



Cerney Valley

Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation Summary

**Produced on behalf of the Cerney Valley Parish Council
by the Cerney Valley Neighbourhood Plan Working Group
as supporting documentation to the
Cerney Valley Neighbourhood Plan**

Consultation Summary

Table of Contents

Why we have produced this summary.....	1
How we consulted	1
The Consultation Process	1
Representations received.....	2
Any Main Issues Identified.....	2
Appendix A “It’s for You” Newsletters.....	4
Appendix B Cerne Valley Neighbourhood Plan Engagement.....	5
Appendix C Summary of responses received during formal consultation period.....	8
Appendix D List of respondents.....	13
Appendix E Godmanstone DDB Briefing for Parish Council 18/09/2013	14
Appendix F Minutes of Cerne Valley Parish Council Meeting 18/09/2013.....	19

Why we have produced this summary

The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations require that, when a neighbourhood plan is submitted for examination, a statement should also be submitted setting out the details of those consulted, how they were consulted, the main issues and concerns raised and how these have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed plan.

How we consulted

The preparation leading to the publication of the Cerne Valley Neighbourhood Plan (hereinafter called the Plan) has included a considerable consultation effort throughout the process. The consultation process was driven by the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (NPWG) acting on behalf of the Cerne Valley Parish Council (CVPC). From the beginning, it was identified that active and effective consultation would be critical in producing a Plan which would ultimately win the support of the residents of the Parish.

At an early stage a dedicated website was established (www.cernevalley.org) which was regularly updated and made available to all residents in the Valley and third parties. The website not only allowed people to see the progress of the Plan to its final maturity, but also information about the various meetings and other activities associated with this progress. This enabled all those interested to keep up to date with developments and issues and to contribute to the consultation exercise as they saw fit.

Another important initiative in this respect was the establishment of a dedicated Newsletter ('It's For You'). This has been published at appropriate times during the process of preparing the plan and delivered to every household in the Parish. The Newsletter was used to further improve communication with the local community, including feedback on the results of the consultation process to date.

Copies of these Newsletters (Appendix A) have been forwarded under separate cover

The Consultation Process

The consultation process commenced with a visit by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), now part of the Design Council, in July 2011. This led to the commissioning of a 3 day event in November 2011, facilitated by the Princes Foundation, to which residents of the community, landowners and other key stakeholders were invited. Following this event the consultation process was further driven forward by a variety of events, recorded in a document entitled 'Cerne Valley Neighbourhood Plan Engagement'.

The latest issue of this is at Appendix B.

Considerable effort was devoted, throughout the consultation process and using a variety of means, to reach out to as many people as possible. The aim was to obtain as many views as possible in preparing a Plan that would accurately reflect the wishes of the community. People were encouraged to provide either written or verbal feedback and, to this end, feedback forms were made freely available to the community throughout the process. The issues of the Newsletter 'It's For You' were used to provide analyses of this feedback as the consultation progressed.

One event worth highlighting was the Landowners Development Day, held on 11 September 2012. This event was publicised in the community and invitations were extended to local landowners, estate agents, Housing Associations, District and County Council officials, and anyone else who considered they had a contribution to make. The purpose of the day was to establish what interest or opportunities there might be in developing new housing projects in the Parish in the foreseeable future. The outcome of this event in terms of identifying new housing opportunities was limited, as reflected in the Plan, but was a good example of the extent the NPWG went to consult widely.

Ultimately, the outcome of this consultation process was used to prepare a draft Plan during late 2012 and early 2013. Following approval by the Parish Council of this draft Plan on 25 April 2013, a formal consultation was undertaken.

A copy of the draft Plan was forwarded to Dorset County Council, West Dorset District Council, Environment Agency, Dorset AONB, Natural England and other key stakeholders on 23 May 2013, inviting responses within a 6 week period ending 5 July 2013. During this 6 week formal consultation period, meetings were also held at Cerne Abbas and Godmanstone Village Halls to which the respective communities were invited. Formal presentations based on the draft Plan were complemented by comprehensive displays and presentations. These meetings were well supported and generated vigorous and welcome discussion. The Cerne Abbas meeting demonstrated that there was overwhelming support for the draft Plan. At the Godmanstone meeting, whilst there was broad support for the Plan, the particular issue of a Defined Development Boundary (DDB) for the village was one that became the focus of considerable further debate. The formal consultation period was extended, exceptionally, for Godmanstone to 15 July, to allow more time to consider this issue. The issue was finally resolved and this is discussed in greater detail below.

Hard copies of the draft Plan were made freely available at both village meetings and more copies provided separately on request. Hard copies were also placed in the Cerne Abbas Village Stores, a central point of contact for everyone in the Cerne Valley community, for anyone to take. Hard copies were also placed in the Surgery, the public houses, other shops and the School for people to read. In all, some 50 hard copies were produced and distributed.

