



Alderholt Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Prepared by: Dorset Planning Consultant Ltd, on behalf of Alderholt Parish Council

This Consultation Statement summarises all the statutory and non-statutory consultation that has been undertaken with the community and other relevant statutory bodies and stakeholders in developing the Alderholt Neighbourhood Plan (NP). It describes how concerns have been addressed and what changes have been made to the final Plan as a result of the pre-submission consultation.

The purpose of this document is to demonstrate that the Neighbourhood Plan has been developed on the basis of wide and thorough community engagement. More specifically, the neighbourhood planning regulations require a consultation statement to be produced which —

(a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan or neighbourhood development plan as proposed to be modified;

(b) explains how they were consulted;

(c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and

(d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan or neighbourhood development plan as proposed to be modified.

Date of report: April 2024

CONTENTS

Stage 1.	Vision and Objectives.....	2
Stage 2.	Site Options – Landowner Consultation	4
Stage 3.	Options Consultation	5
Stage 4.	Local Green Spaces – Landowner Consultation.....	10
Stage 5.	Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation.....	13
Appendix 1:	Scoping File Note	63
Appendix 2.	Display boards and survey used in the Options Consultation.....	65
Appendix 3.	Display boards and survey used in the Pre-Submission Consultation.....	76

Stage 1. Vision and Objectives

What was done:

1.1 The Parish Council set up a committee to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for Alderholt, which met for the first time in the summer of 2020. Prior to this, the Parish Council had set up a Local Plan Liaison Committee, as the possible large-scale expansion of the village suggested as an option in the Local Plan Review in 2018, and as part of that work had undertaken two fairly extensive household surveys (in 2017 and 2019).

1.2 The first consultation event that took place after work commenced on the Neighbourhood Plan, was in the form of a focus day, held on Saturday 5 February 2022. This was a facilitated event, with various representative groups hosting stalls on specific topics (housing, trailway, transport, leisure, education, environment, young people and employment), asking for feedback by way of post-it notes with maps, and using photographs etc used to show how Alderholt had changed over time and encourage discussion on what had worked and what hadn't. Comments on post-it notes were then tabulated into a spreadsheet. The results from this and the previous household surveys fed into the first draft of a Vision and Objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan.

1.3 Progress on the Neighbourhood Plan was then presented to the Parish meeting on 1 April 2023, which ran between 10.30am - 1pm. The displays included the draft 'vision', information on the housing numbers and potential sites (as identified from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment). This was publicised via posters displayed around the parish, communicated by social media via various channels, and included in the March and April editions of the parish magazine. In addition, banners were used to raise awareness of the meeting.

Copy of page advert in the Parish Magazine

Who responded:

1.4 Whilst an exact tally of people attending the February 2022 focus group session was not kept, the Committee estimated that between 300 and 400 people attended. There were 47 attendees at the Annual Parish meeting in 2023.

ALDERHOLT ANNUAL PARISH MEETING

ON

SATURDAY 1st APRIL

10.30am — 1.00pm

IN THE VILLAGE HALL

Get involved young and old!

IT'S YOUR VILLAGE

IT'S YOUR FUTURE

IT'S YOUR VIEWS

IT'S YOUR IDEAS

IT'S YOUR OPPORTUNITY

IT'S YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Main findings:

1.5 Whilst the findings from the Focus Day consultation were not documented at that time, an analysis of the responses was undertaken by Dorset Planning Consultants Ltd, together with data from the earlier surveys – see File Note in Appendix 1. In particular, the response collated from the consultation indicated that the main concerns of local residents related to housing, transport and local facilities, as summarised below:

Housing

Main concerns noted were regarding the potential scale of growth, and the impact on the village and its facilities. If additional houses are built this should include social housing that is genuinely affordable to local people. The existing consents should be progressed first – particularly the Surplus Stores site as this is brownfield land.

Transport

Main concerns were the lack of any viable alternatives to the car, and that the highway network is inadequate for major traffic increases and there are problems with speeding traffic. There could be better traffic management (speed and HGV restrictions), and better public transport is needed. The railway could provide a safe cycling route (but recognising that this is unlikely to operate as an effective alternative to the car)

Leisure and Facilities

The village would benefit from additional facilities – such as a gym or skate park, a youth club and a better network of footways for getting around the village. Concerns regarding capacity in the local schools, access to healthcare and the reliability of the internet / broadband connections

1.6 These findings were used to inform the first draft of the vision and objectives. Feedback at the Annual Parish meeting, however was limited due to the consultation on the Alderholt Meadows outline planning application (P/OUT/2023/01166) – with those who attended generally speaking against the planning application. As a result, it was considered appropriate to re-consult on the vision and objectives at the next opportunity.

Stage 2. Site Options – Landowner Consultation

What was done:

2.1 In May 2023 landowners were contacted to check that the information about the availability of their site/s, as recorded by Dorset Council in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, was correct. This was done via email / letter with landowners either known or records checked via HM Land Registry.

2.2 The landowners were advised that initial research (in terms of housing numbers) indicated that it was likely the Neighbourhood Plan would look to make provision for about 50 dwellings in total over the next 12 years. As such, the Parish Council were interested in identifying one or more sites to deliver this quantum of development, and which would deliver at least 35% as affordable housing as part of the housing mix (although sites that would provide a higher proportion of affordable housing are likely to be more favourably considered). The first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan vision and objectives was also attached for information.

2.3 The landowners were asked to confirm their contact details, and whether:

- the site area as mapped for the SHLAA was correct (if not please could they supply an accurate map)
- they would wish their site to be considered for one of more of the following:
 - o Open market housing
 - o A mix of open market and 35% affordable housing
 - o A higher level of affordable housing (please specify)
 - o Employment / workspaces
 - o Mix of development (all of the above)
 - o Anything else (please specify)
- they wished to make any comments in terms of how their site could help meet the draft objectives.

Who responded:

2.4 Responses were received in relation to all sites, although this did require some follow-up contact to achieve, and not all responded to all of the questions.

Main findings:

2.5 Three parties indicated that they did not wish their sites to be considered – these were the Parish Council (in relation to the Recreation Ground) and two private owners of the plots known as Pittswood on Daggons Road and Cromwell Cottage on Ringwood Road. Whilst no direct contact was received from the owner of the site known as The Oaks on Daggons Road, the agent, Chapman Lily Planning, confirmed that they had contacted the owner and had had no response/instructions from them with regard to the site.

Stage 3. Options Consultation

What was done:

The options consultation was held in July 2023. This was done to get feedback on the potential site options that had been identified and assessed, as well as checking the vision and objectives, and whether the NP committee had identified those facilities and features (such as important views and local green spaces) that were valued by the community.

A two-page spread about the consultation and progress on the Neighbourhood Plan was included in the June 2023 issue of the parish magazine, and made available on the Parish Council website. A further single page advert was also placed in the July 2023 issue of the parish magazine to flag up the consultation events on 8th and 17th July. Posters were distributed around the village, and the consultation promoted on Alderholt’s Facebook page from the end of June. A Prize Draw was also offered to encourage a good response level, given the potential for consultation fatigue.



Two drop-in events were held in the village, the first on the morning of Saturday 8 July from 10 – 12:30pm, the second on the Monday evening of 17 July between 7 to 9pm. These were manned by volunteers from the NP committee, and used display boards. Printed copies of the survey forms were made available. Copies of the display boards and survey are provided in Appendix 2.

Who responded:


174 completed survey forms were received, representing 233 people (as some forms were completed by a couple or family rather than individually). The majority of responses were from people living in the village, with a broadly even distribution across the area (although slightly favouring the eastern side of the village), as shown in the table below:

Village - South (south of Earlswood / Birchwood Drive)	53	27.0%
Village - West (between Park Lane / the Churchill Arms)	38	19.4%
Village - East (between Park Lane / Hillbury Road, north of Birchwood Drive)	75	38.3%
Daggons	14	7.1%
Other outlying hamlets / farms (Cripplestyle, Crendell)	5	2.6%
Outside of the parish	11	5.6%

Main findings:


Vision and Objectives

The vision was broadly supported (average rating 3.5 out of 4 stars) and all of the proposed objectives received over 80% support.



Site Options

The consultation focused on the shortlisted options identified through the site options assessment undertaken by AECOM.




There were mixed views on the merits of the different site options, and these were examined further with reference to the comments and considering the area of the village where the site was proposed. Sites 004, 007a, 013 and 016a were clearly considered unsuitable by the majority of residents. Site 020 was finely balanced between those that felt it was suitable versus those that

did not. The remaining sites all had more people suggesting that they may be suitable (than not), with sites 002, 006a and 009 having the fewest negative responses.

There was no indication that any of the sites rejected at the first stage needed to be reconsidered in preference to the shortlisted options (90% of responses to this question were 'no').

Local Green Spaces and Views

The 11 Local Green Spaces put forward by the NP Committee as possible options were broadly agreed by those responding to the survey, with at most only 10% of respondents indicating that the spaces were not important, and at least 69% saying that they were important.



Additional green spaces were suggested for consideration, including Bonfire Hill, the allotments, and several of the site options. These suggestions were considered by the NP Committee.

Similarly the 5 important views suggested were also endorsed, with at least 80% of respondents agreeing that each one was important. Suggestions were also put forward for other views to be considered, including views across some of the site options.

Design

Several questions were posed regarding which housing styles and layouts people thought would be appropriate for Alderholt – the results of which were passed onto AECOM who were tasked with preparing some design guidelines.


Photo 1 was the most popular, followed by Photo 6, then 7. Photos 2 to 5 were the least popular.

Additionally, for each photo, people were asked what they liked or disliked about the development. They were asked to evaluate building



appearance, parking arrangement, architectural variety, open space, relation to context, accessibility. They were also invited to make any additional detailed comments. Photos 1, 6 and 7, which had received the most positive feedback, were generally liked in terms of their building appearance, architectural variety and open space – these factors were seen as the most positively influential. The other developments received a more mixed response.


Residents were then asked to what extent they agreed with design ideas suggested by the NP Committee. The following indicates the proportion of respondents who agreed with the suggested approach. Most were endorsed by at least 75% of those responding, with the exception of modern designs on the edge of the settlement.



Residents were then invited to rank these ideas in terms of their overall importance. Trees, green spaces, pavements and parking provision were ranked as most important. Affordability and eco-friendly design were ranked as fairly important. Modern, 21st century designs were ranked as least important. Finally, residents were asked to outline which design elements were of most and least importance for future development. The most important factor respondents identified was rural character; followed by open spaces and energy efficiency, pavements and parking provision. Affordability and beautiful designs were identified as least important.

Heritage

A question was also included to gauge how much time should be spent on identifying non-designated heritage assets, as this could potentially delay the preparation of the Plan. The response suggested that it was moderately important, and therefore some work on this was undertaken within the resources available to the committee.



Stage 4. Local Green Spaces – Landowner Consultation

What was done:

In September 2023, based on the feedback from the Options consultation, the landowners of the various Local Green Spaces likely to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan were identified and contacted by email / letter. The proposed Local Green Spaces were:

- LGS1 Alderholt Recreation Ground and Play Area
- LGS2 Blackwater Grove Triangle
- LGS3 Churchill Close Kickabout Area
- LGS4 Earlswood Drive Amenity Space
- LGS5 Oak Road woodland corridor
- LGS6 Tudor Close Amenity Area
- LGS7 Kestrel Way Amenity Areas (2)
- LGS8 Windsor Way kickabout area
- LGS9 Alderholt School Playing Field
- LGS10 Blackwater Grove field
- LGS11 Strouds Firs
- LGS12 Bonfire Hill

The landowners were provided with:

- A map showing the proposed site;
- A brief explanation about Local Green Space designation and the NPPF criteria (i.e. that the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land);
- Clarification that land can be considered for designation even if there is no public access. However designation does not in itself confer any rights of public access over what exists at present or any specific requirements as to how the land is managed.

They were asked to give their views on the possible designation of their land.

Who responded:

Responses were received from landowners in respect of the following spaces:

LGS	Landowner comment
LGS1 Alderholt Recreation Ground and Play Area	Agree with designation <i>Alderholt Parish Council</i>
LGS5 Oak Road woodland corridor	We do not want our property, LGS5, included in the Green Spaces Plan and we would object very strongly to any decisions to the contrary. When we bought the land, the Park Lane end was a complete mess. It had been used by "fly tippers" and it took months to clear the debris. Eventually, we cleared the rubbish and had the area levelled off and put down to grass. By keeping the grass short, it looks as though it is part of

	<p>the front garden of No 43 Park Lane. As a result of all our work, we would like to keep it in private ownership and not part of any local plan. The Woodland section is subject to various restrictions and has no monetary value. The only way that we would agree to the Council could including the woodland section as a Local Green Space would be for the Council to take ownership of the woodland.</p>
<p>LGS10 Blackwater Grove field</p>	<p>I do not wish for my land to be put forward as Local Green Space within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The land has recently formed part of a planning application submitted by Dudsbury Homes Ltd (planning reference P/OUT/2023/01166 Land south of Ringwood Road Alderholt) which was refused planning permission and is also being promoted through the emerging Dorset Local Plan. This area was proposed as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to help mitigate the impacts of recreational pressures on protected habitats, and therefore forms part of a more strategic approach to the future growth of Alderholt being promoted and considered through the Local Plan making process.</p> <p>I have not seen or been provided with any rationale for the proposed Local Green Space designation meeting the NPPF tests. The test that the proposed LGS is ‘demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular significance e.g. its beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of its wildlife.’ has not been met. LGS10 is regularly cut for grass and / or grazed by livestock and is utilitarian in its use. It has no public access and therefore no recreational value. It has no special features or beauty that make it stand out. It carries no historic significance, is less tranquil than other land that is further from the settlement and is not rich in wildlife. I am not aware of it ever having any special connection to the residents of Alderholt, given that it has been in my or my family’s ownership for approximately the last 100 years.</p>
<p>LGS11 Strouds Firs</p>	<p>Object to the proposed designation of the Strouds Firs. Appears that the designation is being made to prevent development. The wider site extends to 14ha and offers potential to be part developed to support the village if not now, then in the future.</p> <p>The vast majority of land at Strouds Firs is not visible from any public vantage point. Only the area along Station Road is visible to the public and this is not an area that the Estate would include within any development proposals.</p> <p>The LGS also disregards the Government advice that the green area is not an extensive tract of land.</p>

Main findings:

The feedback was discussed by the NP Committee. The lack of responses was considered disappointing, but it was noted that there would be further consultation on the draft plan (and therefore the proposed LGS) as part of the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission consultation. In terms of

the feedback, whilst the objections to sites 5, 10 and 11 were noted, these were not considered to provide any evidence that the designation of these sites would be unsuitable (just unwanted).

LGS5: The different characteristics within LGS5 were noted (woodland corridor and Park Lane grassed area), and it was felt could be better explained within the Neighbourhood Plan description. The latter continues the route of Park Lane, which was considered an appropriate location for an amenity greenspace in the 1971 Village Plan, and is therefore of some historic note in understanding the village's history.

LGS10: The characteristics of LGS10 and its significance to local residents would be described in the Regulation 14 draft plan, and the landowner could comment further as part of that consultation. The two potential roles (potential SANG and LGS) were not considered to be mutually exclusive.

LGS11: The area of Strouds Firs proposed for LGS designation does not extend to the entire site and is approximately 3.4ha. It covers the area closest to the highway, which is both more visible and of greater landscape and wildlife value, and therefore of greatest significance. It does not include the area of potential development land as shown on the Estates' submission to the Parish Council (email 13 June 2023), which indicated that all of the area proposed as LGS could provide flood mitigation opportunities. The two potential roles were not considered to be mutually exclusive.

Stage 5. Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation

What was done:

The consultation on the draft Plan took place during December and January 2023/4, for just over 6 weeks. The consultation was aimed at people who live work or carry on business in the area, and also sent to a range of statutory consultees, including Dorset Council, neighbouring Councils, and organisations such as Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency. As the Plan was also subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment, the draft findings of that assessment were also made available for comment as part of the consultation.

Publicity regarding the plan was posted in the parish news section of the parish magazine for the November and December editions, with an update being given for the January edition. Posters were printed and distributed week commencing 20th November. Social media networks were also used.

Two drop-in events were run by the NP committee, the first on Monday 4th December between 18:30 - 21:00 and the second on Saturday 13th January between 10:00 - 12:30 in the Village Hall. Posters were put up around the village publicising the consultation and drop-in events.

