

Motcombe Neighbourhood Plan

Pre-Submission Consultation: 17 October to 30 November 2018

The following summarises the main issues raised by consultees regarding the pre-submission consultation by Motcombe Parish Council. The following statutory and other consultees were directly contacted for their input at this stage:

| Local Councils Consultees | Response | Other Statutory Consultees | Response | Local Service Providers | Response |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|
| - Dorset County Council | ✓ | - Environment Agency | | - Motcombe School | ✓ |
| - North Dorset District Council | ✓ | - Historic England | ✓ | - Memorial Hall Trustees | ✓ |
| - Wiltshire (Unitary) Council | | - Natural England | ✓ | - Port Regis School | ✓ |
| - Mere Town Council | | - Cranborne AONB Team | ✓ | - | |
| - Gillingham Town Council | | - Network Rail Infrastructure | ✓ | - | |
| - The Stours Group Parish Council | | - Highways England | ✓ | - | |
| - Shaftesbury Town Council | ✓ | - Scottish & Southern Energy | | - | |
| - Melbury Abbas & Cann Parish Council | | - Southern Gas Network | | - | |
| - Donhead St Mary Parish Council | | - Wessex Water | ✓ | - | |
| - Donhead St Andrew Parish Council | | - | | - | |

Response forms were also received from local residents and written responses were received from the following parties:

- Wyatt Homes (working with the owners of the land adjacent Shires Meadow, Motcombe Road)
- Bittles Green and Frog Lane Group (comprising 41 local residents, the majority who also submitted separate response forms indicating that they would like to see substantial changes) including a report from Planning Base Ltd

In total, 131 responses were received from residents, landowners/agents and other local/statutory bodies.

On the final question of the response form (please indicate if you support the plan as drafted, generally support the plan but would like to see some minor changes, or do not support the plan / I consider it needs fundamental changes), The results showed the following pattern of support:

- 38 responses: support the Plan as drafted
- 39 responses: generally support the Plan but would like to see some minor changes
- 39 responses: generally support the Plan but would like to see 'substantial' changes (residents had changed the wording on the response form from 'minor' to 'substantial')
- 4 responses: do not support the Plan.

