

Question 1:

Do you think there is a need for additional housing in Lytchett Matravers?

Strongly Agree

There is an overwhelming case for massive additional house building in the UK. LM is a good location for this & must play its role. No to NIMBYs please	Noted.
But with road improvement to support it	Acceptance of new housing on the proviso that the exiting infrastructure was improved to support it.
Easy access to centre of village/buses, school etc.	The location of new housing was a point raised. The closer to existing facilities the better was the view.
Site is a good central area to amenities. Building and site access would be away from problematic school road.	
But on option E	The sites put forward have all been considered to be realistic in terms of deliverability and suitability for housing. Justification needs to be given to include a site for consideration or to dismiss it.
How much longer is this site going to be discussed?	The sites need to be discussed in length to make sure that the best possible option is chosen and taken forward. The plan will cover a period of fifteen years and therefore careful consideration is appropriate.
Sympathetic village starter homes for young parents needed, not council houses or another spinney! Keep Lytchett pretty & desirable, but functional.	The types and tenures of housing are an important consideration of the neighbourhood plan. Meeting our own housing needs and requirements is an important aim of the plan.
We wish to move from a 2 bed to 3 bed property and remain in the village, however very little is available. (Check the registered interest for properties on rightmove.com)	

Agree

Don't think we have an option	The neighbourhood plan will recognise that there is a wider need for housing and that it will need to allocate land for new homes. There were several responses acknowledging that there is a need for housing across the entire country. While the plan will be required to allocate some housing there is a
We are aware that nationally there is a shortage of housing	
New housing is desperately needed and we need to take our share	
I agree in the general sense that the country needs more housing. I am not aware that LM especially needs more	
I appreciate the village needs to show willing on housing development. Even with estates population new housing is needed	
Nationally we clearly need more houses and Lytchett needs to be part of this	
The UK urgently needs more affordable houses which every area should contribute to	

I do not necessarily agree that this is needed, however the country has a critical housing shortage and we should contribute	real opportunity to shape where that housing goes.
We do not want to attract lots more people to the village if this means eating into the green belt, but we probably DO need	While two accepted new development, there was concern that this should not be at the loss of the Green Belt. However, the plan needs to be realistic and accept that by identifying land for development the village will be in a much stronger place when resisting inappropriate development,
Against any loss of Green Belt, whilst brown field sites are available. At age 75 my concern is not personal	
Not Huntick until widened and footpath provided	Concerns were raised about the site on Huntick, which is the Council's allocated site. Although by-and-large these related to the existing infrastructure and condition of the road than the principal of developing it. The Core Strategy is clear insofar as Site A will need to mitigate its impacts and if this is not achievable then other sites will be considered.
Huntick Road is already a traffic hazard/race track	
Site A create to much traffic towards Lytchett Minster . Already a dangereoud road for children attending L/M school.	
Limited to Huntick Road site only!	
As long as Huntick Road is improved	
To a limited extent, but ONLY if services such as doctors/schools are expanded to allow for this	The ability of the existing infrastructure to cope with growth was raised as a concern by others, who agreed with more housing but only on the condition that services and infrastructure were upgraded to support the growth.
PROVIDING the schools and doctors can cope and they are of good quality	
But only if parking area inreased at local school	
Any development must be linked with additional infrastructure and amenities	
housing for singles, young people who would otherwise have to cram in with their families. Where is the evidence?	In terms of what the respondents wanted in terms of new housing there was support for housing that was suitable for first-time buyers, particularly where they were local people.
If made available to locals first	
Ideally for local people & in particular to help young people onto the housing ladder	
Agree as long as houses that are built are 2/3bed for locals	
Yes for young people trying to gt on the property ladder.	
When your children grow up they want their own place	
Provided it is affordable housing for first time buyers & is not going to be bought by buy-to-let investors	
Of type to suit local people	
Plus a council estate on site E would solve all housing problems in LM	
yes affordable housing	Affordable housing received some support from five respondents.
But should be affordable	
Affordable housing for young people	
Social housing	

Smaller 2-3 bedroom houses	In terms of the density and design of what should be delivered there was a clear preference for smaller homes built at a low density.
Keep to a reasonable density	
Need for good family homes not like barrat development off wareham road	
Also bad lighting due to trees etc.	
50 is OK but that is enough	The provision of 50 homes was questioned by two respondents, while a third stated that they agreed with the 50, but no more.
But not too much or it will lose its village character and the infrastructure will be overwhelmed	
30 would be better	
Is Lytchett a village or a town?	General comments received by those that agreed with the need for more housing related to character and positioning of the proposed housing.
Keep any development central to existing village housing	
Don't think we have much choice but we can influence number and situation	
But should be repositioned	
Though it depends on what type of housing - who for?	

Neutral

Very dependent on improving current position of Tesco's, possibly to site A	This respondent was looking at the existing issues faced with the congestion around Tesco and suggested that relocating it, for example to within the new housing development, could improve the situation.
---	---

Disagree

This is a village	The general consensus amongst those that disagreed with there being a need for additional housing was that they were concerned with the loss of the village by its growth into a more urban environment.
Lytchett has expanded considerably over the past 25 years & needs respite form development	
Do not think there is	
There are normally properties for sale in the village. The infrastructure would not cope with anymore	
The village is big enough already	
Based on the slow uptake of houses currently for sale	
Lytchett is large enough	
No this is a village NOT a town!	
More houses will means less fields and less of a village feel.	
Kept small stays as village.	
We don't think there is a need for extra houses	Concerns were raised about the limitations of the existing infrastructure and the impact that a new development would have on the village particularly in terms of school places and the highways.
School full. Roads busy	
Schools already oversubscribed and growing	
The existing infrastructure will not cope with an extra 200-300 residents not to mention an extra 100 cars	
Unless a new doctors surgery & dentist is included & bungalows with easy access to everything.	
Primary school oversubscribed now better shopping choice	

i.e. competition for tesco	
Not enough room in local school and difficult for parking traffic	
The school/pre-school are full with waiting lists. We do not have sufficient infrastructure to support them.	
Village is getting too big already, infrastructure cannot cope	
A need no, room yes, but more houses require more services and maintenance	
We already have social housing in the village	There was some acceptance from two of the respondents who disagreed with a general need for housing, stating that there may be scope for affordable housing. Contrary to this another response stated that there was adequate social housing in the village.
Maybe scope for some private or affordable housing developments	
If there was affordable housing built - yes	
Small infill only.	There is a need to allocate housing. The village plan cannot rely on windfall development.
Need to use brown sites first	
Is there a need for housing by local people? Most housing built in recent years has been brought by immigrants (like me!)	The responses received by those who agreed that housing was needed pointed to smaller starter homes that are more affordable to local people.
It looks as if in the long term it is intended to develop A,B+C.	The principle behind the neighbourhood plan is to allocate a single site for housing to meet the 50 home requirement set out in the Council's Core Strategy.
The village has recently had numerous housing estates built	
A development site will spoil the village, restrict size of developments	
Without the data how would I base a considered opinion	
But best position if it goes ahead	

Strongly Disagree

infrastructure & amenities not suitable for more families	The main reason given by respondents who strongly disagreed with the need for new housing related to the infrastructure and the demands that any additional housing would place upon it.
The village amenities will not sustain the resulting population increase	
Traffic level already too high	The question regarding what services and facilities people would like to see in the village was covered later in the consultation. The main concerns raised for this issue were school capacity and highways objections.
Roads are totally unsuitable for extra traffic	
We cannot provide good pavement or roads in the village	
No infrastructure	
Infrastructure & resources not able to cope -too much impact	
Roads & school already over crowded	
More racing traffic? Especially by parents! Diminishing public transport	
Village infrastructure could not support additional 50 houses	
The village has more than reached capacity for local amenities to cope	