The draft Plan was also posted on the website. The formal consultation period saw an encouraging response, with 291 hits being recorded 219 of which were new visitors to the site an increase of 63% during this period.

Representations received

A summary of responses received during the formal 6 week consultation period commencing 23 May, with actions taken as a consequence, will be found at **Appendix C**. Generally, comments have been recorded against the most relevant chapter or Policy on which they have a bearing.

A list of the respondents is recorded separately at **Appendix D**.

Any Main Issues Identified

Overall, there was considerable community support for the draft Plan, in accurately reflecting the views of the residents of the Parish. This support will, of course, only be confirmed by the required forthcoming Referendum. As far as Cerne Abbas was concerned, there were no main issues identified as outstanding after this final 6 week formal consultation period.

Godmanstone and its DDB. This was the single issue which generated most debate in Godmanstone throughout the whole consultation process. It concerned the creation of a DDB, a new concept for the village. In the early stages of the consultation process there appeared to be little appetite for such a proposal. However, as the consultation process progressed, residents warmed to the idea, recognising its potential benefits for the village. Eventually there was general support for a DDB, in principle.

Establishing a DDB in principle was one thing, obtaining majority agreement where it should be drawn proved to be more protracted. Considerable effort was expended by the NPWG to find a solution which would satisfy a majority of those engaged in the debate. This effort is best described in the paper presented to the CVPC at an Extraordinary Meeting held on 18 September 2013 and is at **Appendix E**.

Appendix E also records the activities of a Parish Councillor (since resigned) in attempting to canvas support for his proposal for another DDB option, which was without the sanction or authority of the CVPC. Despite this unfortunate intervention, a clear majority of those who responded supported the DDB proposal in the original draft Plan (sometimes called Option1) and this was approved by the CVPC at the Extraordinary Meeting. The minutes of this meeting are at **Appendix F**.

Appendix F also records that the draft Plan submitted to the CVPC at this meeting was adopted unanimously. It was also agreed that it should be submitted without delay to WDDC for their examination as the CVPC's definitive Plan.

Appendix A “It’s for You” Newsletters

Because of their bulk, these have been forwarded under separate cover

Appendix B Cerne Valley Neighbourhood Plan Engagement

Activity	Method Used	Who involved	Issues/Concerns	Details	How Addressed?	How to feedback
CABE walk around Cerne Abbas	Walk around centre of Cerne Abbas 08/08/11	CABE experts plus Cerne Valley PC members	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preservation of existing character 2. Pedestrian network 3. Develop a shared vision 4. Make better use of infill rather than extend boundaries 5. Derelict shops 	See CABE report dated 23/08/11	Appoint Princes Foundation to run a three day event to involve key stakeholders and the whole local community.	Website
Community Planning Workshop	Three day event held in CA Village Hall 28-30/11/2011	PC, Princes Foundation, Stakeholders and all residents	Contrast between No Growth and Sustainable Growth visions.	See PF Report dated November 2011	New Working Group members appointed to communicate PF outcome and further develop communications and planning activities.	Website and newsletter "It's for You" distributed to all households.
It's for You (Spring)	Four page colour newsletter March 2012	Hand delivered to all local dwellings	Detailed extracts from Princes Foundation report	See hard copies: Two Visions	Feedback forms distributed and analysed. See example.	Village meetings and Summer edition of It's for You
Raise awareness	Gazebo outside shop 21/04/2012	Manned by WG and PC members	Map displays and discussions of community views	Feedback forms completed	Feedback included in analysis sheets and actioned through Focus Groups.	Included on website and It's for You.
School visit	WG Chairman visited school	Teachers and schoolchildren	Drawings of their visions for future		Captured in Feedback analysis	Initial plan ideas will be shown to school
Godmanstone meetings	Open invitation to Village Hall 14/4/2012 and autumn meetings	Godmanstone residents and WG members	General discussion of proposed Plan	See notes of meeting	DDB possibilities drafted	Will be included in Draft Plan

