

## Piddle Valley Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Plan Representation Summary

Piddle Valley Parish Council submitted their final version of the Piddle Valley Neighbourhood Plan to West Dorset District Council for independent examination in March 2016. People were given six weeks from Friday 13 May 2016 until Friday 24 June 2016, to comment on the content of the plan or how it was produced. At the close of the public consultation 12 representations were received.

Rep ID	Respondent	Summary
1	A N Jolliffe	Opposed. Concerns about sewage and surface & Groundwater drainage problems in the valley. Concern in relation to adequate infrastructure and essential service provision. Need for water resources and water management plan. Provision of infrastructure for existing community should come ahead of a future plan. Flooding and drainage problems in the Egypt area and resulting contamination of the River Piddle are an issue. A neighbourhood plan that does not consider the possibility of water related problems is not relevant or useful.
2	West Dorset District Council - Aboricultural Officer	<u>Policy 15 Land at West Cottage</u> Aboricultural constraints have been understated. Position and protection of large and mature trees are a significant constrain limiting the developable area. Significant degree of shading across the site. Hedgerow along Kiddles Lane may be “important”, proposals to cut through would have significant adverse impact. Visibility splay, realignment and introduction of surfacing materials would significantly impact on rural quality. Pattern of landscape would be lost.
3	West Dorset District Council - Conservation Officer	<u>Policy 15 Land at West Cottage</u> Recognises a reduction in the site area. To assess the impact need to appreciate the historical development of the area. Tithings pass through the site. Significance of the pattern of development and the affect on it by the proposed site is not considered. Site would not preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. It would cause substantial harm to the setting of the Grade II* Manor house and the setting of the locally important West Cottage. The site would adversely affect a Historic Park and Garden of Local Importance. Site would not uphold the significance of Kiddles Lane (a non-designated heritage asset). The impacts of the site on the character of Cerne Hill would have substantial harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Concern about the harm caused to trees and hedgerows and the risk to the character and appearance of the conservation area from the loss of natural features. Site should be withdrawn.
4	Richard Brown Dorset AONB Partnership	Welcome the plans recognition of the purpose and special qualities of the AONB. Quality of the maps could be enhanced. Supportive of plan overall. Welcome inclusion of policies that aim to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the Piddle Valley. Policies to conserve and enhance wildlife, the historic environment and character of rural

Piddle Valley Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses

		<p>roads are well aligned with AONB Management Plan. Latest draft has further reduced the potential impact of housing growth on the AONB but stronger evidence in terms of supporting the growth proposed would be beneficial.</p> <p><u>Policy 14 Land at Austral Farm</u> Consider site potentially suitable in terms of foreseeable effects on the AONB</p> <p><u>Policy 15 Land at West Cottage</u> Previously raised concerns regarding site. Recognised impact is likely to be localised. Effects on wider countryside more limited. Inclusion of site preferred to other site with more elevated and exposed location discounted following earlier consultation.</p> <p><u>Policy 16 Kingrove Farm</u> Consider site potentially suitable in terms of foreseeable effects on AONB.</p>
5	Michael Holm Environment Agency	<p>Support the aims of the document. Covers the interest’ of the EA and accords with environmental section of NPPF.</p> <p><u>Policy 8 Reducing flood risk and sewage inundation</u> Support. Reducing water use in new development has a beneficial impact on sewage volume.</p> <p><u>Policies 14, 15, 16 (Site allocations)</u> Support that sites will be accompanied by a flood risk assessment to demonstrate layout is acceptable given sites fall within flood risk maps. All new built development must be outside flood zones to accord with Sequential Approach. Recommend areas of floodzones are defined as public open space/communal use to provide buffer to watercourse and prevent future occupants from modifying the area.</p>
6	West Dorset District Council	<p><u>Vision and Aims</u> May be circumstances where external lighting is appropriate, should not “prohibit” this development.</p> <p><u>Policy 1 Local Green Spaces</u> Need to ensure that designated Local Green Spaces meet the definition and criteria of NPPF</p> <p><u>Policy 6 Features of Historic Interest</u></p>