Pre-Submission Consultation Summary

The following summarises the key points raised and suggested way forward

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| 0 General | We are satisfied that they are unlikely to result in development which would adversely affect the SRN and we therefore have no specific comments to make. | Highways England | Support noted. |
| 0 General | There are no issues upon which we wish to comment other than to congratulate your community on its progress to date and to wish it well in the making of its Plan. | Historic England | Support noted. |
| 0 General | Shaftesbury Town Council congratulate you on the work put into the plan and have no concerns about the content at all. | Shaftesbury Town Council | Support noted. |
| 0 General | We do not have any comments. | Wessex Water | Support noted. |
| 0 General | Supports plan as drafted. | Motcombe Primary School | Support noted. |
| 0 General | It would be premature to proceed with the preparation of this Plan whilst the District Council cannot prove a five year rolling housing supply | Bittles Green and Frog Lane Group | <p>Changes can still be made prior to submission in light of any planning decisions. Progressing the Neighbourhood Plan that includes housing site allocations should become influential in planning decisions (despite the absence of a 5 year housing supply) particularly once the Neighbourhood Plan has been examined and approval given for it to proceed to referendum.</p> <p>There is no requirement for an up-to-date Local Plan to be in place prior to developing a Neighbourhood Plan, as confirmed by <i>BDW Trading Ltd. v. Cheshire West & Chester Borough Council</i> [2014] EWHC 1470 (Admin) and <i>R (Gladman Developments Ltd.) v. Aylesbury Vale District Council</i> [2014] EWHC 4323.</p> |
| 1.02 | Suggest that the Local Plan is referred to as the 'North Dorset Local Plan Part 1' in the first instance to avoid ambiguity particularly given the Dorset council's merger in April 2019 when the new authority will be responsible for multiple local plans. Also in the | North Dorset District Council | <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Proposed change – amend references as suggested.</p> |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|---------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| | penultimate sentence clarify that the strategy is (not was)... | | |
| 1.09 / 1.19 | The Introduction refers to views in and around the village. Identifying those views at this stage could be valuable when considering a future development proposal. It could also be useful to identify key views towards the AONB that could help emphasise the location of Motcombe within the setting of this AONB. | Cranborne AONB Team | <p>Agree that it would be appropriate to include a policy on the importance of local views, which could be added to section 3. It would be difficult to provide a definitive list of all the key views, however examples can be given.</p> <p>Proposed change – add new policy (using similar wording to Holwell’s examined plan – that “The design and layout of development should minimise adverse impacts on views from public rights of way over open countryside and preserve and enhance such views where possible.”) and supporting text identifying examples of such views.</p> |
| 1.19 / Policies Map | The Plan entitled ‘Policies Map – wider area’ could usefully show the Specific local needs identified include: AONB | Cranborne AONB Team | <p>Noted – however it would then be appropriate to show all the other constraints (such as Listed Buildings, Conservation Area, flood risk areas, SSSIs etc) which would complicate the map.</p> <p>Proposed change – make clear on the map that this does not include other national or local plan policy designations, and include AONB designation on NP area map.</p> |
| 1.24 | Consider increasing the plan period to 2031 to ensure that you are in general conformity with the Local Plan. See para 5.2-5.4 on the Examiner's Report into the Pimperne NP for recent thinking on plan periods. | North Dorset District Council | A longer plan period to coincide with the adopted Local Plan was considered but dismissed given the uncertainty over the Shorts Green Farm planning application, and the fact that the Neighbourhood Plan is likely to be reviewed within 5 years providing a further opportunity to allocate sites when the Local Plan has been reviewed. There is no legal or conformity requirement for the two timescales to coincide. The Pimperne Examiner only expressed an opinion as to whether the plan period proposed for that area (which did go to 2031) should align to the emerging Local Plan (ie to 2033) and did not consider such a change was necessary for conformity. |
| 3 | The AONB would also encourage the inclusion of a policy that prevents light pollution. Suggested wording | Cranborne AONB | In response to the earlier household questionnaire, there were mixed views on lighting, with 11% indicating that |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|---------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| | <p>provided:</p> <p>Dark Skies</p> <p>In considering new development, the first factor to consider is whether external lighting is necessary. If there is a case for its inclusion (for example for security or safety reasons), its design should minimise its impact, both on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties, and in terms of light spillage and glare. Timed PIR lights, down-lighters or 'wall washers' are examples of lighting schemes that generally have less impact.</p> <p>Policy MOTXX - Dark Skies</p> <p>Development should be designed to conserve and enhance the intrinsic quality of the dark night skies. Lighting which is proposed to be installed should meet or exceed the level of protection appropriate to Environmental Zone 1 (as defined by the Institution of Lighting Professionals), with the addition that external lighting should not exceed a correlated colour temperature (CCT) of 3000K.</p> | Team | <p>there is already too much street lighting in the village, 62% that the lighting was sufficient, 14% were unsure whether more lighting was needed in the village and 13% more certain of their opinion that there should be more street lighting within the village.</p> <p>The Dark Skies map www.nightblight.cpre.org.uk illustrates the light pollution impact from Gillingham and Shaftesbury and how much more the AONB benefits from dark skies. The policy suggested by the AONB appears to strike an appropriate balance between protecting dark skies as far as practical but recognising that where it is necessary it can and should be designed to minimise light pollution.</p> <p>Proposed change – add Dark Skies policy and supporting text to section 3 of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> |
| 3.01 / MOT1 | <p>“Specific local needs identified include:...” ... “This should include contributions towards the above identified requirements...” - these appear to be projects rather than needs / requirements. For example, insufficient play facilities for the village children would suggest a need, upgrading the play area at the Memorial Hall is a project to address that need.</p> | North Dorset District Council | Noted – amend second paragraph of Policy MOT1 to refer to “Specific local projects to address identified needs include:...” |
| 3.01 / MOT1 | <p>Policy 27 in the Local Plan Part 1 (2016) already offers a level of protection for community facilities – there is no need to duplicate policies.</p> | North Dorset District Council | <p>The policy is more detailed than the generic policy in the Local Plan and similar supplementary policies have been accepted by Examiners of the other North Dorset Neighbourhood Plans.</p> |