Emails were sent to the following statutory consultees:

- Dorset Council
- New Forest District Council
- Hampshire County Council
- Fordingbridge Town Council
- Ringwood Town Council
- Verwood Town Council
- Ellingham, Harbridge & Ibsley Parish Council
- Cranborne Parish Council
- Sandleheath Parish Council
- Damerham Parish Council
- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Cranborne and West Wilts AONB team
- National Trust
- Woodland Trust
- Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
- Scottish and Southern Energy
- Southern Gas Network
- Public Health Programme Advisor
- Royal Bournemouth & Christchurch Hosp's
- Wessex Water
- Bournemouth Water
- Magna Housing
- Spectrum Housing Group



**ALDERHOLT
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
NEEDS YOU!**

**Comment on the DRAFT PLAN
Have Your Say
ON LINE at
www.alderholtparishcouncil.gov.uk
OR IN PERSON
IN THE VILLAGE HALL
Monday 4th December 6.30pm – 9.00pm
Saturday 13th January 10.00am – 12.30pm**

The draft Alderholt Neighbourhood Plan is the "pre-submission" (Regulation 14) version. The deadline for making representations on the draft plan is 19 January 2024. We would encourage anyone who lives, works or carries out business in the parish to respond. The Neighbourhood Plan will be available online, at the Village Hall events, and will also be available for viewing at the Reading Room, and the Parish Office during normal opening hours (Monday, 09:30-12:00) throughout December and January. A response form (online and paper versions) will be available at those locations, with paper forms to be returned to the Parish Office, 1 Station Road, Alderholt, Fordingbridge, Hants, SP6 3RB or by email to clerk@alderholtparishcouncil.gov.uk.

- Forestry Commission
- Fordingbridge Surgery
- Fordingbridge MyDentist
- Alderholt School
- Cranborne GP Surgery
- Stonewater Housing
- Sovereign Housing
- Access Dorset and DOTS Disability CIC
- Dorset Race Equality Council

Copies of the display boards and survey are provided in Appendix 3.

Who responded:


89 questionnaires / emails were received from local residents. Consultation responses were also received from the following Statutory Consultees, businesses and landowners:

Statutory Consultees	Local businesses / organisations	Landowners ((Site ref)
- Dorset Council	- Alderholt Motors (*)	- 004: Highwood (email)
- Environment Agency	- Alderholt Stables (*)	- 006a: Macra Limited (via SM)
- Historic England	- Alderholt Village Hall (*)	- 007: Dudsbury Homes (via SM)
- National Highways	- Fordingbridge and District Community Centre (*)	- 010/011: N Thorne (via SM and email)
- South West Water	- The Chris Walker Swingtet (*)	- 011: Metis Homes (email)
- Damerham Parish Council	<i>NB all of these were completed by local residents, and are included in the local resident responses</i>	
- Sandleheath Parish Council		

Late responses (included in the summary of main issues raised) were also received from the landowners of Site 002: Mr & Mrs McIlwain and Site 009 Commercial Freeholds Limited, as well as Natural England and the Cranborne Chase National Landscape.


Main Findings:

About one half (51%) of those responding to the online survey who live in the area said that they would support the plan at the referendum as drafted, with another third (35%) also indicating support for the plan, but suggesting that some minor changes made. If making the assumption that those responding via email (and who did not respond specifically on this point) would not support the plan, these proportions would drop to 44% and 29% respectively, with 27% considering that major changes are needed.




The first graph illustrates the level of overall support for each policy as expressed through the survey forms or clearly indicated in the emailed responses completed by local residents. The 15 responses received via Survey Monkey that represented business / landowner interests from people not resident in the area, is shown in the second graph.

Responses - RESIDENTS



Responses - Non-Residents



The main contentious policies are clearly Policy 13 and 14, which deal with two of the site allocations (Policy 13 is the Paddock, South of Daggons Road, and Policy 14 is land south of Blackwater Grove). However in both cases the majority of those responding agreed with these policies. The issues raised in respect of these sites have been considered, and the respective landowners have been contacted and, where appropriate, supplied further information in relation to the sites.

Natural England did raise concerns regarding the mitigation requirements for the protected heathlands, and also in respect to the railway routing through Cranborne Common. These issues have been addressed through changes to the plan, and Natural England have advised that they “have no objection to the proposed Neighbourhood Plan modifications. It would be appropriate for a conclusion of no adverse effect on the integrity of the designated habitats and International sites to be reached.”

Cranborne Chase National Landscape Partnership raised a number of issues in relation to the potential impact of development on their designated area, both in terms of the dark skies, and also recreational and other indirect impacts. These concerns have been discussed with the Partnership Officer and amendments made to recognise these issues. They are content that the level of housing proposed through the NP should retain its village character, distinctiveness, and cohesiveness.

Several landowners / developers whose sites were not included as site allocations suggested that their (rejected) sites were preferable. However based on the SEA findings and resident's feedback there are no obvious reasons to change the Neighbourhood Plan's site allocations in this regard.

There was broad support for the three projects put forward, with more than three-quarter of local residents stating that they would be in favour of these.

All comments have been read and considered, and the main comments made (as relevant to the plan or process) have been summarised in the table that follows. In some cases where the comment may have been input against one area but is more applicable to another policy / part of the plan, the latter has been used. Every effort has been made to try to summarise remarks clearly, although there may be minor errors due to the wide-ranging nature of the comments received.

Summary of all main issues and proposed response:

Abbreviations: DC = Dorset Council, HRA = Habitats Regulations Assessment, LP = Local Plan, NP = Neighbourhood Plan, NPG = Neighbourhood Plan Group, NPPF = National Planning Policy Framework, SEA = Strategic Environmental Assessment

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Damersham and Sandله Heath Parish Councils	--	ALL	Support the plan as drafted	Support noted.
Land promoters Dudson Homes (Site 007)	--	ALL	Dudson Homes has submitted proposals which could deliver the Neighbourhood Plan aspirations and create a sustainable village. Regrettably there has been no attempt by the NP Group to engage with Dudson Homes in the preparation of this Neighbourhood Plan, even to discuss the basis of the Plan's aspirations and strategy. Progressing this Plan to adoption without major changes will simply set the Plan up to fail its local residents. Dudson Homes would again request the opportunity to engage with the NP Group and Parish Council on the development of the Neighbourhood Plan. Dudson Homes wishes to avoid the need to submit objections to the NP Examination on these issues where constructive dialogue is possible.	The NP did engage with Dudson Homes through the Call for Sites consultation, and they responded that the vision and objectives were not deliverable without a step change in the scale of development. Whilst not explicit in their response, the implication was that this would be of a scale proposed as part of the outline application which had already been submitted to Dorset Council and consulted on. On this basis it is difficult to envisage that there can be constructive dialogue – subsequent response to the options consultation give no indication that Dudson Homes are interesting in working with the NP Group to deliver the level of development sought by the local community, nor any additional information on their sites. Nonetheless the NP Group can contact the respondent to ascertain what additional points they would add and in what areas they consider constructive dialogue may be possible.
Dorset Council	1.2	Para 1.2.10 and diagram on page 3	Misses the Regulation 16 consultation which provides a second opportunity for public	The diagram is intended to be a simplistic representation of the process, but reference can be made to the additional consultation stage. Section

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Environment Agency	1.3	Para 1.3.8	<p>consultation after the plan has been submitted but before the plan goes to the examiner.</p> <p>Your plan includes areas which are in Source Protection Zones (SPZs), which are groundwater resources that are particularly sensitive to contamination and other impacts. These SPZs should be considered within your plan especially as growth or development is proposed. Potentially contaminative development should be avoided in these SPZ areas. The relevance of the designation and the potential implication upon development proposals should be considered with reference to our Groundwater Protection guidance: https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection</p>	<p>1.2 is being updated in any event to reflect the stage reached. <i>Amend diagram to add Reg 16 consultation, and update Section 1.2 to reflect stage reached.</i></p> <p>Noted – this can be referenced in the overview of the area (section 1.3) but only impacts on a very limited area about 100m wide on the border with Damerham parish. There are no definite proposals for potentially contaminative developments being put forward, and given the location would be unlikely to come forward under the parameters set under Policy 10 (and in any eventuality would be covered by national policy in this regard). <i>Reference limited SPZ area within the parish under section 1.3.</i></p>
Land promoters Highwood (Site 006)	1.5	Objectives	<p>The necessity to adequately plan for and provide affordable housing to meet local needs should be included prominently within the stated ‘Our Objectives’</p>	<p>This is covered in the fourth objective – it is not considered necessary to specifically reference affordable housing which is in any event discussed in much more detail in section 4.1.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
Cranborne Chase National Landscape Partnership	1.5	Vision and Objectives	<p>The NP ‘vision’ aligns with its location in the setting of a nationally important and nationally designed NL / AONB and the Partnership supports that vision. The ‘objectives’ flow naturally from that vision.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
Dorset Council	3.1	Policy 1	<p>Noted and supported – although see comments above regarding making Map 3 clearer.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Historic England	3.1	Policy 1	We note and applaud your community's dedication to preserving and enhancing its distinctive historic character through policies designed to identify and protect this, as well as resources aimed at assisting in informed decision making such as the Character Area appraisal and Design Guidance.	Support noted
Land promoters Macra Ltd (Site 006a)	3.1	Policy 1	Broadly in support of this Policy, however is it correct that all houses will require 6m front gardens? This green space could be better served as more public open space or rear gardens.	The policy has been drafted to recognise that there may be exceptions as it uses the phrased 'should generally' and also gives examples of a possible exception by using the word 'such as' in terms of mitigating circumstances.
Land promoters Individual (Sites 010 and 011)	3.1	Policy 1	Not all properties require a front garden, and some variation can be positive.	The policy provides these guidelines to set out clearly the community's expectations, so that applicants have as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable, as per NPPF paragraph 132. The policy does recognise the possibility of exceptions, but it will be down to the applicant to provide clearly justification of the mitigating circumstances why varying from the guidance is appropriate in that location.
Local resident responses	3.1	Policy 1	The phrase "strong rhythm within the areas of planned development" is not clear enough for a planning policy.	This could perhaps be clarified by including the word 'repetition' and make clear that this is in regard to layouts. <i>Amend first sentence of the third paragraph of Policy 1 to read "Where there is a strong rhythm / repetition of layouts within the areas of planned development (areas CA2a and CA2b as shown on Map 3), that rhythm / repetition should be respected.</i>
Local resident responses	3.1	Policy 1	Not clear why "Large scale backland development behind existing buildings should be avoided" is	This refers to where this would undermine the area's character. It is considered that development

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Dorset Council	3.2	Policy 2	<p>ignored in relation to development south of Blackwater Close.</p> <p>Noted and supported</p>	<p>south of Blackwater Close can be carefully designed to avoid such harm.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
Land promoters McIlwain (Site 002)	3.2	Policy 2	<p>Whilst broadly in agreement the policy should recognise that direct and attractive routes may only be provided where feasible</p>	<p>Noted – this is already accepted to a degree in the policy wording, and paragraph 3.2.5 is intended to convey that best endeavours are demonstrated to achieve such links. The wording has been reviewed and a few further amendments can be included to clarify these points.</p> <p><i>Amend last sentence of 3.2.5 read: “This may not always be feasible, or may require collaboration with adjacent landowners, and developers should explain what negotiations have taken place within their design and access statements if no link or a sub-standard link is proposed.”</i></p> <p><i>Amend second bullet of Policy 2 to read “ensuring any proposed on-street parking provision does not visually dominate the street”</i></p> <p><i>Amend fourth bullet by adding “...where feasible”</i></p> <p><i>Amend fifth bullet to start “the inclusion of...”</i></p> <p><i>Amend penultimate paragraph to read “Cul-de-sac developments should provide safe and attractive onward pedestrian links for a more connected and permeable settlement where this is possible, taking into account the potential for future connections to be made.”</i></p>
Local resident responses	3.2	Policy 2	<p>Provision of lighting on interlinking footways should ideally be low level or baffled to prevent excess light pollution</p>	<p>Noted – the specification of street lighting is a matter for Dorset Council who expect the upward light ratio to be restricted. However it may be useful to refer to the general principles contained</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Local resident responses	3.2	Policy 2	Concerns that 'cut through' footpaths from existing cul-de-sacs will increase opportunities for neighbourhood crimes and used inappropriately by electric scooter / bikes going too fast.	<p>in the Commission for Dark Skies Lighting Guidelines that lights must be designed to respect biodiversity (in particular in relation to potential wildlife corridors), prevent light spilling into people's homes and properties, or spillage above 70 degrees from the vertical. This is particularly important given that having International Dark Sky Reserve status puts an obligation on the National Landscape Partners, including Dorset Council, to reduce light pollution in the vicinity of Cranborne Chase.</p> <p><i>Expand 3.2.7 to reference the above considerations, and amend final bullet to read "provision of lighting where new footways are planned, designed to minimise harmful impacts on wildlife corridors, and light spilling into people's homes or upwards into the night sky."</i></p> <p>It is acknowledged that there can be mixed views on this – better permeability allows for more walking / cycling and potential socialising, but can also increase opportunities for crime. Having considered this further, if onward links are provided, it will be important for these to be designed to avoid allowing easy access to side / rear with no overlooking and that the routes should be well-lit when people are likely to use them. Links may not always be appropriate – for example, where there is no obvious desire lines (so the route would not be well-used).</p> <p><i>Retain and amend policy and supporting text, to add in reference to avoid allowing access to side / rear</i></p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				<i>with no overlooking and focussing on obvious desire lines which should ensure the routes are reasonably well-used.</i>
Local resident responses	3.2	Policy 2	All roads should have a pavement that can be used for running as well as for pedestrians. Currently some main roads lack a pavement area.	The policy encourages the inclusion of a pedestrian footway and tree-pit / verge either side of the carriageway where possible, with 3.2.5 providing further guidance that there should be a minimum of 2m.
Local resident responses	3.2	Policy 2	Concerns that street trees will not be maintained.	If part of the adopted highway their maintenance will be undertaken by Dorset Council as the Highways Authority. Where part of a private highway their maintenance will be considered as part of the landscape scheme, and if linked to the biodiversity mitigation off-sets will be required for a minimum of 30 years.
Dorset Council	3.3	Policy 3	Comments from the Transport Planning Team: The Neighbourhood Plan should refer to the inclusion of secure cycle parking/storage in either Policy 3 or referenced in the sites allocated for development. This is to help encourage cycle use for residents.	The policy was specifically covering provision for cars, as there was no intention to vary cycle parking as covered under existing policy. Policy KS12 of the core strategy simply requires that adequate cycle parking facilities are provided by the developer to serve the needs of the proposed development in accordance with the LTP parking guidance. The current Residential Car Parking guidance (May 2011) refers to section 8.2 of the 2007 Manual for Streets for advice and guidance on cycle parking, which does not give any clear standards but does suggest that this should reflect the likely level of cycle ownership (using the 2021 census data on the proportion of trips to work made by cycle as a proxy) and that bespoke, secure storage that is