Activity	Method Used	Who involved	Issues/Concerns	Details	How Addressed?	How to feedback
School Fete	Gazebo exhibition 19/5/2012	Parents and children	Progress on school relocation discussions	In progress with WDDC	School relocation will be included in Plan	Draft will be circulated in 2013
Cerne Abbas Annual village meeting	Open meeting run by Parish Council in village hall 19/5/2012	All CA residents	Update on Plan progress and request for Focus Group helpers	See notes of meeting	Feedback forms re-distributed	Website and It's for You plus Parish Newsletters and Notice Boards
It's for You (Summer)	Four page colour newsletter July 2012	Hand delivered to all local dwellings	Analysis of Feedback received and update on Working Group activity	See hard copy	Announcement of Development Day on Sept 11 2012	Invitation to join Focus Group and/or Development Day.
Cerne Abbas Landowners Development Day	Invitation to village hall 11/9/2012	Landowners, developers, estate agents and WDDC representatives. All residents invited to pm session.	Assurance that any development proposed will be sympathetic to environmental concerns and focus on infill rather than boundary extension.	See notes of meeting	Housing Focus group will incorporate outcomes in the draft Plan.	Notes on website and in Parish Newsletters
Godmanstone Village Meeting	Invitation to Village Hall 15/10/2012	All Godmanstone residents invited plus NPWG	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where should the DDB be drawn? 2. Do we need a DDB? 	See notes of meeting	DDB proposal drafted	Further public meeting on 30/11/2012
Godmanstone Village Meeting	Invitation to village hall 30/11/2012	All Godmanstone residents invited plus NPWG	Positioning of the DDB	See notes of meeting	Redraft of proposed DDB then publication in It's for You Spring 2013	Contact the NPWG
CABE Draft Plan Review	Walkaround followed by meeting 27/02/2013	Meeting with NPWG members and CABE advisors	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear vision statement 2. Brevity 3. Use existing policies 4. Clarify differences 	See CABE Report	New Draft written before publishing to community.	Revised plan sent to CABE

Activity	Method Used	Who involved	Issues/Concerns	Details	How Addressed?	How to feedback
Draft Plan published	It's for You Spring 2013 website and hard copies in village shop	NPWG	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Publication of Exec Summary of Draft Plan 2. Q&A with WDDC rep. 3. Publication of proposed maps 	See IFY Spring 2013	Invitation to Village Meetings.	Feedback requested to Parish Clerk or through website
Cerne Abbas Village Meeting	Village Hall exhibition and meeting 16/5/2013	County, District, Parish Councillors and all residents who wished to come	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Legal status of Plan 2. Green spaces definition 	See Minutes of meeting	Further revision to incorporate community views where possible	
Godmanstone Village Meeting	Village Hall exhibition and meeting 21/5/2013	District and Parish Councillors and all residents who wished to attend	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DDB definition 	See Minutes of meeting	Further community meetings to discuss location of DDB.	
Incorporation of formal responses in Draft Plan	Analysis of responses by Focus Groups and writing final Plan	NPWG	See analysis of feedback		Changes made where requested	Revised Plan on website
Submit final Draft to Parish Council	Website, email distribution and hard copies. Parish Council Meeting 18/9/2013	NPWG and Parish Council	See Minutes of PC meeting	Slight changes requested	Changes incorporated	Revised Plan on website and emailed to PC
Parish Council sends Final Plan to WDDC	Electronic submission	Parish Council and WDDC				

Appendix C Summary of responses received during formal consultation period

Section	Comments from	Summary of main issues raised	Response
Policy 1	Savills Estate Agents on behalf of Fry's Builders (1)	(a) Registering development interest on behalf of Fry's re Simsay Fields land. (b) Listing generic benefits of development at this location	No changes made as land currently falls outside the Cerne Abbas DDB.
Policy 6 Location 1	Michael Holm Environment Agency (2)	(a) Issues re flood inundation at Location 1 (b) Suggested amendment to Policy 6	Following discussions with respondent wording of Policy 6 amended and minor addition to Location 1
Policies 2 and 5 Locations 1 and 2 General Comments	Sue Mitchell on behalf of Dorset ANOB (3)	Generally supportive comments (a) Minor wording suggestions to Policies 2 and 5 (b) Observations re lighting at Location 1 and traffic measures at Location 2 (c) Further observations re water biodiversity, speed reduction measures, natural habitats, treescape	(a) Plan amended (b) Plan amended (c) Plan amended
Policy 7...	Rohan Torkildsen and David Stuart on behalf of English Heritage (4)	Generally supportive comments. Agree SEA screening not necessary (a) Importance of design criteria in respect of new school (b) Consider declaring two Grade listed buildings in Market Square as Community Assets (c) Design of developments at Locations 1 and 2 should have regard for heritage setting of Cerne Abbas	All comments noted, amendments made to Plan.
Policies 7 and 8	Gill Smith on behalf of Dorset County Council (5)	(a) Supports safeguarding land owned by DCC for new school, but encourage Parish Council to secure Community Infrastructure Levies for any new developments to help funding of building school.	Noted but no amendment to Plan deemed necessary.