Pre-Submission Consultation Summary

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|---------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| 3.02 / MOT1 | As the Parish Council are already consulted on planning applications it would be useful to explain in the supporting text what else, if anything, is expected. | North Dorset District Council | Agreed. Proposed change – include supporting text to confirm that consultation on proposals affecting community facility should where possible be undertaken by the applicant prior to submitting an application (although there is no legal requirement at present for such pre-application requirement). Parish Council comments should be respectfully considered. |
| 3.05 / MOT1 | The relocation of the village shop would not be necessary to make housing development acceptable and therefore S.106 money cannot be spent on this (ref NPPF para 56) | North Dorset District Council | Noted. Proposed change – amend final sentence of third paragraph to read “This should include contributions towards the above projects where applicable to that application, and the consideration of any other needs that may be identified in consultation with the Parish Council.” |
| 3.06 / MOT1 | Additional parking for the school and church are urgently needed – ideally to the west, with a safe pathway and at least spaces for 50 cars. | Motcombe Primary School | A local landowner has indicated that they may be willing to consider working with the Parish Council to deliver a suitable scheme, subject to funding and viability. This will require further discussion and exploration. It is not considered that this will set a precedent and it this stage it is difficult to specify whether it would involve a park and stride solution. Proposed change – add informative text that the Parish Council would welcome proposals to provide a viable solution to this issue, and include information on the level of provision ideally required as indicated by the school. |
| 3.06 / MOT1 | Whilst we appreciate the local issues at the school which the policy is seeking to address, the Highway Authority would be concerned if improved parking provision to serve the Primary School set a precedent at other schools - we are however supportive of park and stride where appropriate and safe. | Dorset County Council | |
| 3.16 / MOT4 | Natural England welcomes the inclusion of this policy | Natural England | Support noted. |
| 3.16 / MOT4 | Need to clarify what would improve the enjoyment of a space, as this may otherwise be ambiguous – alternatively consider similar wording to Gillingham NP Policy 22. | North Dorset District Council | Similar wording to this (“Other than in very special circumstances, no development may take place which would harm the enjoyment of these spaces or would undermine their importance”) has been accepted in the examination of the Fontmell Magna Neighbourhood Plan. |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|---------------|--|---|--|
| 3.17 / MOT4 | NPPF para 100 states that LGS cannot be an 'extensive tract of land'. At 10 hectares it is questionable whether Motcombe Meadows meets this criteria. | North Dorset District Council | Although measuring at just over 10ha this is not considered extensive in the context of the parish (which is just under 2,000ha – and altogether the three LGS designations would cover less than 0.7% of the Neighbourhood Plan area). Furthermore the area is public open space donated to the Parish (as describe in the supporting text). |
| 3.18 / MOT4 | The Recreation Ground was left on trust to the village largely for recreational use by its inhabitants, and concerned that there may be a conflict between existing or possible future conditions / restrictions on the use of the land as a Local Green Space and the trust duty to use it for recreational purposes. | Motcombe Memorial Hall and Recreation Ground Trustees | The area designated as LGS does not include the entire site (with the area closest to the settlement and including the play area excluded) in order to ensure that there is flexibility to provide for the built recreational needs if appropriate. Proposed change – for consistency St Mary's Churchyard should also be included as a Local Green Space given that it meets the criteria and there is evidence from the 2017 household survey that it is locally valued as a green space. |
| 3.20 / MOT4 | Include MOT 9 (land adjoining Shire Meadows) as a green space | Local residents (41 comments) | The Household Questionnaire asked "If there are any other areas in the parish that are important green spaces, please list them below". Of the 293 questionnaire returned, this area in general was only mentioned in 8 responses, suggesting that it is not particularly valued by most local residents for a specific reason (but only suggested as a Local Green Space at this stage due to the proposal for it to be developed). |
| 3.22 / Map | Map needs a key / legend. | North Dorset District Council | Agreed. Proposed change – add key / legend as suggested. |
| 3.22 / MOT5 | Natural England welcomes the inclusion of this policy | Natural England | Support noted. |
| 3.23 / MOT5 | Gillingham NP Policy 6 encourages additional woodland planting in the GRF area – would it be useful to have something similar as the area designated by the Local Plan spans both parishes? | North Dorset District Council | Agreed that it would be appropriate to better reflect the GRF proposals, and although it does not commit local landowners to the project it does encourage and would result in biodiversity, recreational and cultural benefits. |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| 3.23 / MOT5 | Limit access to woods; plant more trees | Local residents (4 comments) | Proposed change – amend Policy MOT5 by the addition of wording similar to GNP Policy 6(a) “Proposals that enhance the landscape and low-key recreational use of the countryside in keeping with the character of the area will be supported, particularly through the provision of additional woodland planting in the Gillingham Royal Forest area.” Add informative supporting text that there is no Parish Council land within the Gillingham Royal Forest area suitable for further woodland planting, but the Parish Council would encourage local landowners to identify opportunities for further woodland planting on their land. |
| 3.24 / MOT6 | Natural England welcomes the inclusion of this policy | Natural England | Support noted. |
| 3.24 / MOT6 | Need wildlife corridors/biodiversity/community wildlife group/nest boxes | Local residents (7 comments) | |
| 3.25 / MOT6 and MOT9(d) | Policy MOT6 duplicates requirements already set out with regard to the need for submission of an approved Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan. We would suggest that the policy is not therefore necessary. | Wyatt Homes | This is not currently a policy requirement or specifically mentioned in the Local Plan, and therefore is appropriate to include as a policy. This has been supported at examination in the Fontmell Magna and other North Dorset Neighbourhood Plans. |
