

## MOTCOMBE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2017 to 2027

### Summary of representations submitted to the examiner

Below is a summary of representations submitted to the independent examiner with respect to the examination of the Motcombe Neighbourhood Plan between April and May 2019. Electronic copies of the original representations can be downloaded from: [www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/motcombe-neighbourhood-plan](http://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/motcombe-neighbourhood-plan)

Please note that the representations are listed in order of receipt. A large number of representations were received that were identical or near identical. MOT04 was the first to arrive; in this report later representations simply refer back to this one.

Rep #	Respondent	Summary
MOT01	Ian Bailey	Object on the grounds that the preferred site on Shorts Green Farm was omitted from the submission plan by the Parish Council because their consultant had concluded that this site would be rejected by the Dorset Council due to unresolved issues relating to the site. The planning application remains current. Due to the unchallenged suitability of the Shorts Green Farm site, the Parish Council should have included it in the submission plan.
MOT02	Highways Agency	Unlikely to affect the SRN and therefore have no specific comments to make.
MOT03	Cranborne Chase AONB	Broadly content with this straightforward and readable Neighbourhood Plan. The numbering of the policies seems a little inconsistent. On page 38 not all the evidence based links work.
MOT04	Gillian Blows	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The document does not represent the views of the villagers:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The consultation process was deeply flawed.</li> <li>○ Input from villagers was ignored in favour of the views of landowners.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The conclusions drawn do not adhere to the principles and aspirations set out by the Plan and do not follow logic.</li> </ul> <p>SUGGESTED MODIFICATION: Remove Site 4 in accordance with the many objections which have been ignored.</p>
MOT05	Christopher Blows	Same as MOT04.
MOT06	Sarah Lloyd	Same as MOT04.
MOT07	Markus Lloyd	Same as MOT04.

Rep #	Respondent	Summary
MOT08	Jacqueline Collis	Same as MOT04.
MOT09	Nigel Collis	Same as MOT04.
MOT10	Edward Coney	Same as MOT04 but without the Suggested Modification at the end.
MOT11	Diane Coney	Same as MOT04 but without the Suggested Modification at the end.
MOT12	Andrew Prosser	Same as MOT04.
MOT13	Susan Prosser	Same as MOT04.
MOT14	Alastair Nye	Same as MOT04.
MOT15a	Wyatt Homes	<p>Object to Policy MOT7. The suggested modifications to policy MOT7 can be summarised as follows (text proposed to be deleted struck through and proposed additional text underlined):</p> <p>The amount of housing growth supported is intended to deliver <u>at least</u> 3.6 dwellings per annum, <del>averaged</del> over the plan period.</p> <p><del>Affordable housing will be provided on all major developments.</del> Affordable housing will be provided on all sites that deliver eleven or more net additional dwellings and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of more than 1,000 square metres.</p> <p>The type and size of affordable homes should include a mix of 1-3 bedroom rented, shared ownership and starter homes (or a different mix if justified by an up-to-date housing needs survey). Provision may also be made through rural exception sites, under Policy MOT13.</p> <p>The type and size of open market housing should provide a mix of 1, <del>2 and 3 bedroom</del> homes to include, <del>at least 50% as</del> <u>in appropriate locations</u>, apartments or terraced properties, including those designed for age-ready housing.</p>
MOT15b	Wyatt Homes	<p>Object to Policy MOT9. The suggested modifications to policy MOT9 can be summarised as follows (text proposed to be deleted struck through and proposed additional text underlined):</p> <p>Land at Shire Meadows, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for <u>at least</u> <del>about</del> 10 dwellings <del>including at least 4 affordable homes</del>, at a density appropriate to the village's character, subject to <del>a</del> <u>consideration</u> of the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The type and size of housing accords with Policy MOT7;</li> <li>The layout of development respects the linear pattern of roadside development;</li> </ol>