Section	Comments from	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		(b) Support cycle path proposal Raises concerns re traffic management issues for village centre parking. Highlights some concerns over school playing fields being designated as Green Space	
Policies 1 to 9 and Development Principles	Jo Witherden on behalf of West Dorset County Council (6)	<p>(a) Policy 1-Clarify restriction does not apply to affordable housing</p> <p>(b) Policy 2-Suggested amendment to replace treescape assessment to arboricultural assessment and provide guidance re same.</p> <p>(c) Policy3- Amend text to reflect that policy considerations in Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan will still apply.</p> <p>(d) Policy 4- Clarify Density level principles for Godmanstone.</p> <p>(e) Policy 5- No suggested changes</p> <p>(f) Policy 6- Clarify which flood risk zones are relevant to Plan(see also feedback from Environment Agency.</p> <p>(g) Policy 7- No suggested changes</p> <p>(h) Policy 8- Clarify policy re Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>(i) Policy9- Amend to clarify other policy considerations in Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan may be given greater weight.</p> <p>(j) Development Principles. Observations re status</p>	<p>(a) Plan amended</p> <p>(b) Plan amended</p> <p>(c) Plan amended</p> <p>(d) Plan amended</p> <p>(e) No action required</p> <p>(f) Plan amended</p> <p>(g) No action required</p> <p>(h) Plan amended</p> <p>(i) Plan amended</p> <p>(j) Noted, plan amended to reflect the status of the Development Principles.</p>
Policy 4 and Development Principles	Hugh and Justine Chapman (7)	(a) Request to clarify building density Principle wording in Plan as it relates to Godmanstone.	Plan amended
	Graham Paisley on behalf of Southern Electric Power Distribution (8)	(a) Clarification re Development Principle regarding power supplies to new developments and existing customers.	Noted, wording of Development Principle amended to clarify requirement would be “where reasonable and practical”.

Section	Comments from	Summary of main issues raised	Response
Policy 4	Bruce Voss on behalf of Homes and Communities Agency (9)	(a) Query over density levels in Godmanstone re terraced development and affordable housing.	Noted, plan amended to clarify density levels wording.
	Gaynor Gallacher on behalf of Highways Agency (10)	(a) Content with Plan.	Noted, no action required.
	Clive Fox (11)	(a) Host of general comments, nothing specific	Noted, no action required.
Policies 6 and 7	Edward Gallia (12)	Supportive comments about the Plan. (a) Comments about the gradual loss of beech trees along the A352 (b) Comments about the design and need for a cycle path to blend in with the landscape (c) Suggestion to extend the northern extension off Cerne Abbas DDB to point of triangle	Noted (a) No action required (b) No action required (c) Proposal rejected by Parish Council
Policies 4 and 6	Will Best (13)	(a) Support for Godmanstone DDB to be retained as per Appendix 4 in draft Plan (b) Suggestion that wording re renewable energy sources should be amended to encourage local small scale projects as opposed to large schemes.	(a) Noted in keeping with results of village survey. (b) Plan amended
Policy 1	Shaune Reeves (14)	(a) Concerns re development on green field sites outside Cerne Abbas DDB	Noted, no action required
	John Stobert on Behalf of Natural England (15)	(a) Comment about impact of additional housing being of a neutral rather than positive impact	SEA screening template amended
Locations 1 and 2	Tessa Greenaway (16)	Overall Support for Plan. Raises concerns as to potential impact of development at locations 1 and 2	Noted, no action required
	Julie Bratcher (17)	Overall support for Plan	Noted, no action required
Policy 8 and Location 2	John Stenhouse (18)	(a) Request that Location 2 be extended to include the whole of	(a) Request rejected by Parish Council (b) Plan amended regarding Green

Section	Comments from	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		<p>“Back Field” as opposed to half of that location.</p> <p>(b) Proposal that only some of Wills lane Field be designated as a Green Space thus allowing the potential in the future for a small development of housing on the remainder in due course.</p>	Space
Policies 4 and 5. Also Development Principles	Malcolm Savage (19)	<p>(a) Density for Barn conversions</p> <p>(b) Density wording in Draft Plan</p>	(a) and (b) wording in Plan amended.
Policy 8	Yvonne Rossiter (20)	<p>(a) Visibility Fry’s Lane requires trees to be removed</p> <p>(b) Village Green need protecting</p>	<p>(a) Noted, no action taken</p> <p>(b) Included in Plan</p>
Policy 8	Mrs D Wheeler (21)	<p>(a) Need for Bus Shelter Fry’s Lane</p> <p>(b) Need for seat on grass Fry’s Lane</p>	<p>(a) Noted, no action taken</p> <p>(b) Noted, no action taken</p>
Policies 4 and 8	Jo Ballantyne and Tom Weeks(22)	<p>(a) Generally not in favour of DDB but if one Option 1</p> <p>(b) Support traffic calming measures in Godmanstone including traffic lights and single lane access. Would like pavement.</p> <p>(c) Concerns as to confidence of process in particular in relation to conflicts of interest relating to member of CVPC and a member of the CVNWG</p>	<p>(a) Noted as part of Godmanstone DDB consultation</p> <p>(b) Reflected in plan in terms of traffic management issues.</p> <p>(c) Highlighted to Parish Council</p>
Policy 4	Godmanstone Residents DDB Options Survey results (23)	(a) See summary of DDB survey results in attached paper	(a) Results of survey presented to Parish Council for decision. Option 1 selected.
Policy 4 and Development Principles	Eric and Jenny Christian (24)	<p>(a) Detailed 12 page response to both NP and DDB ranging fro concern’s re flood risks to the manner of consultation process.</p> <p>(b) No clear preference for Godmanstone DDB, but raising</p>	<p>(a) Noted., many of issues reflected in Plan</p> <p>(b) Issue of status of Godmanstone DDB Options 3 and 4 highlighted to Parish Council.</p>