| 3.26 / MOT6(d) | How are you defining a pond? With this policy, if someone creates a pond in their garden it immediately impacts on all their neighbours. This seems unreasonable and would likely discourage the creation of new ponds. | North Dorset District Council | <p>A pond is noted in the advice to LPAs (https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/countryside-coast-parks/countryside-management/biodiversity/pdfs/biodiversity-appraisal-survey-request-flow-chart.pdf) as a semi-natural habitat whose presence should be considered when determining whether an ecological survey should be carried out. The 10m buffer is considered to be a relatively low threshold given protected species such as Great Crested Newts have much greater range from ponds.</p> <p>Proposed change – amend final criteria to read “works within 10 metres of a pond or watercourse or having the potential to affect any known ecological interests associated with nearby waterbodies.”</p> |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|---------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| 4.02 / MOT7 | House completions are whole numbers. The policy could be better expressed as “The plan supports the delivery of X number of homes over the plan period.” The supporting text could add that this results in an average delivery rate of 3 to 4 dwellings a year – although you may get 10 completions one year and none for the next two years (for example). | North Dorset District Council | Noted. The policy can be amended to make clearer that this is an average over the plan period. However it is not felt necessary to round the annual figure (or express it as a range) purely for monitoring purposes. Proposed change – amend first sentence of MOT7 to read “The amount of housing growth supported is intended to deliver in the region of 3.6 dwellings per annum, averaged over the plan period.” |
| 4.02 / MOT7 | The housing figure of 285 dwellings per annum (dpa) in the adopted North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (January 2016) is a minimum target. The North Dorset Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation (November 2017) proposes a 28% increase in the housing target from 285 dpa to 366 dpa to take account of the latest local housing need assessment figure using the standard method in national planning guidance. To ensure a robust plan it would be helpful to ensure that this increase is taken into account within the NP housing requirement figure, which throughout the document should also be referred to as ‘at least’ to be consistent with the reference at paragraph 60 of the NPPF to housing requirement figures being a minimum. | Wyatt Homes | The highest (2014-based Government projections) proposing 366dpa have yet to be tested through the Local Plan examination but have been used as the basis of the 3.6 homes a year in the Neighbourhood Plan – exceeding the pro-rata equivalent minimum target set in the adopted Local Plan which equates to the 2.8 homes a year. This increase has therefore been taken into account. Para 60 of the NPPF relates to strategic policies and does not therefore apply to Neighbourhood Plan policies. Given that paragraph 3.40 of the supporting text to the Local Plan Policy 2 explains that “In the recent past, housing development in the rural areas significantly exceeded planned rates, yet did not always enable rural facilities to be retained or enhanced. The Council does not want to see this unsustainable spatial distribution of development repeated.” implies that a minimum target that could be mis-interpreted as allowing any level of growth in excess would in itself raise a potential conformity issue. |
| 4.02 / MOT7 | Conformity issue with policy 8 (affordable housing) of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (NDLP) which requires development of eleven or more net additional dwellings to contribute towards affordable housing and acknowledges, in line with government policy, that this figure may be reduced if it can be demonstrated not to be viable at the planning application stage. | Wyatt Homes | The Local Plan Policy was modified at its examination on the basis of the Written Ministerial Statement dated 28th November 2014 when it was confirmed (among other things) that affordable housing contributions on sites of 10 units or less should not be sought. This element of the WMS has now been superseded by the revised NPPF, to which the Neighbourhood Plan must have due regard. |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|---------------|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>However it would be appropriate to refer briefly to the approach to be taken if the proposed mix would be unviable, as set out in the Local Plan and paragraph 57 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Proposed change – add paragraph “The viability assessments underpinning the adopted Local Plan suggested that in villages like Motcombe, it should be possible to build 40% of homes of larger sites as affordable. If site-specific constraints or circumstances mean this amount of affordable housing is not possible (confirmed by an ‘open book’ economic appraisal), then a different mix that maximises the number of locally needed affordable homes may be accepted.”</p> |
| 4.03 / MOT7 | <p>The suggested market housing mix within draft policy MOT7 (paragraph 4.5 also refers to it being unlikely that further 4 bedroom or larger homes will be needed) differs quite significantly from that set out within policy 7 of the NDLP, which was based on the Eastern Dorset Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The provision of apartments is not likely to be appropriate on sites such as that allocated via policy MOT9. Suggest that the third paragraph of policy MOT7 be revised as: “The type and size of open market housing should provide a mix of homes to include, in appropriate locations, apartments or terraced properties, including those designed for age-ready housing.”</p> | Wyatt Homes, Bittles Green and Frog Lane Group | <p>The mix suggested through the Eastern Dorset Strategic Housing Market Assessment applies across urban and rural settlements and therefore although a useful starting point does need to be considered in the context of the current provision in Motcombe (as identified through the last Census) which shows a marginally lower proportion of households with 5 or more people (compared to North Dorset), and a much higher proportion of dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms.</p> <p>Apartments can be appropriate to a rural area if carefully designed and need not be urban-style flats. For example, Motcombe Grange has effectively been sub-divided into 31 apartments on a site of approximately 1.5ha. This can be clarified in the text.</p> <p>Proposed change – amend first sentence of paragraph 4.4 to read “The open market housing provided should be a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom homes to include, if appropriate to the site, a significant proportion of apartments (designed in a manner appropriate to a rural area, such as a subdivided gentry-style building) and terraced properties (typically cottages)...”</p> |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| 4.03 / MOT7 and MOT12 | The perceived need for housing in and around this AONB is for affordable dwellings. The AONB Partnership does, therefore, support the approach of the Motcombe Neighbourhood Plan to focus on the provision of smaller and affordable homes. | Cranborne AONB Team | Support noted. |