Heavily burdened facilities and infrastructure already, school, drainage etc.	
Foxhills not able to take increased traffic	
Not enough services, roads poor and it's a village!	
Certainly NOT, the village infrastructure is already at breaking point	
The school is inadequate for more children	
Not enough space in school, so no more housing should be built. Also not enough facilities for the community	
Existing village resources cannot support an additional 50 houses	
Congestion, road surfaces bad, lack of school places, Drs appointment waiting times long, bus service bad	
Not without addressing improved infrastructure for roads/schools	
Current infrastructure inadequate to support additional development	
not enough facilities for any more families	
Traffic already horrendous at times	
School is full, roads congested and it risks losing its village atmosphere	
Already at max capacity - school too small!	
The school is full and so is the doctor's surgery	
School is full to bursting and traffic High Street and Wareham Road is awful	
A larger population would put a strain on current amenities available.	
The local school is at full capacity as is the feeder senior school. Traffic around the school is a major problem without additional housing.	
The infrastructure cannot cope. There is no employment in village.	
Not enough facilities to support more people i.e. fuel station, large school	
Additional houses will put more pressure on schools/doctors	
Too many houses not enough facilities or shops, sport centres to cater for the village.	
I don't think the current amenities would cope with the extra strain – especially the school and Doctors.	
Inadequate amenities to cope with any further development. e.g. doctors surgery, school	
The infrastructure is not in place to support further houses	
The school is full and so is the doctor's surgery	
We are a village, not an add on to Poole, if I wanted to live in a town I would have moved there	Following the impact on infrastructure the biggest concern raised was the impact to the character of the village.
No need for additional housing! The more houses built the bigger Lytchett becomes and then will lose its desirable 'village feel'	
Redevelopment of existing run down areas could increase	There was concern that the

number of homes in a tasteful way without destroying more countryside	village lacked the jobs to sustain more housing and that the growth in housing numbers would alter the quality of life currently afforded to its residents.
Losing the village identity by becoming too big	
LM is already a huge village	
The character and identity of the village has already been destroyed	
But as it is likely to happen I would specify that it should be made to look as attractive as possible.	
Lytchett Matravers will lose its identity as a small rural village.	
The village will no longer be a 'village' if we have more housing	
Need to keep Lytchett as a village	
Village is large enough already	
We do not want any more houses in LM	
New homes in Purbeck should be built near places of work. Do not want village enlarged & made into a town. Village boundary was determined in previous consultations & should not be breached	
Why build housing where there is no employment, school placement is difficult and bus service under threat	
Keep Lytchett Matravers a village	
No. More and more houses, why? No industry at all, simply an over-spill	
With additional homes already in place this is sufficient for our village any more will impact on quality of village	
It has already been destroyed as a "village" leave it alone. All the trees on this plot have TPOs	
I think the village is plenty large enough already - it will lose its village status	
Huntick Road is busy enough & dangerous for children walking to school at the manor. Far too much traffic already	Similar concerns to other respondents in regards to Huntick Road and the potential harm new development would have on traffic and road safety.
Huntick Road is far too busy as everybody seems to cut through off the main Blandford Road	
Already too busy on Huntick Road for additional traffic, road already dangerous at times	
The Huntick Road is already too busy. It is completely unsuitable for the amount of traffic. I cycle along this road. It is a death trap.	
Large village with dangerously congested main road. Already a large village	
This is Green Belt land	Two objections related to the loss of green belt land.
It is a village with green belt and should be remembered so.	
Village residents should be context with living in only one house	In terms of who the new housing should be for two comments seemed to imply that they should be for existing residents and not used as second homes.
Any new housing should be for young and old already living here.	
Do not believe additional housing needed currently. At some future time after site A's 50 houses are fully inhabited further	General comments raised fears about a sense of inevitable

need may arise	growth in the village as has been witnesses previously.
Will lose our local community	
The village is already larger than a village, has already increased very considerably	

General Comments - No Preference

Not in a position to judge if there is a need	The neighbourhood plan will need to be consistent with local and national policy. The requirements for housing have been established and are presented to the village community to plan how to facilitate the growth.
I don't know what the current situation is regarding housing	
No information	
Need more facilities first, Drs	This was a common concern raised for this question.
Has a need for additional housing been identified?? If it has then site A appears ok.	Preference given towards one of the housing sites.

Question 1 Summary and Response

In response to whether there is a need for additional housing in Lytchett Matravers, a total of 457 responses were received. The slight majority of 56% of returns either disagreed or strongly disagreed:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Blank
347	228	173	205	19

The comments fell loosely into one of these ten categories:

- Infrastructure
- Huntick Road
- Affordable Homes
- Amount
- Density/Design
- Local Housing
- Green Belt
- National Shortage
- No More Housing
- General Comments

The biggest concern was the impact of new housing on the existing infrastructure, with school places and highways common concerns.

Response to Feedback

Infrastructure

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted by the Council in March 2014. Lytchett Matravers falls within an area identified as the Purbeck Rural Fringe. Put simplistically, the CIL would charge £100 per square metre for net increase for new residential developments. The legislation is complicated and pitted with loopholes, but by and large money will be collected and spent to mitigate against the impact of the new development. One of the Council's priorities is improving the Baker's Arms roundabout, which will have a wider benefit, but an allocation of the money received will be spent by the Parish Council in line with the priorities of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Huntick Road

The Council have allocated Site A as a strategic allocation, that site is no longer included within the Green Belt. The Council expect development to be designed in consultation with the village and set out a range of criteria which it expects to be satisfied. This includes a minimum of 50% affordable housing for local people, the potential for some new office space and also some new public open space.

Affordable Homes

The policy for affordable homes states that developments of two or more dwellings or sites over 0.05ha will be required to contribute towards affordable housing provision of at least 40% with the exception of the allocated sites which are raised to 50%. This should be provided onsite, but if that is not possible then a financial contribution would be accepted. However, if it can be shown by a developer that a contribution would make their scheme unviable then a smaller percentage would be considered.

As an overarching policy our plan cannot undermine what the Council have adopted, there is scope for looking into increasing the amount if that was preferred, but that subject is dealt with later in this document.

Amount

The amount that has been allocated to Site A is not set in stone, but it is clear that the Council are battling to ensure that they maintain a five year housing land supply. We have looked into the historic windfall development in the village and have found....

By demonstrating that a percentage of development has come from windfall in the past and if it is accepted that small infill development will happen over the plan period then it is possible to reconsider whether 50 homes are needed on the strategic allocation. However, care has to be given as Infrastructure concerns were common in the feedback, through all the housing questions, and there is a very real danger that piecemeal development of single houses could return a lot less in terms of contributions to mitigate the impacts. As mentioned above the CIL legislation makes certain allowances, for example self-build housing is not liable to pay CIL.

Density/Design

The allocated Site A proposed up to 50 dwellings on the site. The area of the site is approximately 3.52ha and this would result in a density of slightly over 14 dwellings per hectare (dph). To put this in context, at one time it was national policy (though not anymore) to enforce a minimum density of 30dph and for comparison new development in town centres like Bournemouth is nearer 150dph.

The Council have an adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on design issues, the apply titled Design Guide SPD. This sets out criteria against which proposals will be assessed. Box 2 of the SPD concentrates on local distinctiveness, while Box 3 focuses on scale, mass and form. As part of the neighbourhood plan it may be appropriate to set out what characterises the village and to ensure that all new development enhances what is already there. Materials are a key component of good design and it is suggested that development should be built to a high standard.