Section	Comments from	Summary of main issues raised	Response
		considerable concerns over the motives and propriety of proposer of Option 3 and 4.	
Policy 4	Michael Ridley (25)	(a) Supports Option 4	(a) Noted as part of Godmanstone DDB consultation.
Policy 4	Sidney Rossiter (26)	(a) Urges support of Godmanstone DDB Option 1 (b) Rejects no DDB and Option 4 as the way forward	(a) Noted, in keeping with Parish Council survey. (b) Noted as part of Godmanstone DDB consultation
	Kath Hutchinson (27)	(a) Concern about Godmanstone DDB options particularly those proposed in relation to Options 3 and 4.	(a) Noted and drawn to the attention of Parish Council

Appendix D List of respondents

By Name/Organisation

Savills Estate Agents on behalf of Fry's Builders (1)
Michael Holm Environment Agency (2)
Sue Mitchell Dorset AONB Partnership (3)
Rohan Torkildsen and David Stuart English Heritage (4)
Gill Smith Dorset County Council (5)
Joanne Withenden West Dorset District Council (6)
Hugh and Justin Chapman (7)
Graham Paisley SSE (8)
Bruce Voss Home and Communities Agency (9)
Gaynor Gallacher Highways Agency (10)
Clive Fox (11)
Edward Gallia (12)
Will Best (13)
Shaune Reeves (14)
John Stobert of Natural England (15)
Tessa Greenaway (16)
Julie Bratcher (17)
John Stenhouse (18)
Malcolm Savage (19)
Yvonne Rossiter (20)
Mrs D Wheeler (21)
Jo Ballantyne and Tom Weeks (22)
Survey of Godmanstone Residents re DDB Options (23)
Eric and Jenny Christian (24)
Michael Ridley (25)
Sidney Rossiter (26) ***** Kath Hutchinson (27)

GODMANSTONE DEFINED DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY

BRIEF FOR PARISH COUNCIL

This subject was first discussed at the Godmanstone annual village meeting of April 2012 when the subject of the neighbourhood plan was explained to those present at that meeting. Most people at that time wanted little or no development in Godmanstone and no DDB was the feeling of that meeting. However, at this early stage of the consultation few people understood the arguments for and against adopting a DDB, even though several landowners were present.

In September 2012 a landowners' meeting was held in Cerne Abbas Village Hall to find out if anyone in the parish wanted their land put forward for consideration for housing. From Cerne Abbas only two people came forward, but from Godmanstone a total of eight came forward. As a result of so much interest from Godmanstone it was felt by the NPWG that further meetings ought to be held to gauge the villagers' feelings on this issue. Therefore, a village meeting was arranged in October 2012 with notices of the meeting being delivered to every household, inviting everyone interested to attend. After much discussion at that meeting it was agreed that a DDB for Godmanstone would be the correct way forward and that two people from Godmanstone and two from Cerne Abbas would be tasked to draw a provisional DDB, with criteria being a tight one that would allow very limited housing development. These four produced a DDB that they felt met their remit. The next step was to present this to the village.

In November 2012 another meeting was arranged with every household invited and with that invitation a map showing the DDB as drawn up by the four. After much discussion the DDB line was redrawn with the help and guidance by those present. This map was put in the draft Neighbourhood Plan and presented to the Parish Council for consideration. The Plan was endorsed, including the DDBs for Cerne Abbas and Godmanstone. The draft Plan was then presented at the annual village meetings at Cerne Abbas on the 16th May 2013 and Godmanstone on the 21st May 2013. At those meetings comments were asked for and a six week consultation period began, to end on the 5th July 2013.

At the Godmanstone meeting two residents put forward two alternative DDBs. It was agreed that the village should be allowed to consider these alternatives. A form was therefore drawn up offering three options. These were **Option 1**, the one previously presented to the Parish Council and endorsed by them, and the two alternatives put forward by the two residents, to be called Option 2 and Option 3. This form was duly sent to every household in Godmanstone for their comments, with the same deadline for return of 5th July 2013.