| 4.12 | <p>The land at Shorts Green Farm should be reinstated as an allocated site for housing development</p> <p>The site has been omitted due to concerns of theoretical flood risk of 1 in a 1000 years. However, as part of the planning application submitted for this site (2/2018/0057/OUT) it has been indicated that adequate flood mitigation measures to satisfy 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 years can be provided. As part of this or any subsequent planning application a requirement can be included for the necessary and acceptable flood mitigation measures to be implemented.</p> <p>Including this site would not result in an excessive housing supply over a 10 year period. Development of this site would not physically overwhelm the village and the site allows scope for a design in a traditional form and layout in line with the village character . If necessary development could also be phased over a period of time.</p> | Bittles Green and Frog Lane Group Local residents (48 comments) | <p>The reason for this site's exclusion is clearly explained in paragraph 4.12. In essence, a significant part of the site is within a flood risk area and Government guidance is clear that development in such locations should be avoided where alternative sites at lesser risk are available, before mitigations measures can be taken into account. It is clearly the case that there are other potential sites which should therefore be preferred, and that the inclusion of this site would raise a significant conformity issue. However it may be useful to cover the implications to the plan if the site were to be approved (contrary to expectation).</p> <p>Proposed change – amend supporting text to clarify that if approval were to be given, the Parish Council would consider the implications of the decision on the plan.</p> |
| 4.12 | Some development at Sherborne Causeway should be considered as this location benefits from being located on the A30 and within much easier reach of Shaftesbury compared to any site being put forward in the draft Plan. Sherborne Causeway has more than 140 dwellings and is in lots of ways a more sustainable settlement than Motcombe village. | Bittles Green and Frog Lane Group | <p>A search for UPRN (unique postal addresses) on the Causeway within the parish identify 48 entries, of which 37 were residential (including 13 park homes).</p> <p>The underlying evidence on the Local Plan clearly shows that settlements with populations of less than 400 residents are relatively unsustainable and would require significant growth and facilities to change this. Policy 2 of the Local Plan makes clear that in such areas development will be strictly controlled unless it is required to enable essential rural needs to be met.</p> |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| 4.12 | Port Regis School has a site which could be considered under potential development sites for housing, retirement, etc. It is accessed via Motcombe, a lane close to the primary school. It opens out into a Victorian walled garden. | Port Regis School | The site has not been formally submitted for assessment, but is considered unlikely to be preferable to the allocated sites based on access (it is accessed from the village via a single access track for about 250m that floods on occasion). |
| 4.16 / MOT8 | 1st bullet "site allocations" – consider adding "as detailed in Policies 9 to 11/12" to give the reader certainty what allocations you are referring to. | North Dorset District Council | Agreed. Proposed change – amend references as suggested. |
| 4.16 / MOT8 | Policy MOT8 should be re-expressed more clearly in the following manner (and the existing text of the policy retained as supportive text): Locational criteria for new housing development New housing development should only take place within the designated village settlement boundary as shown in the Neighbourhood Plan. | Bittles Green and Frog Lane Group | The suggested text would not reflect national guidance and Local Plan policies which does allow some development in the countryside including the conversion of existing buildings and rural workers' dwellings where an essential need is proven. |
| 4.16 / MOT8 | Sites of biodiversity need greater protection | Local residents (38 comments) | Site allocations have had a biodiversity survey to ensure that they are not of particular interest, and Policy MOT6 provides further assurance that development should enhance biodiversity, through an understanding of the wildlife interest that may be affected by development, and the inclusion of measures that will secure an overall biodiversity gain |
| 4.17 / MOT9 4.19 / MOT10 4.21 / MOT11 | Quote the site reference number used on the Policy Map in order to give certainty as to which site you are referring to. Consider providing the estimated number of houses on each site. | North Dorset District Council | Agreed. Proposed change – amend references as suggested, including an indication of numbers in the policy (as per Table 5) but caveated that the number is based on achieving an appropriate density. |
| 4.17 / MOT9 | In order to maximise the benefits that development of this site can bring to the local community, including provision of affordable housing, and to make best use of the land available, consideration should be given to extending the proposed site allocation southwards | Wyatt Homes | The development of a larger area as suggested by Wyatts Homes would mean that the development was not linear and therefore would not appear as an incremental, organic change in keeping with the village character. The land also rises to the south (before dipping again) and |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|--------------------|--|--|---|