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				<p>readily accessible is preferable unless any garages are designed specifically to accommodate cycle parking.</p> <p>Cycle use appear to be very low for work trips (1% in Alderholt compared to an average of 2.5% across Dorset).</p> <p><i>Add further paragraph and policy insert referencing provision of cycle storage / parking as a means of encouraging greater usage.</i></p>
Land promoters McIlwain (Site 002)	3.3	Policy 3	<p>Parking provision should be provided in accordance only with the district level parking requirements. The requirement for the parking to be behind the building line is too restrictive, and would be inappropriate as a blanket requirement, but could be rephased as ‘where possible’ or ‘where appropriate’. Similarly, the requirement for no more than 3 on-street spaces in a row is too prescriptive, and there should be allowance within the policy for well-designed alternatives.</p>	<p>The level of parking provision is not dissimilar to the county standards but reflects local car ownership levels at this time (2021) rather than being based on 2001-based projections. The reference to provision being behind the building line includes the words “wherever practicable and in keeping with the character of the area”. The reference to 3-in-a-row is simply to ensure that there is a ‘break’ such as through the inclusion of a street tree, and it is not considered that longer lines are likely to be more ‘well-designed’.</p>
Local resident responses	3.3	Policy 3	<p>Consider requirement for 2 (rather than 1.9) cars would be more appropriate / logical, particularly given that the calculation may be an underestimate as many households with 3+ cars may have 4 or more cars. Parking is important, there’s too much parking on pavements throughout the whole village.</p>	<p>The guidance is based on the current estimated average. In practice for smaller developments, with rounding this will in practice equate to 2 cars. This can be made clearer in the supporting text.</p> <p><i>Add to end of 3.3.2 “This figure should be used as the starting point for assessing parking requirements, rounded up to the nearest whole space.”</i></p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Dorset Council	3.4	Para 3.4.2	Repetition can be attractive (eg The Royal Crescent in Bath – as worded the text conveys that you may be looking for a more organic approach in a village.	This is correct – repetition is considered more applicable to the type of development seen historically in towns, and a more organic approach in keeping with typical village character is what is desired here.
Dorset Council	3.4	Para 3.4.4	This paragraph is a little confusing. It seems to be describing a policy, however this isn't reflected in Policy 4 below. The final paragraph of Policy 4 talks about discretely placing meter boxes, etc. A key difference is that the Policy doesn't mention solar panels. Policy 5 talks about support for solar panels that are in keeping with "local character", whereas para 3.4.4 talks about "the character of the building". From reading the rest of the plan, it is clear that the majority of the village is fairly recent (1970s onwards), and therefore modern-day features (such as meter boxes and solar panels) may not feel out of place. While some features, such as meter boxes, can be placed discretely, this is not so easy with solar panels, particularly considering the benefits these have. Paragraph 164 of the latest NPPF (Dec 2023) tells us to give significant weight to the need to support energy efficiency and low carbon heating improvements to existing buildings (including through installation of heat pumps and solar panels).	Noted – solar panels and air source heat pumps are better addressed more in Policy 5. Policy 4 is intended to note features that can add clutter that detracts from the character of the main façade (in particular), such as meter boxes and lighting / security features. <i>Amend 3.4.4 to read: "In addition, modern-day features (such as meter boxes and security panels) should be clearly shown to demonstrate how these are to be integrated successfully into the design without adding clutter or otherwise harming the character of the building as seen from the surrounding area. Careful consideration similarly needs to be applied to solar panels and air source heat pumps, and this is covered in Policy 5. Amend final paragraph of Policy 4 to remove reference to air-source heat pumps Amend first sentence of 3.5.6 by adding "...and placed discretely to avoid harming the character of the building and its surrounds as viewed from the street." Amend Policy 5 to insert 'sensitive' before 'incorporation' for solar and air source heat pumps.</i>
Dorset Council	3.4	Policy 4	Noted and generally supported.	Support noted.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Historic England	3.4	Policy 4	We note and applaud your community's dedication to preserving and enhancing its distinctive historic character through policies designed to identify and protect this, as well as resources aimed at assisting in informed decision making such as the Character Area appraisal and Design Guidance.	Support noted
Land promoters McIlwain (Site 002)	3.4	Policy 4	Larger sites rely upon repeating house forms and designs without appearing to be uniform across the site as a whole, and this is a design element that should not be overlooked, and one which the current policy is unclear on.	It is acknowledged that standard house designs are typically used in large site approach, and to achieve 'variety' they typically use the same forms, sometimes mirrored / rotated, but still obviously repeated. If we are to avoid this then the policy needs to remain strong on this point. <i>Clarify in 3.4.2 that the simple rotation / mirroring of built forms does not resolve the issue of repetition, and include more clearly within Policy 4.</i>
Local resident responses	3.5 5.2	3.5.3 5.2.2	This wording suggests that green spaces should be accessible, safe and inviting with pleasant seating and shaded areas, whereas the description of Local Green Spaces in 5.2.2 makes clear that they this designation can be applied to private land and does not give any additional public rights of access to these areas.	Section 3.5.3 is intended to apply only to public open spaces, and this can be made clearer. Whilst some public open spaces can be a local green space, not all are, and the same applies vice versa. All of the landowners of the proposed LGS have been consulted as part of the preparation of the Plan. <i>Amend 3.5.3 to more clearly reference the context as applying to green spaces intended for public access.</i>
Dorset Council	3.5	Policy 5	Noted and supported. The NP could also refer to the Sustainability Guidance and Checklist that Dorset Council has recently published, and is now a requirement for planning applications	Support noted, and agreed. <i>Add reference to Sustainability Guidance and Checklist requirements within section 3.5.</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Environment Agency	3.5	Policy 5	<p>Whilst noting the inclusion of Policy 5 ‘Environmental performance and sustainability’, we would encourage that neighbourhood plans include a specific policy on climate change.</p> <p>On-going policy reform presents an opportunity to strengthen the role the planning system plays in mitigating and adapting to climate change, and to ensure a fair transition to a low carbon economy. Therefore, your plan should ensure any policies, site allocations and design of development, takes the future challenges of climate change into account.</p>	<p>Climate change has been considered and because of its broad implications is included within the plan in many places as opposed attempting to address this in a single policy. It has influenced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Policies 2 and 9 – which aim to encourage walking / cycling – Policy 3 – reference to car charging points – Policy 5 – renewable energy and other sustainability requirements for buildings – Policy 6 – landscaping with biodiversity and flood risk / sustainable drainage considerations – Policies 8 and 10 which aim to support a mix of uses to meet local needs in suitable locations, to help reduce the need for travel. <p>The site allocations have been tested through the SEA process which includes the consideration of climate change. All sites allocated scored the highest in terms of the climate change criteria. It is not clear what aspects a climate change policy could address which are not already covered in the above or through broader local / national guidance.</p>
Natural England	3.5	Policy 5	<p>Reference to provision of bird/bat/bee bricks/boxes is welcomed</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
South West Water (Bournemouth Water)	3.5	Policy 5	<p>Support the requirement, where practicable, to include the ‘collection of surface water to reuse, either through a water butt or rainwater harvesting system’.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Land promoters McIlwain (Site 002)	3.5	Policy 5	The NP should not be covering an element of the building process which is covered by building regulations – this is overly prescriptive and will be likely to duplicate the policy of the emerging Local Plan.	The policy does not set prescriptive standards, and recognizes that there may be exceptions on the grounds of practicability. The policy is supported by Dorset Council.
Land promoters Individual (Sites 010 and 011)	3.5	Policy 5	Does the settlement have the capacity in the local power network to designate EV charging points?	The requirement for EV charging is now part of Building Regulations, and Scottish and Southern Energy were consulted on the Neighbourhood Plan (no response received).
Local resident responses	3.5	Policy 5	Can this policy be strengthened further? E.g. using “must” instead of “should”.	Whilst recognising that many people would support a ‘stronger’ policy, it is recognised that the measures set out may not be practicable in all cases and therefore the policy reflects this. The Council’s introduction of their checklist will help in providing clarity on what steps an applicant has taken to address the expectations set out in this policy, to help test whether these were reasonable.
Local resident responses	3.5	Policy 5	Can this policy reference hedgehog highways?	Policy 5 relates to buildings. Policy 6 deals with boundary treatments and whilst para 3.6.6 refers to hedgehog-friendly gates it is acknowledge that this is not made explicit in the policy. <i>Amend Policy 6 to reference hedge-hog friendly boundary treatments.</i>
Dorset Council	3.6	Para 3.6.6	Regarding existing and potential wildlife corridors, the NP could refer to the Eco-networks produced by DERC and shown on Dorset Explorer. https://gl.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/explorer/?layers=14746,14745&basemap=25605&x=411974.58&y=112557.56&epsq=27700&zoom=15	The existing eco-networks shown on Dorset Explorer do not currently include any of the more local wildlife corridors that have been created by the network of green spaces, wooded corridors and hedgerows that run through the village. As such it is considered of limited relevance in this regard – but it may help to make this clearer in the text, and

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				<p>include reference to the FoE Tree Canopy Map (potentially included as an Appendix – see end) in this regard.</p> <p><i>Insert before final sentence in 3.6.2 “Whilst much of the area east and north of the village is recognised as being part of the existing ecological network recorded on Dorset Explorer, more local wildlife corridors existing within the village, created by the network of green spaces, wooded corridors and hedgerows that run through and around the village (an indication of this extent of this network can be seen by viewing the tree canopy map in Appendix [number]. This network should ideally be extended.”</i></p>
Dorset Council	3.6	Para 3.6.6	<p>Regarding biodiversity net gain, generally only householder applications and very small applications (less than 25 sqm) are going to be exempt from BNG. Details of exempt developments can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain-exempt-developments</p>	<p>Noted – this can be made clearer.</p> <p><i>Amend final sentence to read “On most developments this is likely to be covered under the requirements for biodiversity net gain under the Environment Act 2021, but some, such as householder applications, will be exempt.”</i></p>
Dorset Council	3.6	Policy 6	<p>Regarding the final paragraph which requires BNG to be maintained for the lifetime of the development. The lifetime of development could easily be 100+ years. Legislation requires BNG to be maintained for at least 30 years and this will be secured through a legal agreement. https://www.gov.uk/guidance/understanding-biodiversity-net-gain</p>	<p>With reference to PINS model conditions (dated 24 Nov 2023), this advises a period of at least five years to enable satisfactory plant establishment and that this may be extended further to reflect the nature of the scheme.</p> <p><i>Amend final sentence to read “...is maintained for a reasonable period, which should be at least 5 years to enable satisfactory plant establishment and, in the case of significant biodiversity net gains, not less than 30 years.” and include explanation of 30</i></p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			<p>It would be unreasonable / unrealistic to require the maintenance to last longer than 30 years. Consider removing this requirement for lifetime maintenance from the policy.</p>	<p><i>Years minimum management requirement for significant on-site gains, and all off-site gains for BNG under paragraph 3.6.6</i></p>
Natural England	3.6	Policy 6	<p>This policy is welcomed.</p> <p>In the light of the now legal requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain it may be appropriate for the Plan to consider the identification of areas to which priority should be given for net gain. The plan area is also well resourced in coverage of Ancient Woodland, and consideration should be given to the encouragement of the restoration of planted ancient woodland areas to native broadleaved cover as a contribution to both biodiversity restoration and positive climate change measures at a time of ecological emergency.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The matter of off-site BNG will depend on the potential willingness of landowners to offer such opportunities, in the knowledge that this will require them to commit to management of that land in a certain way for at least 30 years. This will require further discussion / negotiation to clarify, and may be something that can be explored through the next view, with the supporting text simply noting this as an option at this point.</p> <p><i>Include within supporting text reference to potential opportunities for off-site compensatory measures through the restoration of planted ancient woodland areas to native broadleaved cover.</i></p>
Land promoters Individual (Sites 010 and 011)	3.6	Policy 6	<p>Need to consider that any trees provided will need to be managed, and therefore a blanket TPO on trees provided would not be appropriate. Some areas of trees are managed for a variety of reasons including commercial timber.</p>	<p>The policy is not proposing the imposition of a blanket TPO on any sites / areas. Where a TPO is considered appropriate (which is a decision matter for Dorset Council), this does not prohibit that tree from being managed appropriately, but does provide a check to ensure that inappropriate management or felling is avoided.</p>
Environment Agency	3.6	Policy 6	<p>We are pleased to see that ensuring biodiversity net gain requirements has been recognised and included within Policy 6.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
Local resident responses	3.6	Policy 6	<p>The woodland corridor linking Cranborne Heath and Drove End should be recognised as of great</p>	<p>The area of woodland running in a south-westerly direct from Drove End along the parish boundary is</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			<p>environmental importance and for potential heathland restoration. Links from this to the Avon Valley are important wildlife corridors which should not be lost.</p>	<p>noted as a priority habitat (deciduous woodland) in the Natural England inventory. There are no proposals to build in this location, and such woodlands that fall within the parish would be protected as a key landscape feature under Policy 17.</p>
Environment Agency	3.6	Other	<p>The Water Framework Directive seeks to: deliver positive and sustained outcomes for the water environment by promoting a better understanding of the environment at a local level; and to encourage local collaboration and more transparent decision-making when both planning and delivering activities to improve the water environment.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans provide an opportunity to deliver multi-functional benefits through linking development with enhancements to the environment. You can find more information on the challenges that threaten the water environment and how these challenges can be managed for your plan area in your River Basin Management Plan.</p>	<p>According to the data available, both Ashford Water and Sleep Brook have ‘good’ ecological status. Having looked at the linked River Basin Management Plan it is not at all clear what, is any, additional actions the Neighbourhood Plan should consider that would be specific to the area.</p> <p>To research this further at this late stage, would appear optional, and given the desire to get a Neighbourhood Plan in place as soon as possible, no further action is proposed.</p>
Dorset Council	4.1	<p>Para 4.1.4, 4.1.19, 4.1.30, 5.1.1</p>	<p>There are several references in the document to household surveys undertaken in 2017 and 2019 (before work on the neighbourhood plan began). No explanation is given about who undertook these surveys until Appendix 1 (para A1.7). These references are therefore confusing for anyone reading the plan from front to back. If the results of these surveys have been used in the formulation of the plan, it might be useful if they could be</p>	<p>The results of these surveys were considered and taken on board in the formulation of the policies. They are reported on in a paper “Alderholt and the East Dorset Local Plan Review” that was published as part of the 24 February 2020 minutes of the Alderholt PC Local plan Liaison Committee. <i>Amend introduction (section 1.2) to reference the surveys and include paper within Appendix 4 (Supporting Documents).</i></p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			<p>mentioned in the introduction (under ‘What has happened so far...’), more clearly referenced with footnotes, and links provided in Appendix 4 (Supporting Documents) to where the survey results can be viewed.</p>	
Dorset Council	4.1	Para 4.1.8 and Policy 7	<p>Comments from the Housing Enabling Team: Para 4.1.8 of the plan states, “A more accurate picture of local need for affordable rented home sizes should be determined through a review of the housing register at the time an application is prepared.” If the Neighbourhood Plan omits 4 bedroom houses this could be used at an argument to not provide them. Currently we have 242 households requiring 4 bedroom homes on the housing register with many large families stuck in temporary accommodation due to the limited amount of four bedroom houses being delivered. It should include a mix of 1,2,3 and 4 bedroom units to be determined through a review of the housing register at the time an application is prepared.</p>	<p>The December 2022 extract from the affordable housing register indicated 1 household in need of larger accommodation (requiring a 5 bedroom property). This was still the case as at January 2024 (figures checks with Dorset Council). The Policy is not intended to prohibit 4 bedroom affordable homes to rent if there is a local need for this at that time, but reflects the fact that the data continues to show that the great need is for 1 – 3 bedroom homes. This can be clarified. <i>Amend 4th paragraph of Policy 7 to read: “Affordable home sizes are expected to deliver mainly 1, 2 and 3 bedroom houses in line with Table 1, but the exact mix of affordable rented accommodation should be based on the requirements of eligible households with a local connection to Alderholt parish, as recorded in the Dorset Council affordable housing register at the time the application is considered.”</i></p>
Cranborne Chase National Landscape Partnership	4.1	Para 4.1.11 and 4.1.13	<p>Whilst section 4.1 emphasises the potential impacts of development at Alderholt on the Dorset Heaths and the New Forest, there is no mention of compensation being provided by new development to the NL / AONB for the impacts of additional</p>	<p>Whilst funding for projects to mitigate and/or compensate for the impacts of additional traffic and recreational pressures on the Cranborne Chase National Landscape would be welcomed, the Parish Council has no clear evidence that this is necessary (unlike the other two examples where possible</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			<p>traffic and recreational pressures on the designated area.</p>	<p>harm to the European network of wildlife sites has been demonstrated). However this can be mentioned and may be a material consideration under the LURA 2023.</p> <p>Further discussion with the CCNL on this point has highlighted that the review of the NL Management Plan – to be in place for April 2025 – and the issue of compensation may be developed and elaborated there. The Management Plan is statutorily adopted by Dorset Council setting out its policies for the NL. The Alderholt NP could, therefore, reference the Management Plan on the dual issues of mitigation and compensation.</p> <p><i>Add in additional paragraph in section 5.3: “The Cranborne Chase National Landscape Partnership has also suggested that consideration may need to be given to the impacts of additional traffic and recreational pressures on the National Landscape, and whether mitigation and compensation may be required. This is particularly pertinent in light of the new duty, introduced through the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023, to seek to further the statutory purposes of National Landscapes. The duty applies to local planning authorities and other decision makers in making planning decisions on development and infrastructure proposals, as well as to other public bodies and statutory undertakers. It is anticipated that the Government will provide guidance on how the duty should be applied in due course, that this issue may well be covered in the next iteration of the Cranborne Chase Management</i></p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				<i>Plan (2025), and will be a material consideration in decision making.</i> ”
Natural England	4.1	Para 4.1.17	It is incorrect to say that excessive nutrient enrichment is due solely to sewage as the highest proportion comes from agricultural sources which act in-combination with nutrients from STWs. The text should be adjusted. Following the full enactment of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 it is likely that the nutrient offsetting requirements will change as lower discharge levels at STWs are required.	Noted. The text was no intended to imply that it was the sole reason, but rather a contributing factor to the harm – particularly given that the cumulative impact is considered to be significant. <i>Amend text by inserting “one of a number of factors” and reference LURA-based anticipated changes.</i>
Dorset Council	4.1	Policy 7	Noted and supported.	Support noted.
Environment Agency	4.1	Policy 7	We are pleased to see that nutrient neutrality in relation to the River Avon SAC has been recognised and included.	Support noted.
Natural England	4.1	Policy 7	The indicative housing target of 192 is in principle agreeable to Natural England, however whilst the two larger developments 44 and 89 are approved subject to providing mitigation, and provision of further heathland mitigation as part of Policy 14, there could still be a shortfall in mitigation provision over the plan period. Natural England advise that the plan group consult the Council forward planning officers about how best to address this matter.	Following discussions with Natural England and Dorset Council, the level of development is clarified as up to 192 dwellings based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Alderholt Surplus Stores, Daggons Road pp 3/11/0558/REM granted 24/03/2015 for 89 dwellings – Land north of Ringwood Road pp 3/19/2077/RM granted 14/07/2023 for 44 dwellings (net) – 58 Ringwood Road pp P/RES/2023/00142 pending for 4 dwellings – Alderholt Nursery, East of Ringwood Road, NP Policy 12 for (about) 20 dwellings