Before this expiry date and without the authority or sanction of the Parish Council or the NPWG, the original proposer of Option 3 (a Parish Councillor) produced a further option, afterwards described as Option 4. This he took round Godmanstone in the form of a petition asking a selection of people to sign in its support. It subsequently transpired that the introduction of this fourth option caused considerable confusion, with many who had already answered Options 1, 2 or 3 uncertain of its status. It was also reported that some who answered Option 4 did not then consider it necessary to answer the authorised form proposing Options 1, 2 or 3. At the Parish Council meeting of the 11th of July, held at Godmanstone Village Hall, many residents wanted to know what was going on.

The Chairman explained to everyone present the situation and, because of the confusion, gave those who wished to make further comments on the DDB issue an extended time limit of 15th July 2013. The Parishioner Councillor concerned has since resigned from the council.

At the end of the official consultation period of 5th July all the returned forms were given to a Cerne Abbas member of the NPWG with no connections with Godmanstone, to evaluate the results independently. With all the comments now in, the results this evaluation is complete and is at Annex A. This concluded that **Option 1** continued to have most support.

At the meeting of the NPWG on 14th August Annex A was discussed and it was decided to record additionally a summary of the responses in the Godmanstone DDB Consultation opposed to Option 1. This summary was completed by the same independent Cerne Abbas member of the NPWG. The results of this summary are at Annex B.

Conclusions

It is concluded that:

- a. Despite the confusion introduced by Option 4, Option 1 easily had the most support at 68% and the least who disagreed with it at 29%.
- b. Option 4 was produced without the authority or sanction of the Parish Council or the NPWG. Objections have also been raised by some Godmanstone residents as to the methods adopted in promoting it. Therefore, it is concluded that the Option 4 exercise was conducted outside the agreed policies and procedures of the Parish Council and should be considered null and void for the purposes of this consultation.

Recommendation

The NPWG recommends Option 1 DDB for Godmanstone for adoption by the Parish Council as the basis for submission of the draft Neighbourhood Plan to West Dorset District Council for the next stage of its scrutiny.

On a final note, it has to be noted that the process of establishing a Godmanstone DDB has caused some division in the village. However, the NPWG is satisfied that it has provided every opportunity for the people of Godmanstone to have their say and that their comments have been given due weight in arriving at this final position.

Fred Horsington Chairman NPWG

ANNEX A

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSE TO

GODMANSTONE DEFINED DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY CONSULTATION

WHICH ENDED 5 JULY 2013

Following a request by the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group the following analysis is provided (from hard copy forms supplied by the Clerk of the Cerne Valley Parish Council) as an aid to the Parish Council and others in order to help comprehend the response to the three options offered.

A fourth (unofficial) option was sought but this has been discounted by the working group due to a significant number of residents expressing a variety of concerns over the way in which it was conducted.

All responses are available to view by arrangement.

There were 121 residents on the Electoral Register in December 2012. An additional 15 residents who are not registered also responded, totalling 136 possible respondents.

However, it should be noted that up to 5 people of the same family have expressed their identical view with NO case of a difference of opinion within any family. In many cases 1 or 2 people may represent the views of 3, 4 or 5. There are 60 surnames on the Electoral Register in December 2012. An additional 9 surnames are not registered but also responded totalling 69 possible 'surname respondents'.

Accepting the fact that some people have moved out of the village since December 2012 and some have moved in the analysis below uses the 136 possible respondents as basis (except the 'surnames' line). It is acknowledged that whilst this may alter the percentage of respondents expressed as part of the village it still defines the proportion of positive and negative responses to each of the options (expressed as percentages) and this is a requisite part of the consultation process

GENERAL	Number	Percentage of total	Total
Total respondents	42	30.9%	136
Surnames' who responded	34	49.3%	69
Respondents against all options	4	2.9%	136
Respondents who 'Don't mind'	7	5.1%	136

OPTION ONE	Number	Percentage of total	Total
Actual respondents	42	30.9%	136
Broadly Support	28	68.3%	41
Don't mind	2	4.9%	41
Don't agree	12	29.3%	41

OPTION TWO	Number	Percentage of total	Total
Actual respondents	41	30.1%	136
Broadly Support	3	7.3%	41
Don't mind	3	7.3%	41
Don't agree	35	85.4%	41

OPTION THREE	Number	Percentage of total	Total
Actual respondents	41	30.1%	136
Broadly Support	9	23.1%	39
Don't mind	2	5.1%	39
Don't agree	30	76.9%	39

OPTION FOUR ONLY	Number	Percentage of total	Total
Total respondents	67	49.3%	136
Surnames' who responded	44	63.8%	69
Double' respondents	11	16.4%	67
Double 'surnames'	8	18.2%	44

TO ALL FOUR OPTIONS			
No response individuals	33	24.3%	136
No response 'surnames'	8	5.9%	136

The Fourth Option represented 49.3% (67) of all possible respondents and 63.8% (44) of 'Surnames'. 16.4% (11) of respondents and 18.2% (8) of 'surnames' answered two different questions (Options 1, 2 or 3 and, in isolation, Option 4) with two different and, thereby, conflicting answers and in so doing they had said 'yes' or 'no' more than once. Introduction of the fourth option thereby confused those who had already answered Options 1, 2 or 3 and may have resulted in those who answered option 4 first to not respond to Options 1, 2 or 3 later.