| | <p>(plan attached) to enable the provision of between 20 and 25 dwellings (at a density of up to 15 dwellings per hectare).</p> <p>Welcome the reference to ‘as far as practical’ within criterion e) but would also suggest that “and viable” is added.</p> | | <p>development to the rear would therefore be more prominent in the landscape. Local residents have also made clear that they would prefer smaller sites (up to 15 houses) and the majority of those responding to the household survey considered larger sites to be generally unacceptable.</p> <p>The wording ‘as far as practical’ is considered to encompass tests of viability (and deliverability).</p> |
| <p>4.17 / MOT9</p> | <p>Question legitimacy of including the site as an allocation.</p> <p>The meadow provides a special character to the southern end of the village – one of openness with the low hedges allowing wide-ranging views to passers-by and could be considered for LGS designation.</p> <p>It is not ideally positioned in relation to the services and facilities that are located in more central and northern parts of Motcombe. The route to The Street is not easily navigable, particularly in darkness, and this situation cannot readily be made good with pedestrian enhancements. The supporting text and the policy should be amended to make the provision of a safe pedestrian footpath an essential requirement of any development. There are no physical constraints for including footways within the site as the site is sufficiently large to accommodate such provision. There is also a need to include when the footways should be completed.</p> <p>The draft Plan discounts large parts of the village for infill on heritage and flood risk grounds when sensitive and small scale developments would make a valuable contribution to housing supply. It would be prudent and appropriate to make sure that any necessary appropriate flood mitigation measures.</p> | <p>Bittles Green and Frog Lane Group Local residents (60 comments)</p> | <p>With approximately 60 of the 120 responses not supporting the inclusion of Site 4, there is significant local opposition to development on this site (and the comments indicate that this objection could not be easily remedied by changes to the policy criteria). The responses from this consultation represent approximately 10% of the local population – fewer than those responding to the options stage (which had about 200 responses) which showed that there was majority support (albeit less than the alternatives sites allocated or for the site at Shorts Green Farm).</p> <p>However the site does perform comparatively well against the assessment criteria, compared to alternatives that have been rejected. It is not considered to be of greater local value as a green space or view than other areas of countryside around the village. The site is within the village, having development to either side, and being within the 30mph speed limit. Although pedestrian access into the centre is not ideal, the road is generally of sufficient width to accommodate measures to improve pedestrian safety (and improvements are sought as part of the policy, allowing various options to be considered as far as these would be reasonable and necessary for the development to happen – as they cannot otherwise be conditioned). The stretch of road between The Street and Frog Lane already serves approximately 40 dwellings. Although the site is not of a size to require a site-specific</p> |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>It would shift the existing settlement boundary both southwards and eastwards and fail to retain the 'compact form of the village'.</p> | | <p>flood risk assessment, and is not shown to have flooding or drainage problems, it is noted that surface water flooding does occur immediately west of the site and it is accepted that drainage from the site could adversely impact on this given that the site slopes in a north-westerly direction. As a precaution this should therefore be mentioned.</p> <p>For the reasons set out elsewhere, the more centrally located Shorts Green Farm site cannot be allocated without raising a significant conformity issue on flood risk grounds (and is therefore considered likely to be rejected at examination). As such, if Site 4 were to be removed from the plan it would need to be replaced with a less suitable site that is likely to have even less local support.</p> <p>Proposed change – amend policy and supporting text to reference the need to ensure that surface water drainage is designed so as to avoid (and ideally reduce) flood risk on land with and immediately adjoining Shire Meadows.</p> |
| <p>4.17 onwards MOT9 / MOT10 / MOT11 / MOT12</p> | <p>The policies should be expressed clearly that housing development will be supported subject to meeting the requirements that have been set out.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>Land at [insert location name], as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for [housing / a rural affordable housing exceptions site]. Development for housing will be acceptable subject to the following requirements: ...</p> | <p>Bittles Green and Frog Lane Group</p> | <p>There is no material difference in the wording suggested compared to that already included in the plan, which is considered to be clearly expressed.</p> |
| <p>4.20 / MOT10d 4.24 / MOT12e</p> | <p>The supporting text and the policy should be amended to make the provision of a safe pedestrian footpath an essential requirement of any development. There is also a need to include when the footways should be completed.</p> | <p>Bittles Green and Frog Lane Group</p> | <p>Although pedestrian access into the centre is not ideal, the measures to improve pedestrian safety have to be reasonable and necessary for the development to happen in order to be conditioned. This therefore needs to be reflected in the policy criteria, given that the site is not proposed to accommodate a significant number of open</p> |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|---------------------|---|--|---|
| | Suggested policy wording: d) The site access is made safe, and a pedestrian footway is provided allowing for safe connection to The Street by the time of the completion of any development | | market dwellings to be able to fund major improvements. Proposed change – amend policy criteria to include “as far as practical” |
| 4.21 / MOT11 | Previous refusal should apply; impact on local properties; cause congestion | Local residents (3 comments) | The refusal in 2000 (ref 2/2000/0220) was based purely on the reason that the site lay outside the settlement boundary. There were no highway objections at that time and no concerns raised specifically on impact on local properties (the application was outline). |