Local Housing

The allocated Site A seeks a 50% return for affordable homes for local people. It is unrealistic to expect all new development in the village to be built solely for the existing families. A sensible amount of in and out migration from the village is inevitable and therefore schemes that come forwards over the plan period will need to reflect that. Restricting new homes in terms of marketing ultimately will have a negative impact on the homes coming forwards, while the neighbourhood plan seeks to influence development it cannot restrict it. Ultimately having a plan in place is preferable to not having one, but care needs to be taken to ensure that the plan will deliver what is expected otherwise it will not be adopted.

Green Belt

The green belt and the purposes of it are now well established. Since the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework there had been a lot of uncertainty regarding the green belt and the protection it was afforded, however it has become clear that the government are not willing to let the green belt go easily. The boundaries of the green belt can only be amended through the plan making process, this is what happened with allocated Site A. If an alternative site is needed then the boundary would have to be amended again, it will be the intention of the neighbourhood plan to ensure that should another site be needed then Site A should be returned to its green belt allocation.

National Shortage vs No More Housing

It is widely accepted that there is a housing shortage and as one respondent pointed out, the village has to do its bit. The requirement and responsibility is placed with the Council and it has responded by allocating different sites throughout the district. As Lytchett Matravers has an allocated site the responsibility of the neighbourhood plan is to assess the potential for other sites in the event that Site A is not suitable.

While extensive expansion and urbanisation of the village needs to be safeguarded against a pragmatic approach needs to be taken. Some responses indicate that there is a need for starter homes for the younger members of the community and the fact is that development will happen, the plan either seeks to direct it or the village will lose its input.

Question 2
Options for “Plan B”

None

Why are the areas being considered in the already crowded part of this village? Why not build to the west, e.g. Jenny's Lane?	Three responses alluded that the options were in the wrong place. Particularly as they are all outside the settlement boundary.
Green Belt should not be built on	
All outside village boundary as at 2012 (See PDC doc on line) In 2012-3 consultation we were not given an option of NO development	
In addition to A	General comments gave a preference to site A, while two responses indicated that any of the choices would be acceptable.
If there are to be houses a is the best site	
The map is far too small for older people to read.	
Any of them are an acceptable choice.	
If A,B,C & D are all built on eventually then E should be off road parking to take pressure off of outgoing and incoming traffic on the Wimborne Road.	Seventeen responses that did not put forward a “Plan B” site reiterated their concerns about having any additional housing at all.
Why build housing where there is no employment, school placement is difficult and bus service under threat	
As commented the village is already at saturation	
This village should stay a village, that’s why we moved here	
We are a village, not an add on to Poole, if I wanted to live in a town I would have moved there	
We don't want ANY	
Already over developed	
The village amenities will not sustain the resulting population increase	
There is enough housing the school can't cope as it is	
Keep Lytchett as it is!	
The character and identity of the village has already been destroyed	
There is no point dumping people in the middle of nowhere with no proper transport links.	
None of these unless the necessary infrastructure to cope with increased housing is in place first i.e. better traffic flow + school size	
Leave Lytchett as a village	
No more houses	
None.	
The village cannot cope with heavy traffic throughout the day.	
LM is now a commuting area for Bournemouth, Southampton and even London. So the demand for extra housing is not local	

Option B

I prefer a compact village with inhabitants close to the centre, rather than sprawling into surrounding countryside	The majority of comments relating to Option B highlighted close proximity to the centre of the village and the services there.
This area is closer to the centre of the village	
Link B & A together with road from Wimborne Road to Huntick Road	
Close to village centre	
Because it is close to village centre and main road exit from village	
This is next nearest to village centre	
More central in the village with better roads	
Order preference b,c,e,d based on road access and proximity to school, shops etc.	
This site is still near the central amenities of the village	
Needs to be as close as possible to existing facilities	
Better access. Closer to centre	
All building needs to be as central as possible to reduce traffic	
Closer to amenities	
Site B is the most central as an alternative to site A. Site C to be maintained as green space would be important	Not sure if this statement meant that site B was also in a central area.
Site A is a good central area to amenities. Building and site access would be away from problematic school road	
New houses would not be an eyesore in a b or c	How the new homes would fit in and relate to the village will be an important consideration. In more sensitive locations the density of development may need to be reduced to mitigate visual impact.
If A does not go ahead then this seems obvious	Noted
Not d&e	Noted
Plans for allowing green/wooded land in village necessary. Ensure do not pack houses too tightly	Noted

Options B and/or C

Retain reasonable size buildings or plots	Design criteria can be considered as part of the neighbourhood plan.
Why would Huntick Rd not go ahead?	This is a "Plan B", just in case site A does not progress.
Closer to existing amenities	Having sites that are accessible to the centre is a key consideration in the sites that have been put forwards.
Either as near centre of village & not encroaching on Green Belt	
Keep development near the centre.	
Road access to A350 is good, way into village centre, resurrect the Legion	New development will aid in the ability of the village to improve on services and infrastructure.

Small part of B/C, not complete.	This is an option that can be considered as the plan progresses.
----------------------------------	--

Option C

Or north part of B are a need to funnel traffic away from school Wareham Road is already a 'Rat Run'	Comments received in support of C reference the desire to shift traffic away from the two main routes through the village.
Speed and traffic at school time already too great	
E & D would increase traffic down the High St. which is already very busy and even worse at school open close times	
If extra housing is voted for	This is a "Plan B" alternative, not in addition to.
Definitely keep within the heart of the village not an outer - would rather none!	Having sites that are accessible to the centre is a key consideration in the sites that have been put forwards.
Site appears smaller	Noted
Site E could be unfairly chosen as there are fewer residents who could object. The other sites could have more objectors (NIMBY)	The plan process needs to critically assess all the options for the village. The final plan will be open to the village for public referendum, not chosen by a vocal minority.

Option D

I assume younger couples with children would want these new properties. Choice D is nearest both schools and access to A35 is nearer	Depending on the types of properties it is sensible to locate family housing near to the schools.
Because if extra allocation is decided as well as Site A, D would hold fewer houses	Due to the "Plan B" approach the total number of homes would be the same, albeit they could be spread over two sites.
Smallest site	
Same number of houses as planned for Huntick Road – but no more!	This is a "Plan B" approach, no more houses are intended.
D&E totally unsuitable, amazed even being considered due to huge problems already on Deans Drove with traffic and narrow lane	Highways considerations will have a large bearing on the final choice.
Minimal effect on surroundings	In helping to preserve the character of the village, a common concern raised for question 1, the visual impact should be a determining factor.
Building on B & especially C which is beautiful countryside would spoil the rural nature of the village	

Options D and/or E

I believe these sites would involve minimal disruption to the village	Although on slightly different topics, the general consensus from the three responses was that these sites would cause the least impact to the village.
Keeps village spaces as they are	
building houses here would minimise traffic movements in the centre of the village	

