence of Policy 5, similar wording was found to be acceptable in the recent (November 2024) Alderholt Neighbourhood Plan, but could be strengthened to read as an expectation. <i>Add new paragraph to 2.6 to reference and describe the significance of the Gardens and Designed Landscapes of Clifton Maybank House as added to Dorset Council's Local List. Insert new second sentence to Policy 5 to read: "This should include appreciation of the following elements in creating the area's distinctive historic character and interest:</i> <i>- the role and focal point of the Parish Church;</i> <i>- the influence of the railway, river and historic road network in shaping the village form;</i> <i>- the interest and vernacular created by the many surviving historic buildings, including those noted in the Conservation Area Appraisal, and the historic farmhouses, farm cottages and farm buildings in the wider rural area;</i> <i>- the influence and legacy of the owners of Clifton Maybank House; and</i> <i>- the 'hidden' history such as the Roman legacy and Battle of Babylon.</i> <i>Amend final sentence to read: "Proposals should seek to better reveal and allow the appreciation of the area's history and</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				<i>distinctive characteristics."</i>
Local resident	2	Policy 5	Although there is a brief paragraph about the battle of Babylon Hill, there has been no mention of the 1997 Hamstone marker in the layby on the main road – this deserves some recognition?	Agree that the Battle of Babylon Hill should be included. <i>Include further reference, possibly after para. 2.6.2. See: https://www.yeovilhistory.info/babylon.htm .</i>
Local resident	2	Policy 5	Has an Article 4 directive to remove permitted development rights in the conservation area been considered? The seemingly small changes such as UPV-c window, plastic rainwater goods or roof mounted solar panels on non modern buildings in particular can bring about a significant change (usually detrimental) to the character of property and surroundings.	This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, and was not specifically highlighted in the Conservation Area Appraisal as an issue.
Local resident	2	Policy 6	Landowner objection to inclusion of Gollops Ground as Local Green Space (LGS). The riverbank is private land & the recognised footpath runs on the north side of the field. There has never been a recognised footpath alongside the river, and the reference to a Definitive Map Modification Order (DMMO) seeking to reinstate is factually incorrect. The community does not have wider use of the field to access the River Yeo.	LGS designation can be applied to land in private ownership. The LGS is supported by the community, and also Dorset Council, who support the DMMO application to reinstate the riverbank footpath after recognising its long-term use along with free access to the field, see: https://gi.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/rightsofway/definitivemap/register/Details/T725 . The LGS is considered appropriate. <i>Update supporting text to acknowledge most recent DMMO status.</i>
Local residents	2 7	Policy 4 / Policy 11	Existing public footpaths / bridleways should not be used as cycleways or have tarmac surfaces. Is it appropriate to include the creation of cyclable routes here?	The Plan looks to support the creation of an off-road cycle route from Bradford Abbas to Sherborne and Yeovil (7.2.7) – the route for this is not yet determined, nor is the surfacing material. Any impact on existing public footpaths / bridleways would be considered at that time and in