| 4.23 / 4.15 / MOT12 | Concern about allocating rural exception sites. By definition these are meant to be unallocated sites. Once sites are identified as suitable for one type of housing (i.e. affordable), they are by default suitable for all types of housing (i.e. market). Alternatively allocate more 10+ dwelling housing sites (which will be required to provide on-site affordable housing). | North Dorset District Council | The allocation of rural affordable housing exception sites has been accepted in other Neighbourhood Plans at examination (eg Holwell in West Dorset). The matter was explicitly considered in the case of Uplyme in East Devon, with the Examiner stating that “This leads me to the conclusion that rural exception sites can be allocated in plans. The word ‘exception’ is used in the sense not of being an exception to the plan but as an exception from the policies of restraint, for example in the Open Countryside, which would otherwise apply” |
| 4.23 / MOT12 | Unless you can justify why affordable housing is appropriate at one end of the village and not the other, this approach could be deemed unreasonable. | North Dorset District Council, Motcombe Primary School | The policy does not rule out alternative rural exception sites from coming forward, but does identify a site is known to be available and would be suitable. |
| 4.25 / MOT8 | Examiners for Fontmell Magna and Pimperne NPs have both ruled that the settlement boundary should be revised to include new housing allocations. | North Dorset District Council, Wyatt Homes | The Hazelbury Bryan examiner did however adopt a different approach which allowed the choice on this to be in the hands of the Parish Council. The supporting text clearly explains that “no boundary changes have been made in respect of the site-specific allocations, as the exact settlement boundary is better established once the developments are built-out (and can be done at the next review of this Plan or through the Local Plan Review).” No change therefore proposed unless this is insisted on by the |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| | | | Examiner. |
| 4.26 | You may wish to consider a policy that identifies and protects the crucial countryside gaps that separate the village from these two growing towns. | Cranborne AONB Team | Paragraph 4.26 explains that at the current time the identification of a gap is not considered necessary due to the distances involved, but that this is a matter that will be kept under review. |
| 6 | We support the objective of the NP to ensure that new development is of a high quality that strengthens the distinctive character of Motcombe as a village. | Wyatt Homes | Support noted. |
| 6 | The objective should be expressed as a policy so that these key tests are applied to all development proposals | Bittles Green and Frog Lane Group | The objective is considered to be adequately covered by the following policies MOT14 – 15. |
| 6.03 / MOT14 | Your phrase "wherever practicable" presumably recognises the limitations of 'local listing' - i.e. designating sites / buildings without formal legal protection and where permitted development rights may allow householders to make changes to their property without the need for planning permission, including demolition. | North Dorset District Council | Agreed – the phrasing is also intended to recognise that in some cases the buildings may have deteriorated to such an extent that their preservation may not be economically viable. |
| 6.09 / MOT15 | Small pockets, not big estates | Local residents (4 comments) | This characteristic and strong community preference has been taken into consideration in the site allocation process, and is reflected in the third paragraph of the policy. However it may be appropriate to provide further clarification in regard to density and garden size, given recent examples where exceptionally small gardens have been allowed (eg Snowdrop Cottage and 37 The Street). Proposed change – amend policy and supporting text to make reference to rear gardens being of reasonable size in relation to the potential users and to allow planting to be incorporated that can contribute to the overall rural character of the village. |
| 6.18 / MOT16 | No more 3 storey houses | Local residents (3 comments) | The first paragraph of the policy states that building heights should generally vary between one and two |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|---------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| | | | <p>storeys providing variation in any mix. For the avoidance of doubt, a further clarification that 3 storey properties are not supported could be added.</p> <p>Proposed change – amend policy to clarify that 3 storey properties are not supported.</p> |
| 6.25 | <p>The section on Materials and Design is helpful but the photograph on page 30 showing glazing from floor to ridgeline in a converted building is not helpful when it comes to preventing light pollution and conserving the dark night skies of this AONB. The AONB does not encourage that type of extensive glazing.</p> | Cranborne AONB Team | <p>Noted. However in practice permitted development rights that enable conservatories and similar additions to homes means that such impacts are difficult to control.</p> <p>Proposed change – remove or replace photo. Include reference to consideration of light spill from extensive areas of glazing (and how this can be mitigated) as a design consideration.</p> |
| 7 | <p>The objective should be expressed as a policy so that these key tests are applied to all development proposals</p> | Bittles Green and Frog Lane Group | <p>The policies in that chapter are intended to cover the objectives as far as possible but have taken into account that a number of issues (such as the provision of public transport) is outside the control of the Neighbourhood Plan, and that the NPPF paragraph 109 is clear that “Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe”.</p> |
| 7 | <p>The protection of Network Rail Assets and railway operation may require that the developer signs an asset protection agreement with Wessex ASPRO before proceeding with any design/construction works at the site and follows guidance to ensure that any works located adjacent to the Network Rail boundary fence mitigate any risks to railway operation</p> | Network Rail Infrastructure Limited | <p>No sites are allocated that adjoin railway land, but this issue can be mentioned in the plan as an informative.</p> <p>Proposed change – add new section on land adjoining the railway, including advisory information on the need for liaison with Network Rail where development is proposed immediately adjoining railway land.</p> |
| 7.3 / MOT17 | <p>Various suggestions regarding new footpaths / pavements; traffic calming essential; 20mph zones; enforced give-way areas</p> | Local residents (6 comments) | <p>Unless delivered through development, the Neighbourhood Plan is limited in terms of traffic calming measures. Where appropriate the need for improvements has been highlighted in the relevant site allocations.</p> |