Rep #	Respondent	Summary
		<p>c) The design and scale of dwellings, combined with a landscape scheme along the southern boundary, provides a soft landscaped edge and will minimise the visual impact of development in wider views from public rights of way;</p> <p>d) <del>A biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan is secured to provide a net gain in biodiversity</del> <u>A net gain in biodiversity being secured through any measures that may be required as part of an approved biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan;</u></p> <p>e) Suitable safe access is secured, and provision is made for a footway along the site frontage and allowing for safe connection as far as practical <u>and viable</u> to The Street;</p> <p>f) A surface water drainage strategy is secured that ensures drainage from the site is designed so as to avoid (and ideally reduce) flood risk to properties adjoining Shire Meadows</p> <p>Should a need to identify additional land to meet housing requirements be identified during the examination of the NP either as a further allocation or as a reserve site, there is an opportunity to extend the proposed site allocation south, via an amendment to the Policies Map as shown on the enclosed plan.</p>
MOT15c	Wyatt Homes	Policy MOT6 duplicates requirements already set out by Dorset Council with regard to the need for and relevant thresholds in relation to submission of a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan in support of a planning application. Planning policy requirements with respect to biodiversity enhancement are also already included within policy 4 (The Natural Environment) of the adopted North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (January 2016). The policy is not therefore necessary – delete.
MOT15d	Wyatt Homes	Object to Policy MOT7a. Policy 4 of the adopted North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (January 2016) addresses the relevant requirements to be considered with regard to the landscape impact of new development when determining planning applications. As such policy MOT7a is unnecessary and could be deleted. Should policy MOT7A be retained within the NP it should be revised accordingly to make clear that consideration of the impact of views from public rights of way relates to views from within the Cranborne Chase AONB.
MOT15e	Wyatt Homes	Paragraph 3.31 of the NP refers to a requirement for a landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) including photomontages to be produced as part of a planning application for development that would be clearly prominent within open views from a public right of way. This requirement differs from that set out within Dorset Council’s adopted schedule of Planning Application Requirements dated 2nd April 2019, incorrectly putting the emphasis on the impact of views from a public right of way in general terms. Paragraph 3.31 should be deleted. If retained the requirement

<b>Rep #</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary</b>
		should be amended to be consistent with Dorset Council's adopted schedule of Planning Application requirements, or cross refer to it.
MOT15f	Wyatt Homes	Paragraph 4.11 makes reference to a site at Shorts Green Farm that has been excluded from the Plan due to flood risk reasons. It notes however that an outline planning application had been submitted for its development in January 2018 and that if approval were given for that application the Parish Council would consider the implications of such a decision on the NP. This text introduces uncertainty to the NP and is therefore inappropriate, particularly given that if / when the plan is made it will form part of the statutory development plan for the area. Delete the sentence: 'If approval were to be given, the Parish Council would consider the implications of the decision on this Neighbourhood Plan.'
MOT15g	Wyatt Homes	In order to provide consistency between the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan, consideration should be given to extending the settlement boundary to include the proposed housing allocations. This would ensure that future planning applications for the development of the allocated sites can be approved in line with LP policies that restrict development outside settlement boundaries. Paragraph 4.25 should be revised to refer to the settlement boundary having been revised to include the sites allocated for development within the NP and the Policies Map updated accordingly.
MOT15h	Wyatt Homes	The Policies Maps should be amended to include the additional land identified on the enclosed plan in relation to policy MOT9 should a need to identify additional land to meet housing requirements be identified during the examination of the NP, either as an extension to the existing allocation or as a reserve site.
MOT16	Mr & Mrs Jobling	The proposed housing site at Sunset Ridge in Elm Hill (Policy MOT10) is suitable for development and the land owner continues their willingness to make it available for housing development. As such, this proposed allocation is supported.
MOT17	Victoria Madel	Same as MOT04.
MOT18	Chris Madel	Same as MOT04.
MOT19	Neal Hutchinson	Same as MOT04.
MOT20	Kay Hutchinson	Same as MOT04.
MOT21	Charles Hutchinson	Same as MOT04.
MOT22	John Heenan	Same as MOT04.
MOT23	Karen Harvey	Same as MOT04.

<b>Rep #</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary</b>
MOT24	Emma French	Same as MOT04.
MOT25	David French	Same as MOT04.
MOT26	Richard Barford	Same as MOT04.
MOT27	Christine Barford	Same as MOT04.
MOT28	Muriel Walters	Same as MOT04.
MOT29	Amanda Lucas	Same as MOT04.
MOT30	Samuel Lucas	Same as MOT04.
MOT31	Harriet Lucas	Same as MOT04.
MOT32	Christopher Percival	Same as MOT04.
MOT33	Leslie Turner	Same as MOT04.
MOT34	Kim Christopher	Same as MOT04.
MOT35	Eric Powell	Same as MOT04.
MOT36	Sylvia Curbishley	Same as MOT04.
MOT37	Susan Curbishley	Same as MOT04.
MOT38	Lynn Stoneham	Same as MOT04.
MOT39	Doreen Stoneham	Same as MOT04.
MOT40	Stanley Wilson	Same as MOT04.
MOT41	Christine Wilson	Same as MOT04.
MOT42	Alannah Carey Bates	Same as MOT04.
MOT43	Simon Whelan	Same as MOT04.
MOT44	Ann Bayfield	Same as MOT04.
MOT45	Alan Bayfield	Same as MOT04.
MOT46	Janice Heyes	Same as MOT04.
MOT47	Edward Hunter	Same as MOT04.
MOT48	Eloise Collis Hunter	Same as MOT04.
MOT49	Ian Bailey	Same as MOT04 but with the addition of the extra Suggested Modification: "The reinsertion of Site