Option E

Near to school	Depending on the types of properties it is sensible to locate family housing near to the school.
If it had to be, E nearer the school	
Nearest site to school	
E would be a least disruptive development	
Concerned about residents, all new residents on B would join A350 at same spot, causing hold ups	
E is closer to the Dorchester road & dual carriageway. As too much traffic cuts through Lytchett to Blandford Road	
See map A&E balance the village, distributing the amount of traffic that will be created	
Simple road access	
Good access not interfering with village congested areas. Unless shopping, doctors etc., has pathway to walk to shops	
Better access in/out of village. Less impact on traffic in village centre	
Although I do not want further housing development within Lytchett Option E is near main road not over used village roads. It is near school so children can walk to school (they won't even from other locations suggested -people don't want to now) It is near local privately owned shop- revenue for private owners not large Tesco	
Increased traffic would be more easily accommodated on Wareham Road than Wimborne Road e.g. at junction with A350	
Easier access to A350.	
Excellent road access	
Traffic would naturally flow down the Wareham Road, so avoiding problems in village centre	
So there is less traffic & safer for children attending junior school	
Would reduce traffic from village.	
Better road and pavement access	
Although this site is further from the centre, travel to Poole/Dorchester will keep congestion away from village	
Infilling this site would attach Glebe Road area to village proper	
Access good to A35 & school & bring Glebe road into the village.	
E maybe a little out of the village but it is flat land on a main road. B, C & D would have more visual impact , D has no footpath to school with extra cars taking people to work	
There are other areas in Lytchett to assist if planning restrictions were lifted. However the planning authority could ensure the proposed housing are within keeping in the village?	
Good for village, but not great impact	
Least impact to scenery	This allocation would constitute a strategic infill allocation.
If building is considered necessary, let it be blended in with existing buildings/estates	
	Amongst other comments raised it was noted that this option was considered less visually intrusive by five respondents.

Plans for allowing green/wooded land in village necessary. Ensure do not pack houses too tightly	Noted
If A does not go ahead then E, if A goes ahead then 50 is enough	This is a "Plan B" alternative, not in addition to.
Only if no choice to say no to more housing	
Although A is most appropriate, I just don't want to live in a 'town'	
I think B C & D should go ahead ASAP	Noted
Would also be a possibility	Noted

No Preference

No preference	Noted
Any of these sites	
According to preference of villagers directly affected	Due to the nature of the village an urban extension of 50 homes is likely to have some impact on all residents.
Present plans seem the least worst. Surely that would do for a few years?	The purpose of the plan is to undergo a public referendum and gain weight as a material planning consideration. Stopping the process after this consultation will not help to shape the future of the village nor prevent inappropriate development coming forward.
If it is found that housing is required, site A or B is the most suitable	Option B.

Question 2 Summary

In response to what alternative site should be considered as "Plan B" should Site A not progress, a total of 741 choices were received. The slight majority of 26% of returns opted for Option E with only 21% opted for either C or D combined:

B	C	D	E	None	Blank
162	84	73	195	185	42

The criteria upon which the commentary on each site fell was in the main within five topics:

- No new development
- Proximity to the centre
- Proximity to school
- Transport impacts
- Visual impact

The biggest concern was the impact of any new housing location on the existing transport infrastructure including walking to services and congestion.

No new development

The purpose of this question was linked to the Purbeck Core Strategy Policy NE and the caveat within that policy that should site A not be deliverable then a further review of the green belt would be required. It is not the intention of the plan to allocate a different site for residential development, merely an indication from the village that if a different site needed to be found that the village has a preference for that site.

Proximity to the Centre

Plan making has moved on under the National Planning Policy Framework to acknowledge that sustainable development is not merely based on the physical location of a site, although that is still a noticeable consideration. In practice terms a plan can be based upon physical access and the amount of time it takes to get from A-B. It is a logical conclusion that the further a person is from their destination the more likely they will be to use a private vehicle. As a rule of thumb 400m is a good indication as to a reasonable walking distance before transport should usually be considered.

To put this into real terms, the four hundred metres from the shopping parade would only take you as far as the junction where Huntick Road meets Middle Road, or Wareham Road meets either Wimborne Road or Prospect Road to the north and south respectively.

The proximity to the centre is certainly something that goes in favour of both the allocated site and alternative Site B. It is also important to make clear that it is recognised that the village has more to offer than a Tesco store and the library, doctors, village hall etc are all near to this location.

Proximity to the School

If a similar exercise is applied to the school, then the 400m takes one close to Site E or almost to the bottom end of Dean's Drove. What is interesting is that heading towards the centre takes Wareham Road up to where it meets Prospect Road; making it the most sustainable place within the village in the traditional sense.

The close proximity to the school would also alleviate other concerns that were raised. Transport impacts are felt most acutely near the school and it would be hoped that new development closer to the school would encourage any children living there to be taken to school on foot.

Transport Impacts

It is recognised that additional development, whether that be residential or commercial, puts an added burden on the existing infrastructure. This is particularly evident where the infrastructure is already struggling to be fit for purpose.

While there will be mitigation from the allocated site it is likely that the money received by Purbeck District Council will be directed towards larger strategic infrastructure improvements and while these are hoped to be of benefit to the residents who live in the village the local plan needs to look at what needs to be improved and prepare itself for the anticipated housing growth.

Visual Impact

The design and integration of a development into the village will play an important role into how it is accepted by the village. The neighbourhood plan can look to extract details of what we would like to see brought forwards in terms of design and introduce policies to steer development towards good design that raises the quality and appearance of the village.

**Question 3:
Further Developments Within the Boundary**

Strongly Agree

Otherwise we just extend suburban sprawl and lose the best that Lytchett has to offer to people who actually prefer not to live in a town	Those that strongly agreed were concerned with the green belt, recognising that development in the village decreases demand on areas surrounding it.
Should avoid any village sprawl	
Village is already tending to sprawl, and surrounding countryside is an important amenity. Greenbelt should be preserved.	
The green belt should be protected.	
Please let's keep our Green Belt	
We understand that Site E is Green Belt land and has covenants covering its use	
We don't want to destroy the green belt around the village.	
Any site outside the existing boundary should have direct access to one of the main village access roads	While it was recognised that within the village boundaries sites are naturally closer to existing services there was concern that the services and infrastructure would still need to be upgraded.
However the existing infrastructure will not cope with extra housing	
As long as highway matters are adhered to sensibly	
You must be joking! Try doing a survey of how far cars have come to local shops p- I bet in some cases it is measured in 100s of yards. People just won't walk	
Any further developments should be within the current boundary but would require improvement/development of the amenities in the area.	Noted
Except for 'D'	
Village boundary should include site E.	
Careful planning should aim to maximise land used within current village building envelope	Available land is scarce as the need to identify housing sites has shown. Would intensification be the desirable option?

Agree

To stop the village spreading bigger	Preventing the need to spread and preserving the open countryside were comments shared by those that agreed and strongly agreed.
Once boundary breached where does it end. Also infrastructure not in place i.e. broadband	
Shame to ruin areas of countryside with building	
Makes sense to keep the village compact. i.e. not to sprawl out over fields	
Slow growth enables the village to absorb the newcomers. The people who move here want to live in a village, not a suburb	Smaller developments would have a gradual impact on the character of the village, helping it to evolve slowly. However, thought needs to be given to upgrading facilities, piecemeal
Some small developments within original boundary	
Yes to feel part of village	

	development is likely to contribute significantly less.
More parking required in all areas of the village	Points regarding the transport infrastructure were again raised.
Avoid cars driving to centre of village	
Site a good access to A350 but traffic lights essential at Junction of A350.	A number of comments were received that related to the individual sites. These have been dealt with in questions 1 and 2 and if they are preferred to development within the boundary then the respondents perhaps disagree with what the question asks.
If council estate on site E would get local young people a home in their village	
Probably D or E	
Developing Huntick Road sit will of course add to the problem, especially with school traffic	
Site C	
It looks like A is the only option, field behind Chequers or Recreation Ground	
If the boundary is identified by the black line then site A is the only one within the boundary. If more is needed then B or C or D would minimise through traffic	
Map is not clear, only A seems to be inside boundary	Not sure which houses are being mentioned here.
Have adjacent houses been consulted?	
But on no account should any part of the Recreation Ground be developed	The recreation ground is not an option. Development will not be permitted there.
If the need arises then yes	Noted
Other current green belt areas should be considered.	This suggests that the respondent disagrees with what the question asks.
How would a development REDUCE additional traffic and parking?!	New development will also place an additional strain on the existing infrastructure.