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				<p>– Paddock South of Daggons Road, NP Policy 13 for (about) 15 dwellings</p> <p>– Land South of Blackwater Grove, NP Policy 14 for (about) 15 – 20 dwellings</p> <p>In addition, it is possible that additional dwellings may come forward through windfall (infill) development within the village envelope. Based on the 5 year average (2018-2023) this could be in the region of 5 dwellings per annum, or 30 dwellings for the period 2028 – 2034. These windfall sites would also require mitigation. At the current time, there is a single pending application for 1 dwelling on land at South Lodge, Daggons Road (P/FUL/2023/03371) – whilst this is outside of the village envelope, it could potentially be approved if mitigation can be secured prior to the Neighbourhood Plan coming into effect.</p> <p>There is also an application for up to 1,700 dwellings on land to the South of Ringwood Road which was refused planning permission in July 2023 (P/OUT/2023/01166). This decision has been appealed, but given the refusal and proposals within the plans to provide mitigation, this application has not been included in the above assessment.</p> <p>In terms of mitigation, the following projects are identified:</p> <p>– HIP at Alderholt Surplus Stores, Daggons Road (planning application reference</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				<p>3/11/0558/REM) - within the northern part of the site currently being developed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High Wood SANG (planning application reference 3/20/1732/FUL), currently linked to delivery of Land north of Ringwood Road - HIP on Land South of Blackwater Grove, 2ha site proposed as part of NP Policy 14. <p>Whilst the above should be sufficient to mitigate the extant planning consents and site allocations, it is accepted that the mitigation measures need to come forward in a timely manner and may need to be revisited should the rate of past infill windfall development continue / increase further.</p> <p>Natural England have advised that adapted wording (using a similar approach to that agreed in the latest Proposed Supplementary Main Modification SMM 43 to policy H8(e) (Purbeck Local Plan), would address this potential risk, and that the following modifications removes their objection on this point.</p> <p>Following further discussion with Dorset Council and Natural England, it is also suggested that the supporting text and policy are updated in respect of reference to The Dorset Heathlands Interim Air Quality Strategy.</p> <p><i>Insert the following paragraph at the start of the HRA section of Policy 7:</i></p> <p><i>The impact of proposed development on the national site network (including European sites), alone or in combination with other existing and proposed development, will be screened for likely</i></p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				<p><i>significant effects under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (amended) (EU exit), 2019 and/or any equivalent relevant legislation or regulations. Where there is a probability or risk of a significant effect, the proposed development will be subject of an appropriate assessment (taking into account the lifetime of the development). Development proposals should, therefore, be accompanied by information reasonably required to undertake an appropriate assessment, and demonstrate how the development will avoid or otherwise mitigate any adverse impact on the integrity of any relevant site(s) in the national site network.</i></p> <p><i>Delete reference to “a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment” in the next paragraph (to avoid duplication) and include reference to the requirements of the Dorset Heathland Air Quality Strategy.</i></p> <p><i>Amend second bullet of 4.1.11 with the insertion of “including any planning applications where there is a net gain in homes”</i></p> <p><i>Amend supporting text (4.1.12) to read as follows:</i></p> <p><i>The following Heathland Infrastructure Projects are currently identified, and, together with Strategic Access, Management and Monitoring, are expected to be sufficient to mitigate the likely impact on the heathland area arising from the amount of housing development anticipated during the plan period:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>HIP at Alderholt Surplus Stores, Daggons Road (planning application reference 3/11/0558/REM)</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Cranborne Chase National Landscape Partnership	4.1	Policy 7	<p>The draft NP seeks to accommodate some 50 additional dwellings, including affordable housing. That seems to be more than enough if the village is to retain its village character, distinctiveness, and cohesiveness. The AONB Management Plan 2019-24 is relevant, not least because it is statutorily the adopted policies of Dorset Council for this designated area. As the acknowledged housing need in and around this NL / AONB is for affordable dwellings that aspect of the NP is welcomed. The Partnership is very concerned regarding the higher levels of development being promoted in the Parish, which will increase traffic westwards into the NL / AONB and the historic village of Cranborne which is already significantly congested. That additional traffic would impact adversely on key</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p><i>High Wood SANG (planning application reference 3/20/1732/FUL)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>HIP on Land South of Blackwater Grove (Policy 14)</i> <p><i>This mitigation will need to be delivered in a timely fashion, and landowners are expected to work together, potentially purchasing ‘credits’ from the respective HIP / SANG landowner to secure their delivery, or to agree suitable alternative provision with Natural England. Applicants should therefore assist Dorset Council with information regarding the contribution that their site will make towards the proportionate delivery of these mitigation projects. Add additional paragraph to highlight requirement the Dorset Heathlands Interim Air Quality Strategy.</i></p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Land promoters McIlwain (Site 002)	4.1	Policy 7	<p>characteristics of the NL / AONB, such as tranquillity, and put at risk the road verges and the sense of place of the relatively peaceful country lanes. The scale of extension of the village envelope does seem to be of an appropriate scale to achieve the retention of the village character encapsulated in the vision.</p>	<p>The target of 192 included in the NP takes into account a wide range of factors as set out in the NP Appx 1. It also happens to equate to the Reg 18 target in the LP, but it should be noted that the LP target applies for a 17 year period (i.e. 5 additional years) and therefore would be reduced if applied to the NP period of 2022-2034. Furthermore, this target is likely to be exceeded given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Extant consents for 138 new homes as of April 2022. – Site allocations totalling about 50 – 55 dwellings (20 + 15 + 15-20) – Potential for further windfall through infill within the village boundary and replacement dwellings in the countryside <p>Whilst the Surplus Stores site did stall, construction recommenced in late 2023 and the first homes are now at roof height (April 2024).</p> <p>Dorset Council are supportive of the housing target, as noted in Appendix 1. This notes in A1.30 that the plan (and housing target) should be reviewed within 5 years of the plan being made, in order to</p>
Land promoters Highwood (Site 006)	4.1	Policy 7	<p>Question whether the Surplus Store site should be included in the supply calculations, only due to the fact that the site has had at extant permission in place for a number of years and does not appear to be coming forward for delivery in a timely manner.</p> <p>The most recent planning strategy, the Reg.18 Plan identified a potential level of housing for Alderholt expressed as two possible options: 1. around 300 new homes and 0.25ha commercial and 2. significant expansion – comprising a series of sustainable urban extensions around the settlement to create a self-contained ‘town’ (to be quantified). Appendix 2 of the Local Plan outlines a minimum 192 dwellings for Alderholt, but with an asterisk noting that there is an optional additional site for the village. The NP should make provision for more homes than is currently proposed to be considered to meet the Basic Conditions in this regard.</p>	<p>The target of 192 included in the NP takes into account a wide range of factors as set out in the NP Appx 1. It also happens to equate to the Reg 18 target in the LP, but it should be noted that the LP target applies for a 17 year period (i.e. 5 additional years) and therefore would be reduced if applied to the NP period of 2022-2034. Furthermore, this target is likely to be exceeded given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Extant consents for 138 new homes as of April 2022. – Site allocations totalling about 50 – 55 dwellings (20 + 15 + 15-20) – Potential for further windfall through infill within the village boundary and replacement dwellings in the countryside <p>Whilst the Surplus Stores site did stall, construction recommenced in late 2023 and the first homes are now at roof height (April 2024).</p> <p>Dorset Council are supportive of the housing target, as noted in Appendix 1. This notes in A1.30 that the plan (and housing target) should be reviewed within 5 years of the plan being made, in order to</p>
Land promoters Dudsbury Homes (Site 007)	4.1	Policy 7	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan should have properly considered the potential of larger scale growth and revisions to the village which are capable of delivering sustainable development.</p>	<p>The target of 192 included in the NP takes into account a wide range of factors as set out in the NP Appx 1. It also happens to equate to the Reg 18 target in the LP, but it should be noted that the LP target applies for a 17 year period (i.e. 5 additional years) and therefore would be reduced if applied to the NP period of 2022-2034. Furthermore, this target is likely to be exceeded given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Extant consents for 138 new homes as of April 2022. – Site allocations totalling about 50 – 55 dwellings (20 + 15 + 15-20) – Potential for further windfall through infill within the village boundary and replacement dwellings in the countryside <p>Whilst the Surplus Stores site did stall, construction recommenced in late 2023 and the first homes are now at roof height (April 2024).</p> <p>Dorset Council are supportive of the housing target, as noted in Appendix 1. This notes in A1.30 that the plan (and housing target) should be reviewed within 5 years of the plan being made, in order to</p>


Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Land promoters Commercial Freeholds Limited (Site 009)	4.1	Policy 7	It is suggested that the NP should seek to slightly exceed the figure of ‘a further 50 dwellings’ to ensure appropriate commitments are made to meet this need in full. Site 009 is capable of delivering approximately 50 homes, higher than currently proposed in the NP.	consider both the Local Plan target (which is expected to be confirmed in 2026) and whether any further allocations may be necessary. This could be clarified in the section on monitoring and review. <i>Amend 1.2.14 to reference that the plan (and housing target) should be reviewed within 5 years of the Plan being made, in order to consider both the Local Plan target (which is expected to be confirmed in 2027) and whether any further allocations may be necessary</i>
Land promoters Individual (Sites 010 and 011)	4.1	Policy 7	There are few suitable residential development sites in Dorset - Alderholt is fairly unique in that the village could be allowed to grow to make it sustainable. The Surplus Stores site has had planning permission granted on it for a long time – if this is excluded from the housing numbers there appears to be a shortfall.	The Parish Council has been guided by Natural England’s advice on this matter.
Land promoters McIlwain (Site 002)	4.1	Policy 7	Question the need for the habitat regulation requirements to be repeated within the NP. These are national requirements and it seems unnecessary to be included in this level of plan; it is a duplication of process. The inclusion of reference to the NFNPA mitigation scheme also creates confusion. Dorset Council is the competent authority for all assessments and legal agreements and mitigation strategies will need to be secured through them.	
Land promoters Highwood (Site 006)	4.1	Policy 7	The ANP approach to Housing expressed through Policy 7 will not provide the affordable housing required to meet local need identified in household surveys. Option 1 of the DCLP outlined that 300 dwellings could be required at Alderholt. At 35% affordable housing, this would deliver 105	Affordable housing needs are difficult to quantify with precision as these change over time, with households falling in / out of need and take-up of the existing stock. The 2019 household survey results were based on the question “Is someone in your home (or immediate family living away) likely

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			affordable dwellings for the village. The ANP as drafted will not deliver anything near that level of affordable housing.	to require an affordable home in the Alderholt area in the next 10 years?" and therefore was based on a degree of speculation and could include double counting. This can be clarified. The following paragraphs go on to consider more recent evidence on affordable housing need. The housing target has been agreed with Dorset Council, and whilst a greater level of housing would include more affordable housing, Alderholt is not well placed for large-scale growth given its lack of transport links, local facilities and employment, and a greater scale of growth would also be less compatible with the objectives of protecting and retaining the character of the village and the intrinsic beauty and enjoyment of the countryside and approaches to Alderholt. <i>Amend A1.9 to further clarify the basis of the survey responses.</i>
Land promoters Macra Ltd (Site 006a)	4.1	Policy 7	The downside of all dwellings being M4(2) is that these houses are not necessarily any bigger, so space that may be used for storage or living space is used for accessibility. Most people do not need an M4(2) specification home so lose space in this way. A proportion of 30-50% M4(2)dwellings may be more practical.	As announced in July 2022, the Government intend to mandate the current M4(2) (Category 2: Accessible and adaptable dwellings) requirement in Building Regulations as a minimum standard for all new homes. This policy provides an interim requirement for this to be achieved where practicable.
Land promoters Dudsbury Homes (Site 007)	4.1	Policy 7	It is noted in the Appendix to the Plan that the 138 dwellings already committed in Alderholt are forecast to deliver just 7 affordable homes (5%), which suggests that the proposed allocation will be unlikely to deliver any affordable homes at all.	The reduced provision of affordable housing on the Surplus Stores and Ringwood Road sites are specific to those sites and there is no reason to suggest that such exceptional viability issues will be raised going forward. The Parish Council has liaised closely with

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Land promoters Commercial Freeholds Limited (Site 009)	4.1	Policy 7	<p>Whilst aspects of this policy area supported (the overarching spatial strategy; 50/50 provision between rented and intermediate tenure to support greater affordable home ownership; and focus on 1 – 3 bedroom properties for affordable housing needs) it is not considered appropriate to seek to restrict the open market home mix in line with Table 1 as this will impact on the flexibility of developers in respect of individual sites and in relation to the matter of viability and changes in economic circumstances, and the policy should be worded to make clear that the mix of both affordable and open market homes is not prescribed / fixed.</p>	<p>The relevant landowners, and specifically asked for them to respond on this point. All three have confirmed that they have not identified any issues at this point (Regulation 14) that would raise viability concerns or require a reduction in the amount of affordable homes proposed.</p> <p>The policy as worded does contain a degree of flexibility, but is intended to provide clear guidance on the broad mix of homes expected based on the evidence available. Should new evidence come to light it will be open for any applicant to put this forward as a material consideration if they consider an alternative mix would be more appropriate.</p> <p>Whilst viability is a consideration, Government guidance in the NPPG is clear that “it is important for developers and other parties buying (or interested in buying) land to have regard to the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies when agreeing a price for the land. Under no circumstances will the price paid for land be a relevant justification for failing to accord with relevant policies in the plan.”</p> <p>The Parish Council contacted the site promoter to offer them the opportunity to submit evidence of viability issues</p> <p>(https://www.gov.uk/guidance/viability) – to which they responded that they were not raising viability issues with respect to Land at Blackwater Grove, but their comment was in regard to possible unknown issues that could render adherence to the</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Local resident responses	4.1	Policy 7	Range of views expressed, including scepticism that developers will build any affordable housing (given reduction on recent sites due to viability), and suggestions that the number of homes overall should be limited.	Whilst viability is a material consideration, the land value should be based on a clear understanding that there are policies in place requiring affordable housing provision. The sites are of a size to deliver affordable housing, and overall number is based on the housing target assessment set out in Appendix 1. The inclusion of these matters in an up-to-date Neighbourhood Plan provides the best opportunity to see these aspirations delivered.
Dorset Council	4.1	Policy 8	Whilst the intentions behind the policy are understood, it is uncertain how this will be assessed and what would be reasonable to expect, in particular requiring new residential development to be convertible to retail and requiring it to provide suitable customer parking. What does this mean in practice? E.g. does there have to be a	It may be helpful to explain the likely requirements in more detail. These should be based on the typical requirements of a premises falling within Class E (as this is the main use class for most High Street premises), and would include: the ability to readily convert the ground floor to provide a readily accessible workspace that can