SUMMARY

In answer to the official Options 1, 2 and 3, 30% of individuals responded and nearly 50% of families did. **Option 1 easily has the most support at 68% and the least who disagree with it at 29%.**

ANNEX B

GODMANSTONE DEFINED DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES OPPOSED TO OPTION 1

At the meeting of the NPWG on 14th August it was requested that a summary be produced of the returned forms to the Godmanstone DDB Consultation opposed to Option 1. A total of 10 responses opposed were provided by the Clerk to the Parish Council. Each was given a reference from 1 to 10. Of these ten the first was a letter which is dealt with elsewhere and the tenth was actually a comment on another option. The nature of the response from the remaining eight has been collated and the response from the NPWG against each is also shown.

Godmanstone DDB Consultation - Summary of Responses Opposed to Option 1

Nature of responses	Response (Ref) received (8)									Response by CVNP Working Group
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Tot	
Against all 3 options	1	1						1	3	Noted.
Did not mind (but stated preferences)			1	1						Noted.
Management of process								1	1	Noted.
Lack of safety provisions to support development – pavement, street lighting, traffic calming	1			1					2	Noted.
Neighbourhood plan not appropriate	1								1	Noted.
Conservation Area should be maintained	1							1	2	Noted.
Traffic lights needed	1								1	Noted.
Leave village as it is		1	1						2	Noted.
Should be No Defined Development Boundary			1						1	Noted.
No Comments					1				1	Noted.
Option 1 does not allow enough space for slow growth of village to compensate for declining population							1		1	Noted.
No opportunity to address proposals at meetings								1	1	Noted.
Insufficient notice of public meetings/no agenda issued								1	1	Noted.
CVNPWG minutes accuracy and authenticity								1	1	Noted.
Some Parish Council minutes not available on website								1	1	Noted.
Non attendance at meetings presumes no interest								1	1	Noted.
Has the NP already been politically accepted and therefore the process is tokenistic?								1	1	Noted.
Results of previous questionnaires not available								1	1	Noted.
Multiple questions arising from the DDB consultation questionnaire								1	1	Noted.
Conditions of development do not state what conditions apply if 3 or less properties are built								1	1	Noted.

CERNE VALLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Andrea Schafer, Clerk to the Council

32 Back Lane, Cerne Abbas, Dorchester, DT2 7JW

Phone: 01300 341464 E-mail: cernevalley@dorsetparishes.gov.uk

**Minutes of an extra meeting of Cerne Valley Parish Council held at 7.30pm on
Wednesday 18 September 2013 at Cerne Abbas Village Hall**

Abbreviations: DDB – Defined development boundary, NPWG – Neighbourhood Plan working group WDDC – West Dorset District Council

Present: Cllrs. T.Handley (Chairman) J. Barry (Vice Chairman), S. Beresford, J. Bolt, M. Eltherington, N.Furness, F. Horsington, I. Humphreys, G. Stevens, C.Trim. Also present WDDC Cllr A. Chisholm and 18 members of the public

1. Apologies for absence - None

2. Declarations of pecuniary and other interests. All Cllrs signed a dispensation to be able to take part in the discussions as all the councillors owned or rented property in the Valley. (Appendix 1)

Cllrs Horsington and Humphreys declared interests as the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group.

Cllrs Furness and Trim declared interests specifically in item 3b, as affected landowners.

Public Discussion period

John Vivian spoke concerning the proposed DDB for Godmanstone he had put forward via a village petition which had become known as Option 4. He explained that it had been designed to be less intrusive than option 3 and to relieve the fear that Option 3 would increase the number of new houses that could be built.

He stated that he had spoken to Cllrs Horsington and Humphreys about his petition before circulating it and that a meeting had been suggested which was never organised. As a result of this he had presumed he was Ok to proceed with his petition.

According to his petition 64% of adult residents and 57% of households in Godmanstone were in favour of Option 4 for the DDB. He explained that he had provided copies of his figures for all councillors (Appendix 2)

Mr Vivian joked that the option 4 could lead to an increase in the value of his property when he sold it to buy his retirement bungalow

Robert Morpeth stated that the figures were clear for Option 4 and the support was irrefutable

Hugh Chapman reported that he had been involved in the process since the beginning and he believed that Godmanstone needed a DDB and that it would be good for the village. He felt it was irrelevant which option was chosen

Penny Gostelow stated that the DDB should be about supporting the community; Godmanstone needed modest growth to stop the slow decline that was happening at present and prevent the loss of any more services.

The set density of 3 houses per acre precluded any mass development.