Agree/Disagree

See field to south of school - this could be developed to alleviate school parking problems	This site is outside of the boundary. The need to use land for non visually intrusive development is noted.
---	---

Disagree

There seems little space available to develop within the existing boundary, apart from A	With space within the village tight, three respondents recognised that finding adequate space would be challenging.
There appears no remaining space within the village boundary	
The village boundary has been drawn too tightly.	
Too much traffic not enough facilities	The need for improvements to infrastructure was raised. This is recognised and will be the case regardless of whether new development is located within the boundary or adjacent to it. This does raise the issue of
Minimum of 2 cars per home, the amount of extra traffic which isn't changing under current plan- people prefer to drive everywhere	
Any development will increase traffic in village	
Traffic and parking are an inevitable consequence regardless of location	

Huntick road needs major improvement.	smaller developments potentially contributing less towards improvements.
There is more than enough through traffic issues. I cannot see how the existing infrastructure can sustain more people/cars	
Needs to be with main road access and not adding to current safety concerns. E.g. school parking on Deans Drove	
OK for local people (I cannot afford to move within the village) I don't think pressure should be put on the village boundary	
No we may have to consider developments outside the village boundary shown on the map	There was some acceptance that permitting some development outside of the boundary would reduce the pressure within it.
If the village boundary is the black line on the map then we disagree	
They HAVE to be outside black line on map preferably B D C E	
However, site C is unsuitable due to very poor drainage& history of flooding	A number of comments were received that related to the individual sites. These have been dealt with in questions 1 and 2.
Close to village like B or E existing houses	
Proposed site A is sufficient	
50 houses is enough	
The Huntick Road site is not appropriate and does not need to be so close to shops and would make the road a 'main' road - too much traffic	
Village boundary moves anyway	The boundary of the village is established. The choices that are made now will shape the village boundary in the future, whether that is to retain it as it is or to add a new site to the village.
Where do you draw the line? People come here for a rural environment, not some ghastly 'new town' with 'landscaping' and other nonsense	The need for additional housing has to be accepted. Limited infill development can be easier to control in terms of design and minimising impact, conversely a new development away from the existing village will have a far lower impact on the existing character.
You could put pavements to the Manor for kids, improved road speed restrictions needed too	Noted
Any site should be fit for purpose regardless of whether it is within existing village boundary.	Noted.
Purbeck schools continue to have low numbers, put the housing there, Corfe etc.	Noted.

Strongly Disagree

No development	To produce a sound plan we need to recognise that there is a need to provide for more housing. If Council's cannot demonstrate a sufficient supply
No other developments.	
No more new houses	
No more houses.	

No new houses.	then they a vulnerable to development in less desirable areas.
The village amenities will not sustain the resulting population increase	Twenty-two comments were received that related to the highways infrastructure and services generally within the village.
We already have traffic and parking problems at peak times	
50 houses= min 200 people, 100 cars - problems with parking, traffic!	
Will clearly bring more traffic into the village center	
Have you seen the traffic at school times!!	
No infrastructure	
Parking in High Street already out of control	
It s small village equipped only just to cope with what we have already	
Any additional housing in the village will need the development of the infrastructure to support it	
No employment on village, bus series under threat - people will drive 10 yd especially in adverse weather	
Traffic n the village drives too fats anyway. The village is increasing the chance of an accident by putting more housing within the boundary	
50+ more cars plus pressure on school and doctors. How can this minimise traffic?	
The infrastructure in the village is compeltely inadequate	
Think about pathways, lighting , safety of pedestrians etc.	
There are already traffic and parking problems that still need addressing for existing residents	
Extra housing means extra traffic!	
There has been far too much housing development already. The village does not have the facilities for anymore housing.	
Sewage system means pumping station needs to be augumented.	
During school times Huntick Road is a nightmare.	
Any additional housing will increase traffic regardless of position owing to senior school being too dangerous to walk to.	
Not enough infrastructure to support what we have as it is.	
Village is large enough	Keeping the feel and character of the village was a common concern. Not creating an urban environment by over intensification would require an expansion to the village.
We need to retain green space within the village. There should be minimal new property within existing boundary, on a new for old type basis	
Keep us as a village	
The character and identity of the village has already been destroyed	
Should not be any more development within Lythett Matravers. How long before we become a suburb of Poole?.	
More pressure on Countryside.	
No, keep Lytchett green. Do not make another Upton.	

Villages should be kept as villages, not joined up into towns. This will happen eventually if development is not sorted	
We need to protect greenfield sites	
Expand Poole which is already built up - leave local villages rural	
There doesn't appear to be any sites within the existing boundary	Two comments were received that related to the individual sites. These have been dealt with in questions 1 and 2.
It will add to it. Site E.	
Only other available space inside the black boundary line are the playing fields - a community amenity	It is unsure whether development outside the boundaries or within would upset the NIMBYs.
And watch the reaction of the wealthy NIMBYs...	It is unsure whether development outside the boundaries or within would upset the NIMBYs.
Who chose this boundary? What's its purpose?	The boundary is established by Purbeck Council and its purpose is to define what is considered as countryside when planning applications are submitted.
Why is Tesco or hairdresser the best place to choose as the village center. It just means more traffic driving round the village - better to be near school & other shop/main road	The school is certainly an important consideration particularly if family homes are built, however the shopping parade is considered the centre by many as it serves the entire community and is close to the recreation ground, pharmacy, doctors and public houses.
The boundary is against the existing buildings, Only by building on the Rec could more houses be built within the boundary - poor question	There is limited opportunities within the boundaries, but this option is explored and is considered reasonable.
There is much land on the outskirts of the village, why not use this	This question is establishing the support for expanding the village to include those sites, or to try and find sites suitable for development or intensification within the boundary.

Blank

Don't understand this question because none of the other sites lie within the village boundary. Infill within existing boundary appear almost impossible now without loss of amenity space	There are other ways of directing development within the boundaries, but it is accepted that would likely to be at the expense of gardens and at a higher density.
The way this is worded makes it difficult to answer	Noted.
Boundaries should be subject to change	Boundaries are subject to

	change, through the plan making process.
No opinion	
Dual question? Better within boundary ANY additional housing will cause traffic problems	Car ownership in the village is almost certainly going to increase with new development. The principals behind locating new housing close to services serves two purposes, firstly it makes walking to those services more attractive and achievable and secondly it enables all sections of the community to be able to live there, regardless of whether they can drive or not.
I don't see being close to the centre minimises traffic & parking. It certainly doesn't mean less people will have cars.	
If forced upon us, more housing at A	This has been dealt with in questions 1 and 2.
There shouldn't be further developments, the village is big enough to be a town already & further housing will soon mean that the Primary School will not be big enough for the Annual intake. WHAT THEN!!	The increased pressure on the existing services is a common concern.

Question 3 Summary

In response to whether there should be further development within the village boundary a total of 672 choices were received. The majority of 56% disagreed or strongly disagreed with more development within the boundaries:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Blank
78	176	170	208	40

The justification for the opinion was divided, with those agreeing with the idea of further development within the boundary pointing towards urban sprawl and the need to protect the green belt. Those that disagreed pointed to the lack of available space and the importance of retaining the village identify. Whether agreeing or not, all groups pointed to the impact on services, particularly highways impacts.

