

# INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE SHAFTESBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FIRST REVIEW

EXAMINER: Andrew Mead BSc (Hons) MRTPI MIQ

Examination Ref: 02/AM/SNP

Sybille Maddock  
Interim Town Clerk to Shaftesbury Town Council

Philip Reese  
Senior Planning Policy Officer  
Dorset Council

25 February 2026

Via email

Dear Ms Maddock and Mr Reese

Having carried out my visit to the Shaftesbury Neighbourhood Plan First Review (SNP) Area, I have identified some matters on which clarification from Shaftesbury Town Council (STC) and Dorset Council (DC) would assist me in my examination of the SNP. May I request the submission of responses to my questions by **18 March 2026**. In the event that you wish to request an extension to this target date, please contact the IPe office team.

## Questions to Shaftesbury Town Council (STC) and Dorset Council (DC)

There are eleven questions to STC and DC listed below. These questions are posed in the context of establishing whether the SNP meets the Basic Conditions and is legally compliant. The questions are seeking either clarification, confirmation of amended policy wording, or updating Appendices. Given that the report will include Examiner Modifications rather than Recommended Modifications<sup>1</sup>, I would be grateful if STC and DC could submit a **Statement of Common Ground** in which all the answers to the questions are agreed between the Councils where possible or, if appropriate, where the failure to agree is fully explained.

### Policy SFTC4

- 1. Q to STC.** I note the comments of DC in the Regulation 16 representation and agree that Policy SFTC4 in the First Review Plan is the same as that in the made Plan. Therefore, is the final sentence in the STC Modification Statement Chapter 2 The Town Centre incorrect?

### Settlement boundary

- 2. Q to STC and DC.** Following the comments of DC, it might be appropriate to update the settlement boundary where development has occurred and where planning permissions have been granted. However, I recognise that the settlement boundary could then extend beyond the boundary of the Plan area. It may be preferable for any updating of the boundary to take place in the Dorset Local Plan. Nevertheless, I would be pleased to have the comments of both Councils, and should they agree on updating the boundary, I would be grateful if a revised boundary could be agreed and an appropriate illustrative plan submitted that I could refer to in an Examiner Modification.

---

<sup>1</sup> Recommended Modifications may be rejected by the local planning authority, provided reasons are given. Examiner Modifications must be accepted in order for a neighbourhood plan review to be made (adopted).

- 3. Q to STC.** Please could the references to the Land at Higher Blandford Road and the ATS Euromaster Site be updated in the light of the comments from DC (See page 12 of the Plan)?

#### **Policy SFHE1**

- 4. Q to STC and DC.** Taking into account the representations by DC, my suggestions for rephrasing Policy SFHE1 are given below and on which I would be grateful for the comments of both Councils.

Amend the first paragraph to: *“Sufficient land has been identified within the Neighbourhood Plan which, if delivered, together with the extant ....”*.

Amend the third paragraph to: *“Given the identified supply exceeds the current housing need requirement, applications for residential development outside the settlement boundary will only be supported where they are consistent with policies in the Local Plan.”*

#### **Policies SFHE 1c, SFG13 and SFG14**

- 5. Q to STC.** DC has suggested two amendments to Policy SFHE 1c and an amendment each to Policy SFG13 and Policy SFG14 about which I would be pleased to have the comments of STC.

#### **Policy SFDH1**

- 6. Q to STC.** DC comments that some built up parts of the Plan area are not included in a character zone and queries whether Policy SFDH1 would apply to them and how it would apply. I would be pleased to have comments from STC.

#### **Policy SFDH4**

- 7. Q to STC.** I note the comments of DC about the substitution of a sentence in Policy SFDH4 and would be pleased to have the comments from STC on whether the inclusion would be acceptable.

#### **Policy SFDH5**

- 8. Q to STC and DC.** DC has suggested moving the reference to LTN 1/20 from Policy SFDH1 to the supporting text or to make it a requirement for larger schemes because of the length of the document. I consider that LTN 1/20 is extremely useful guidance for cycle infrastructure design; parking is dealt with only at pages 132-139, which is far less than the DC residential parking standards documentation. Therefore, given that the theme of the section and Policy SFDC5 is parking provision, I suggest that LTN 1/20 is not discarded from the policy, but that the “cycle parking provision” is qualified by “where appropriate”, thereby resulting in the phrase: *“... and taking account of LTN 1/20 guidance on cycle parking provision, where appropriate.”* I would be pleased to have comments from both STC and DC on this suggestion.

#### **Policy SFDH7**

- 9. Q to STC.** I would be pleased to have clarification of what constitute “high sustainability credentials” and whether Policy SFDC7 should be expanded slightly to include this clarification?

## Land at Wincombe Land

**10. Q to STC and DC.** A representation by Nightingale Land seeks the allocation of land at Wincombe Lane for residential development. I would be pleased to receive comments from both Councils on the merits of the proposal.

## Appendices L and N

**11. Q to STC and DC.** DC has suggested that Appendices L and N could be updated, which seems sensible. I would be grateful if STC and DC could agree updating information in Appendices L and N and any others which would be appropriate.

In the interests of transparency, may I prevail upon you to ensure a copy of this letter is placed on the Town Council and Dorset Council websites.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Yours sincerely

*Andy Mead*

Examiner