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				consultation with the community.
Local resident	3	Paragraph 3.4	Disagree that the new drain will improve things at the top of North Street is correct - a new drain needs to be installed between North Street and Back Lane as was originally intended.	Noted - although the new gully grate at the top of North Street has helped with capturing some of the run-off during heavy rain, agree further works are needed. At a site meeting with Dorset Council in January 2024, the officer agreed to install an extra gully in Cross Road, opposite Nether Coombe, but as yet this hasn't happened. <i>Update paragraph 3.4 to reflect the above understanding.</i>
Environment Agency	3	Policy 7	Welcomes the inclusion of the policy relating to flood risk and suggests that reference to the development needing to pass the sequential and exception test is included.	Given that the need for the sequential and exception test is set out in national policy this does not need to be detailed in the policy, but the policy could be updated to make clearer the link between national policy and the use of the additional flood risk information contained in the preceding sections. <i>Amend first sentence of policy to read: "All new development within the parishes must be located and designed in line with national policy to avoid exacerbating existing flood risks or creating new ones, having regard to the known flood risks and challenges identified in sections 3.3 and 3.4."</i>
Local resident	3	Project P6	How can any community based renewable scheme be cost effective? Perhaps examples of this could be shown?	The Centre for Sustainable Energy website provides a useful source of information on community renewable energy projects <i>Include link to https://www.cse.org.uk/my-community/community-projects/ within the supporting text.</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Dorset Council	4	Policy 8	The final sentence of the first paragraph “every effort should be made to work with the local community to investigate potential solutions to avoid any unnecessary loss of these valued services” reads as an action rather than a policy test and would be better located in the supporting text. The supporting text could clarify that the marketing of the property should last for 12 months at a suitable price that has been verified by 3 valuations. Dorset Council notes the identification of the community hub that lies either side of the western end of Church Road (as indicated on Map 7) which is considered suitable for small-scale retail and other E class or similar sui generis uses appropriate to a local centre. NPPF, paragraph 93 suggests that the sequential approach to planning applications should not be applied to applications for small scale rural offices or other small scale rural development. As a possible guide, the reference in the policy to ‘small-scale’ could be interpreted as below 280m² gross floorspace, as this is considered to be of a scale that would not require any sequential or impact assessment (based on the recommendations of the 2022 update to the Dorset Retail & Leisure Study) and therefore appropriate to a rural area.	Similar wording to the first paragraph was found to be acceptable in the recent (July 2025) Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan. More recently the Marnhull NP has passed examination, and using the wording from that plan may be clearer. Agree that reference to an appropriate marketing would be helpful, and that guidance on what is meant by small-scale could also be useful, although in reality the scope for any buildings of more than 280m² in this location would be severely limited. <i>Amend first paragraph of Policy to read: “Community facilities (as listed in section 4.2 and shown on Map 6) are important to residents and should be retained. The loss or reduction of such facilities will only be supported if, after involving the local community in assessing potential solutions to retain the facility, and appropriate marketing, it is clear that their retention would be unreasonable on the grounds of viability, and the service provider / site owner has pro-actively worked with the local community and relevant authorities to investigate potential solutions to retain the facility, or the change proposed provides clear community benefits and has the community’s backing.”</i> <i>Expand 4.3 to discuss expected marketing period and price verification (as suggested), and guidance on ‘small scale’ threshold (as suggested – noting that realistically the scope for anything close to this size is likely to be severely limited).</i>
Local resident	4	Policy 8 and	The most obvious location for a ‘community shop’ is at	This would not be prevented by Policy 8, as the latter

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
		Project P8	the Sports and Social club which has an abundance of parking, already connected to all mains services and would also benefit from potential footfall.	element is encouraging of such facilities within the community hub but would not prevent other locations in line with the second paragraph. <i>Amend Project 8 to read " a suitably central and/or accessible location" to address this point.</i>
Local resident	4	4.3.5	If the school site is owned by Salisbury Diocese does that mean it falls under being exempt from allowed as an Asset of Community Value (ACV)?	Agreed that the text is not clear on this point – the legislation refers to the disposal of a (redundant) church https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2012/2421/made#f00020 as these are considered under separate legislation (see Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011) <i>Amend text to read “but these cannot include homes, hotels and may not be applicable in other certain circumstances, such as redundant churches (footnote to 2012 regulations)”</i>
Dorset Council	5	Policy 9	Notes that there are no additional opportunity sites from the Dorset Council Local Plan Options Consultation (2025), therefore the windfall element remains broadly correct, and the low windfall allowance can be met through future infill and conversion applications. At this stage the Neighbourhood Housing Requirement is a draft figure and would not become finalised until the Dorset Council Local Plan is adopted. Support inclusion of secure arrangements to ensure that affordable housing remains accessible to those with a local connection over time.	Draft status of housing target figure noted. No changes required. Support noted. The potential for the removal of the DDB proposed in the Options Consultation could have wider implications in terms of the delivery of affordable housing via rural exception sites, which is the vehicle currently noted in the Plan as likely to deliver such housing. If taken forward the draft flexible settlement strategy would apply to all Tier 1 - 3 settlements (including Bradford Abbas), with exceptions only likely to be made for recently made neighbourhood plan which include allocations for new homes. This could