Urban Sprawl and Green Belt

Any new development that comes forward on a windfall basis within the existing boundary will contribute towards Purbeck District Council's housing delivery. Although it will not contribute towards LM playing its part (like an allocation does) it can benefit the village in the long-run. The requirement and demand for new houses to be built is not going to stop once Site A is built, but in contributing to the district housing numbers it helps to keep their delivery on track and stops development from coming forwards that otherwise might should they fail to demonstrate sufficient supply.

The National Planning Policy Framework introduced extreme measures to ensure that councils plan proactively to meet their identified housing needs. While recent government messages have held that green belt takes precedent over any failure to meet that need, it is not impossible to imagine that this position may change in the future if housing supply fails to deliver. Failing to show a five year supply with a 'buffer' of sites for added choice condemns local housing policies to be considered out of date, giving developers a lot more freedom and choice when it comes to their applications.

Village Identity

A major concern about new development is that it can bring with it change. LM is not too dissimilar to many places across the south where people are afraid of new development. This term is often referred to as NIMBY, standing for "not in my back yard". However, there is merit in a lot of the concerns that were raised and many pointed to the fact that they chose to live in a village and want to retain that character, rather than becoming urbanised.

Preventing urbanisation would obviously help to retain the village identity, but the neighbourhood plan cannot restrict development. What it can do is guide it. New development to the village could therefore be required to meet certain design aspirations that are considered appropriate to the village.

Lack of Space

In terms of space, there is very little that the neighbourhood plan can actually achieve without allocating new sites within the boundary for development, such as the Wessex Water or British Legion site. However, it is a consideration of helping to shape the direction of growth and character of the village that the plan should look for development to make the most efficient use of the available land by providing for homes that the village require. New development could be expected to show that there was a need for a particular development type and this could help to prevent unsympathetic and opportunistic development coming forward.

Question 4
Type of housing?

Large

There is a lack of good quality family homes available	Family sized dwellings were suggested as a positive of larger homes.
A mixture of small and larger houses, no flats	
It is good to attract families who will utilize the strong school system available and contribute to the close community we have.	
This is a family orientated village so needs family houses, though I don't think the village needs more people.	
Need gardens and parking	General concerns raised about amenity space and ensuring that new development has parking.
Any must have own parking	
Bungalows	Two comments were received that caveated the selection with design criteria.
In keeping with current housing.	
Although size of Doctors' surgery and school class size must be considered.	Point raised relating to the infrastructure and services in the village
We agree there needs to be a good mix of homes of all sizes too many affordable housing association will detract the quality of our village larger family homes will continue to retain village ambience	This comment suggests that larger homes will retain a better ambience that smaller homes would bring.
It should identify the need and build to that.	Noted

Large/ 3 Bed

Nice to encourage families to Lytchett	Family sized dwellings were suggested as a positive of larger homes.
--	--

3 Bed

Certainly family houses, a 3 bed might be more affordable	There was support for smaller family homes of three bedrooms, which were considered to be pro-family as well as being more affordable.
Family housing needed not single occupancy units	
Family homes, school age children. Not too large already expensive	
To cater for working families	
Lytchett has enough large family homes. 1&2 bed flats, bad unless well designed. To look and function well new families need space to grow!!	
Need to provide more family styled properties.	
No street parking, need new development.	Off-street parking was raised as a requirement.
According to size of site.	Design the types of housing by the size of the site.
All types to include opportunities for all people	Noted
& some single person accommodation - 2-3 bed units	Noted
Preferably no more housing developments in Lytchett	Noted

Matravers.	
With provision made for retired people and starter homes.	Homes designed for certain sections of the community. This is an important consideration, particularly with support for homes for locals and an aging population.
If affordable?! (Less than 240k)	Desirability to live in the village will always have an impact on house prices. However, if tenure is limited to local people it is possible that the price of housing is kept lower.

2/3 Bed

An even mix would be best	A mix of smaller housing depending on need was a common remark.
A balanced profile of the selections indicated	
It should be a mix to range of socio economic groups with a weighting towards the smaller end of the scale. Currently young people/couples have to move to the city for affordable housing	
No one choice is right & any decisions should be based on figures re. need	
A mixture depending on demand	
LM is likely to be a village for families rather than singletons - there are no attractions for them	It was still felt that smaller homes could still attract families to the village.
To encourage families	
Mixture of 2/3 bed houses to encourage families	
So that they have gardens	Noted
Smaller units should always be close to urban conurbations and good transport links	It is unclear why smaller units as a rule should be located closer to the conurbation.
More smaller affordable houses to maintain diversity of population	Noted.
If there has to be more housing no need for big houses	Noted.
Depends on the perceived need	Noted.
A mix of 2/3 bed houses	Noted.
What about 2/3 bed bungalows which would be popular & more acceptable	Although bungalows can be considered to be less visually intrusive they tend to cover a wider footprint, requiring more land to build the same number of units as housing.
A mixture of the 2 & 3 bed house. Greater stability than flats.	Not sure why a house is considered to offer greater flexibility than a flat. Particularly in relation to the elderly and young as championed by others.

2 Bed

No family houses the school is already overcrowded	Some resistance to family homes began to be found by those preferring smaller units.
A mixture of all, but no large family homes	
Mix of good family size houses	
As large families are not frequent nowadays - ideal for young couples	
More affordable lower priced houses are required and NOT higher priced ones	There was a mixed response in regards to affordable homes with two insisting that it should be included, while one was against it. This is dealt with in Question 5.
2 beds housing association properties should be included	
We don't want social housing	
Plenty of 3/4 bed in village. Let us have some 1/2 bed suitable for elderly. They can then free up their larger properties.	Homes for the old and young at either end of the property spectrum was a point raised by four respondents. Similarly is was recognised that smaller homes could make ideal starter homes.
Affordable for young local people at bottom of ladder	
Smaller houses would give local young [people a chance to remain in the village. Outsiders are able to go elsewhere	
Starter homes	
We need starter homes	
Possible chance for 1st time buyers	
Mix housing may be optimum compromise, high density should be avoided	A mix of housing sizes was mentioned, with an avoidance on an over-concentration of any sizes.
Needs to be spread, not a large majority	
It's a compromise between smaller 'affordable' housing (probably resulting in many more vehicles on the development) or larger houses with fewer drivers for the same footprint	Noted.
Holiday homes are not required	Noted.

2 Bed houses/flats

I guess most new developments include these supersized houses because they generate profit, not because we need them.	Comments were received that pointed at the need for housing being for the smaller units, rather than larger units built allegedly for greater profit.
What is the average family size? 4, if that in other words max 3 bed. We don't need extra bedrooms or houses of such is proportion as the monsters built in Old Pound Close,	
2 answers - if it is to fit housing need not a forced choice.	

2 Bed Houses / 2 bed flats / 1 bed flats

1 & 2 bedrooms are needed	General comments relating to the need for smaller units.
Developments need to be balanced with a mix of housing types. There is a need for flats, maisonettes & small DETACHED bungalows for single/small households & the elderly. These need	
Need a mixture to meet community needs, not just 'posh' places - affordable, sociable	
Needs greatest for starter homes/single ?. Larger housing	

fairly plentiful elsewhere	
National there is a shortage of smaller houses	Noted.
to be located close to the main village amenities. Quality is all forms of housing is essential	The location of any new development is covered in other questions.