She felt that Options 3 or 4 offered the best solution for the village

Duncan Lewis reported that at the last meeting 3 options had been presented and people thought this was the end of the process, however Option 4 appeared after this official meeting and people were confused. Perhaps if Option 4 had been presented at the meeting people would feel differently about it.

Alistair Chisholm felt that the principle was the community should decide. He was concerned that the option of no DDB had been put forward. He stated that Option 4 seemed to be the most popular choice

Yvonne Rossiter referred to a working document that had been circulated to NPWG members for discussion before the last Godmanstone meeting that had suggested that CVPC should choose between Option 1 and no DDB; she was concerned that Option 4 was being ignored.

Jo Ballantyne stated that she had never seen Option 4 and had never been asked to vote on it

Public discussion finished at 7.40pm

3. To receive the Draft Neighbourhood Plan and decide whether to adopt it a. To decide on the proposed Godmanstone Defined Development boundary.

Cllr Horsington read out the report from the NPWG concerning the history of the process to set a DDB for Godmanstone, the meetings that had taken place with the community to discuss the subject and the analysis of the survey that had taken place asking for comments on Options 1-3. The NPWG recommended that the Parish Council should adopt Option 1, which was the option presented in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. The report had been circulated to all Cllrs before the meeting (Appendix 3 & 4).

Cllr Horsington then read out an email from a Godmanstone resident that stated that Mr Vivian had told people not to return the official survey form if they had signed the petition for Option 4.

Cllr Beresford asked to see maps of all 4 options; these were provided at the meeting.

Cllr Handley then asked the Cllrs to vote on whether to set a DDB for Godmanstone and which of the 4 options to choose.

Resolved 8 of the 10 councillors voted to choose Option 1 as the DDB for Godmanstone. Cllrs Horsington and Humphreys abstained from the vote

b. To decide on the proposed Cerne Abbas Defined Development boundary

Cllr Furness left the room before the discussion started

Cllr Humphreys explained that in the 1st version of the draft plan the DDB for Cerne Abbas had been extended in two areas, a request had been made by John Stenhouse, one of the landowners, to extend the Western extension further to fully include the field behind Francombe Farm and square off the DDB. Mr Stenhouse had written to the NPWG and attended one of their meetings to explain his reasons for this request. He felt that to set the DDB, as had been proposed, would leave a small area of land which could not be used agriculturally and that the natural hedge line provided a better boundary line. The increased DDB would then enable a greater opportunity to extend housing in this area.

Cllr Trim reported that he owned land that would be covered by this proposal and left the room

Cllr Beresford queried whether the NPWG would have incorporated this request into the plan, if they had received the letter before the DDB was set? He felt that the proposed new boundary was large enough at present and believed that the DDB should be left as it was in the original draft plan.

Cllr Horsington stated that following the draft plan being circulated to residents nobody else had requested any changes to this area and he believed that to change things now would raise questions as to why.

He also reminded Cllrs that under existing planning regulations it was possible to build affordable housing outside the DDB.

Cllr Handley stated that if the request had come in at the beginning of the process it could have been included, however now the draft plan should be accepted as it was, especially as it did not preclude affordable housing.

Cllr Humphreys reported that, although he did not have a preference, residents had had ample opportunity to express an interest or put land forward at the early stages of the plan.

Cllr Eltherington asked if the DDB proposed in the draft plan followed a field line? No it didn't, the line was across the field.

Resolved 8 of the 10 councillors voted to choose for the Cerne Abbas DDB to remain as proposed in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. Cllrs Furness and Trim were absent from the vote

c. To decide whether to accept the draft plan version 4a (Appendix 5)

Cllr Handley opened the discussion by expressing respect for Cllrs Horsington and Humphreys and the NPWG team for the amount of time and commitment they had invested in the plan over the last 2 years

Cllr Humphreys briefly explained the history of the draft plan. Version 1 had been published on the website; hard copies had been distributed around the villages, and to all consultees. The draft had also been presented at both Annual Village meetings in May/June 2013. Following a consultation stage which had finished in July 2013, feedback had been received from a variety of sources (Appendix 6) and the 1st draft had been amended to reflect this feedback. The final version 4a had been colour coded to relate to the feedback and show which sections had been amended.

Cllr Beresford stated that the council had already studied the first draft and accepted the plan. This final version was a worthwhile and commendable document

Resolved that the council accepted the draft plan version 4a unanimously and agreed that it should be submitted to WDDC on behalf of the Cerne Valley Parish Council

Cllrs Horsington and Humphreys explained that the next stage was to submit the plan and the backup documents to WDDC. WDDC would then carry out a further consultation. Following this the plan would be submitted to an independent examiner. Once this stage had been passed it would return to the Valley for a referendum.

They both thanked everyone past and present who had been involved in the production of the plan and hoped that the community would support the plan at the referendum

The meeting closed at 8.15pm