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				allow sites of up to 30 homes on land that is adjacent to the edge of the built-up area – and whilst this may provide some affordable homes, it is not yet clear at what proportion or whether this would be the case for small sites of up to 10 homes. Given the uplift in land value, this change may significantly diminish the likelihood of a landowners progressing a rural exception site for affordable housing. It would therefore be appropriate to note this potential problem and the need to consider reviewing the Plan to allocate one or more affordable housing exception sites, and reinstate the DDB, should this be considered a more appropriate strategy for the area. <i>Update section 5.2 to explain the uncertainty regarding DDB in light of possible changes to the Local Plan.</i>
Local resident	5	Policy 9	There are better places to put houses	The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to meet local needs arising from within the parish, and does not look to allocate large areas of land for housing.
Local resident	5	Policy 9	There is a need for social housing. If other forms of affordable housing are built then this should be 2 bed bungalow style only.	This is broadly reflected in the policy.
Dorset Council	6	6.3.1	The Babylon Hill site was assessed against the SHLAA criteria for residential development rather than for employment. Following further discussion with Dorset Council, they have confirmed that the Land at Babylon Hill	Noted – given the site does not appear to have been actively promoted for employment or mixed uses, it is agreed that it would not be reasonable to reference it as such in the Plan. <i>Amend paragraph to reflect that no sites had been promoted for</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			(LA/BRAB/001) was originally submitted by Alder King on behalf of Hallam Land Management in October 2019 through the call for sites for residential development (for 250-450 dwellings), and subsequently by David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land in March 2021 through the Local Plan consultation, December 2024 call for sites and October 2025 Local Plan consultation, all for residential development (450 dwellings).	<i>employment uses via the Local Plan call for sites.</i>
Dorset Council	6	Policy 10	It would be helpful to clarify what is meant by local businesses, services and facilities. This could be achieved by reference to the use class order or by providing a definition in the supporting text or glossary of terms.	Having reviewed the nature of local businesses, services and facilities operating in the Neighbourhood Plan area, the use of use class order definitions is not considered particularly helpful, compared to the criteria already applied through the policy. However the December 2025 draft NPPF does include some useful definitions of community uses and explains rural business development – and can be adapted to provide a useful and logical steer. <i>Include definition of local businesses, services and facilities (in the supporting text) as follows:</i> <i>What is meant by local businesses, services and facilities?</i> <i>For the purpose of this Plan, would include local shops, cafes, offices, workshops and similar premises that typically provide goods or services that local residents may use, or that would typically be used by visitors to the area, such as rural leisure and tourism facilities, as well as agricultural and other land-based businesses.</i>
Dorset Council	6	Policy 10	The requirement for an outbuilding or extension to remain available for business use ancillary to the primary	The same wording was found to be acceptable in the recent (February 2025) Fontmell Magna Neighbourhood