2 Bed Flats

1-2 bed flats also would benefit the purchase of first time buyers.	Some support for smaller units providing lower cost housing.
For young people and older people. 2 bed flats are by far the best. Costs can be shared & give those starting out a fighting chance to get going on the property ladder & living independently	
Larger houses = larger families= more traffic & pressure on schools & facilities	This comment suggests that bigger houses cause more traffic, which is the opposite of what was suggested by another respondent.
Village school is already oversubscribed and there is a lack of accommodation for single people	A lack of accommodation this size was cited as justification for this selection.
Lack of 2 bedroom flats.	
Ageing population. A case could be made for retirement village.	Noted.

1 Bed Flats

As well as family homes I think they should do more flats as well.	Noted.
--	--------

None

A mixture would seem to be a sensible approach	Some without a preference stated that a mix would be the best outcome.
Although I say none - I know it will happen - we just need a good mix	
Any development should be an even mixed of sizes, particularly not all small properties	
A mixture helps keep the demographic and make the village affordable.	
Should be a good mix.	
Or 2 bed houses, 2 bed flats or 1 bed flat.	
Could the school and surgery cope?	There were further concerns raised about the capacity of the existing infrastructure and services.
LM school & Lytchett Minster are already full	
The village is already large enough. The school has been extend twice on recent years and still oversubscribed	
50 houses could create a further 100cars in the village	
For reasons already stated -traffic, stay a village, improve infrastructure and school	
As previously mentioned (school inadequate, infrastructure)	
The village will not cope with additional doctors/schools.	
No more new houses	Noted.

No development in Lytchett Matravers at all	
No local housing need	
No new development	
None!	
Whichever there is most need for	Noted.
Protect Green Belt form development	This is covered in other questions.
My children had to leave the village because of a lack of affordable housing	Noted.

Blank

A mix would be preferred	Eighteen respondents noted that a mix would be the best option.
A mix is required. Larger houses will probably bring more children into the village with consequent effects on the school	
We think a mixture of all is needed	
A good mix based upon local need	
A mixture of accommodation is most likely needed, shall be researched	
It has to be a mix to cater for all to abide by the law	
A good mixture of all the above	
A mixture of 4-3-2 beds plus 2 or 3 bed bungalows	
It should be a mix of housing/flats to open the opportunity to meet the needs of the public	
Mixture	
Mixture of all	
Should be a mixture of large, 3 & 2 bedroom houses.	
Should be a balanced mix of all.	
Any new development should have a variety of housing from bungalows/flats, small to med and larger houses.	
should be a mixture	
mixture based on known demand	
a mix of all, who can afford £400k	
mixture	
The type of housing built be developers is driven by profit. Small units do not generate as much profit as larger ones	
Should fulfill a need not more speculative profit for developers (at the expense of a village community)	The existing services were said to be at capacity.
Not sure as Lytchett is not sustainable for any more people. Sort that problem and a good mix of housing would be great	
While I agree there is a need for 3-4 bedroom homes, consideration must be given to schooling as the local primary is already very oversubscribed	
No more school places so probably smaller houses.	Two comments related to the design of any new development.
Development within boundary should be in character with surrounding properties but buildings could be sub-divided into flats etc.,.	

Typical settlement patterns are for similar size properties to be grouped together. We should maintain this pattern which sustains stronger cohesion in neighborhoods	
More elderly apartments - warden 2 bed flats	While one commented on the need for more elderly accommodation a point was raised that any restrictions on buildings need to remain in perpetuity.
Why bother, Friars and Abbots Courts were for elderly any age gets one now	
No new development	Noted.
No building !	
No new houses.	
If necessary then must include affordable housing for LOCAL young people not Housing Association	Noted.
This is a professional decision -I do not have the necessary overall information	Noted.
Basically what are housing requirements? Luxury or social?	Noted.

Question 4 Summary

In response to what type of housing should be built there were arguments for and against family housing, with most pointing to a lack of capacity in the existing school as a problem. In terms of smaller units there was some support for smaller sized units to provide accommodation for first time buyers and the elderly, while all sectors tended to be wary of development built to maximise profits, with meeting an identified need a key point from the feedback.

Large Houses	3 Bed	2 Bed	2 Bed Flat	1 Bed Flat	None	Blank
75	222	165	63	28	176	39

In terms of responses 768 options were selected, with the majority wanting either two bedroom houses or flats (30%), while three bedroom houses received a similar support (29%). There was little support at the two extremes of the options, namely larger houses and one bedroom flats collecting a combined 13% of votes.

Capacity of Schools

The capacity issue surrounding the school is somewhat distorted by the numbers of children who travel into the village to attend. It is felt that the school would have the capacity to deal with more children from the village, but this would be at the expense of places offered to a wider catchment. There may be the need for a period of transition, especially if a large estate like the Huntick Road site is built out.

Smaller Units

There were some in support of smaller units for first-time buyers and the elderly and there is scope for encouraging this type of development to enable those people living in the village to downsize in later life but still remain within the community. There is a fine balance to be met however and the caution shown to development built to maximise profits is a very similar concern to those that raised the character and identity of the village as something they want to preserve.

Having smaller units to meet an identified need and demand would be appropriate, but it is sensible to direct developers to demonstrate that the development is the best for the village and not simply maximising profits. To preserve the character of the village and prevent over development there is a case for requiring appropriate landscaping and garden areas for all development.

5 Affordable housing?

Strongly Agree

Otherwise you drive young villagers out and lose the family connections	There was support for affordable homes to enable the younger generation to get onto the housing ladder.
Where will poorer families live and youngsters	
There is a need to help local people purchase/rent 1 st homes.	
This type of housing should be available for young people from the village.	
There might be a danger that LM becomes a middle class suburb of Poole - we need to prevent that!	Maintaining a mixed community was considered important to community life.
We are a happily socially-mixed village and I would like to keep it that way rather than encouraging more of the wealthy & NIMBYS	
To encourage more community life	
I'd have one!	Noted
Holiday homes are not required	Existing home owners would not be eligible to buy an affordable home as a second home.
Stop outsiders moving in	Noted
Wages have not kept up with inflation and nor has the 'affordable' system	Not entirely sure what is meant by this comment.
Not everyone can afford a mortgage so paying rent is a good thing.	Noted
Although 'renting' is a huge problem in this country. Give more people opportunity to buy.	Noted
But well built in considered setting or arrangement. Space and light are vital.	Noted

Agree

But not for EU migrants, our own young people must have a chance to stay in village	There was support for affordable homes for the existing villagers. With particular emphasis on retaining young people within the village.
Local homes for local people, under slob?	
Aimed primarily at EXISTING YOUNG PEOPLE VILLAGE RESIDENTS	
To enable Lytchett young people to stay in the village	
For village people only	
'Affordable' homes for people brought up or working in the village	
Affordable for local people.	
For local people.	
To enable families to stay within the village and maintain	

family links	
Affordable is a ridiculous term. However, youngsters should be able to stay in the village	
But no more than 25%	In terms of splits there was support for a smaller percentage of sites, with the common consensus being below half the site.
To reasonable proportion of say 10 %	
Some shared ownership, but not 'significant'	
Focus should be on private rather than social housing	
Small amount only	
% of 50 properties only.	
A proportion should be affordable but too much rent in one area raises issues.	
Development need to be balanced & mixed, but not dominated by 'affordable' housing. Build more homes and eventually the price will fall. Quality & design of all builds is very important	
Although I don't know the figures of need. We do not want a lot of inflow into 'posh' housing	
A mixture to suit all housing needs.	
There does however need to be a balanced approach.	
But subject to NO second home	Existing home owners would not be eligible to buy an affordable home as a second home.
Current govt policy says that 80% of full market now is 'affordable'. Best to sell properties at a fixed discount price as they did in Tolpuddle to local people recently	Holding affordable homes in perpetuity.
Open to all, not necessarily people with village connections	Not a popular opinion, but one respondent said that the homes should not be limited to local connections.
However it is still a concern that people on limited budgets will struggle with poor and infrequent transport, and little leisure activity in the village!	Lack of infrastructure is a common concern surrounding any new housing.
But don't believe it will happen	Noted.
Off street parking made available.	Noted.
No point building large houses if people can't afford them	A conflict between two responses as to what size the affordable houses should be.
But bigger houses,	
Ah yes, affordable housing as a proportion of development. And what a vexed issue this is now, since the change in legislation last September. Purbeck will never have the expertise and money to fight off the pleas of developers that they cannot turn in the expected profit unless the percentage of affordable housing is reduced from the planning agreements and in some authorities the percentage has ended up as NIL. We do need social housing (probably evidence?) but unless we can find a way to support the District Council at the appropriate time, we will never get as much as we should through planning and development	The issue of development viability is a complex one. The purpose of having an affordable homes policy can strengthen the Council's position.