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Land promoters Macra Ltd (Site 006a)	4.1	Policy 8	front room with a minimum floorspace and shopfront type window? The level of customer parking may differ depending on the nature of the business. Having to future proof houses for conversion will have a negative effect on the character of the entrance to the village; as these houses would need to effectively have shop fronts and more parking provision. This site may be better laid out with a soft frontage onto Daggons Road formed through front facing houses with green space, footpaths and trees.	accommodate and attract customers (whether this is a shop, salon or another use), back office area / stockroom and staff / customer toilets. With reference to Fordingbridge (business rate data) the rateable floor areas for shops and similar premises in that town is typically around 65sqm (median), with the lower quartile figure around 45sqm. The requirement for parking for such premises (taking into account that Dorset Council's parking standards have not yet been updated to include Class E) is likely to require 2 – 4 spaces for this type of property. <i>Expand explanation of matters to consider, reflecting the about anticipated requirements for such premises.</i>
Land promoters Dudsbury Homes (Site 007)	4.1	Policy 8	Daggons Lane is a poor location for new services and will likely encourage more car trips even by local residents given the distance of the location from much of the housing in the village. Furthermore, there is no certainty that infill development will create some sort of retail or commercial frontage, any infill which does occur is likely to be very small scale and will not deliver a commercial element at all.	Disagree that the indicated area is a poor location – as explained in 4.1.21 most of the existing provision is located along Daggons Road / Station Road and at the junction with Ringwood Road, and it is this part of the village that formed its historic base and continues to act as the village centre / high street. Creating a 'new' village centre away from this area would not be on the main through route and would have little regard the village's historic character.
Local resident responses	4.1	Policy 8	Whilst broadly supported there was some scepticism expressed over whether this policy was realistic.	Whilst it is accepted that this is an enabling policy to encourage such development and will depend on opportunities arising within this area. However by setting out the vision and aspiration this does raise awareness and its success and possible

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Dorset Council	4.1	Policy 9	Noted and supported.	Support noted.
Natural England	4.1	Policy 9 Policy 13	Support the proposed recreational path/cycle link east from Alderholt towards Fordingbridge. Object to the proposed Trailway route to the west of Alderholt as the route passes through several parts of Cranborne Common SSSI, SPA, SAC and Ramsar. The plan presents no evidence or assessment which indicates how recreation related impacts can be avoided, despite proposing a direct route into the designated sites from the settlement. In the absence of any information to conclude otherwise the western link should not be proposed, although the Plan may still indicate an intention to explore further westwards options during the plan period. A similar adjustment needs to be made to Para 4.2.12 and Policy 13 in relation to the Trailway. The westwards extension should be considered as uncertain at this time.	Support of eastward link noted. Note concerns raised regarding the westward link, and whilst this was recognised in the draft Plan (4.1.24 and Policy 9), agree that these can be 'downgraded' for the part of the track extending beyond the western extent of the village to a feasibility project at this stage. Natural England have advised that the following modifications removes their objection on this point <i>Amend map as follows:</i>  <i>Amend second part of 4.2.10 to read: "4.2.10 The route going east from the village towards Fordingbridge provides the most potential benefit for local trips, and should therefore be prioritised in</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				<p><i>bringing forward this project. A westerly link towards Verwood, whilst desirable, could increase recreational pressures on Cranborne Common (an important part of the Dorset Heathlands), and Natural England have advised that further work is needed to show how such harm could be avoided. As such this west-bound route, beyond the village, is not shown, pending further feasibility work. The potential route within the village west of Daggons Road is shown on the map to indicate the future connection from that may be achieved as a result of the site allocation proposed under Policy 13, but this should not be provided without ensuring that this link would not result in walkers continuing along the old railway track to the west (unless it is demonstrated that this would not result in harm to the Dorset Heathlands)."</i></p> <p>Amend second paragraph of Policy 9 to read: "Any proposals to extend the trailway west of Daggons Road will need to be supported by a project-level Habitats Regulations Assessment, demonstrating that the impacts of any potential increase in recreational footprint on the Dorset Heathlands are adequately mitigated"</p> <p>Amend Trailway Project by the addition of: "This will include further feasibility work, particularly with regard to any westward extension towards Verwood, given the need to avoid harm to Dorset heathlands."</p> <p>Amend Policy 13 to refer to "Future connections through land to the south to provide the potential for pedestrian / cycle links to the Trailway, if this is</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Cranborne Chase National Landscape Partnership	4.1	Policy 9	The proposal for the Trailway recreational link could, in addition to its intrinsic benefits, divert the recreational pressures of new residents from the public rights of way and those that lead into this NL / AONB. We do, therefore, encourage that project.	Support noted. <i>extended westwards from the village, should be included within the design of the layout.” And update the supporting text accordingly to reference that this route ‘may’ run to the south and is subject to further feasibility work.</i>
Land promoters Mclwain (Site 002)	4.1	Policy 9	My clients are happy to support the provision of the trailway as a public benefit, but as a land owner of some (not inconsiderable) proportion of the track, they would wish to see the wider benefits of the trailway being explored; the trailway has the potential to become a very sustainable and safe route between settlements for pedestrians and cyclists. As such, future consideration should be given to opening up the land along the route of the trailway (which is in close proximity to the village) to facilitate bringing forward the wider aims of opening up the route and delivering a benefit to the public.	Noted. This is a long-term project and it is helpful to know that there would be willingness to consider access to sections of the Trailway. Further discussion on how this may be facilitated will be welcomed, the results of which may influence the future review on the NP.
Land promoters Highwood (Site 006)	4.1	Policy 9	Land at Cross Farm incorporates the railway embankment along which the proposed Trailway will pass through the site along it’s northern boundary. Highwood (Site 006) are uniquely placed to be able to deliver this significant first stage of the Trailway Project to the benefit of the village and wider community along with improvements to	Noted. This is a long-term project and it is helpful to know that there would be willingness to consider access to sections of the Trailway. Further discussion on how this may be facilitated will be welcomed, the results of which may influence the future review on the NP.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			the wider public rights of way network as part of development proposals for Cross Farm.	
Dorset Council	4.1	Policy 10	Noted and supported.	Support noted.
Land promoters Dudsbury Homes (Site 007)	4.1	Policy 10	The small level of employment proposed, coupled with the overall low level of growth, is very unlikely to be achieved	There is no employment land target set for the area. The policy is supportive of employment in line with the requirements of the NPPF, but given that Alderholt is not well connected and is not identified for employment investment it is accepted that the scale of development likely to take place will depend on local entrepreneurs. There is no evidence to suggest that the take-up of employment land will be magically 'cured' by the scale of housebuilding proposed under the Dudsbury Homes scheme or that it would provide more jobs than the growth in population.
Land promoters Individual (Sites 010 and 011)	4.1	Policy 10	Employment within / close proximity to Alderholt will allow it to maintain itself as a self-contained community - the policy as currently proposed is too restricted.	Disagree – the policy does not restrict employment development provided that it is of a nature and scale appropriate to its location.
Local resident responses	4.1	Policy 10	Whilst broadly supported there were some concerns about potential noise / light pollution and traffic impacts from additional employment that may be to the detriment of the rural character of the area.	These issues are intended to be covered by the policy criteria, as noise / light pollution would be significant adverse environmental impacts – however this can be clarified. <i>Amend policy and supporting text to clarify that adverse environmental impacts may include noise / light pollution.</i>
Dorset Council	4.2	Other	Comments from the Transport Planning Team: Due to the scale of development included within the Neighbourhood Plan, there is limited scope to	Noted – however in order for this to be effective, further work is likely to be needed on project

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			<p>improve facilities and transport links. However, we would push that the Neighbourhood Plan maximises the opportunity to secure developer funding from the allocated sites to contribute towards local transport improvements. This could include contributions towards community transport, where feasible, and/or towards The Trailway Project.</p>	<p>costings / feasibility. This is considered more appropriately tackled through a future review.</p>
Dorset Council	4.2	Para 4.2.2	<p>“The village envelope has been updated to include these sites.... Whilst these extant sites are not included as specific allocations...” – it is confusing in this context what is meant by “these extant sites”. The sites are labelled as “existing permission” on Map 10, but this needs to be made clearer in this paragraph as without further explanation it appears to be referring to the sites listed directly above. A table of extant sites is provided below A1.23 which could be referred to or the table copied into this section.</p>	<p>Noted and need for clarification agreed. The first sentence refers to the preceding site allocations, and it is the second sentence that needs to address the extant sites. <i>Amend 4.2.2 to explain more clearly that the sites with extant planning consent, known as Surplus Stores and Hawthorns (as shown on Map 10), are not included as specific allocations because...</i></p>
Environment Agency	4.2	Policy 11 - 14	<p>Where your plan proposes development or promotes growth, we recommend early consultation with the relevant water company. Your plan should determine whether there is (or will be prior to occupation) sufficient infrastructure capacity available for wastewater and water supply services, that will not impact on the water environment.</p>	<p>See South West Water response confirming that the level of development proposed can be accommodated within the existing water supply network and infrastructure.</p>
Historic England	4.2	Policy 11 - 14	<p>We note that 3 sites are proposed as site allocations (policies 12, 13 & 14) and that the extension of the village envelope is proposed in</p>	<p>The advice on heritage matters included within the site options assessment and subsequently through the SEA has been followed, and the Conservation</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			<p>order to accommodate them (policy 11). It will be important to ensure through the site allocation and assessment process via the SEA that these proposals take appropriate account of relevant heritage assets, and in conformity with overarching national and local planning policy avoid causing harm to the historic environment.</p>	<p>Team's responses to this consultation have also been considered and where possible followed (see relevant Dorset Council points).</p>
National Highways	4.2	Policy 11 - 14	<p>Having reviewed the plan's proposed policies, we consider that these are unlikely to lead to a scale of development that would adversely impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. We therefore have no specific comments to offer.</p>	Noted.
South West Water (Bournemouth Water)	4.2	Policy 11 - 14	<p>The level of development proposed can be accommodated within the existing water supply network and infrastructure. Any potential future upgrades required to accommodate, particularly large-scale proposals, would require assessment, and allocation of relevant funding not currently included within the current business plan. South West Water is currently carrying out a detailed study of the growth in the Alderholt area which will confirm the design and timings of any infrastructure upgrades required to the water distribution network - if the development Land South of Ringwood Road goes ahead of circa 1,700 dwellings, then work will be required to the water distribution network along Ringwood Road which could take up to 18 months to install once construction has commenced.</p>	Noted.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Dorset Council	4.2	Policy 11	Generally support, however the wording is a little confusing. The policy appears to be saying that the revised village envelope defines the extent of the smaller hamlets, but this isn't the case (it defines the extent of the main village, and everything else in the parish is classed as 'countryside').	Support noted and need for clarification agreed. <i>Amend Policy 11 as follows: "The village envelope boundary, which defines the extent of the village (in policy terms) as distinct from the wider countryside (including the smaller hamlets), is updated..."</i>
Natural England	4.2	Policy 11	No objection.	Noted.
Local resident responses	4.2	Policy 11	Whilst broadly supported there were some concerns about the loss of greenfield sites and that the village was already 'big enough'.	If the Neighbourhood is to be effective it has to be based on an understanding of housing need and seek to meet such needs. Where insufficient brownfield sites exist to meet this need (as is the case in Alderholt) this will result in some greenfield development. The issue is whether these choices are undertaken through a Neighbourhood Plan, or left to the Local Plan policies. The Parish Council have opted for these decisions to be made locally on where development should happen, taking on board the latest evidence of housing needs.
Dorset Council	4.2	Policy 12	Noted and supported.	Support noted.
Land promoters McIlwain (Site 002)	4.2	Policy 12	In broad agreement with the policy and the parameters it sets. The provision of onward connection to the community facilities at the Recreation Ground would be provided where feasible, and this element should be reflected in amended wording of the policy to 'where feasible/possible', if – for whatever reason – this might not be achievable.	Agree that it would be appropriate to acknowledge that this is subject to feasible but also make clear that if not provided, the developer must demonstrate that they have made best endeavours to achieve such links. <i>Amend policy by addition of "if feasible" at the end of the fourth paragraph. Include additional explanation in supporting text that the developer will be expected to explain what negotiations have taken place if no link, or a sub-standard link is</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				<i>Proposed, to show that they have made their best endeavours to secure this at a reasonable cost.</i>
Land promoters Highwood (Site 006)	4.2	Policy 12	The Site Assessment was on the basis of no employment proposed at this site, yet the consultation boards Autumn 2023 factored in employment and the proposed NP policy does not mention employment at all. The public consultation votes are therefore questionable for this site as the residents voted towards a scheme that was before and after consultation never going to deliver employment land. Cross Farm will deliver employment. The Site Assessment acknowledges the scheme will likely not deliver policy-compliant affordable housing due to it being brownfield land and due to possible viability issues. Cross Farm will deliver affordable housing as per policy.	The potential for some employment was considered, but given the location of this site, nature of the road network in this location and higher base land value, the draft plan has not included employment as part of the proposed mix. The public response to this has been further tested through the Regulation 14 consultation. The site is former Nursery land (and therefore not brownfield per se) and the Parish Council have contacted the site promoter to check whether there are any viability issues, and they have confirmed their commitment to delivering the affordable housing in line with the policy requirements.
Land promoters Commercial Freeholds Limited (Site 009)	4.2	Policy 12	The capacity of this site needs to be assessed and may need to be reduced in order to provide an acceptable sustainable drainage system. It is also some distance from the centre of the village and residents are likely to walk along Ringwood Road (an unsafe walking environment) as this would be more direct than through the alternative routes proposed. Site 009 is capable of delivering a greater quantum of housing and would represent a more sustainable development consistent with the objectives of the NP in a manner that would consolidate the village and not lead to development extending more	The Parish Council contacted the site promoter in respect of these matters. In terms of drainage, they state that the site has never flooded and does not suffer from standing water, even in periods of heavy rainfall. It has a ditch which runs around the perimeter of the site at present and any additional swales or other measures are capable of being incorporated into the site design without impacting on overall numbers. The site has the potential for two routes of access as identified in the Plan, and ideally both of these will be provided for maximum connectivity. This involves Parish Council land (who have endorsed the Neighbourhood Plan) as one

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Local resident responses	4.2	Policy 12	gradually out into the countryside to the south of the settlement. Main concerns relate to the increase in traffic along Ringwood Road which is narrow with no footpath and becomes flooded to the south. One comment queried location of the access into Broomfield Drive.	option, and a third party for the second option, who have also indicated that they are happy to connect both sites for the benefits of all residents. Given that facilities within the village stretch along the length of Station Road, some will be closer and some less close that alternatives, and residents of site 009 could likewise tend to use Ringwood Road as the most direct link to the sports facilities.
Dorset Council	4.2	Para 4.2.14	The paragraph says that commercial uses can be provided both adjoining the garage site and along the road frontage, however Policy 13 appears to say that employment uses should be on the road frontage only.	Noted – the Policy is not intended to prevent the area adjoining the garage being considered for employment. <i>Amend Policy wording to read: “...The location of employment areas should be on the road frontage in line with Policy 8 (The Village “High Street”) and may also include the area adjoining the garage site.”</i>
Dorset Council	4.2	Policy 13	Noted and supported.	Support noted.
Land promoters Macra Ltd (Site 006a)	4.2	Policy 13	As landowner we are very supportive of this Policy and the draft allocation of this site. We believe it constitutes natural infill within the village form, at an appropriate scale and it will enhance the entrance to the village from the west. It provides a great opportunity to deliver much needed housing and employment on the high street.	Support noted.
Local resident responses	4.2	Policy 13	Main concerns raised relate to: – flood risk (adjoining landowner, Alderholt Motors, cites high water table and regular flooding in recent years (the site is not flat) that already impacts on their business and Churchill Close) – including how the changes in site level	The Parish Council contacted the site promoter in respect of these matters. In terms of flood risk / drainage, they provided a flood risk note by Condon Drew Associates Ltd, that notes that site is within an area of possible groundwater susceptibility, and any flooding is likely to be