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			use as a dwelling would appear unreasonable as it would restrict homeowners from using their property for its primary use.	Plan (First Review). It would not prevent the outbuilding being used for other uses when no longer needed, so long as it could revert to an ancillary business use if the household were to need it.
Local resident	7	7.2 and associated maps	Highway safety issues – omission: the junction of Cross Road with Back Lane should be highlighted as dangerous. Need to have road markings on Back Lane "Slow" on approaching Cross Road junction.	Agreed. <i>Add 'dangerous junction' symbol at the junction of Back Lane and Cross Road, and provide a larger map for clarity.</i>
Barwick and Stoford Parish Council	7	Project P10	We would ask for your support in requesting a bridge widening at Stoford Bridge, Stoford. We have asked Somerset Council for the bridge to be widened and we understand that Dorset Council have blocked this request because they would need to part finance a widening project. Council money has to pay for frequent repairs due to it being damaged by too wide vehicles, and associated bridge closures.	It is unclear how this would be achieved given that the bridge is Grade II listed, and likelihood that such widening would harm its historic interest. <i>Amend supporting text to recognise the issues raised by Barwick and Stoford Parish Council but acknowledging that this is not easy to 'fix' given that Stoford Bridge is Grade II listed.</i> <i>Add 'road narrows' symbol at both bridges.</i>
Dorset Council	8	8.1.3	It may be worth noting that (unless Policy 12 is amended) the Design Code and Guidance document is for information purposes only, as a guide for planning applicants, and does not have the 'full weight' of a development plan. Given the scope of Policy 12, this may not be a concern.	Noted – this can be clarified by minor amendments to 8.1.3 and/or 8.2.1. The policy can also reference the Design Guidance and Codes specifically. <i>Amend supporting text to note that Policy 12 was informed by the AECOM work, which provides further information, but does not have the status of the development plan policy.</i> <i>Amend Policy 12: "...and have full regard to the guidance contained in sections 8.2 – 8.4 of this Plan (and as expanded on in the Bradford Abbas and Clifton Maybank Design Guidance and</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				<i>Codes, December 2023), relating to:"</i>
Dorset Council	8	8.2 – 8.4	Some of the paragraphs within sections 8.2 and 8.4 are worded with the phrasing 'should' which mean that any applicant is not required to implement this policy as the policy is only guidance. Consideration should be given to changing the phrase to 'must' or 'are required'.	The guidance, whilst intended to apply in most scenarios, may not be applicable in some limited circumstances due to extraordinary matters. The word "should" does not imply that the matter is optional, and developers are expected to use their best endeavours to comply with such requirements unless they are clearly unreasonable in those specific circumstances. Applicants who consider that their case is an exception must include information explaining the reasons why they consider such an exception should be made. <i>Add note in supporting text to clarify the above.</i>
Local resident	9	Appendix 2	It might be appropriate to add that James Buckman's grave is in the village churchyard.	Agreed <i>Update text accordingly.</i>
Dorset Council		HRA	Suggest that for completeness a new paragraph is added to the Plan similar to that recommended in the case of the North Cadbury and Yarlinton Examination (PM5): "Natural England has advised that, in light of the unfavourable condition of the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar Site, before determining a planning application that may give rise to additional phosphates within the Ramsar Site catchment, competent authorities (the local planning authority) should undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). This is to ensure mitigation measures are in place to address nutrient neutrality so the local planning authority is satisfied that the requirements of the Conservation of Species and	Agreed <i>Add Habitats Regulations Assessment text (as suggested) to the Plan.</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended) are met.”	

5 Proposed Local Green Spaces – Landowner Consultation

Appendix 6 provides copies of the documents referred to below.

- 5.1 Following the Regulation 14 Consultation between September and November 2025, concern was raised that the landowners of some of the proposed Local Green Spaces in the Pre-submission draft Plan had not responded to the consultation, and the working group could not be confident that they knew their land was being proposed for designation. To ensure full transparency and fairness, consultation letters were sent directly to these landowners in March 2026 to ensure they were aware of the proposals. Each letter was accompanied by the relevant pages of the draft Plan explaining why each site in question had been selected, together with a map showing the proposed LGS sites. Recipients were invited to respond either by letter or email to the Bradford Abbas Parish Clerk.
- 5.2 Letters were sent to the owners of:
- Rose and Crown PH Garden (freeholder and leaseholder)
 - Field south of Church Road and opposite the pub
 - Sports Club Field (Trustees)
 - St Mary’s Churchyard (Parochial Church Council).
- 5.3 No concerns had been raised by Bradford Abbas Parish Council which owns the recreation ground, or by Dorset Council which owns the school playing field, during the Regulation 14 Consultation. The owner of Gollops Ground, however, had already responded to the Regulation 14 Consultation by raising an objection. These landowners were therefore not included in the subsequent consultation.
- 5.4 The table below summarises the responses received from landowners during the Reg 14 and the March 2026 consultations in respect of the proposed Local Green Spaces:

Local Green Space	Respondent	Response
Gollops Ground	Private landowner	Objection. Land is private and requests removal from the Plan. There has never been permissive access to the land, and no recognised footpath along the river. <i>(Reg 14 consultation)</i>
Recreation Ground	Owned by Bradford Abbas Parish Council	No comment.
Rose & Crown PH garden	Private landowner	Objection. Could result in potential issues that could negatively impact the vitality and viability of the business. Further restrictions are not justified or required, site is well managed, an important community facility, and owners have no intention to develop it. <i>(March 2026 consultation)</i>
School playing field	Owned by Dorset Council	No concerns raised. <i>(Reg 14 consultation)</i>
Field opposite the Rose & Crown PH	Private landowner	Objection. It neither has access to nor view of the River Yeo, and does not have distinctive character. <i>(March 2026 consultation)</i>
Sports Club field	Trustees	Confirmed that the deed requires it to remain a green recreational space for the benefit of the village. <i>(Reg 14 Consultation)</i>

Local Green Space	Respondent	Response
St Mary's Churchyard	PCC	No comment.

- 5.5 The owner of Gollops Ground provided no substantial reason for the objection, claiming the designation is unnecessary and asserting that there has never been permissive access to the field to access the River Yeo. However, following the collection of evidence to disprove this claim, an application by Bradford Abbas Parish Council has recently resulted in the modification of the definitive map by Dorset Council, adding the footpath along the River Yeo at Gollops Ground. The landowner has now reinstated the riverside footpath. The contribution this field makes to the character of the village is beyond question; it offers views of the church and the river from the two footpaths that cross the site, and its designation is clearly warranted. It has therefore been retained in the Plan as a LGS.
- 5.6 The owners of the Rose & Crown PH provide an overview of relevant planning policy, all of which in fact appears to support the conservation of sites such as the pub garden in Bradford Abbas, making the LGS designation an entirely appropriate vehicle to achieve this. The owners claim the designation would result in potential issues but do not specify these beyond stating that it might negatively impact upon the vitality and viability of the business. This is an important point, as it is not in the community's interest for the business to fail. However, in the absence of any concrete evidence, it is firmly believed that the LGS designation would not damage the business and may in fact support it, by formally recognising what the owners themselves describe as an important community facility in part because it provides a view of the Church, and views southwards, as identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal.
- 5.7 The Rose & Crown PH garden overlooks the field directly to the south of Church Road, the owner of which has also objected to LGS designation. Again, the owner has provided no sound justification for the objection, other than disagreeing that the field has distinctive character, despite it forming part of an important and historic green swathe of land within the Conservation Area that connects the centre of the village to the River Yeo and permits views of the Dorset Downs to the south.
- 5.8 As part of the Regulation 14 Consultation, Dorset Council considered the proposed LGSs and concluded that "all proposed [LGS] sites are within close proximity to the communities they serve, demonstrably special to the local community, local in character and are not extensive tracts of land. No concerns are raised". Furthermore, there has been strong public support for the proposed LGS designations. The household survey results show that 86% of respondents supported the designation of Gollops Ground as a LGS, 91% supported the Rose & Crown PH garden, and 96% supported the field opposite the pub.
- 5.9 In light of the clear support from both Dorset Council and the public, and that no substantive objections have been received from landowners that would conflict with the criteria for designation of any of the proposed sites, it is considered that all Local Green Spaces as originally identified should be retained.