controls	
----------	--

Agree/Disagree

Some affordable housing is needed, but the market will determine how much. A 'significant proportion' sounds like too much.	Noted.
---	--------

Disagree

There is already plenty via Synergy & around Huntick estate	There was a feeling that there are sufficient levels of affordable housing already in the village.
Plenty of affordable renting around. Interest rates are low so some can afford to by	
No evidence this type of housing is needed	
There are many already and those requiring such housing would not have the jobs here to make it viable	
There are already council properties at the Spinney	
There is already a good mix, which is healthy for the overall community	
I feel there is enough of this sort of housing here already	
Already ample affordable housing has been built in the past	With reference to the lack of infrastructure and facilities other urban areas were considered to be better placed.
Village is too remote for people need this, More appropriatae for Bournemouth / Poole area	
Better placed closer to Poole to access better public transport/work	
There is no work in the village, transport iout is not feasible on public transport	
No, as we believe many small properties go to people with no real need to live in the village, which is now near its sustainable size as a village	In terms of design, there were two general comments relating to the appearance of any affordable homes and the car parking provision for those homes.
The example of the development in Wareham Road is a case in point - many small residences with only 1 car space each - resulting in an overflow of car parking on the road	
If they are built they should be very attractive, not ugly like some in the crossroads on the High Street from the 1960's. They should be like the Lime Kilm Road ones – pretty, attractive, inspiring etc.	Particular disagree was levied at the term 'significant', suggesting that a proportion may be acceptable.
A proportion needs to be available NOT a significant proportion	
A small proportion of houses only to be made available	Three comments related to a desire to encourage more financial strength into the village.
New residents should bring income and stability to village	
We are a young couple who have both chosen to study, work and save enough for our deposit and mortgage on our home. We don't feel this has been a hardship and those with similar ethics should be encouraged.	
Home ownership should be encouraged rather than rented properties	Similarly some concern was raised about the social impact it could have on the village.
How do you avoid the inevitable trouble?	
PDCC tend to put problem families from Swanage into Lytchett.	Noted
I've lived in shared ownership and it doesn't help anyone	
Depends on site	Noted

Disagree / Strongly Disagree

Lots already	Noted
--------------	-------

Strongly Disagree

There is plenty in the village already	There was a feeling that there are sufficient levels of affordable housing already in the village.
We have enough	
We have more than enough social housing in the village, considering its size and the impact on the environment- I would expect a full assessment on this and any further developments	
We already have some - what about those trying to climb the housing ladder?	
There is this type of housing already with a good balance across the village	
Enough in the village already	
There is already a disproportionate amount of low cost housing in this village	
We have enough low cost housing	
Too many already	
We already have some affordable housing	
Got enough of those already thanks.	
There are enough already. The roads are in disrepair especially around the Minster.	
We already have enough living in the Spinney.	
Got plenty, thank you.	
The village has adequate amounts of housing association for the size of village.	With reference to the lack of infrastructure and facilities it was considered that the existing village could not support additional affordable homes.
We have enough already.	
Lytchett Matravers already has 'affordable homes'.	
This type of housing would be better placed near places of employment or somewhere with a good public transport service	
Why build housing where there is no employment, school placement is difficult and bus service under threat	
Infrastructure/roads would not cope, transport system (i.e. bus)	
Existing traffic problems especially in Wareham Road would be made worse	
Lower income families should have good support system around them. Lytchett distances them making it harder for them to sustain themselves	
There is no work in the village.	
Build elsewhere.	
But the single parents, unemployed seem to benefit a lot in this village	
No more social housing enough already !	
Enough & not affordable	
Would create more anti social behaviour within the village	
Unfortunately affordable housing brings its own social problems (personal experience)	

Affordable risks upsetting the character of the village and the existing mix of dwellings.	
If private rented then pointless as there is no cap on what landlords can charge	Affordable homes are traditionally rented through Registered Social Landlords.
A/A	?
Do not agree shared ownership.	Noted
This would bring down house prices.	Noted
Definitely not.	Noted
Affordable yes, but not H/A or council properties. Too much anti-social behaviour in the village already!	Noted
Private housing is most likely to result in extra income.	Noted
Present character of village should be maintained	Noted
We need affordable housing for the children of the village	Noted

Blank

The village already contains sufficient housing association properties	The most common response from those who left their choice blank was that they felt there was sufficient levels of affordable housing in the village already.
Lytchett already has a large amount of social housing and dense populated areas, i.e. Spinney	
I thought we already had quite a lot of this type of housing.	
More than enough housing associations in the village	
Already have a high proportion of affordable in relation to total village population	Some felt the more information was required before they could make an informed decision.
Unfortunately do not have any information/statistics and presume PC do?	
Don't know, what is the demand in this area	
I have no idea what percentage of housing is already affordable. Would need to know this info to make a fair choice.	In the context of this question affordable is in comparable terms and refers to social housing.
Affordable not possible with current building regs?	
Not really and certainly not second home or private rental	Noted
We don't need more housing	Noted
There is no such thing as affordable housing. Lots of the house/flat sales are at the bottom end of the market	In the context of this question affordable is in comparable terms and refers to social housing.
Out of character to what is already here, would create issues	Point raised on character and also social issues.
No development should be predominantly 'affordable'	Particular disagreement was levied at the term 'significant', suggesting that a proportion may be acceptable.

Question 5 Summary

In response to whether affordable housing was required there was a fairly negative response. In total 680 preferences were submitted, with 53% either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Blank
56	231	137	223	33

In terms of issues raised those in support of affordable homes were generally supporting homes for first-time buyers and for the benefit of local people. In terms of objections there were references to the lack of facilities and suggestions that a more sustainable location should be preferred. There were concerns raised about potential social impacts and a wide opinion that the village had sufficient levels of affordable housing already.

In terms of the percentage of new housing, those that commented felt that the term significant should not mean over 50% at most.

National Situation

There are certain reforms to the planning system that are anticipated to come into effect in the near future. Including introducing a minimum threshold for developments, while that change may only be temporary there will always be national directives that will overrule local policies.

As there is less support for affordable housing it is considered wise to leave policies governing this to the wider development plan and documents higher in the hierarchy.

Local Situation

There seemed to be more support for housing for local first-time buyers and there is certainly a case for ensuring that development aids the village grow in a sustainable way and part of that could include ensuring that there are homes available locally for younger members of the community to move into; rather than forcing them into the conurbation. However, the affordable housing for this purpose was specifically as defined for planning purposes rather than economic.