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Land promoters Commercial Freeholds Limited (Site 009)	4.2	Policy 13	<p>will be dealt with given the site frontage is below the main road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – compatibility with the existing business (given there are already noise complaints from residents of the properties along Jubilee Court). – further removal of trees including mature oaks (in addition to those removed in 2020) – loss of attractive paddock as part of the ‘entrance’ to the village (as well as from nearby homes) – impact on wildlife (including bats and owls seen locally) – increased traffic and parking on the main road, and poor visibility, causing highway safety issues – lack of infrastructure to support further development. 	<p>perched water atop a clay layer that lies beneath the topsoil. They have provided a concept drainage strategy (based on a detailed topographic survey) to indicate how utilising positive discharge from the site should result in betterment in terms of flood risk both on and off the site. Foul flows will be discharged via gravity sewer and connected into an existing chamber in Daggons Road.</p> <p>The site promoter has discussed options for access with the Highways Authority and can confirm that they do not need to remove any trees to achieve this, and that sufficient parking provision can be made within the site.</p> <p>The nature of employment proposed falls outside of B2 (heavy industrial) use and would be compatible with a residential area – and may indeed provide a ‘buffer’ between any residential and Alderholt Motors.</p> <p>Whilst the paddock is acknowledged to be an attractive green space, this does not over-ride the other factors in favour of this location which is broadly supported by the community as appropriate for development. The biodiversity net gain requirements will ensure that any impact on local species will be more than compensated for. An indicative site layout plan has been provided, and whilst they layout is not endorsed by the Parish Council, it does indicate that the site should have adequate capacity to deliver the quantum of development proposed.</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				<i>Update supporting text to referent that initial flood risk evidence has been provided that indicates how the site should decrease flood risk both on and off the site</i>
Dorset Council	4.2	Para 4.2.15	“Which is not currently shown as adopted highway” – would it be more accurate to simply say “which is not currently adopted highway”? Do you know if there are plans for the highways authority to adopt this road?	The site promoter has confirmed that they hold the required land to upgrade the route to adoptable standards with a carriageway width consistent with the initial section of Blackwater Close supporting two way traffic. <i>Agree point of clarification on current status and potential to upgrade the access to adoptable standards.</i>
Dorset Council	4.2	Para 4.2.18	Refers to “9 Blackwater Close” but I think this should be “9 Blackwater Grove”	No – this is the large site at the eastern end of Blackwater Grove that backs onto the development site. Whilst the landowner has not current intention of developing the land, it clearly provides a potential future brownfield option.
Dorset Council	4.2	Policy 14	Noted and supported.	Support noted.
Natural England	4.2	Policy 14	This site is known to support at least two species of protected reptiles. The proposed mitigation project at this site is of a suitable scale for the number of dwellings indicated. The configuration of the area will need to be informed by an ecological survey. It is likely that the area supports breeding birds and may also be of importance for bats and SPA birds. The policy wording should be adjusted to accessible natural greenspace.	Noted – suggest amending text to reference these points. <i>Add the following to the start of the supporting text on ecology “This site is known to support at least two species of protected reptiles. Any areas that support breeding birds may also be of importance for bats, and will need to be considered with reference to the Dorset heathlands (as one of the reasons for its significance related to breeding birds such as the European nightjar and Dartford warbler). ”</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Local resident responses	4.2	Policy 14	<p>Main concerns raised relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – flooding impacting on adjoining properties (where there have already been incidences of groundwater flooding) and given the sloping nature of the site towards the village. – impact on wildlife (including hedgehogs, slow-worms, bats and owls seen locally) – at the current time the site is regenerating with many saplings etc that will mature into trees – unsuitable nature of the access into Blackwater Close and Blackwater Grove. There have been many times that local services have not been able to access this road due to the amount of cars parked along the small close in Blackwater Close with bins not being emptied.. The houses in Blackwater Grove have very limited parking and therefore there is a lot of on road parking. The Blackwater Close junction is often used by public to do a 3 point turn in. Blackwater Grove is used by horseriders and dog walkers as a bridleway. 	<p>The Parish Council contacted the site promoter in respect of these matters. In terms of flood risk / drainage, there is no evidence of surface water risk on the Government flood maps. Whilst Dorset Council's mapping indicates that a small part of the site may be susceptible to groundwater flooding, this risk can be dealt with through the layout and drainage strategy.</p> <p>The biodiversity net gain requirements will ensure that any impact on local species will be more than compensated for.</p> <p>With regard to access, Dorset Council officers have confirmed that the vehicular and pedestrian access options proposed are appropriate, and may be able to accommodate additional development (although this would need to be further assessed).</p> <p><i>Amend reference to access to note Dorset Council's response to access concerns.</i></p>
Land promoters Highwood (Site 006)	4.2	Policy 14	<p>This site is allocated for 15-20 dwellings but it is not demonstrated that access to the site can be achieved.</p>	
Land promoters Highwood (Site 006)	4.2	Policy 14	<p>There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the plan's housing target can be delivered in relation to the Heathland Infrastructure Project requirements</p>	<p>The Parish Council has been guided by Natural England on this point, and has indicated that the combination of the planned and proposed HIPS / SANG at Alderholt Surplus Stores, Daggons Road</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Land promoters Commercial Freeholds Limited (Site 009)	4.2	Policy 14	The approach is also inconsistent as the other two development sites are accepted as being reliant upon off-site SANG. Furthermore, the site is more than capable of being brought forwards for 50 homes with its own site specific SANG within the scope of its the 3.6ha site area.	(planning application reference 3/11/0558/REM) - within the northern part of the site currently being developed, at High Wood (planning application reference 3/20/1732/FUL), and on Land South of Blackwater Grove (NP Policy 14) should be sufficient to mitigate the extant planning consents and site allocations.
Land promoters Individual (Sites 010 and 011)	4.2	Policy 14	The SANG could be provided on adjoining land to enable the whole of this parcel of land to be development	The potential for alternative SANG provision is not ruled out and may be considered.
Land promoters Commercial Freeholds Limited (Site 009)	4.2	Policy 14	This density of development is unreasonably and unrealistically low and would result in a significantly inefficient use of the land, contrary to the NPPF. Even if only 2ha of the site were to be built upon as is suggested, the delivery of a scheme of 40 dwellings would only result in a density of 20dph, which is more in line with the other proposed allocations. The suggestion that development be limited to the eastern part of the site would prevent open space being integrated through the scheme - it is suggested that flexibility is provided to arrange the dwellings throughout the site and to locate SANG and open space elements in the most appropriate locations where existing landscape features or interest can be best preserved or enhanced. Amended policy wording suggested reflecting the above.	The supporting text makes clear that 20 homes should not be interpreted as an absolute capacity, but if there is capacity to include additional housing (which would exceed the level of development advised as acceptable by Natural England at this time), this could come forward as part of a later phase of development when this Plan is reviewed. It is not expected (or indeed made a policy required) that the 15 – 20 homes should be ‘spread’ across the full site. The area identified as proposed greenspace (SANG / HIP) has a greater interface with the countryside and its features appear to lend itself more to providing an interesting alternative greenspace. This does not prevent the SANG from extending further eastwards, indeed the area shown measures approximately 1.6ha and therefore this is implied to provide a 2ha site.
Land promoters Highwood (Site 006)	4.2	Site omission	Given the scoring in the AECOM Site Options and Assessment Report and potential issues in relation	The SEA scores for this site (004) in Table 5.1 of that report do not indicate that this site is

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			<p>to the allocated sites, it is difficult to comprehend why Cross Farm was not allocated. Development at Cross Farm (Site 004) scored very positively in the AECOM report and will evidently meet the vision and objectives of the ANP better than other alternatives – not least through delivery of over 50 homes, with policy compliant affordable housing and facilitating delivery of the Alderholt to Fordingbridge Trailway, which no other site can deliver. It is a sustainable option for development and suitable, deliverable and available. We will be preparing additional technical evidence to further support such an allocation ahead of ANP examination and will be more than willing to continue engagement with the parish council and local community on bringing forward a development with all the benefits to the village it would bring</p>	<p>significantly preferable to those chosen (sites 002, 006a and 009). Based simplistically on the numerical ‘scores’ in Table 5.1 of the SEA, where a low number is more positive, Site 004 scored 20, and sites 002, 006a and 009 scored 8, 11 and 14 respectively. Furthermore, the consultation responses do not indicate that land at Cross Farm was considered a suitable site by local residents. It is similar in some respects to site 009 insofar as it is mainly ‘backland’ site that would not be suitable for employment but could provide open space, but given its greater degree of flood risk and current use as agricultural land was considered less suitable at this time.</p>
Land promoters Individual (Sites 010 and 011)	4.2	Site omission	<p>Additional land adjacent to the Paddocks should be included to support any further development and make it sustainable.</p>	<p>Site 011 was assessed a not suitable for development as part of the Dorset SHLAA. This was confirmed through the independent assessment undertaken by AECOM, and its omission supported through the options consultation.</p>
Dorset Council	5.1	Policy 15	<p>Noted and supported.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
Cranborne Chase National Landscape Partnership	5.1	Policy 15	<p>The Partnership commends the NP group for recognising the importance of the allotments, not just in relation to their obvious function but also the substantial amount of community investment of time and effort.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Land promoters Dudsbury Homes (Site 007)	5.1	Policy 15	Whilst this policy is laudable in itself, continued low levels of growth in Alderholt have already seen a steady decline in local services. Trying to protect services whilst failing to permit the growth that they need to survive is a policy which will fail and impose unreasonable demands on business owners who are losing trade and custom through static population growth.	There are many factors that influence whether or not a business is successful, and having a larger population is not a guaranteed 'fix'. The existing population of around 3,200 residents is significantly higher than many villages in the Dorset area, and this policy reflects national and local policy.
Dorset Council	5.2	Policy 16	Noted and supported. The following sites are owned by Dorset Council, and the Assets and Property team have been consulted and have no objections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – LGS6 – Tudor Close amenity area – LGS7 – Kestrel Way amenity area – LGS8 – Windsor Way kickabout area – LGS9 – Alderholt School playing field. 	Support noted.
Natural England	5.2	Policy 16	Support the allocation of the Important Local Green Spaces.	Support noted.
Landowner	5.2	Policy 16	As the owner of LGS5 I want this space deleted from the plan.	The landowner was consulted and their previous points of objection were considered prior to commencing the Regulation 14 consultation, but the points raised were not deemed to be sufficient to delete the proposed designation. No new points have been put forward by the landowner in response to this consultation.
Land promoters Individual (Sites 010 and 011)	5.2	Policy 16	LGS10 has not been put forward as a potential Local Green Space and still very much forms part of a more strategic approach to the future growth of Alderholt being promoted and considered through	As referenced in para 5.2.4, Appendix 2 includes a more detailed description of each site and their reason for their designation.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			<p>the Local Plan making process. There needs to be a clear rationale and evidence for Local Green Space designation and that it is not being misused to prevent development. No rationale for the proposed Local Green Space designation has been provided. The NPPF test requires a piece of land to be ‘demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular significance e.g. its beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of its wildlife’ and this has not been evidenced.</p>	<p>Whilst the owner considers that this is an ordinary piece of land that is not particularly valued by the community, this is not a view shared by the respondents to the consultations.</p>
Local resident responses	5.2	Policy 16	<p>Suggest protection of the allotments as a LGS or heritage asset</p>	<p>The allotments were considered for LGS designation, but given that the main reason for safeguarding these was the use (which could be transferred to another site if necessary), their protection was considered better achieved through their inclusion as a local facility under Policy 15.</p>
Local resident responses	5.2	Policy 16	<p>Suggest protection of the Paddock (Site 006a) as a LGS as an attractive green space at the entrance to the village.</p>	<p>The site is proposed for development, and this is supported by the majority of those responding, suggesting that this site is not strongly valued by the community (as a whole).</p>
Local resident responses	5.2	Policy 16	<p>Not sure that the Recreation Ground should be classed as an open space as it is a sports field.</p>	<p>The site meets the criteria for LGS designation, and there are many examples of sports fields being so designated. This does not prevent its continuing use as a sports field, or the erection of ancillary structures to support its continued use provided that these would not reduce its open character or recreational use and ability to host village events that require a large open area. The area immediately adjoining the road, including the</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Dorset Council	5.3	Policy 17	Noted and supported.	clubhouse and pavilion, is not part of the LGS designation. Support noted.
Cranborne Chase National Landscape Partnership	5.3	Policy 17	There is no information on the prevention of light pollution and the provision of good lighting. Both those elements should be included in a NP that adjoins an International Dark Sky Reserve.	Agreed – dark night skies are a key characteristic of the rural areas of the parish, important in terms of the adjoining National Landscape’s status and also in minimising potentially harmful impacts on nocturnal species. <i>Reference the dark nights skies in section 2.4 (including link to https://www.cpre.org.uk/light-pollution-dark-skies-map/) and need to minimise the harmful impacts of street lighting in Policy 2 and supporting text, and more generally in Policy 17.</i>
Cranborne Chase National Landscape Partnership	5.3	Policy 17	The obvious, but easily taken for granted, mature Oak trees along the lanes are shown to provide a special rural character.	Support noted.
Land promoters Individual (Sites 010 and 011)	5.3	Policy 17	As per LGS10 this policy is also flawed in that it refers to a place that doesn't exist.	Disagree for the reasons given in relation to the LGS designation.
Local resident responses	5.3	Policy 17	Suggest addition of view from recreation field looking east towards New Forest	This view was previously considered at the meeting in June 2023 but was not considered to merit inclusion.
Local resident responses	5.3	Policy 17	Suggest addition of views on approach roads to village, particularly along Ringwood Road and around Pressey's Corner	No specific views have been identified, but the policy does seek to protect and where possible reinforce the character provided by the winding hedge lined lanes, and mature oak trees that line the lanes around and approaching the village.
Dorset Council	5.4	Table 2 (page 53), V1	Just to note that this refers to “the iconic block of conifers” – does this contradict Policy 17, which	Policy 17 refers to the hard geometric edges of the conifer plantations, whereas the stand of conifers

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			describes conifer plantations as a detracting feature?	in this location is not a plantation (so photo on Map 14) and may be better referenced as 'stand' than 'block'. <i>Amend description to refer to 'stand'</i>
Dorset Council	5.4	Policy 18	Noted and supported.	Support noted.
Natural England	5.4	Policy 18	Some viewpoints are currently dependent on trees which are nearing the end of their lifespan eg V1. It would seem appropriate for the Plan to indicate that some of these locations should be priority locations for tree enhancement/management eg through the oak tree project.	Noted and agreed. <i>Add additional paragraph in supporting text "Where trees are important landmarks within views, their retention and ongoing management is encouraged, and may form part of the Oak Tree Project." Amend project to reference "and in locations where trees are important in local views"</i>
Cranborne Chase National Landscape Partnership	5.4	Policy 18	The NP group may wish to consider whether there are more than just the identified four important views. It may, for example, be useful to consider special, typical, or iconic views within the Parish and settlement rather than just looking outwards. Such views could include heritage features and locally significant cultural localities.	Noted – this is a matter that would be better researched as part of a future review of this Plan.
Dorset Council	5.5	Policy 19	Noted and supported. Suggest clarify "Features associated with railway" – should this read former railway?	Support noted and need for clarification agreed. <i>Amend last bullet of Policy 19 to read: "Features associated with the former railway."</i>
Dorset Council	--	SEA report	Environmental Assessment Officer comments: the report is thorough and prepared to a high standard, but please note that there will need to be further assessment undertaken at the later stages of the plan preparation process, as per the 'Next Steps' section in para 6.64 onwards. It may be prudent to provide greater explanation of the reasons for selecting/rejecting each of the nine sites	Noted – these comments have been passed to AECOM.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			considered in the analysis of reasonable alternatives in the final Environmental Report.	
Dorset Council	--	HRA Report	Environmental Assessment Officer comments: the report is thorough and high quality, as expected from AECOM. However, there are a couple of minor issues which need correcting, including the suggested mitigation for the New Forest recreational pressure issue, which comprises a change in wording to policy 7, doesn't reflect the most recent progress which has been made with developing a SAMM strategy for the New Forest (which isn't public at this stage). The air quality section doesn't have regard to the Dorset Heathlands Interim Air Quality Strategy despite the proximity to the Dorset Heaths.	Noted – these comments have been passed to AECOM.

Appendix 1: Scoping File Note

File Note – Vision and Objectives

Prepared by Jo Witherden BSc(Hons) DipTP DipUD MRTPI

What local residents have previously told us:

2017 Local Plan consultation (460 responses)

Key conclusions from the open text responses:

There were 287 extensive text responses and the greatest issues/priorities were:-

These appear to major on the need to retain the village feel of Alderholt in its rural setting, a requirement for the infrastructure to be improved/provided before any development, especially the road network into and out of the village, and better public transport/bus service. Also, any development should “look nice” – be well designed and generally small scale. There was an emphasis also on the fact that children have to move away at present due to the level of unaffordability and unavailability of property in Alderholt.

Mention was made of the need for there to be adequate parking provision for any development, and that the provision of workplaces in the village would help reduce the level of commuting into and out of the village.

2019 Survey – key findings (420 responses)

What was valued (top 7 priorities):

- Rural setting
- Shops
- Village feel
- Public footpaths
- Recreation ground
- Garage
- Community Spirit

Priorities for improvement (top 7 priorities):

- Bus Service
- Shops / services
- Doctors
- Traffic management / improved roads
- Footpaths
- Schools
- Gym / leisure centre

Most people did their main food shop in either Ringwood, Verwood or Fordingbridge. People went further afield (typically Bournemouth or Salisbury) for more general shopping.