	<p>Policy should be reworded to better align with national policy requirements.</p> <p><u>Policy 7 Important Community Facilities</u> Outlines of the facilities should be shown on the maps. Policy needs to be clear whether it only applies to the listed facilities. General approach supported but policy requirements need to be less vague.</p> <p><u>Policy 8 Reducing Flood Risk and Sewage Inundation</u> Policy does not allow for the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests. Plans to implement flood alleviation measures could require Flood Defence Consent in addition to the usual Flood Risk Assessment submitted.</p> <p><u>Policy 11 Development Within The Settlement Boundaries</u> Approach taken and terminology used are likely to cause confusion. Relationship of proposed boundaries with Local Plan DDBs is unclear. Inclusion of “rural exception sites” within settlement boundaries is confusing. Difficult to secure anything other than 35% affordable housing on sites within settlement boundaries.</p> <p><u>Policy 12 Development Outside The Settlement Boundaries</u> General aim supported but policy appears to restrict development beyond the approach established in the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Policy 13 Housing</u> Needs to have regard to the reintroduction of national policy and changes to Planning Practice Guidance relating to affordable housing. Should be reviewed in light of affordable housing thresholds set out in ministerial statement. Policy requirements in relation to PDL are not reflected in requirements of Neighbourhood Plan Policy 11. Requiring a greater percentage of affordable housing than the Local Plan on large infill sites is likely to impact on delivery and needs to be supported by viability evidence.</p> <p><u>Policy 14 Land at Austral Farm</u> Has potential to accommodate a large number of dwellings. Although supporting text does not anticipate significant development this should be made clearer in the policy.</p> <p><u>Policy 15 Land at West Cottage</u> Concerns in relation to impact on heritage assets and mature trees.</p>
--	--

Piddle Valley Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses

		<p><u>Policy 18 Enterprise Park and Bourne Park</u> Site is identified in local plan as “key employment site” but neighbourhood plan adopts a more restrictive approach to development.</p> <p><u>Policy 22 External Lighting</u> Planning permission is not usually required so will be difficult to control. Use of planning condition could be seen as unreasonable. Such restriction would only be appropriate in cases where there is likely to be some harm and should not be applied to all development.</p>
7	Gaynor Gallacher Highways England	<p>Policies proposed are unlikely to lead to development that will cause a severe impact on the strategic road network. No specific comments on draft but in general terms welcome proposals which enable limited growth to reflect local need and support community facilities, the encouragement of new development to consider road safety improvements and the promotion of sustainable transport measures, pedestrian and cycle links which can reduce the need for out-commuting and the reliance on the private car.</p>
8	David Stuart Historic England	<p>Reviewed previous comments in the light of latest consultation and have no observations. Happy for the Local Authority to exercise discretion in addressing any heritage issues associated with the plan.</p>
9	Sally and Michael Howard-Tripp	<p>Plan in general well prepared.</p> <p><u>Policy 15 Land at West Cottage</u> Several road accidents on Cerne Hill due to excessive speed, narrow road and poor visibility. Badly affected by frost in winter. Increase in large vehicle use of road. Additional housing especially for the young should be considered but this site should be taken out of the plan.</p>
10	Michael and Caroline Sharp	<p>Strongly agree with WDDC additional pre-submission comments-conservation team, in particular concerns for the impact of the proposed settlement boundary on the future of heritage assets including the conservation area and its setting. Concern for the Grade I listed church in Piddletrenhide and its setting which is outside the Local Plan DDB but would be inside the proposed settlement boundary and at risk of the presumption in favour of development. Propose the local plan boundary should be used for the church and nearby properties and supplies map.</p>
11	John Stobart Natural England	<p>No objection. Fully support policies 1 to 5 and Policy 8 which directly affect our interests. Unclear from site appraisal report whether greenfield allocations have had a basic walkover survey by competent ecologist. The allocation of priority grassland habitats should be avoided. If necessary, appropriate surveys should be commissioned and considered prior to the adoption of the plan.</p>

Piddle Valley Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses

12	Piddletrenthide Parish Church Council	The Neighbourhood Plan boundary at Piddlehinton puts the west side of the Grade I listed All Saints Church inside the boundary and at risk of development. Care and sensitivity should be afforded to heritage assets and the areas around them. The current West Dorset boundary should be reinstated to protect the church.
----	---------------------------------------	---