Rep #	Respondent	Summary
		13 (Shorts Green Farm) which was assessed and approved by villagers but removed without due reference to residents.”
MOT50	Jane Bailey	Same as MOT04.
MOT51	Rupert Lawson-Tancred	Site 21/22 should be completely removed and never be reconsidered. It satisfies none of the stated criteria – dangerous road bend, Grade II Listed asset, public views, dark skies, ribbon development. Coppleridge is a distinct historical area and rural farm land well away from centre of village. Completely inappropriate. Cycle way should not run on bridal way, too narrow dangerous, ruin natural habitat corridor would force additional traffic out onto dangerous bend. Shorts Green Farm should be put on development list highly suitable central site a proactive approach should be taken to mitigate any flood risks. The report is short sighted.
MOT52	Caroline Clark	Strongly object. <u>Page 21 4.14/4.15</u> plus other areas – the significance of Coppleridge as an historically distinct area has been completely ignored again (despite it being clear in the historical map where other marked areas are mentioned). <u>Sites 20/21</u> should be completely abandoned and not reconsidered. It satisfies no criteria that the report states is important. There seems to be more appetite amongst the authors to protect Frog Lane. <u>Site 18</u> – why is the affordable housing being put out on a limb? It should be central. <u>Sunrise Ridge (p23 4.19)</u> – there should be no road parking – which is not achievable onsite – you will push horses in to the road also there is a pond with great newts on the site and critical field drainage plus wayleaves
MOT53a	Mr & Mrs Hurd	The Consultation Statement does not meet legal requirements. It should be withdrawn and re-submitted with a reference and consideration of our previous representation.
MOT53b	Mr & Mrs Hurd	Object to Land West of Little Elms being a rural affordable housing exception site. It should be allocated as a housing site instead of or in addition to the other housing site allocations proposed.
MOT54	Alan Cluett	Same as MOT04.
MOT55	Helen Cluett	Same as MOT04.
MOT56	Freddie Hutchinson	Same as MOT04.
MOT57	Dorset Council	<b>Page 1</b> The map misses the northern most tip of the parish boundary. Also, parts of the parish boundary are difficult to distinguish as they are drawn in blue (the same colour as the flood zone). <b>Page 13</b> Suggest showing the Gillingham Royal Forest area as this is referred to by Policy MOT5.

Rep #	Respondent	Summary
		<p><b>Page 14</b> Suggest that the second paragraph of Policy MOT6 should clarify that it only applies in cases where development requires planning permission (i.e. permitted development schemes can't have additional requirements imposed).</p> <p><b>Page 21</b> Suggest that in Policy MOT8 the 4th bullet point "conversion of existing buildings" needs clarifying (cf. para 4.6 on page 19). It should state that it relates to permitted development schemes and also schemes compliant with Local Plan Part 1 Policy 29 (The Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside), to avoid giving the impression that there is general policy support for the conversion of buildings in the open countryside.</p> <p><b>Page 22 onwards</b> For Policies MOT9 + MOT10 + MOT11 we suggest quoting the site reference number used on the Policy Map in order to give the reader certainty as to which site is being referred to.</p> <p><b>Page 25</b> suggest the Motcombe Neighbourhood Plan revises the settlement boundary to include its new housing allocations.</p> <p><b>Page 36</b> The examiner's report of the Milborne St Andrew NP has recently recommended striking out the policy requirement for local parking standards where they differ to the county-wide standards. For consistency we suggest that a similar approach is taken in Policy MOT18.</p>
MOT58	Symonds & Sampson LLP	Resubmission of a response to a previous questionnaire issued by the neighbourhood plan group regarding site suitability. Overall the response was in support of allocating Site 5 for development purposes and is critical of the reasons for its non-selection. It concludes that the site will not have the adverse impacts of other chosen sites.