A significant proportion of respondents worked from home, but otherwise work destinations were quite scattered – including Bournemouth, Fordingbridge, Ringwood, Salisbury and Southampton. The vast majority commuted to work by car (as the main driver).

About a third of respondents said that someone in their household had been involved in a road traffic incident in the local area in the last 5 years. Only about a fifth of these accidents were actively reported.

2022 Focus Group session – key findings:

Housing

Main concerns noted were regarding the potential scale of growth, and the impact on the village and its facilities. If additional houses are built this should include social housing that is genuinely affordable to local people. The existing consents should be progressed first – particularly the Surplus Stores site as this is brownfield land.

Transport

Main concerns were the lack of any viable alternatives to the car, and that the highway network is inadequate for major traffic increases and there are problems with speeding traffic. There could be better traffic management (speed and HGV restrictions), and better public transport is needed. The railway could provide a safe cycling route (but recognising that this is unlikely to operate as an effective alternative to the car)

Leisure and Facilities

The village would benefit from additional facilities – such as a gym or skate park, a youth club and a better network of footways for getting around the village. Concerns regarding capacity in the local schools, access to healthcare and the reliability of the internet / broadband connections

Vision and Objectives Discussion

Vision

By (2034) Alderholt will be...

The vision can cover issues that matter most to local people, what they particularly want to cherish, and what they want to see improved. It can also to cover relationship with outlying areas within and outside of the parish. It benefits from being 'unique' to the area – so that it will resonate with local people.

Objectives

Possible themes:

- Housing needs and opportunities
- Employment needs and opportunities
- Transport and travel (including road safety, public transport, walking and cycling)
- Community Facilities (including education, health, amenities and facilities for all ages)
- Green spaces / environment / biodiversity
- Flooding and drainage
- Character / design
- Village centre / hub / 'high street'
- Climate change (although this is often cross-cutting through all of the themes)

Appendix 2. Display boards and survey used in the Options Consultation



Welcome

... to our consultation event for the
Alderholt Neighbourhood Plan.



You can complete this online (scan in the QR code) or take a survey form (and a pen) and let us have your written feedback on the ideas and options we have identified.

If you have any questions, please do ask one of our volunteers (all local residents) who will try their best to answer.

The information and survey can also be viewed at <http://www.alderholtparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Our Vision

To ensure that Alderholt remains a village with the essential amenities and facilities that enables residents and visitors to enjoy the beautiful countryside whilst being part of an active and friendly community in a peaceful rural setting.

Our Objectives

Do you broadly agree with the following objectives for our Plan?

- ⇒ Protect and retain the character of the village – its uniqueness on the edge of Dorset, its compact form and quiet nature, its links to the former railway, historic buildings and the surrounding countryside.
- ⇒ Reinforce the sense of a village centre/high street.
- ⇒ Protect and strengthen the highly valued amenities and community facilities that provide its residents with a strong sense of connection and community, allowing them and newcomers to be active, develop and thrive.
- ⇒ Identify suitable sites for the level of development required to meet the anticipated need for housing, as well as providing opportunities for some local employment, that would be compatible with the nature of our village and limited road access.
- ⇒ Ensure there are safe and attractive walking and cycling routes around the village, and support the project to re-use the former railway for recreation and onward connection to Fordingbridge.
- ⇒ Protect the intrinsic beauty and enjoyment of the countryside and approaches to Alderholt
- ⇒ Protect and strengthen the more isolated settlements – Cripplestyle, Daggons and Crendell - and the wider countryside from inappropriate development ensuring its rural nature and the extensive biodiversity of our parish is enhanced.

Please use this opportunity to comment on the vision and objectives. Have we got it about right? What do you disagree with? What have we missed out that should be included?

Potential Development Sites

Based on a 12 year plan period (2022 – 2034), and working with Dorset Council, we have calculated that we need about 192 new dwellings in total. Deducting the existing housing supply from this total (such as the Surplus Stores site and the Hawthorns site on Ringwood Road), the Neighbourhood Plan would need to make provision for about 50 dwellings in total. Allocating sites that will deliver at least 10 dwellings as part of this supply should ensure that those sites would deliver at least 35% as affordable housing or more as part of the housing mix, and demonstrate that we have a robust Plan.

We have had all of the sites that have been suggested by local landowners independently assessed for their suitability for development (and therefore could be included in our plan), and we would now like your opinion on which of the sites would be the most suitable. These are the purple and yellow (partial) sites shown below

016a: Stroud Firs, North of Station Road


Limited developable area (scrub) just south of railway line. Estimated as potentially accommodating about 20 - 25 homes, and accessible woodland space / SANG. Enables access to trailway. Access options limited - would need further discussion with Highways.

004: Cross Farm, North of Station Road

Potentially able to accommodate about 30 homes, or less with some employment, plus public open space. Areas at risk of surface water flooding would not be built on. Enables access to trailway. Access can be provided from 137 Station Road (owned).

013: Presseys Corner, Fordingbridge Rd

Estimated as potentially accommodating up to around 20 homes, or less with some employment. Central / southern area is higher ground and would be less suitable for development. Possible to include some public open space within the site. Access options limited - would need further discussion with Highways. Could provide pavement inside hedge, possibly with road from Fordingbridge giving access to parking to rear.



006a: Paddock South of Daggons Road

Estimated as potentially accommodating up to around 15–20 homes, or less with some employment.

007b: West of Hillbury Road

Could accommodate the full 50 homes, plus some employment and public open space. Should not require all of the land indicated.

002: Alderholt Nursery, East of Ringwood Road

Estimated as potentially accommodating up to around 20 homes, or less with some employment. Possible to include some public open space within the site. It should be possible to retain the trees on the site boundary.

020: Land at Blackwater House, Blackwater Grove

Estimated as potentially accommodating about 40 homes. Enables access to trailway. Ponds and mature trees on the site would be retained.

009: Land south of Blackwater Grove

Estimated as potentially accommodating up to about 50 homes, depending on access. Potential to include some public open space within the site. Access from Blackwater Close may be difficult — further discussion with Highways needed. Possible option to link through site 007a. Trees at the SW corner of the site would be retained.

007a: Land south of Ringwood Road


Could accommodate the full 50 homes, plus some employment and public open space. Should not require all of the land indicated. Could provide access to Site 009. Potential to create pavements along the site boundary, retaining mature oaks.

Rejected Development Sites (first stage)

What site options have we already ruled out?

AECOM have identified that a number of sites are highly unlikely to be suitable for development, for a range of reasons including distance from the village, proximity to sensitive wildlife habitats, difficult access etc...

However if you feel strongly that one or more of these sites should be reconsidered, please let us know now.




Local Green Spaces

We are considering whether the sites shown below should be designated as Local Green Spaces, which if agreed would mean that no development would be allowed on them that would harm that green space, other than in very special circumstances.

NB: Local Green Spaces are not necessarily public open space, and their designation does not give any additional public rights of access to these areas. If these spaces are to be designated we will also need to consult the landowners to consider what they may have to say about the designation.

Local Green Spaces must be clearly valued by the community and of obvious importance for their recreational, landscape, historic, cultural or wildlife value. They cannot be extensive tracts of countryside, or land which may have planning permission for development or likely to be needed for development in the foreseeable future.

Do you agree that these spaces should be protected? Have we missed any other important green spaces?




Locally Important Views

We have also considered the importance of views around the village - those that are visible from public areas. We need you to tell us whether you think these are particularly important / iconic and should be protected, and whether we have missed any views that should also be included in the plan.

National Planning Policy recognises that planning policies and decisions should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

However - are there some landscapes that are more valued than others in the area? Identifying much-loved views can help us justify why some areas are particularly valued, over and above the wider countryside.



Have we missed any really important views? Let us know...

Village Character and Design

We are working with a company called AECOM (as part of the Government support package for Neighbourhood Planning) to provide some more detailed design guidance that is right for our area. They have asked a series of questions about what you think of different designs and styles, what you think works well, and would be appropriate for our village where new development is most likely to happen. To guide them on this, they have provided some images and ask that you give us your thoughts on what is good or bad.

We are also asking whether you agree with the following principles for new design, and which is the most and least important:

- ⇒ Retain and strengthen the number of mature trees (particularly oaks) along the roads
- ⇒ Have space between and around homes to allow some greenery / planting
- ⇒ If new sites on the edge of the village are developed, these can use modern, 21st century designs
- ⇒ All new homes should be eco-friendly
- ⇒ Affordability is important - in terms of mix of sizes, materials as well as running / home maintenance costs
- ⇒ Pavements should be included in designs, to separate cars from pedestrians
- ⇒ There should be enough off-street parking provision to minimise on-street parking





Thank you

... for attending our consultation event and helping steer the choices for our Plan.

Please complete the final page of the questionnaire - this helps us understand how many people took part, whether the responses were from an individual or collectively from a household, and avoid accidental duplications. There is also the opportunity to enter the **PRIZE DRAW** – with prizes gifted to us from local businesses.




Did your friends and neighbours hear about this consultation?

If they weren't able to come to the event, they can still complete the survey online at <http://www.alderholtparishcouncil.gov.uk>, or you can send them the link from this QR code. **This consultation closes 31 July.**

Our Next Steps

The following is our best guess at the current time in terms of how the next stages of the Plan will progress.

- ⇒ Analyse the results of this consultation (August)
- ⇒ Liaise with landowners as necessary to confirm options (August / September)
- ⇒ Draft the Plan (September)
- ⇒ Consult on the Plan (November / December)
- ⇒ Finalise Plan, revised as necessary, for submission (March 2024)
- ⇒ Examination and Referendum (Summer / Autumn 2024)



Together we can shape the future for Alderholt...



Alderholt Neighbourhood Plan

Options Consultation - Summer 2023

NB the following is the paper copy used at the event, the online survey also included relevant maps as shown on the display boards.

Vision and Objectives

Do you broadly agree with the VISION - how many thumbs up would you give it? Please circle

1 2 3 4

You can add any comments here about what you think we have missed or got wrong.

Do you broadly agree with the following objectives? Please tick Yes or No

Yes No

Protect and retain the character of the village – its uniqueness on the edge of Dorset, its compact form and quiet nature, its links to the former railway, historic buildings and the surrounding countryside		
Reinforce the sense of a village centre/high street Protect and strengthen the highly valued amenities and community facilities that provide its residents with a strong sense of connection and community, allowing them and newcomers to be active, develop and thrive		
Identify suitable sites for the level of development required to meet the anticipated need for housing, as well as providing opportunities for some local employment, that would be compatible with the nature of our village and limited road access		
Ensure there are safe and attractive walking and cycling routes around the village, and support the project to re-use the former railway for recreation and onward connection to Fordingbridge		
Protect the intrinsic beauty and enjoyment of the countryside and approaches to Alderholt		
Protect and strengthen the more isolated settlements – Cripplestyle, Daggons and Crendell and the wider countryside from inappropriate development ensuring its rural nature and the extensive biodiversity of our parish is enhanced		

Potential Development Sites

Which site do you think could be suitable for development? Please select up to 3 options as 'most suitable' Otherwise choose suitable, not suitable or don't know.

	Most Suitable (tick up to 3)	Suitable	Unsuitable	Don't know
002: Alderholt Nursery, East of Ringwood Rd				
004: Cross Farm, North of Station Road				
006a: Paddock South of Daggons Road				
007a: Land South of Ringwood Road				

	Most Suitable (tick up to 3)	Suitable	Unsuitable	Don't know
007b: West of Hillbury Road				
009: Land at South of Blackwater Grove				
013: Presseys Corner				
016a: Stroud Firs, North of Station Road				
020: Land at Blackwater House, Blackwater Grove				

You can add any comments about the sites here – please include the reference number:

Rejected sites

Do you think any of the sites that were rejected at the first stage should be considered (in preference to those above)? *Please circle*

No

Yes - please note the reference number of the site and why it would be more suitable here:

Local Green Spaces and Locally Important Views

Which of the following green spaces do you consider to be important?

Please tick one box per row

	Very important	Reasonably important	Not important at all	Don't know site
LGS1: Alderholt Recreation Ground / Play Area				
LGS2: Blackwater Grove Triangle				
LGS3: Churchill Close Kickabout Area				
LGS4: Earlswood Drive Amenity Space				
LGS5: Oak Road southern woodland corridor				
LGS6: Tudor Close Amenity Area				
LGS8: Windsor Way kickabout area				
LGS7: Kestrel Way Amenity Area (2 parcels)				
LGS9: Alderholt School Playing Field				
LGS10: Blackwater Grove field with pine trees				
LGS11: Stroud Firs (frontage / adj Station Road)				

Please describe any important green spaces that you think we have missed (and where) here

Which of the follow views do you think are particularly important and should be specifically protected? Please tick one box per row

	Important	Not important
V1: Blackwater Lane towards the Common (and pine trees)		
V2: View from Dotty’s Bench on Telegraph Hill		
V3: View of Vine Cottage from footpath E34/6 to Wolvercroft		
V4: View from King Barrow		
V5: View along footpath E34/31 to Alderholt Park		

Please describe any important views that you think we have missed here (if at all possible please say where you are standing when you see the view - either the name of the place or grid reference - and approximately what direction you are looking). NB views must be from publicly accessible places, such as the public footpath network.

Design and Local Character

Please indicate which of the housing styles and layouts you think would be appropriate for Alderholt - you can circle as many or as few as you like.

Photo 1 Photo 2 Photo 3 Photo 4 Photo 5 Photo 6 Photo 7

If you can and would like to spend a little more time giving us your feedback on the good and bad aspects of these designs, please also complete the following questions:

Photo 1	Good	Neutral	Bad
Building appearance (materials, colour, detailing, etc.)			
Parking arrangement (street, garage, courtyard, etc.)			
Architectural variety (style, height, rooflines, etc.)			
Open space (greenery, gardens, setback, etc.)			
Relation to context (between buildings, layout, orientation, etc.)			
Accessibility (walking/cycling/disabled-friendly, waste collection etc)			
Any comments about this layout?			

Photo 2	Good	Neutral	Bad
Building appearance (materials, colour, detailing, etc.)			
Parking arrangement (street, garage, courtyard, etc.)			
Architectural variety (style, height, rooflines, etc.)			
Open space (greenery, gardens, setback, etc.)			
Relation to context (between buildings, layout, orientation, etc.)			
Accessibility (walking/cycling/disabled-friendly, waste collection etc)			
Any comments about this layout?			

Photo 3	Good	Neutral	Bad
Building appearance (materials, colour, detailing, etc.)			
Parking arrangement (street, garage, courtyard, etc.)			

Architectural variety (style, height, rooflines, etc.)			
Open space (greenery, gardens, setback, etc.)			
Relation to context (between buildings, layout, orientation, etc.)			
Accessibility (walking/cycling/disabled-friendly, waste collection etc)			
Any comments about this layout?			

Photo 4	Good	Neutral	Bad
Building appearance (materials, colour, detailing, etc.)			
Parking arrangement (street, garage, courtyard, etc.)			
Architectural variety (style, height, rooflines, etc.)			
Open space (greenery, gardens, setback, etc.)			
Relation to context (between buildings, layout, orientation, etc.)			
Accessibility (walking/cycling/disabled-friendly, waste collection etc)			
Any comments about this layout?			

Photo 5	Good	Neutral	Bad
Building appearance (materials, colour, detailing, etc.)			
Parking arrangement (street, garage, courtyard, etc.)			
Architectural variety (style, height, rooflines, etc.)			
Open space (greenery, gardens, setback, etc.)			
Relation to context (between buildings, layout, orientation, etc.)			
Accessibility (walking/cycling/disabled-friendly, waste collection etc)			
Any comments about this layout?			

Photo 6	Good	Neutral	Bad
Building appearance (materials, colour, detailing, etc.)			
Parking arrangement (street, garage, courtyard, etc.)			
Architectural variety (style, height, rooflines, etc.)			
Open space (greenery, gardens, setback, etc.)			
Relation to context (between buildings, layout, orientation, etc.)			
Accessibility (walking/cycling/disabled-friendly, waste collection etc)			
Any comments about this layout?			

Photo 7	Good	Neutral	Bad
Building appearance (materials, colour, detailing, etc.)			
Parking arrangement (street, garage, courtyard, etc.)			
Architectural variety (style, height, rooflines, etc.)			
Open space (greenery, gardens, setback, etc.)			
Relation to context (between buildings, layout, orientation, etc.)			
Accessibility (walking/cycling/disabled-friendly, waste collection etc)			
Any comments about this layout?			

