



MOTCOMBE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Regulation 16 Consultation 12 April to 24 May 2019

Response Form

The proposed Motcombe Neighbourhood Plan 2017 to 2027 has been submitted to Dorset Council for examination. The neighbourhood plan and all supporting documentation can be viewed on Dorset Council's website: www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/motcombe-neighbourhood-plan

Please return completed forms to:

Email: planningpolicyteam@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk

Post: Planning Policy, South Walks House, South Walks Road, Dorchester, DT1 1UZ

Deadline: 4pm on Friday 24 May 2019. Representations received after this date will not be accepted.

Part A – Personal Details

This part of the form must be completed by all people making representations as **anonymous comments cannot be accepted**. By submitting this response form you consent to your information being disclosed to third parties for this purpose, personal details will not be visible on our website, although they will be shown on paper copies that will be sent to the independent examiner and available for inspection. Your information will be retained by the Council in line with its retention schedule and privacy policy (www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/privacypolicy). Your data will be destroyed when the plan becomes redundant.

	Personal Details *	Agent's Details *
Title	Miss	
First Name	Harriet	
Last Name	Lucas	
Job Title(if relevant)	n/a	

Organisation (if relevant)	n/a	
Address	[REDACTED]	
Postcode	[REDACTED]	
Tel. No.	[REDACTED]	
Email Address	[REDACTED]	

**If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes to the personal details but complete the full contact details of the agent. All correspondence will be sent to the agent.*

Part B – Representation

1. To which document does the comment relate? *Please tick one box only.*

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Submission Plan
<input type="checkbox"/>	Consultation Statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Basic Conditions Statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other – please specify:-

2. To which part of the document does the comment relate? *Please identify the text that you are commenting on, where appropriate.*

	<i>Location of Text</i>
Whole document	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In particular MOT 9
Section	
Policy	
Page	
Appendix	

3. Do you wish to? *Please tick one box only.*

	Support
x	Object
	Make an observation

4. Please use the box below to give reasons for your support or objection, or to make your observation.

I/we formally challenge the validity and legality of the Motcombe Neighbourhood Plan, submitted by Motcombe Parish Council (MPC) for approval to be given for it to proceed to referendum, on the following grounds:

The primary response referendum offered to the village was only taken up by 10% of residents, and the subsequent options stage had even fewer responses, numbering only 120 residents. This was in major part due to the fact that, whilst the Draft Plan available was very well presented by MPC at its open sessions, the opportunity for respondents to be actively involved in the emergence of the Plan was not made clear, contrary to paragraph 080 of guidance given by the Secretary of State. Attendants at the sessions were encouraged to submit their responses before they left, totally inadequate time to give an advised response, and it was not explained that their responses should have been the initiation of proper engagement and consultation in the forming of the Plan. Many residents who did take response forms away were given the same impression, and did not bother to return them. In layman's terms, they were not advised that their responses could, would, and should have made a difference to the Plan, again contrary to guidance given by the Secretary of State. Added to the already ambiguous choice of responses, which were that you either supported the Plan, supported it with "minor changes" (which would count as supporting anyway), or did not support it, the advice of MPC was that "a Plan was needed, and if it did not get passed, the village would be worse off, so would have no control over planning, and (North Dorset Council would allow houses to be built anywhere"!

However, but still with this in mind, 120 responses were returned, and of these, 4 were totally against the Draft Plan, and 39 (a significant 32.5%) respectfully acknowledged that whilst a Plan was needed, it required "substantial" changes, specifically the removal of Site 4 (MOT 9). These changes were explained in detail with professional qualification, on the rightful understanding that guidance given by the Secretary of State would be implemented by MPC. This was not the case, and despite numerous vigorous requests for this consultation, all were ignored by MPC. It should have been acknowledged by MPC that 68.3% of respondents voted that at least some minor changes were needed, and these should have been consulted upon and the Plan amended to reflect the responses. This was not the case.

HOWEVER, changes were made to the Draft Plan prior to submission, not due to any response consultation with residents, but rather with Landowners and/or their agents (and specifically Wyatt Homes) all of which have resulted in MPC facilitating easement of the conditions and criteria which residents have been led to believe have been set in the Plan. One important example, of many, is "that developments should not be considered where it was not possible to walk safely to the centre of the village and/or its amenities". At the

request of Wyatt Homes, "as far as practical" has been added. (417/MOT 9) It is impossible to provide pavements from Shires Meadow to the Village and dangerous to walk without pavements.

It is evident, and can be proven, that MPC has individually, and wrongly removed suitable sites, for example Sites 15, 16, 17, and specifically Site 13 (Shorts Green Farm), all of which meet most, if not all, proposal criteria, whilst then promoting Site 4 (Shires Meadow) which does not, undoubtedly allowing itself to succumb to lobbying from Wyatt Homes, which already has a 5 year option to purchase this particular site. We believe Wyatt Homes have had undue influence on MPC to promote their interest in Shires Meadow.

The Secretary of State guidelines for the drawing up of Neighbourhood Plans is very clear, both in paragraph 047 and 080, that the process MUST allow members of the community to be actively involved in shaping the emerging Plan, and must specifically invite active discussion, and therefore consult with, members who were particularly affected by its proposals. No residents directly affected by Site 4 have had the courtesy of direct contact with MPC.

It goes without saying that the importance of this cannot be understated, along with all the important criteria in the Plan that are supposed to protect the village, and its residents, as well as providing for its future needs.

MPC misled respondents into thinking that to question, challenge, suggest changes to, or indeed oppose the Draft Plan as it was presented, would result in Motcombe not having a Plan.

SUMMARY: Motcombe Parish Council has not followed advice given by the Secretary of State, and has failed to follow key stages in neighbourhood planning, in that those living and working in the area, and those with an interest in, or affected by the proposals were not consulted or engaged with properly, or at any time.

PROPOSAL: The Plan submitted, and in its present form, is returned to Motcombe Parish Council so as to receive proper and due process with residents of the village, after which it can be resubmitted.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

5. Please give details of any suggested modifications in the box below.

Specifically removal of Site 4 in accordance with the many objections which have been totally ignored and replacement with a more suitable site.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

6. Do you wish to be notified of Dorset Council's decision to make or refuse to make the neighbourhood plan? Please tick one box only.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No

Signature: _____

Date: 18.05.19

If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.