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|---------------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| 7.11 / MOT18 | The proposed standards are not in conformity with policy 23 of the NDLP which refers to the Dorset Residential Car Parking Study adopted by Dorset County Council, in particular the need for 3 off road spaces to serve all 3 bedroom and 4 bedroom properties and 4 spaces to serve 5+ bedroom properties. The proposed figures also differ from the research on typical car ownership set out within table 9 of the draft NP, which indicates that the majority of respondents to the survey that live in three and four bedroom properties own 2 cars. Suggest policy is deleted. If retained it should at least make clear that the proposed standards include spaces within garages. | Wyatt Homes | <p>The proposed standards are supported by evidence and considered appropriate and reasonable.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.11 clearly explains that yellow shading indicates the 'average' (median) value, but that the parking standards for new homes should be designed to cater for 'above' average scenarios by adopting the 85% standard, although a lower provision of off-road parking may be justified if there is adequate on-road parking available immediately outside. The County standards are based on 2001 Census data. According to the 2011 Census there were 945 cars/vans in the parish serving 564 occupied residences - a ratio of 1.68 vehicles per household. This compares to a District average of 1.52. The 2011 figure also is a 11.4% increase compared to the 2001 Census (the 2001 Census was used as the basis for the car parking study), growing more than the district average and broadly achieving the 2026 North Dorset growth levels predicted in the parking study by 2011.</p> |
| 7.11 / MOT18 | Various suggestions regarding how to stipulate appropriate parking provision, including not counting on-street parking, 1 bedroom = 2 cars, limiting off-street parking, limiting reversing onto roads | Local residents (13 comments) | <p>Agree that the supporting text could be usefully clarified in terms of how garage spaces are considered.</p> <p>Proposed change – amend the supporting text to clarify that open car ports / car barns will count as 1 space but garages that may be used for storage will only count as 0.5 spaces. In-line provision of more than 2 spaces (i.e. three spaces end to end in a line or two spaces in front of a garage) will only count as a maximum of 2 spaces (due to the blocking effect created that renders this layout less flexible).</p> |
| 7.14 / MOT19 | Please refer to Gillingham Town Council and their NP to make sure that both plans' aspirations align. Your proposed cycleway as shown deviates away from the existing bridleway and goes north of Kings Court, whereas the route shown on the Gillingham NP follows the existing bridleway. | North Dorset District Council | The route as shown reflects the latest plans and ongoing work between Gillingham Town Council and Motcombe Parish Council (and post-dates the plans as included in the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan). |

Pre-Submission Consultation Summary

| Para / Policy | Main points raised | Respondent/s | Response and proposed changes (if applicable) |
|---------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| 7.14 / MOT19 | Network Rail is supportive of the proposed Motcombe to Gillingham cycleway scheme which could 'include the diversion of the footpath to Woodwater Farm to run beside the River Lodden and pass under the railway (and remove the current at-level crossing)'. Motcombe Parish Council will need to continue to engage with Network Rail as plans for the scheme progress. | Network Rail Infrastructure Limited | Support noted. |
| 7.14 / MOT19 | It may be useful to reflect the desire that Shaftesbury still has to link up with Motcombe via a cycle path that would also then link in with the Gillingham to Motcombe cycle path. | Shaftesbury Town Council | Agreed. Proposed change – amend the supporting text to clarify that although no routes have as yet been identified, the principle of extending the cycleway to Shaftesbury is supported. |