The following points have been identified by the Neighbourhood Plan group as features that they think would be important factors in the design of new development. We would like to check whether you agree. Please tick as many as you agree with.

- Retain and strengthen the number of mature trees (particularly oaks) along the roads
- Have space between and around homes to allow some greenery / planting
- If new sites on the edge of the village are developed, these can use modern, 21st century designs
- All new homes should be eco-friendly
- Affordability is important - both in terms of size, materials and running / home maintenance costs
- Pavements should be included in designs, to separate cars from pedestrians
- There should be enough off-street parking provision to minimise on-street parking

Which do you consider to be the most and the least important of the following? Tick one box either side

Least important		Most important
	Rural character	
	Open spaces, including front and back gardens	
	Energy efficient designs including solar panels etc	
	Affordable costs – size of homes and cheaper building materials	
	Beautiful designs - unique architecture and detailing	
	Parking provision	
	Pavements / opportunities for walking / cycling around the village	

There are very few buildings in the village that date back more than 100 years. Over time, older buildings have been demolished and redeveloped - and unless a building is Listed, there are no planning rules that would prevent demolition. **To what extent do you think we should identify the remaining older buildings and encourage their retention?** Please tick one of the following boxes.

- Waste of time
- Moderately important
- Very important

And finally...

In which part of the parish do you live? Please tick one of the following boxes.

- Alderholt Village - **East** (between Park Lane and Hillbury Road, north of Birchwood Drive)
- Alderholt Village - **South** (south of Earlswood / Birchwood Drive)
- Alderholt Village - **West** (between Park Lane and the Churchill Arms)
- Daggons
- Other outlying hamlets / farms (Cripplestyle, Crendell)
- Outside of the parish

Or you can tell us your postcode:

Please tell us your name (or names if this is completed on behalf of a family) *This is to help check how many people responded and avoid duplication - your names will not be published. If you feel strongly that you do not want to give this personal information, you can leave this question blank.*

--

Prize Draw! If you would like to enter the prize draw (gifted by local Alderholt businesses) please give your name and contact details below:

Name:

Address:

Email or

telephone:

If you have supplied any personal information (such as name or contact details) we need your consent to hold this. *Please tick one of the following boxes.*

- I consent
- I do not consent

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. We will be consulting further as we progress, but if there is anything you want to raise now, please do so here.

Appendix 3. Display boards and survey used in the Pre-Submission Consultation



Welcome

... to our consultation event on the draft **Alderholt Neighbourhood Plan**



You can complete this online (scan in the QR code above) or take a survey form (and a pen) and let us have your written feedback on the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

If you have any questions, please do ask one of our volunteers (all local residents) who will try their best to answer.

The information and survey can also be viewed at <http://www.alderholtparishcouncil.gov.uk>


A quick recap...

This document is the first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan for the parish of Alderholt. When finalised, it will have the official status of being part of the "development plan" for the area, used by Dorset Council to determine planning applications, what is built (and what isn't).

The Plan has been prepared by local residents, shaped by feedback from the various consultations, with technical input from a range of planning and other experts. This has been done on behalf of the Parish Council, who are responsible for Neighbourhood Planning.

What happens next?

We are now at the 'Regulation 14' or 'Pre-submission' consultation stage.



You will find copies of the draft Plan here on the tables, and can view / download a copy by scanning this QR code:



The Plan will no doubt change as a result of the feedback we receive from this consultation, before it will be checked by an Independent Examiner. Local residents then get the final say (through a referendum) as to whether the Plan should be used.

Please use this opportunity to comment on the draft Plan.

Have we got it about right? What do you disagree with? What have we missed out that should be in the Plan?

A Quick Read...


The main need for development in our area is for housing, but there is already quite a lot of housing planned at the Surplus Stores site and on the Hawthorns Nursery. Dorset Council have agreed our **housing target, to find sites for about 50 more homes**.

We have identified three sites to include in this Plan. These received a good degree of support in the consultation that ran during the summer, and were felt to best meet the Plan's objectives.

> **Alderholt Nursery, Ringwood Road**, for about 20 homes, and would include a pedestrian link to the village that avoids the need to walk along Ringwood Road.

> **Paddock South of Daggons Road**, for about 15 homes and some small-scale employment workspace units on the road frontage, and would provide a pedestrian route along the front of the site, and a link to enable access to the Trailway in the future.

> **Land South of Blackwater Grove**, for about 15 to 20 homes and including a sizeable area (at least 2 hectares) of accessible green space.



To remain a thriving village, we are also supporting the **retention and possible expansion of local services and community facilities**, looking to encourage new facilities along the main thoroughfare in the village (Daggons Road / Station Road) when sites come up for redevelopment, as the village 'High Street'. We have an aspiration to transform the disused railway into a **recreational trailway**, though this will depend on funding and the agreement of local landowners. We also hope to work with local healthcare providers to **improve access to healthcare services locally**.

A key message that came through all the consultations was how much local people valued the environment and the fact that Alderholt is a village, surrounded by beautiful countryside. So the Plan has policies to **protect important green spaces and views** in and around the village, and



policies to protect other **landscape, wildlife and historic features**, such as the many mature oaks that line the lanes, and the traditional fingerposts and post boxes dotted across the parish.

The **design guidance** reflects the distinctive character of the different parts of the village, lessons learnt from recent developments, and the changes that may be needed to support

zero-carbon homes, such as solar panels and the use of sustainable, low-carbon building materials. The guidance also highlights the need to ensure that development does not take place in the flood areas or worsen flooding off-site, and looks to improve routes for walking and cycling safely around our village.



Altogether, there are **19 planning policies** together with **3 projects** identified for the Parish Council and others to take forward.

Please use this opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Have we got it about right? What do you disagree with? What have we missed out that should be in the Plan?

Understanding our Area

The first couple of chapters in our Plan set out a bit of background on how the Plan was prepared, how it “fits” within the planning system, and information about our local area which has helped shape some of our policies and ideas. We hope you find the information helpful, and that it will also help people looking to build here, understand our area better.

The parish population, as recorded in the 2021 Census, is now around **3,200 usual residents**.

Modern Alderholt really dates from 1971 when the former Wimborne & Cranborne Rural District Council installed a mains drainage system throughout the village. Old maps show the very **early origins of Alderholt village along Fordingbridge Road** around Pressey’s Corner.

Alderholt parish is mainly **rural in character**. Much of the countryside within the parish (to the north and east) is designated as an **Area of Great Landscape Value**.

There are **no railway** stations in the area (the railway having been dismantled following the Beeching cuts in the 1960s), and **no regular bus service** (the previously subsidised No.97 service being withdrawn in December 2023).

Most commuters (58%) travel more than 10km to work, there and back.

Few workers live within 2km of their workplace when compared with the Dorset average.

The relatively low-lying nature of the area and its proximity to the River Avon means that **much of the area is susceptible to groundwater flooding**.

Much of the land around and including Cranborne Common is nationally, and in places internationally, **important for wildlife**.

The main road through the parish is the B3078, which runs east-west connecting the village of Cranborne and the town of Fordingbridge in Hampshire. This road includes sharp bends and pinch-points that make it **unsuitable for large volumes of traffic**.

The distinctive characteristics of the different areas of Alderholt are described in Chapter 2

- > early village footprint
- > planned 1970s development
- > modern infill



Consultations with local residents have highlighted particular concerns:

- The possible scale and unplanned nature of development – much more than is needed locally
- The impact that development could have on the character of the village and surrounding countryside, losing its rural nature
- The likely increase in traffic on the local road network (given the dormitory nature of the village), making it less safe for pedestrians and cyclists using local roads.

General Design Guidance

There are 6 policies in the third chapter of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, which deal with the design of new development, as well as extensions and alterations.

These cover:

Policy 1: Settlement pattern, layout and densities **PAGE 25**

This policy recognises the different road types and patterns in the village. In particular, to retain the feel of our village, buildings should generally be set back from the highway with a front garden depth of at least 6m, unless there are wide green verges already in place.

Policy 2: People-friendly streets and paths **PAGE 26**

This policy encourages new development to include pedestrian footways and trees or grass verges on either side of the road. It suggests that the width of the road should vary to naturally slow traffic. It also requires developers to consider crossing points, surfacing, lighting and how the routes and spaces link together.

Policy 3: Parking provision **PAGE 28**

Developers should plan for the average of 1.9 cars per dwelling plus an allowance for visitors / overflow parking. Most parking should be on the building plot, and set behind the building line, so that it doesn't dominate the street. Planting, clearly marked on-street spaces, and where charging points should be placed are also covered.

Policy 4: Respecting local character in the design **PAGE 29**

This is quite a lengthy policy, and includes guidance on the building form, design and colour palette, to try to make sure that new buildings enrich and complement the character of our area.


Policy 5: Environmental performance and sustainability **PAGE 31**

This policy covers the eco-credentials of building materials, solar energy / heating, heat pumps, rainwater harvesting and wildlife features within buildings (bird bricks / boxes, bee bricks).

Policy 6: Landscaping **PAGE 32**

And finally in this section there is a policy on landscaping, in particular focusing on the need to include street trees, hedgerows and shrubs, where possible linked to create wildlife corridors, and keeping areas of hard surfacing to a minimum.

You will find copies of the draft Plan here on the tables, and can view / download a copy by scanning this QR code:



Future Development Areas

There are 8 policies in the fourth chapter of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, dealing with what type, how much and where development should happen.

Policy 7: Meeting Local Needs - Housing PAGE 37

This policy sets out how our housing target will be met through the proposed allocations and infill, and that there is no need to release further greenfield sites. It also talks about housing mix — affordable homes for rent and sale (particularly for first time buyers), and mainly 2–3 bedroom open market homes.

Policy 8: The Village High Street PAGE 41

This policy encourages more active 'High Street' uses along Daggons Road / Station Road and at the junction with Ringwood Road, when sites are redeveloped.

Policy 9: The Trailway PAGE 40

This is the policy that supports the provision of a recreational trailway along the old track. Where this is not practicable, then the trailway should be closely aligned. There is also a project to try and make progress on this.

PROJECT

Policy 10: Meeting Local Needs - Employment PAGE 43

This talks about the opportunities for new employment through Policies 8 and 13, and also potentially elsewhere within or adjoining the village if they would be appropriate to its rural character (there are several criteria about size, scale, traffic etc to guide this).

Policy 11: Revised Village Envelope PAGE 44

This simply updates the village envelope in line with where development is proposed.


Policy 12: Alderholt Nursery, East of Ringwood Road PAGE 45

Policy 13: Paddock South of Daggons Road PAGE 46

Policy 14: Land South of Blackwater Grove PAGE 48

These are the site allocations. They set out in detail the amount of development, and matters that would need to be addressed through a planning application, such as trees, access links, drainage...

You will find copies of the draft Plan here on the tables, and can view / download a copy by scanning this QR code:

Safeguarded Areas and Facilities

There are 5 policies in the fifth and final chapter of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, dealing with buildings and other features that are particularly important and should be retained.

Policy 15: Safeguarding Local Facilities **PAGE 50**

Seeks to protect our local facilities, some of which can be vulnerable to closure. The policy tries to ensure that options to retain local services are fully explored before any facilities are lost and the building re-purposed / redeveloped for another use.

PROJECT There is a project to try to improve access to healthcare services locally.

Policy 16: Important Local Green Spaces **PAGE 52**

Lists 12 spaces around the village that, with your help, we have identified as important to retain. This includes our play areas, the planned green spaces as part of the 1970s development phase, and wooded / natural areas within and close to the village that are much valued.

Policy 17: Key Landscape Features **PAGE 53**

Lists the main rural features that are particularly important, including the many mature oak trees that line the lanes around and approaching the village.

PROJECT There is a project to get all of the important trees protected through a TPO (Tree Preservation Order) and encourage more tree planting.

Policy 18: Important Views **PAGE 55**

Four 'stand out' views have been identified that should also be protected from incongruous development. From Blackwater Lane, Telegraph Hill, King Barrow and towards Alderholt Park.


Policy 19: Non-designated Heritage Assets around Alderholt **PAGE 56**

Recognising some of the local, unlisted features that are nonetheless important to us and should be retained:

- Buildings of local cultural importance, such as the Old School House and Alderholt Park;
- Buildings where the use of cob or local brick are evident;
- Traditional fingerposts;
- Traditional post boxes;
- Features associated with the brick-making industry, including the many pottery kilns;
- Features associated with (now disused) railway.

Please use this opportunity to comment on the draft Plan.

You will find copies of the draft Plan here on the tables, and can view / download a copy by scanning this QR code:



ALDERHOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Pre-submission consultation

December 2023 / January 2024

This form is to help you respond to the pre-submission consultation. You can choose to comment on any or all of the policies, and there is a section at the end for general comments.

We are happy to hear from anyone who lives, works or has an interest in the area and either wants to let us know if they think the plan is fine, or if not what changes they would like to see and why. Please make sure you return this form by **19 January 2024**. You can:

- > Complete and submit the form online (<https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/ANP-Reg14>)
- > Email your comments to clerk@alderholtparishcouncil.gov.uk
- > Complete a paper form and post or deliver it to the Parish Office, 1 Station Road, Alderholt, SP6 3RB

Copies of the draft Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents can be viewed at the Parish Office (open Mondays, 09:30-13:00), and online at the Parish Council website www.alderholtparishcouncil.gov.uk. There are also drop-in events planned for the Village Hall Monday 4th December 6.30pm – 9.00pm and Saturday 13th January 10.00am – 12.30pm. If you need help completing the form, please speak to the Parish Clerk on 01425 657587.

About you - your details

Your interest in the Neighbourhood Plan

- I live in Alderholt Parish.
- I am responding for a business or other organisation that operates in Alderholt parish (please specify below)
- I don't live here, but I do work in Alderholt parish
- None of the above - but I have an interest in the plan area

Business / organisation (if applicable)

Please note: we are asking for your name and contact details to help us have a clear audit trail of who responded on what issues, and so that we can contact you for further clarification if necessary. We will not publish your email or address. If you are responding as an individual, we do need permission under data protection laws to hold any identifying personal information for the purposes of finalising this Neighbourhood Development Plan - so if you do not give your permission please leave your details (below) blank.

Your name and contact details:

Name:

Email:

Address:

Your thoughts on the Neighbourhood Plan policies

The first 6 policies deal with general matters on design - please let us know whether you agree with them.
You can expand on any comments by using the space at the very end if you need to.

	Agree	Disagree	Neither / not sure
Policy 1. Settlement pattern, layout and densities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 2. People-friendly streets and paths	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 3. Parking Provision	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 4. Respecting local character in the design	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 5. Environmental performance and sustainability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 6. Landscaping	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			

Questions 7 - 11 focus on what development can happen and where

	Agree	Disagree	Neither / not sure
Policy 7. Meeting Local Needs - Housing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 8. The Village "High Street"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 9. The Trailway	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 10. Meeting Local Needs - Employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 11. Revised Village Envelope	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			

Questions 12 - 14 are the main site allocations proposed in the Plan
Please note that any development on these sites would still require a planning application, but would be guided by the policy for the site (and the other general policies on design).

	Agree	Disagree	Neither / not sure
Policy 12. Alderholt Nursery, East of Ringwood Road	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 13. Paddock South of Daggons Road	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 14. Land south of Blackwater Grove	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			

The final 14 policies deal with safeguarding valued features and facilities...

	Agree	Disagree	Neither / not sure
Policy 15. Safeguarding Local Facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 16. Important Local Green Spaces	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 17. Key Landscape Features	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 18. Important Views	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 19. Non-designated Heritage Assets around Alderholt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			

Your thoughts on the Neighbourhood Plan projects

The Plan includes three Projects, which set out some actions that were identified and will be taken forward by the Parish Council during the Plan's lifetime. Please can you indicate whether you think the projects are a good idea?

	Agree	Disagree	Neither / not sure
Trailway Project	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Local Healthcare Outreach Project	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Oak Tree Project	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you don't like one or more of the projects, please say what change you want and why

And finally...

To help us understand at this stage whether we have got the plan 'broadly right', please tick one of the following:

- I would support the plan at the referendum as drafted
- I would support the plan as drafted, but would like some minor changes
- I would not support the plan as drafted, it needs major changes

If you have any comments on the draft Strategic Environmental and Habitats Regulations Assessments, you can comment here:

Please use the space below to add to or make any other comments about the Neighbourhood Plan, if you so wish: