

LYTCHETT MATRAVERS NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
SUBMISSION DRAFT CONSULTATION RESPONSES

November 2015



3 Poole Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH2 5QJ
Telephone: 01202 551991 Fax: 01202 295403
Email: enquiries@hlfplanning.co.uk Web: www.hlfplanning.co.uk

Statement Prepared By:

David Bevan MRTPI AMIMA

T: 01202 444541

M: 07966 439227

E: dbevan@hlfplanning.co.uk



3 Poole Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH2 5QJ

Telephone: 01202 551991 Fax: 01202 295403

Email: enquiries@hlfplanning.co.uk Web: www.hlfplanning.co.uk

The Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan to 2031 and beyond submission draft was subject to public consultation between 8th June 2015 and 19th July 2015. The consultation was advertised on notice boards around the village, on the internet and through the Lytchett Link magazine that is distributed to all homes in the village.

To support the consultation a total of eight sessions were held at the library to allow interested parties the opportunity to discuss the Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan (LMNP) with a member of the group. Over forty households attended a session where the plan's intentions and policies were explained and discussed.

A total of 24 responses were received. The respondents are listed in Appendix A.

The comments received have been reviewed and there are no major changes proposed in the plan. The responses in order of position in the document are reproduced at Appendix B.

The responses by respondent are contained at Appendix C.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

- A. David Ogborne, Wessex Water
- B. Rob Aspray, 92 High Street
- C. Max White, The Old Chapel, Lime Kiln Rd
- D. David & Anne Ireson, Deep Field, Middle Road
- E. Jytte Kristensen, 18 Frys Close
- F. Tim Evans, 7 Hannams Close
- G. Ralph Watts, Kit Robins, Jenny's Lane
- H. Brian and Mary Venison, 17 Scutts Close
- I. Anne and Stuart McGill, Blue Hills, Eldons Drove
- J. Gwyneth Harrop, Annaberg, Middle Rd
- K. Jamie Holland, Sandpipers Eldons Drove
- L. Matt Holland, Sandpipers Eldons Drove
- M. Dr Sue Warren, Sandpipers Eldons Drove
- N. Justin Rush, The Glade, Flowers Drove
- O. Brendan Mullany, Higher Loop Farmhouse, Loop Farm Rd
- P. John Waite, 38 Old Pound Close
- Q. Susan Davidson, Marine Management Organisation
- R. David Stuart, Historic England
- S. John Fleming, Gladman Developments Ltd
- T. Zoe Hughes, Sport England
- U. Terrence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of Bloor Homes
- V. Diane Bemand, Purbeck District Council
- W. Michael Holm, Environment Agency
- X. John Moran, Health and Safety Executive

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

Policy 1

Agree	13
Disagree	1
No comment	1
Total Responses	15

Comments

Response ID C: (Agree) Agree with the policy but I do not agree that the open ground in Fry's Close (Appx E. no. 18) qualifies as an asset in the same way as others listed e.g. the green space in Old Chapel Drive/Scutts Close (also 18). The area in Fry's close is covered in slabs and is poorly maintained with little in the way of attractive features for residents or wildlife. Hence it should either be brought up to the standard of other green spaces or earmarked as a potential development site.

Response ID G: (Disagree) The continued improvement in living standards that we in the UK have benefitted from can only be sustained through economic growth and productivity growth. Key components of economic growth in the UK to date have been through population growth and a continued influx of peoples from other countries over the centuries. The Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan should support continued improvement in living standards in the UK, and therefore support economic growth and productivity growth. Therefore the Development Management Policies need to be phrased more positively in support of these objectives. To have Policy 1 as a statement of what will not be supported is exactly the opposite. It would be overwhelmingly more fruitful to say that development will be supported to achieve the objective of supporting a growing community.

***LMNP Response:** The policy is not worded to depress development coming forward. It is designed to recognise that there are identified assets in the village that deserve protection. Chapter 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework advocates this approach to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities.*

Response ID I: (Agree) However we worry that developers could use their money to influence "the village", ie by effectively bribing the Parish Council with offers of "enhancing" the amenities of the village, against the owners of sites and their neighbours causing conflict that did not exist before.

***LMNP Response:** The policy will form part of the Development Plan as a whole, it is not an overriding policy and is just one consideration that the District Council will need to consider when assessing planning applications. It is ultimately looking to share a benefit new development could bring, which it otherwise wouldn't, while protecting the identified assets.*

Response ID N: (Agree) Strongly agree, all developments of a certain size should be required to enhance assets/infrastructure otherwise the already overloaded village system will deteriorate further.

Response ID P: (Agree) Strategically essential.

Policy 2

Agree	11
Disagree	2
No comment	2
Total Responses	15

Comments

Response ID G: (Disagree) Policy 2 seeks to put yet another hurdle in place of developments, this at a time when Government policy is to stimulate economic growth through relaxing the burden of the planning process. As per my comment on Policy 1, a more positive approach to development in Lytchett Matravers is needed.

***LMNP Response:** Government policy advocates and supports the principle of this policy. By engaging with the local community can assist developers prior to an application being submitted to the council. Often the opportunity to present and explain a proposal can help to ascertain certain elements that are of concern to local residents and help to allay local concerns.*

Response ID I: (Agree) see Policy 1 (above)

Policy 3

Agree	12
Disagree	0
No comment	2
Total Responses	14

Comments

Response ID C: (Agree) Agree in principle but it is not clear where is the section 4.1 which is referred to?

***LMNP Response:** Noted. The reference is not particularly clear it is 1 (i) of section 3; headed up Development Principles. It is expected that once the document has been found sound and accepted at referendum that a more user friendly version will be designed.*

Response ID D: (Agree) Good design is important, but we're not a picture postcard village so "traditional materials" are not essential.

Response ID E: (Agree) I presume the reference to the design principles section 4.1 is in fact a reference to the development principles section 3.1.

If so, the principle for making provision for open green spaces which are linked to the rest of the village is in my view particularly important.

I hope these development principles will be taken into account when the expected planning application for the Wessex Water site is considered by the council.

***LMNP Response:** Correct, the reference should be 3i and as the LMNP moves closer to adoption it increases in importance as a material planning consideration.*

Response ID G: (No Comment) This introduces the matter of who acts as the arbiter of good design. Judgements as to what will "Preserve or Enhance the appearance of village" are a matter of fashion and the opinions of individuals. Will these judgements seek to keep the village character as it is, or improve the village character through developments in building technology and design? The village

already reflects substantial changes in design judgements over recent decades. Future similar changes must be anticipated.

LMNP Response: *Design is by its very nature a subjective measure. However the issue of design is one echoed at both local and national level. The plan is not restricting development, on the contrary it just seeks that what development is built is not to the detriment of the village.*

Response ID I: (Agree) But good design should never be a reason for building on Green Belt land.

LMNP Response: *The LMNP does not alter the Green Belt boundary.*

Response ID N: (Agree) Agree, however Policy 3 refers to Section 4.I which doesn't appear in the LMNP...should this be Section 4 (SVI)?

Response ID R: (Agree) We are pleased to see that a key objective of the Plan is to maintain the distinct village atmosphere (P17) and this is reinforced through the provision of Policy 3 which, inter alia, requires development proposals to preserve or enhance the appearance of the village. (We were not sure what the reference to design principles in section 4.1 might be alluding to).

At the same time we are perhaps surprised that the Plan does not promote any specific policies for the protection and enhancement of its distinctive historic built environment, to complement Policies 1 & 5 for example.

LMNP Response: *The reference is a mistake, and should refer to I (i) of section 3; headed up Development Principles. In terms of specific protection for the historic built environment there are already policies within the Local Plan that address this issue. It is of no value to duplicate the policies that are already adopted.*

Response ID S: (Disagree) This policy states that new development proposals will be expected to clearly identify the materials that will be used in the construction process, preserve or enhance the appearance of the village and adhere to the design principles set out in section 4.1 of the LMNP.

The LMNP needs to apply greater flexibility through its design policies, this policy and alternative policies contained throughout the LMNP, are to prescriptive in detail and inconsistent with the requirements of national planning policy. Any design policies contained in the LMNP should avoid any unnecessary prescription or detail and should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes that they should stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles.

The design policies contained in the LMNP should be made in strict accordance to paragraphs 59 and 60 of the Framework. Failure to do so may result in the LMNP placing undue policy burdens that may affect the viability and deliverability of future sustainable growth opportunities coming forward. Gladman note paragraph 173 of the Framework which states, 'the sites and scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.'

In light of the above we consider it appropriate that the design policies contained throughout the LMNP be reviewed to ensure they are compliant with the requirements of national planning policy and guidance. Failure to do so will result in the LMNP being found inconsistent with Basic Conditions (a) and (d).

LMNP Response: The overriding response from the local residents to the initial questionnaire was that they wanted to retain a village feel. The requirement therefore that new development makes clear what materials will be used is a simple task. The policy is not overly prescriptive and is not considered to be contrary to either national policy or guidance. A Basic Conditions Statement has been prepared for the submission of the plan to Purbeck District Council, the plan has been scrutinised and found to comply with all the conditions set out.

Policy 4

Agree	9
Disagree	5
No comment	1
Total Responses	15

Comments

Response ID B: (Agree) I would like to request that consideration is given to introducing a 20 mph zone at the western end of the High Street starting at the junction with Old Pound Close and ending at the Church. There is no footpath along much of the road and no verge which increases the risk of injury to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. The section of road from the end of the High Street to the Church is particularly hazardous.

Traffic volumes will inevitably increase as the village expands and the road cannot be widened without acquiring land from some of the properties/fields fronting the road.

Speeding is also an increasing problem and some vehicles have been seen travelling at very fast speeds (60mph +) on numerous occasions.

I have spoken with many of my neighbours and they support the introduction of a lower speed limit possibly coupled with traffic calming measures.

Response ID E: (Agree) I agree with the minimum requirement for car spaces for new homes.

Response ID F: (Agree) Would need to resist excessive signage as this can make the area feel 'crowded' with street furniture. I have experienced this as a previous resident of Poole Quarter which itself is in a 'home zone'

Response ID G: (Disagree) I object in the strongest possible terms to further restrictions in speed limits below the existing national speed limit and the 30mh limit for urban areas. My arguments are set out in my response on Roads and Traffic Management.

LMNP Response: Noted

Response ID I: (Agree) But please no new roads (for cars) which cause traffic congestion and parking difficulties in existing quiet lanes eg Eldons Drove.

Response ID K: (Disagree) No building on Middle Road

LMNP Response: Suspect that this refers to the Purbeck Partial Review Issues and Options.

Response ID M: (Disagree) No building of Middle Road

- poor access as country road
- sloping land
- wildlife disruption ie orchids butterflies deer
- souls spoil the whole countryside and feel of the village. Beautiful location sloping towards Purbecks
- distrust common walking route down Middle road with fabulous views

LMNP Response: Noted, but suspect that this refers to the Purbeck Partial Review Issues and Options.

Response ID P: (Disagree) All land capable of contributing to food security should be protected. Existing green belt must not be given up unless and until all brownfield and small infill sites have been used. As an alternative then perhaps unproductive and visually unattractive landscapes I.e abutting the A35, with appropriate infrastructure already close by could be considered for medium sized development with no or minimal threat to DORSET villages

LMNP Response: Noted. The objection mentions the Green Belt and it is thought that perhaps the term "home zones" has been taken to mean an allocation of land for new homes. The adopted document will have illustrations to explain what is meant by the term.

Response ID S: (Disagree) This policy states that the creation of new internal roads should seek to introduce home zones, with shared spaces and strict speed limits. Gladman consider that the application of this policy is better dealt with by the local planning authority based on national standards.

We recommend policy 4 be deleted from the LMNP.

LMNP Response: Noted. The whole concept of Neighbourhood Planning is to deliver local Development Management Policies that shape the way that development integrates into the existing village.

Policy 6

Agree	12
Disagree	1
No comment	2
Total Responses	15

Comments

Response ID C: (Disagree) New development combining residential and light industrial use is not appropriate or in keeping with the character of the village if that means commercial units at street level with flats above as in the High Street (Tesco Express etc). A development plan which encourages a mixture of light industrial developments and separate residential units is more in keeping with the character.

LMNP Response: The policy is aimed at encouraging employment generating development across the village, whether that is a commercial scheme as a stand-alone use or a mixed use development support will be given. This is advocated in the National Planning Policy Framework which is committed to "ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth".

Policy 7

Agree	6
Disagree	3
No comment	3
Total Responses	12

Comments

Response ID C: (Disagree) Too generalised. There are places in the village which are current/former places of employment which would be better redeveloped as residential sites.

***LMNP Response:** The intention is to prevent the village becoming a commuter hub and losing all local employment. The policy is considered suitably flexible to take into account the nature and importance of the employment use.*

Response ID D: (Disagree) This potentially discourages the use of brown field sites.

***LMNP Response:** Noted. However, a balance needs to be struck if the plan is to retain a balance of employment and homes in the village.*

Response ID I: (Disagree) This runs contrary to the existing policy of using brownfield sites for residential development in preference to green fields. A building which was used in the past for commercial purposes or employment (including shops, churches, farms) should be free from this restriction once it has fallen out of use or no longer pays business rates, particularly where it has been used solely for residential occupation over a number of years.

***LMNP Response:** As before, a balance needs to be struck if the plan is to retain a balance of employment and homes in the village. In cases where a Material Change of Use has taken place to a residential unit for a period of over four years the lawful use of that building would change, providing that no deliberate concealment took place.*

Policy 5

Agree	11
Disagree	3
No comment	1
Total Responses	15

Comments

Response ID C: (Disagree) The wording of this policy is nowhere near strong enough to achieve the objective of protecting the environment. Development proposals should not have to justify why they do not include environmental enhancement measures - they just have to. Also the emphasis seems to be more on creating new green spaces than on preserving those already in existence which are generally mature and form part of the village's existing character.

***LMNP Response:** The policy sets out to achieve exactly that; creating new green spaces and links.*

Response ID E: (Agree) Paths which connect housing developments, new as well as old, will enhance the feeling of a community.

Response ID I: (Agree) Native trees can grow extremely large over time. They should not be placed where there is inadequate space for them to grow or where they will affect the light and view of existing properties. They should be maintained and replaced when they are past maturity or are causing a nuisance, ie they should not be subject to Tree Preservation Notices.

Response ID K: (Agree) Need to protect valley in Middle road . No building

Response ID K: (Disagree) Not enough - no building middle road as would destroy the valley with stream and wildlife

Response ID S: (Disagree) This policy states that development which provides open spaces and green assets will be encouraged. Important hedgerows and trees are to be protected and wherever possible enhanced.

Gladman submit that future development proposals can often be successfully integrated into existing natural assets through the use of high quality design. However, in some instances the loss of these assets may be required i.e. for access. It should be remembered that new development will often compensate for any losses caused by development and in some instances the removal of some biodiversity features as part of the development of a wider scheme will likely result in greater improvements to green infrastructure overall.

As proposed, this policy is unduly restrictive and does not identify any hedgerows and trees which are considered to be important. It would be useful if these assets were identified on a proposals map so to provide a clear indication of the location of these important assets to ensure that the decision maker can make a properly informed decision.

***LMNP Response:** The plan is set to have a significant life-span and therefore it would be unhelpful to identify specific trees and hedges on a proposals map as suggested. It is accepted that development can be successfully integrated and this is what the policy is seeking to achieve; protecting what green assets the village has and encouraging suitable new development.*

Response ID W: (Agree) We note that the Neighbourhood plan acknowledges the need for green spaces to be preserved and enhanced to improve the rich biodiversity of the area. We would highlight the important especially for any area that includes wetlands or water bodies (e.g. rivers, streams, ditches) as these provide ecological interest and diversity. We would promote opportunities to enhance any wetland feature should they be identified and delivered through development, as this approach is promoted in the National Planning Policy Framework and is desired outcome of the Water Framework Directive.

Policy 8

Agree	12
Disagree	2
No comment	1
Total Responses	15

Comments

Response ID B: (Agree) Although I agree that something has to be done to deal with the traffic problems in the lower part of the High Street it has to be borne in mind that introducing restrictions could cause more traffic to use minor roads. More vehicles will cut through Eldons Drove, use Middle Road and Lime Kiln Road. It would be better to relocate the Tesco store to a better location where the traffic generated can be better managed and deliveries vehicles can be properly catered for. Part of the site proposed for housing in Huntick Road would a better location for Tesco.

Response ID C: (Disagree) The stretch proposed as a 10mph restricted zone is a main route through the village. Without detailed study of traffic patterns, shopping habits and amenity usage it is likely that such a policy would stifle trade in the village. Also by restricting the High St to 10mph but leaving other main routes including Wimborne Rd/Lime Kiln Rd as 30pm it will shift traffic from the low-limit zone to the high. Far better to create an area which encircles the village centre and have all roads restricted to 20mph. This would include the circuit taking in Rose & Crown crossroads, Wimborne Rd/Wareham Rd T-junction, Castle Farm Rd/Lime Kiln Rd junction and the Middle Rd/Lime Kiln Rd/High St crossroads.

As the village grows there will be more vehicle traffic and an imbalance in the limits on either side of the village will create potential accident black spots, increased noise and more pollution for certain areas.

The vehicles delivering to Tesco Express should be limited to a 7.5t gross weight maximum to keep articulated vehicles out of the village centre. Also large agricultural vehicles (tractors, trailers and other machinery) should be restricted from the circuit described above.

***LMNP Response:** It is acknowledged that by restricting the speed through the centre of the village that some traffic will opt to use alternate routes. However, the intention of the policy is to create a better environment around the existing shops where people are encouraged to walk and cycle, which can be achieved by rebalancing the road priority from vehicles to pedestrians. It is not anticipated that this will have a noticeable impact on the trading capacity of the existing shops because it is not stopping cars, just reducing the speed at which they travel through.*

Response ID D: (Agree) There should be no parking on the road itself.

Response ID G: (Disagree) I object in the strongest possible terms to further restrictions in speed limits below the existing national speed limit and the 30mh limit for urban areas. My arguments are set out in my response on Roads and Traffic Management.

***LMNP Response:** Noted*

Response ID I: (Agree) Presumably buses will be able to drive down the High Street. How many new traffic signs and markings on roads will be generated? This could be regarded as urbanisation.. Please consider safe access for delivery vehicles.

Response ID N: (Agree) Strongly agree. The High Street is not entirely safe adjacent to Tesco Express and the Rec due to parking levels. Also the parking outside of Reservoir House in Limekiln Road is completely unsafe so close to a junction and bus stop. I fail to see how a 4 bedroom house like this obtained planning permission given that it has no off road parking. Therefore the owners, who appear to have 3 cars, park in the road right next to the bus stop and within 10m of the junction. I have seen countless near misses here in the last year as people cannot manoeuvre safely near the junction. The buses even have to stop in the road to drop off passengers....how is this allowed to happen? We need to ensure this doesn't happen in future and is also resolved to a safer standard.

Policy 9

Agree	11
Disagree	3
No comment	1
Total Responses	15

Comments

Response ID C: (Disagree) Policy is unclear and does not support the preceding statements. To make the existing facilities accessible for an ageing population the area outside Tesco Express, Hairdressers & Estate Agents needs to be restricted to disabled badge holders and this needs to be enforced. Improved parking in the current Recreation ground would enable everyone else to park if necessary or encourage them to walk. Parking restrictions or even a light controlled crossing would be needed on the High St to make the road safer to cross from the car park.

***LMNP Response:** This policy is considered to support that which preceded it. With a calmed shared surface where the pedestrian has priority there would be no need for a controlled crossing, with a level surface there would be no kerbs to navigate and the elderly would be able to navigate around the centre much easier than they can at present. What this policy is actually looking to achieve is to protect what services are there.*

Response ID E: (Agree) I agree with statement that what is on offer does not satisfy the everyday needs of residents and a development of shopping facilities is to be encouraged.

This statement is at odds with the statement on page 15: "Lytchett Matravers is a village where there is a core of facilities and services, which allows many residents to meet their daily needs within the village".

***LMNP Response:** Noted*

Response ID I: (Disagree) This policy should read "any proposal... will be considered". The 2nd paragraph is a duplication of Policy 7. Residential development of green sites around the village was "sold" to villagers in the past on the grounds that it would keep shops and school open. In fact the number of shops has decreased due to the growth of supermarkets in the surrounding area and to the advent of internet shopping which supplies many people with their "daily needs" and which is on the increase in the aging population.

***LMNP Response:** Retaining local services is important to the village as proven by the overwhelming demand to improve upon what the village already has. The appropriate response is therefore to encourage new shops providing this is not to the detriment of existing businesses. The duplication with Policy 7 is to the extent that the property must be demonstrated as not being fit for purpose for either another shopping or community use, rather than just employment generating.*

Response ID N: (Agree) Generally agree although would like to see exclusion of any potential for edge-of-village superstore developments which would promote large scale development. Also, shops should be 'small scale' and promote local businesses as opposed to the large corporations such as Tesco etc.

LMNP Response: Noted, development of that scale would be likely to have an adverse impact on the viability and vitality of existing businesses and therefore would not be supported by this policy.

Development Principles

Agree	8
Disagree	4
No comment	2
Total Responses	14

Comments

Response ID C: (Disagree) What is included appears well intentioned but the policy as worded is weak.

Explicit targets should be set for carbon footprint and sustainability - SUDS is included so why not other environmental targets?

The target for light pollution should be zero. Other targets and offset measures should be defined for energy and water consumption, waste water and domestic refuse disposal. Recycling should be specifically addressed.

LMNP Response: *The purpose of the LMNP is to create good new development. However, there are limits as to what an Inspector will find to be a sound plan and while the policy itself may come across as 'weak' it is not appropriate for the neighbourhood plan to insert local targets and agendas above and beyond the national requirements unless robust and credible evidence can be provided to support and justify the position taken. To use SUDS as the example, it is justified to prevent the amount of surface water leaving the site to be the same as before the development took place as this is a measurable fact and one that is justified as it mitigates the development impact. On the flip-side, having zero light pollution may not be practical for all developments and to therefore say that light pollution must be zero cannot be justified.*

Response ID E: (Agree) See my comments on policy 3 above.

Response ID K: (Disagree) No building middle road. My Favourite dog walk. Would spoil the whole open feel of the village and amazing views to Purbecks.

Response ID L: (Disagree) No building on green belt

Response ID M: (Disagree) As above. no building off Middle Road - totally unsuitable as would totally disrupt the whole village and views to the Pubecks.

Response ID V: (Agree) The Neighbourhood Plan states it, '....will support minor developments that conform to the guidelines specified in Building for Life (BfL) 12'. As BfL12 is based on a traffic light system, the Neighbourhood Plan may wish to set criteria for new development to meet.

LMNP Response: Noted.

Strategic Village Improvement 1

Agree	11
Disagree	3
No comment	1
Total Responses	15

Comments

Response ID B: (Agree) If the football pitches are relocated to land adjoining the school please make sure that there are adequate off-road parking facilities for cars.

Response ID D: (Agree) The plan is not clear about what would be done with the recreation field as a "village green". If not sports pitches, then what? It's a big area. Concerned that it may fall into disuse and then be ripe for development.

Response ID E: (Agree) I agree with improving the south side of the High Street to incorporate more shops and facilities incl. a larger supermarket (eg. The size of Sainsbury's in Wareham). However, I disagree with a relocation of the football and cricket pitches to the DCC land adjoining the school thus taking these activities away from the centre of the village. This could also pave the way for unwanted housing development on the village green, regardless of any stipulation for its use.

Response ID F: (Disagree) Unless improvements are made I have concerns that relocating the sports pavilion will simply cause more traffic congestion and parking problems on Wareham Road. In addition having sports played in the village centre on the current site adds to the 'village' feel and encourages passers by to watch, or even get involved. Moving these facilities to the proposed new site would make them remote and 'hidden away' from residents of the village. Could the current facilities not be redeveloped?

***LMNP Response:** To clarify the situation, the intention would be to use the school playing fields as an 'overspill' and increase capacity. Any longer term relocation would be over a much longer time-frame and issues such as parking would obviously need to be taken into account.*

Response ID G: (Disagree) I object in the strongest possible terms to further restrictions in speed limits below the existing national speed limit and the 30mh limit for urban areas. My arguments are set out in my response on Roads and Traffic Management. I make this comment here to respond to the penultimate bullet point in the list of "key elements of the Village Centre redevelopment". This bullet point is not taken up in any of the subsequent SVIs.

Response ID I: (Disagree) We think that the playing of sports on the recreation field at weekends is an integral part of village life in Lytchett Matravers, even if the pitches are not perfect! SV1 will surely result in more traffic using Eldons Drove at weekends, with spectators and parents parking on unspoilt verges and across gateways, especially when there is a competition or tournament. We would be very opposed to use of the track from Eldons Drove to the fields behind the school being used at weekends, or in development of the track to take cars and you will find these views expressed in letters sent to the parish, district and county council in 2003 when an attempt was made to do this under the guise of creating a cycleway.

At present local shops benefit from the trade at weekends of participants and spectators. This would probably not be the case if the sports were moved to the school or would create more local car journeys as parents would drop off their kids and then drive to the shops in or out of the village.

While children could play on the school pitches, youth and adult matches should be held on the Recreation Field to promote both sport and village life.

LMNP Response: Valid points duly accepted, the wording was not appropriately clear and the focus on the plan is the village centre and the existing pitches go some way to keep that focus. The intention would be to use the school playing fields as an 'overspill' as the demand on the rec is so high.

Response ID J: (Agree) Excellent proposal to move the sports pitches to allow the creation of more leisure space on the 'rec'.

Response ID P: (Agree) Very progressive approach that I think would have very wide support

Strategic Village Improvement 2

Agree	8
Disagree	2
No comment	1
Total Responses	11

Comments

Response ID B: (Disagree) The existing businesses already generate too much traffic.

LMNP Response: The hope would be that by introducing more services in a central and easily accessible location residents would be inclined to shop in the village and be less reliant on private vehicles. With the proposed improvements to the centre it is hoped that traffic would not dominate if the centre were to expand.

Response ID C: (Disagree) Policy is so vague it is incomprehensible.

Response ID D: (Agree) If the south side of the High Street is over-developed, the village green idea won't work.

Response ID E: (Agree) This is important.

Response ID I: (Agree) Generally agree, but the use of the Recreation Field for weekend sport will promote this (see comments for SV1 above).

Strategic Village Improvement 3

Agree	8
Disagree	1
No comment	1
Total Responses	10

Comments

Response ID I: (Disagree) This proposal is too restrictive.

***LMNP Response:** It allows for updates if subsequent updates of the plan are made, so it is not restrictive, but it is transparent.*

Strategic Village Improvement 4

Agree	10
Disagree	0
No comment	1
Total Responses	11

Comments

Response ID D: (Agree) Don't like the design infilling right up to the pavement. Why have a parish room in the library and the village hall?

Response ID I: (Agree) Consider expanding the village hall to include the library and associated facilities. This would release the library site for redevelopment and prevent duplication.

Strategic Village Improvement 5

Agree	10
Disagree	0
No comment	1
Total Responses	11

Comments

Response ID D: (Agree) Not sure about the new layout though.

Response ID I: (Agree) but see comments for SVI 4 (above).

Strategic Village Improvement 6

Agree	9
Disagree	5

No comment	1
Total Responses	15

Comments

Response ID C: (Agree) Agree in principle but the wording is quite vague so does it carry any real meaning?

Response ID D: (Agree) LMPC should also resist the release of green belt.

Response ID G: (Disagree) My comments under "Safeguarding our Assets" at Policy 1 above apply here also. I strongly believe that the Parish Council should take a more positive view on development, in order to stimulate continued improvements in the standard of living through economic growth and productivity growth. This positive view should extend to a consideration of the potential for development on Green Belt land. Inevitably such consideration will entail judgements on the balance of benefits.

LMNP Response: It is not within the remit of the LMNP to consider the boundary of the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework makes very clear what development is and is not suitable in the Green Belt. The overwhelming response to the previous consultation was that the Green Belt should be protected and this statement sets out that the LMNP respects that position and through the Parish Council will object to any development within the Green Belt.

Response ID K: (Disagree) No building middle road. Road too small land slopping. Valuable part of village as gives man view to The Purbecks.

Response ID L: (Disagree) No building Middle road - my Favourite dog walk around the village

Response ID M: (Disagree) No Buliding a Middle Road

Response ID P: (Disagree) Strategic gap must be maintained and there must be no incursion into and onto the outstanding landscapes that surround our village.

LMNP Response: It is not within the remit of the LMNP to consider the boundary of the Green Belt. However, it is felt that if additional development is identified by Purbeck District Council then it is better to be part of that conversation rather than have development forced upon the village with no input from the residents.

Response ID U: (Disagree) Policy SVI 6 proposes "to resist development on green belt land". This is a somewhat sweeping statement and is contrary both to the national planning policy framework and the adopted Purbeck local plan part one which would otherwise allow some specific forms of development in green belt, for example playing fields, outdoor recreation, or minor extensions or alterations to existing buildings. It is noted that the planning definition of 'development' is wider than the construction of new buildings.

In addition to addressing the above point it is further recommended that SVI 6 makes clear the relationship of the neighbourhood plan to the local plan partial review process, in particular that the partial review preparation process has not concluded, and that the national planning policy framework confirms at paragraph 84 that green belt boundaries can only be altered, if required, through the local plan preparation and review process.

LMNP Response: Noted. It is accepted that the SVI could be made clearer; indeed the long-term support for additional football pitches is identified as being within the Green Belt. We are well aware of the restrictions on Green Belt and the level of plan that can activate a review of

the Green Belt boundaries. It is felt that this message has been consistent and no further link to the partial review needs to be made as the LMNP ultimately will not affect whether any new sites are allocated from a higher level document.

Strategic Village Improvement 7

Agree	9
Disagree	0
No comment	2
Total Responses	11

Comments

Response ID C: (Agree) Agree in principle but the wording is quite vague so does it carry any real meaning?

Response ID F: (Agree) Agree that it is very important to preserve the green belt around the village as this adds so much to the feel and charm of the area, and gives residents much needed green spaces to walk around.

Response ID S: (Disagree) This policy states that the Parish Council will seek to preserve the character of the village as a hilltop settlement and its wide landscape context. This policy goes over and above the requirements of Neighbourhood Planning and is a matter more suited to be dealt with by the local planning authority based on up-to-date and robust evidence.

We therefore recommend that SVI 7 be deleted from the LMNP

***LMNP Response:** For the sake of clarity it is important to explain that the Strategic Village Improvements are in essence a “wish list” of where the LMNP sees money being invested and improvements made, rather than a policy.*

Response ID U: (Disagree) Policy SVI 7, and the diagram on page 34, refer to preserving the distinct character of the village and protecting an arc of countryside to the south by seeking to have it designated “for its particular landscape quality”.

Purbeck Townscape Character Appraisal work undertaken in September 2012 reports that: “Lytchett Matravers is situated on a broad ridge of relatively high ground...the character of the village, and particularly its boundaries, is...greatly influenced by its landscape setting. Most notably, the broad, elevated ridge on which the village is situated allows many views and glimpses south towards Poole Harbour.”

It further states at 2.2.5: “in contrast to the general containment of the village to north, west and east, the land to the south of the village is markedly different in character. Not only is the topography more uniform, but beyond the southernmost extent of the village the pattern of small irregular and organic field boundaries suddenly gives way to an area of large rectangular arable fields...This change in landscape character has the effect not only of opening up views from the southern part of the village,

but of allowing views back towards the village from the south including Wareham Road, Foxhills Road and the A35 that is more than 1km distant. Development near the southern edge of the village is therefore quite widely visible, as are its lights at night.”

In view of the above it is queried whether it is the landscape to the south of the village that is of special merit, or rather that there are longer distance views into and out of this area, the top of the green slopes provide an obvious edge to the settlement, and that any further development in this location could be particularly intrusive from a landscape perspective.

Bloor Homes supports the principle of preserving the distinct character of the settlement but would suggest that the focus of policy should be on limiting the further southern extension of the settlement due to the sensitivity of this area in wider views, rather than the protection of broad swathes of farmland across the southern undeveloped parts of the parish without any rationale relating to the relative landscape sensitivity of specific fields/landscape parcels.

It may be more appropriate, for example, for the policy to be re-worded to clarify that any further expansion to the southern edge of the village would normally be resisted, subject to further landscape and sustainability analysis.

LMNP Response: *Noted. The SVI is ultimately looking to prevent Lytchett Matravers and Minster from merging together through unregulated sprawl. There is no intention of the part of the LMNP to interfere with the site being represented, that will be decided by Purbeck District Council.*

Strategic Village Improvement 8

Agree	8
Disagree	2
No comment	2
Total Responses	12

Comments

Response ID B: (Agree) Please could you add the word 'safe' before the word 'easy'.

Response ID C: (Disagree) Specifically with second bullet. This could have the effect of causing too much in-fill which destroys the character and amenity of the village quicker than allowing limited development within current green belt.

LMNP Response: *It is not within the remit of the LMNP to decide whether Green Belt should or should not be released. The second bullet point is intended to focus development near to the centre of the village so that reliance on private vehicles is reduced.*

Response ID D: (Agree) One of the attractive characteristics of the village is that the countryside encroaches close to the centre. If development is focussed within 800m, there is a danger that this gets in-filled and the character lost.

Response ID G: (Disagree) My comments under "Safeguarding our Assets" at Policy 1 above apply here also. I strongly believe that the Parish Council should take a more positive view on development, in order to stimulate continued improvements in the standard of living through economic growth and productivity growth. This positive view should extend to a consideration of the potential for additional housing development.

LMNP Response: *The LMNP is not anti-development, it is taking a spatial view of the most appropriate places for development, in this case it looks to focus development near to the centre of the village so that reliance on private vehicles is reduced.*

Response ID S: (Disagree) This policy states that the Parish Council will resist additional housing development over that already identified and accepted in the absence of significant improvements to village infrastructure and amenities or the site is outside a 800m walking distance of the village centre.

Gladman contend that this policy is too restrictive and inconsistent with the positive approach of the Framework, specifically the need to boost significantly the supply of housing . At present, the Council do not have a full understanding of what their OAN for housing is, the level of housing that Lytchett Matravers will be required to accommodate will be dealt with through the review of the Local Plan. If this policy is progressed it would therefore pre-empt the strategic priorities for the wider area and is therefore inconsistent with basic conditions (a), (d) and (e).

LMNP Response: *For the sake of clarity it is important to explain that the Strategic Village Improvements are in essence a “wish list” of where the LMNP sees money being invested and improvements made, rather than a policy. The LMNP is taking a spatial view of the most appropriate places for development, in this case it looks to focus development near to the centre of the village so that reliance on private vehicles is reduced. This is wholly consistent with local and national policy.*

Strategic Village Improvement 9

Agree	8
Disagree	3
No comment	3
Total Responses	14

Comments

Response ID C: (Disagree) Agree in principle except for the focus on village centre which is too focussed on the High St area. This needs to be expanded to the circuit taking in Rose & Crown crossroads, Wimborne Rd/Wareham Rd T-junction, Castle Farm Rd/Lime Kiln Rd junction and the Middle Rd/Lime Kiln Rd/High St crossroads.

LMNP Response: *The road improvements can be assessed as time goes on and additional improvements can therefore be identified in the future.*

Response ID F: (Agree) Wareham Road between the Rose and Crown and the Primary school is already extremely busy, especially during school drop off times. I walk my daughter to school and back every day and would note the following:

- 1) The pavements are very thin which means you are very close to the passing traffic. I feel my daughter and I are vulnerable to passing vehicles and often have to stand back until they have passed. This road is not suitable for lorries/HGV's and desperately needs better pavements and traffic calming measures
- 2) The sheer traffic congestion on this road makes one question whether it is sensible to permit any new developments that would increase traffic volumes.

- 3) At quite times traffic often travels too fast on this road.
- 4) Plans to increase drop-off parking and to remove the bus shelter would be big improvements.

Response ID G: (Disagree) I object in the strongest possible terms to further restrictions in speed limits below the existing national speed limit and the 30mh limit for urban areas.

My arguments in support of this are as follows:

1 The efficient and effective use of the roads network are essential factors in supporting economic growth and productivity growth.

2 Further restrictions in speed limits have significant negative impacts including adding cost, reducing productivity (both through the reductions in speed themselves and also through the potential to redirect traffic to longer routes), and increasing emissions of greenhouse gases and pollutants that are harmful to human health and the environment (both through higher fuel consumption and reduced vehicle emissions performance at lower speeds, and also through the potential to redirect traffic to longer routes).

3 The existing urban speed limit of 30mph was set at a time when automotive technology was far less developed than it is today. There have been substantial improvements in automotive technology, including more effective braking systems, improved steering, better bodywork design to reduce the harm caused through impact, protective measures such as air bags and crumple zones, increased warnings to drivers on proximity, improved all round visibility, and more recently automated braking on close proximity as part of the trend towards driverless cars. As a result of these trends in technology, all of which have been driven by a desire to improve road safety, further restrictions in speed limits represent an attempt to reduce risks to an excessive extent, given the greater need to support continued improvement in the standard of living through economic growth and productivity growth.

4 Even if arguments to reduce urban speed limits to 20mph are accepted (with which I would not agree), further reductions to 10mph deliver minimal incremental benefit.

5 Care must be taken with restrictions aimed at changing behaviour, e.g. to discourage drivers who use the roads within Lytchett Matravers as a through route. It is worth noting that from a historical perspective villages grew up at cross roads, the meeting points of trade routes, to make the most of the benefit from the increase in trade available. Seeking to prevent through traffic therefore has the potential to adversely impact the aspiration to promote retail outlets in the village centre. Further, achieving changes in through traffic through reduced speed limits and "Gateways" has the inevitable effect of imposing restrictions on all of the residents of Lytchett Matravers, making all of their journeys (whether within the village or to destinations outside the village) more time consuming (and therefore less productive), in order to try to change the behaviour of the much smaller number of people using the village as a through route. This is a very blunt instrument.

***LMNP Response:** Reducing the speed limit is not considered to have a noticeable impact on the efficiency of business or the local economy. The resident population is more than adequate to support a range of local shops and services without the need to encourage more vehicles into the village. The overwhelming response from the first consultation was directed at issues surrounding the level of traffic, albeit noticeably at peak times and by addressing speed limits it is felt that better control of traffic volume can be achieved. Whilst it is true that car design has vastly improved over the years the performance of vehicles when hitting a pedestrian or another vehicle are hardly what the plan wants to achieve. Why encourage accidents when they can be avoided.*

Response ID I: (No Comment) No new roads (for cars) connecting to existing quiet lanes (pedestrian and cycleways acceptable.)

Strategic Village Improvement 10

Agree	9
Disagree	2
No comment	3
Total Responses	14

Comments

Response ID B: (Agree) I would like to request that consideration is given to introducing a 20 mph zone at the western end of the High Street starting at the junction with Old Pound Close and ending at the Church. There is no footpath along much of the road and no verge which increases the risk of injury to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. The section of road from the end of the High Street to the Church is particularly hazardous.

Traffic volumes will inevitably increase as the village expands and the road cannot be widened without acquiring land from some of the properties/fields fronting the road.

Speeding is also an increasing problem and some vehicles have been seen travelling at very fast speeds (60mph +) on numerous occasions.

I have spoken with many of my neighbours and they support the introduction of a lower speed limit possibly coupled with traffic calming measures.

Response ID C: (Agree) But in addition the 20mph restriction needs to include all of the circuit taking in Rose & Crown crossroads, Wimborne Rd/Wareham Rd T-junction, Castle Farm Rd/Lime Kiln Rd junction and the Middle Rd/Lime Kiln Rd/High St crossroads.

Response ID F: (Agree) Very good idea that will improve road safety for Children walking to school. There is no need for most large vehicles to be using the village as a 'cut through' route

Response ID G: (Disagree) See comments made above on SVI9.

LMNP Response: Noted.

Response ID I: (Disagree) You need to allow for the passage of buses, delivery lorries, removal vans, horseboxes. Gateways would detract from the rural views in these roads.

LMNP Response: The latter vehicles mentioned would not be affected by the weight restrictions intended. There is a valid point about buses and the LMNP would not want to jeopardise existing services. The gateways, would not be a physical barrier, more a 'no entry' type of signage for vehicles over a certain weight.

Response ID J: (Agree) I would like to suggest that Middle Rd is included in the roads with weight restrictions, unless access is required. It is narrow and has sharp bends which make it dangerous for heavy traffic. Wareham Rd is much wider and straighter so is much more appropriate for heavy traffic coming into the village.

Strategic Village Improvement 11

Agree	10
Disagree	1
No comment	1
Total Responses	12

Comments

Response ID G: (Disagree) See comments made above on SVI9.

LMNP Response: Noted.

Strategic Village Improvement 12

Agree	11
Disagree	0
No comment	1
Total Responses	12

Comments

Response ID I: (Agree) Village needs to be connected to the bus routes to Wareham and Dorchester.

Strategic Village Improvement 13

Agree	10
Disagree	0
No comment	2
Total Responses	12

Comments

Response ID D: (Agree) This has been talked about since the school was built - why is it so difficult? I have spoken with many of my neighbours and they support the introduction of a lower speed limit possibly coupled with traffic calming measures.

Response ID F: (Agree) The pavement from the rose and crown to Eldons drove is also used by parents dropping children to school. This area should also be considered when looking to make walking routes safer.

Response ID I: (No Comment) While we are happy with the idea of schoolchildren passing to and from school via the track from Eldons Drove, please address the possibilities of vandalism, litter and antisocial activity around the school and playing fields when the school is not open. Also how will you prevent the track being used as a drop-off and turning area with all the associated safety issues? We would be very opposed to any measures (eg yellow lines etc) that would spoil our lane. Could parents be asked to use the parking area off the North of Eldons Drove (as they did for a recent football tournament).

Strategic Village Improvement 14

Agree	10
Disagree	0
No comment	2
Total Responses	12

Response ID U: (Agree) Policy SVI 14 proposes a safe walking and cycling route to Lytchett Minster school, with extended routes to Poole and Wareham.

Bloor Homes is supportive of this route in principle, which may primarily involve improvements along Huntick Road.

It is recommended that further work is undertaken with the county highways authority to define a preferred route for this link within the plan area, including confirmation that land in the public highway and along public rights of way is available to deliver the proposed improvement.

***LMNP Response:** If the proposed urban extension to the Minster does take place and a SANG is proposed the LMNP would be interested in linking this to the village to help to deliver the wider benefit to residents of both villages.*

Strategic Village Improvement 15

Agree	10
Disagree	0
No comment	1
Total Responses	11

Response ID U: (Agree) Bloor Homes welcomes proposals to improve access to countryside.

However it is important to manage potential conflicts between public access and farming activities and it is recommended that closer engagement with local farming interests takes place prior to finalising policy.

Bloor Homes is currently exploring the potential to improve public access to land through the introduction of a strategic 'SANG' or country park in the Lytchett Minster area. This is intended to offer recreational benefit to residents in Lytchett Minster, Lytchett Matravers and further afield, as part of wider strategic approach to change in the locality.

Strategic Village Improvement 16

Agree	10
Disagree	2
No comment	1
Total Responses	13

Comments

Response ID B: (Agree) Consider relocating Tesco here.

Response ID C: (Agree) Sounds ok but what does this really mean?

Response ID D: (Disagree) Not necessary if the village hall is improved. Looks like a prime development site to me.

Response ID E: (Disagree) I am not sure how the British Legion can become a village centre as it is located far from the centre.

Response ID I: (No Comment) Resolve this issue quickly and if hall cannot be used, release the land for residential development.

Response ID J: (No Comment) I would question how useful the British Legion building would be as a community centre given its location on the edge of the village.

Response ID P: (Agree) Superb vision and to be fully supported

***LMNP Response:** The legion site has protective covenants on the land which dictates which use it can be used for. It is not within the scope of the LMNP to change those covenants however every encouragement will be given to bringing it into a use that benefits the village.*

Additional Comments:

Response ID A

FAO LMNPG

Thank you for the consultation for the Neighbourhood Plan being prepared for Lytchett Matravers. Please note the following comments made on behalf of Wessex Water acting as the statutory water and sewerage undertaker.

We note the development sites being considered and the future requirements for planned allocations arising from the Purbeck Core Strategy.

The village is served by both water supply and sewer networks. The existing networks will hold limited capacity for new development. Where new sites are promoted through the planning system we will advise upon capacity requirements.

New development should be served by separate foul and surface water systems. Development management policies should ensure that surface water disposal follows current planning policy for sustainable drainage systems. No surface water connections will be permitted to the foul system.

Foul water systems drain southwards to Bulbury Lane pumping station where flows are pumped to Blackheath STW for treatment. We carry out a strategic review of treatment capacity every 5 years to prioritise capacity improvements to match the rate of planned development.

If any further information is required at this stage please advise.

***LMNP Response:** Noted.*

Response ID B

I would just like to compliment those involved in putting together this document. It is a well thought through and sets out a clear vision for the village.

***LMNP Response:** Noted.*

Response ID C

If you need to contact me for further clarification please do so at the address or email provided or on 07*** *****.

Thank you for offering me the opportunity to contribute.

LMNP Response: *Noted. Telephone number removed from public record.*

Response ID E

The Neighbourhood Planning Group is to be commended for a comprehensive and visionary plan for Lytchett Matravers and I hope a high number of residents respond to it.

LMNP Response: *Noted.*

Response ID F

Whilst I accept some development is probably necessary I would urge everyone involved in this process to preserve the 'village feel' that still exists in Lytchett Matravers. Whilst some facilities and infrastructure may appear 'old' it does not mean it automatically needs replacing. I would hope any redevelopment retains the village character and minimizes further traffic volumes. Finally I am aware that the primary school already runs to maximum capacity - has this been considered against the backdrop of further houses being built?

LMNP Response: *Priorities for funding will be agreed once the plan is adopted. How this will be structured, i.e. via the Parish Council or a separate committee is yet to be finalised. In terms of the school capacity the school have been spoken to and the LMNP group are aware that an increase in dwellings may lead to increased pressure on the schools. It is intended that families living in the village will get priority above those from further afield.*

Response ID I

Wessex Water site (area not reserved for amenity) - develop asap for housing for older people and/or young couples ie small dwellings close to shops.

For too long the village has been seen as a soft option to solve housing needs throughout the Purbeck area: development throughout the area should be proportionate. No new houses should be built until the infrastructure has caught up. The catchment area for the school should be reduced to prevent it expanding further (this happens in other parts of the country and results in some very fine schools) and village children should always be given preference for admission.

LMNP Response: *The Wessex Water site is indeed not reserved for public amenity and should an application be submitted it will be assessed against the Development Plan as a whole. The Purbeck Local Plan is currently under review, but what the LMNP cannot do is restrict development. It is intended that once adopted the money collected from new developments can be invested into the village infrastructure to mitigate against the impacts of the new development.*

Response ID J

I should like to thank the Parish Council for producing such a carefully considered and detailed report which is excellently produced. The village will be a much more attractive place to live if its suggestions can be accepted and funded.

LMNP Response: *Noted.*

Response ID K

No building Middle Road
Would spoil whole feel of village
Amazing views to Purbeck loved by all
Popular recreation area walking out of village on quiet road

LMNP Response: *Throughout the responses the issue of Middle Road was raised by this individual. The LMNP is not allocating additional sites and it is hoped that any objection to potential housing sites was submitted to Purbeck District Council as part of their Partial Review consultation.*

Response ID L

No building Middle road
Would destroy vilage open aspect and viesws to Purbecks
Favourite walk Middle Road Bartons lane would be destroyed by traffic
Land too sloping

LMNP Response: *Throughout the responses the issue of Middle Road was raised by this individual. The LMNP is not allocating additional sites and it is hoped that any objection to potential housing sites was submitted to Purbeck District Council as part of their Partial Review consultation.*

Response ID M

No building Middle road
Sloping land
Totally spoil the feel of Lychtett as a country village
Special area views to Purbecks
Middle Road too narrow for mor traffic
Destroy wildlife in valley with stream

LMNP Response: *Throughout the responses the issue of Middle Road was raised by this individual. The LMNP is not allocating additional sites and it is hoped that any objection to potential housing sites was submitted to Purbeck District Council as part of their Partial Review consultation.*

Response ID N

The LMNP is a very good document, professionally prepared and a good basis for ongoing consultation.

However, I believe village residents need to know more about the current status of the 5 proposed development areas in Appendix B....what is the feedback from PDC's consultation in Jan/Feb 2015, what is likelihood of any or all of these areas being developed and when? It would be useful to have feedback on current status as these development areas are no doubt one of the main reasons we now have the LMNP.

LMNP Response: *The sites in Appendix B were not part of this consultation and any feedback and progress (or non-progress) of those sites is with Purbeck District Council. The appendix was useful to aid discussions, but will not form part of the final LMNP.*

Response ID Q

I can confirm that the MMO has no comments to submit in relation to this consultation as it is not within our remit.

Response ID R

Thank you for your consultation on the Lychett Matravers Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

We note the Plan does not have any policies allocating sites for development and restricts its proposals to setting out objectives and the criteria for their realisation.

We are pleased to see that a key objective of the Plan is to maintain the distinct village atmosphere (P17) and this is reinforced through the provision of Policy 3 which, inter alia, requires development proposals to preserve or enhance the appearance of the village. (We were not sure what the reference to design principles in section 4.1 might be alluding to).

At the same time we are perhaps surprised that the Plan does not promote any specific policies for the protection and enhancement of its distinctive historic built environment, to complement Policies 1 & 5 for example.

Appendix G - Sustainability Check List (P58) suggests that there are no relevant heritage considerations when assessing Objective 1. "To maintain or enhance features of historic and cultural importance" but our records indicate that the Plan area has 1 Grade I, 1 Grade II* and 21 Grade II Listed Buildings, 3 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 1 Grade II* Registered Park and Garden. There may also be locally valued but undesignated historic buildings or structures which the community wishes to highlight and protect and include as an expanded, or addition to, Appendix E.

We wrote to Purbeck District Council at the time of the designation of the Neighbourhood Development Area to highlight how an area's heritage can add value to a community's aspirations. We asked that this advice be shared with your community but I am attaching it again for information.

It is of course for the community to determine for itself the extent to which it wishes specifically to formulate policies for the protection and enhancement of its distinctive local environment. But given how important this aspect of the area is stated as being to the future of the village we wonder whether there is benefit in giving further thought to the matter.

We would encourage liaison with the historic environment service at Purbeck District Council or archaeological service at Dorset County Council if this has not already taken place.

LMNP Response: *In terms of specific protection for the historic built environment there are already policies within the Local Plan that address this issue. It is of no value to duplicate the policies that are already adopted.*

Response ID S

Gladman recognise the role of Neighbourhood Plan's as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community, however it is clear from national guidance that Neighbourhood Plan's must be consistent with national planning policy and the up-to-date strategic requirements of the wider local authority area. If a Neighbourhood Plan does not meet all of the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions then there is a real risk that the Plan will fail at Independent Examination.

Through these representations, Gladman has highlighted a number of concerns with the LMNP as proposed. In a number of instances the LMNP lacks clarity and requires further justification to the policies it proposes. We are concerned that the progression of the Neighbourhood Plan at this time will effectively pre-empt the strategic priorities for the wider local authority area and therefore cannot be seen to be in conformity with basic conditions (a) and (e).

A number of policies seek to establish prescriptive design requirements which might hinder the Plan's ability to deliver future sustainable development, and is therefore contrary to basic condition (d).

The adequacy of an SEA/SA goes to the core compliance of basic condition (f). To progress with a Neighbourhood Plan under regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 without first undertaking a scoping report to identify whether the LMNP should be subjected to an SEA/SA gives rise to fundamental legal issues and is therefore contrary to basic condition (f).

Gladman submit that there is critical need review to the suite of policies contained in the LMNP, if the Neighbourhood Plan is progressed to examination in its current form it may be found unable to meet Basic Conditions (a), (d), (e) and (f). We recommend that further work on the LMNP be postponed until there is greater certainty over the strategic policy requirements for the wider area.

LMNP Response: *The requirement for a SA was considered before the consultation and the correct assessment was made that the plan did not require one. This has since been confirmed by Natural England, although the objector was not aware of this.*

It is not necessary to postpone the LMNP whilst awaiting the findings of the countywide SHMA, nor to see what additional allocations (if any) are given to the village. The policies within the plan seek to have harmonious development and that is whether within the existing settlement boundaries or a site coming forward through any future Green Belt review.

Response ID T

Planning Policy in the National Planning Policy Framework identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process and providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type and in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means positive planning for sport, protection from unnecessary loss of sports facilities and an integrated

approach to providing new housing and employment land and community facilities provision is important.

It is important therefore that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects national policy for sport as set out in the above document with particular reference to Parts 73 and 74 to ensure proposals comply with National Planning Policy. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing fields (see link below), as set out in our national guide, 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England - Planning Policy Statement'.

Sport England provides guidance on developing policy for sport and further information can be found following the link below:

<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/>

Sport England works with Local Authorities to ensure Local Plan policy is underpinned by robust and up to date assessments and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports delivery. If local authorities have prepared a Playing Pitch Strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports strategy it will be important that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects the recommendations set out in that document and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support the delivery of those recommendations.

If new sports facilities are being proposed Sport England recommend you ensure such facilities are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.

LMNP Response: *Response noted. The guidance will be a useful tool, particularly if SVI relating to the football pitches is ever realised.*

Response ID V

The Council has no significant issues or concerns with the Development Management Policies in the Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan. However, two minor points have been raised by Council Officers that the Parish Council may wish to address. These are set out below.

Lytchett Matravers has an allocation of 50 dwellings in the Purbeck Local Plan: Part 1 (PLP1). However, as Lytchett Matravers is surrounded by Green Belt the Neighbourhood Plan is unable to allocate land as extension sites. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the possibility of additional growth in Lytchett Matravers following the adoption of the Partial Review of the PLP1.

Section 1.D.2. Page 8. Use of the term social housing

There is sometimes confusion over the terms social and/or affordable housing but in planning 'Affordable Housing' has a very specific meaning. You may wish to consider changing the term 'social housing' to 'affordable housing' and possibly include an explanation of the term in a footnote or in the glossary.

LMNP Response: *Response noted. The use of the term "social housing" was issue of some debate between the LMNP and Purbeck during drafting. We deliberately use this term as it is recognised and understood by more people. The term affordable housing is an industry term and whilst professional users of the plan will undoubtedly know what it means the residents of the village demonstrated through the questionnaire responses that they want affordable housing for their children, but not necessarily social housing. As the LMNP is silent on this issue (as it is not considered expedient to repeat Purbeck policy) there is little harm in the use of this term for the sake of clarity for the casual reader.*

Response ID W

Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above mentioned document. We have no objection to your plan and policies and have the following advice.

Flood Risk and Drainage: The local neighbourhood plan should consider whether there is any desire for growth in areas known to be at risk of fluvial, surface water, or groundwater flooding. If there is development proposed in any area of risk then the Sequential Test / Approach need to be considered, and only water compatible uses considered in the flood risk areas. This is in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework and its associated Practice Guidance.

You can find a copy of our Flood Maps and other environmental information on our 'What's in Your Backyard' website

Please note that whilst a development site may not be within a mapped Flood Zone or Surface Water Flooding it may still be at risk from other sources of flooding e.g. groundwater and overland run-off. Therefore, the plan should acknowledge and consider any known surface water problems and allow for this within any proposed development strategy. Please note that since the 15 April 2015 matters relating to surface water are now dealt with by the Lead Local Flood Authority. This is Dorset County Council, so please consult with them if any issues arise on this aspect.

Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible with sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). This reduces flood risk through the use of soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, grassed swales, ponds etc. SuDS can also increase groundwater recharge, improve water quality and provide amenity opportunities. A SuDS approach is encouraged by the Building Regulations.

We support the planting of trees within catchments, especially headwaters, to reduce surface water runoff too. Therefore, opportunities for increasing the amount of tree planting, in appropriate locations, is considered beneficial.

There should also be consideration about the foul drainage network in the area to understand if there may be existing capacity constraints on the system. This can be done by contacting the sewerage undertaker for the area.

Biodiversity / Green Space: We note that the Neighbourhood plan acknowledges the need for green spaces to be preserved and enhanced to improve the rich biodiversity of the area. We would highlight the important especially for any area that includes wetlands or water bodies (e.g. rivers, streams, ditches) as these provide ecological interest and diversity. We would promote opportunities to enhance any wetland feature should they be identified and delivered through development, as this approach is promoted in the National Planning Policy Framework and is desired outcome of the Water Framework Directive.

We would recommend that Natural England are consulted if any proposed developments may impact on any conservation designations and / or protected species.

LMNP Response: Response noted.

Response ID X

Extract: The following consultation zones are within the proposed neighbourhood plan boundary.

The neighbourhood plan boundary encroaches upon the inner, middle and outer consultation zones associated with a MAHP operated by Southern Gas Networks:

HSE Reference Number: 8064, Transco Index Number: 2323, Pipeline name: East Morden/Fleets Bridge (PO29)

HSE Reference Number: 8082, Transco Index Number: 2341, Pipeline name: Wytch Farm/Sopley (PO58)

The compatibility issues raised by developing housing and workplaces within the inner middle and outer zones are summarised below.

LMNP Response: *The technical representation appears to relate to new development and as the LMNP does not allocate specific sites for development the contents can only be noted.*

APPENDIX C

ID		A
Name	David Ogborne	
Address	Wessex Water, Operations Centre, Claverton Down Road, Bath	
Post Code	BA2 7WW	

Policy 1	No Comment	0
Policy 2	No Comment	0
Policy 3	No Comment	0
Policy 4	No Comment	0
Policy 6	No Comment	0
Policy 7	No Comment	0
Policy 5	No Comment	0
Policy 8	No Comment	0
Policy 9	No Comment	0
Policy 10	No Comment	0
SVI 1	No Comment	0
SVI 2	No Comment	0
SVI 3	No Comment	0
SVI 4	No Comment	0
SVI 5	No Comment	0
SVI 6	No Comment	0
SVI 7	No Comment	0
SVI 8	No Comment	0
SVI 9	No Comment	0
SVI 10	No Comment	0
SVI 11	No Comment	0
SVI 12	No Comment	0
SVI 13	No Comment	0
SVI 14	No Comment	0
SVI 15	No Comment	0
SVI 16	No Comment	0

<p>Additonal Comments</p>		<p>FAO LMNPG</p> <p>Thank you for the consultation for the Neighbourhood Plan being prepared for Lytchett Matravers. Please note the following comments made on behalf of Wessex Water acting as the statutory water and sewerage undertaker.</p> <p>We note the development sites being considered and the future requirements for planned allocations arising from the Purbeck Core Strategy.</p> <p>The village is served by both water supply and sewer networks. The existing networks will hold limited capacity for new development. Where new sites are promoted through the planning system we will advise upon capacity requirements.</p> <p>New development should be served by separate foul and surface water systems. Development management policies should ensure that surface water disposal follows current planning policy for sustainable drainage systems. No surface water connections will be permitted to the foul system.</p> <p>Foul water systems drain southwards to Bulbury Lane pumping station where flows are pumped to Blackheath STW for treatment. We carry out a strategic review of treatment capacity every 5 years to prioritise capacity improvements to match the rate of planned development.</p> <p>If any further information is required at this stage please advise.</p>
---------------------------	--	--

ID		B
Name	Rob Aspray	
Address	92 High Street, LM	
Post Code	BH16 6BJ	

Policy 1	Agree		0
Policy 2	Agree		0
Policy 3	Agree		0
Policy 4	Agree	<p>I would like to request that consideration is given to introducing a 20 mph zone at the western end of the High Street starting at the junction with Old Pound Close and ending at the Church. There is no footpath along much of the road and no verge which increases the risk of injury to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. The section of road from the end of the High Street to the Church is particularly hazardous.</p> <p>Traffic volumes will inevitably increase as the village expands and the road cannot be widened without acquiring land from some of the properties/fields fronting the road.</p> <p>Speeding is also an increasing problem and some vehicles have been seen travelling at very fast speeds (60mph +) on numerous occasions.</p> <p>I have spoken with many of my neighbours and they support the introduction of a lower speed limit possibly coupled with traffic calming measures.</p>	
Policy 6	Agree		0
Policy 7	Agree		0
Policy 5	Agree		0
Policy 8	Agree	<p>Although I agree that something has to be done to deal with the traffic problems in the lower part of the High Street it has to be borne in mind that introducing restrictions could cause more traffic to use minor roads. More vehicles will cut through Eldons Drove, use Middle Road and Lime Kiln Road. It would be better to relocate the Tesco store to a better location where the traffic generated can be better managed and deliveries vehicles can be properly catered for.</p> <p>Part of the site proposed for housing in Huntick Road would a better location for Tesco.</p>	
Policy 9	Agree		0
Policy 10	Agree		0
SVI 1	Agree	If the football pitches are relocated to land adjoining the school please make sure that there are adequate off-road parking facilities for cars.	
SVI 2	Disagree	The existing businesses already generate too much traffic.	
SVI 3	Agree		0
SVI 4	Agree		0
SVI 5	Agree		0
SVI 6	Agree		0
SVI 7	Agree		0
SVI 8	Agree	Please could you add the word 'safe' before the word 'easy'.	
SVI 9	Agree		0

SVI 10	Agree	<p>I would like to request that consideration is given to introducing a 20 mph zone at the western end of the High Street starting at the junction with Old Pound Close and ending at the Church. There is no footpath along much of the road and no verge which increases the risk of injury to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. The section of road from the end of the High Street to the Church is particularly hazardous.</p> <p>Traffic volumes will inevitably increase as the village expands and the road cannot be widened without acquiring land from some of the properties/fields fronting the road.</p> <p>Speeding is also an increasing problem and some vehicles have been seen travelling at very fast speeds (60mph +) on numerous occasions.</p> <p>I have spoken with many of my neighbours and they support the introduction of a lower speed limit possibly coupled with traffic calming measures.</p>	
SVI 11	Agree		0
SVI 12	Agree		0
SVI 13	Agree		0
SVI 14	Agree		0
SVI 15		0	0
SVI 16	Agree	Consider relocating Tesco here.	
Additional Comments		I would just like to compliment those involved in putting together this document. It is a well thought through and sets out a clear vision for the village.	

ID		C
Name	Max White	
Address	The Old Chapel, Lime Kiln Rd, Lytchett Matravers	
Post Code	BH16 6EL	

Policy 1	Agree	Agree with the policy but I do not agree that the open ground in Fry's Close (Appx E. no. 18) qualifies as an asset in the same way as others listed e.g. the green space in Old Chapel Drive/Scutts Close (also 18). The area in Fry's close is covered in slabs and is poorly maintained with little in the way of attractive features for residents or wildlife. Hence it should either be brought up to the standard of other green spaces or earmarked as a potential development site
Policy 2	Agree	0
Policy 3	Agree	Agree in principle but it is not clear where is the section 4.1 which is referred to?
Policy 4	Agree	0
Policy 6	Disagree	New development combining residential and light industrial use is not appropriate or in keeping with the character of the village if that means commercial units at street level with flats above as in the High Street (Tesco Express etc). A development plan which encourages a mixture of light industrial developments and separate residential units is more in keeping with the character.
Policy 7	Disagree	Too generalised. There are places in the village which are current/former places of employment which would be better redeveloped as residential sites.
Policy 5	Disagree	The wording of this policy is nowhere near strong enough to achieve the objective of protecting the environment. Development proposals should not have to justify why they do not include environmental enhancement measures - they just have to. Also the emphasis seems to be more on creating new green spaces than on preserving those already in existence which are generally mature and form part of the village's existing character.
Policy 8	Disagree	<p>The stretch proposed as a 10mph restricted zone is a main route through the village. Without detailed study of traffic patterns, shopping habits and amenity usage it is likely that such a policy would stifle trade in the village. Also by restricting the High St to 10mph but leaving other main routes including Wimborne Rd/Lime Kiln Rd as 30pm it will shift traffic from the low-limit zone to the high. Far better to create an area which encircles the village centre and have all roads restricted to 20mph. This would include the circuit taking in Rose & Crown crossroads, Wimborne Rd/Wareham Rd T-junction, Castle Farm Rd/Lime Kiln Rd junction and the Middle Rd/Lime Kiln Rd/High St crossroads.</p> <p>As the village grows there will be more vehicle traffic and an imbalance in the limits on either side of the village will create potential accident black spots, increased noise and more pollution for certain areas.</p> <p>The vehicles delivering to Tesco Express should be limited to a 7.5t gross waeight maximum to kepp articulated vehicles out of the village centre. Also large agricultural vehicles (tractors, trailers and other machinery) should be restricted from the circuit described above.</p>

Policy 9	Disagree	Policy is unclear and does not support the preceding statements. To make the existing facilities accessible for an ageing population the area outside Tesco Express, Hairdressers & Estate Agents needs to be restricted to disabled badge holders and this needs to be enforced. Improved parking in the current Recreation ground would enable everyone else to park if necessary or encourage them to walk. Parking restrictions or even a light controlled crossing would be needed on the High St to make the road safer to cross from the car park.	
Policy 10	Disagree	What is included appears well intentioned but the policy as worded is weak. Explicit targets should be set for carbon footprint and sustainability - SUDS is included so why not other environmental targets? The target for light pollution should be zero. Other targets and offset measures should be defined for energy and water consumption, waste water and domestic refuse disposal. Recycling should be specifically addressed.	
SVI 1	Agree		0
SVI 2	Disagree	Policy is so vague it is incomprehensible	
SVI 3	Agree		0
SVI 4	Agree		0
SVI 5	Agree		0
SVI 6	Agree	Agree in principle but the wording is quite vague so does it carry any real meaning?	
SVI 7	Agree	Agree in principle but the wording is quite vague so does it carry any real meaning?	
SVI 8	Disagree	Specifically with second bullet. This could have the effect of causing too much in-fill which destroys the character and amenity of the village quicker than allowing limited development within current green belt.	
SVI 9	Disagree	Agree in principle except for the focus on village centre which is too focused on the High St area. This needs to be expanded to the circuit taking in Rose & Crown crossroads, Wimborne Rd/Wareham Rd T-junction, Castle Farm Rd/Lime Kiln Rd junction and the Middle Rd/Lime Kiln Rd/High St crossroads.	
SVI 10	Agree	But in addition the 20mph restriction needs to include all of the circuit taking in Rose & Crown crossroads, Wimborne Rd/Wareham Rd T-junction, Castle Farm Rd/Lime Kiln Rd junction and the Middle Rd/Lime Kiln Rd/High St crossroads.	
SVI 11	Agree		0
SVI 12	Agree		0
SVI 13	Agree		0
SVI 14	Agree		0
SVI 15	Agree		0
SVI 16	Agree	Sounds ok but what does this really mean?	
Additional Comments		If you need to contact me for further clarification please do so at the address or email provided or on 07899 988345. Thank you for offering me the opportunity to contribute.	

ID		D
Name	David & Anne Ireson	
Address	Deep Field, Middle Road	
Post Code	BH16 6HJ	

Policy 1	Agree		0
Policy 2	Agree		0
Policy 3	Agree	Good design is important, but we're not a picture postcard village so "traditional materials" are not essential.	
Policy 4	Agree		0
Policy 6	Agree		0
Policy 7	Disagree	This potentially discourages the use of brown field sites.	
Policy 5	Agree		0
Policy 8	Agree	There should be no parking on the road itself.	
Policy 9	Agree		0
Policy 10	Agree		0
SVI 1	Agree	The plan is not clear about what would be done with the recreation field as a "village green". If not sports pitches, then what? It's a big area. Concerned that it may fall into disuse and then be ripe for development.	
SVI 2	Agree	If the south side of the High Street is over-developed, the village green idea won't work.	
SVI 3	Agree		0
SVI 4	Agree	Don't like the design infilling right up to the pavement. Why have a parish room in the library and the village hall?	
SVI 5	Agree	Not sure about the new layout though.	
SVI 6	Agree	LMPC should also resist the release of green belt.	
SVI 7	Agree		0
SVI 8	Agree	One of the attractive characteristics of the village is that the countryside encroaches close to the centre. If development is focussed within 800m, there is a danger that this gets in-filled and the character lost.	
SVI 9	Agree		0
SVI 10	Agree		0
SVI 11	Agree		0
SVI 12	Agree		0
SVI 13	Agree	This has been talked about since the school was built - why is it so difficult?	
SVI 14	Agree		0
SVI 15	Agree		0
SVI 16	Disagree	Not necessary if the village hall is improved. Looks like a prime development site to me.	
Additonal Comments			0

ID		E
Name	Jytte Kristensen	
Address	18 Frys Close	
Post Code	BH16 6DL	

Policy 1	Agree		0
Policy 2	Agree		0
Policy 3	Agree	<p>I presume the reference to the design principles section 4.I is in fact a reference to the development principles section 3.I.</p> <p>If so, the principle for making provision for open green spaces which are linked to the rest of the village is in my view particularly important.</p> <p>I hope these development principles will be taken into account when the expected planning application for the Wessex Water site is considered by the council.</p>	
Policy 4	Agree	<p>I agree with the minimum requirement for car spaces for new homes.</p> <p>Examples of parked cars causing a nuisance can be seen at the High Street/Middle Road/Limekiln Road crossroads and in Wareham Road.</p>	
Policy 6	Agree		0
Policy 7	Agree		0
Policy 5	Agree	Paths which connect housing developments, new as well as old, will enhance the feeling of a community.	
Policy 8	Agree		0
Policy 9	Agree	<p>I agree with statement that what is on offer does not satisfy the everyday needs of residents and a development of shopping facilities is to be encouraged.</p> <p>This statement is at odds with the statement on page 15: "Lytchett Matravers is a village where there is a core of facilities and services, which allows many residents to meet their daily needs within the village".</p>	
Policy 10	Agree	See my comments on policy 3 above.	
SVI 1	Agree	<p>I agree with improving the south side of the High Street to incorporate more shops and facilities incl. a larger supermarket (eg. The size of Sainsbury's in Wareham).</p> <p>However, I disagree with a relocation of the football and cricket pitches to the DCC land adjoining the school thus taking these activities away from the centre of the village. This could also pave the way for unwanted housing development on the village green, regardless of any stipulation for its use.</p>	
SVI 2	Agree	This is important.	
SVI 3	Agree		0
SVI 4	Agree		0
SVI 5	Agree		0
SVI 6	Agree		0
SVI 7	Agree		0
SVI 8	Agree		0
SVI 9	Agree		0
SVI 10	Agree		0
SVI 11	Agree		0
SVI 12	Agree		0
SVI 13	Agree		0

SVI 14	Agree		0
SVI 15	Agree		0
SVI 16	Disagree	I am not sure how the British Legion can become a village centre as it is located far from the centre.	
Additional Comments		The Neighbourhood Planning Group is to be commended for a comprehensive and visionary plan for Lytchett Matravers and I hope a high number of residents respond to it.	

ID		F
Name	Tim Evans	
Address	7 Hannams Close, Lytchett Matravers	
Post Code	BH16 6DN	

Policy 1	Agree		0
Policy 2	Agree		0
Policy 3	Agree		0
Policy 4	Agree	Would need to resist excessive signage as this can make the area feel 'crowded' with street furniture. I have experienced this as a previous resident of Poole Quarter which itself is in a 'home zone'	
Policy 6	Agree		0
Policy 7	Agree		0
Policy 5	Agree		0
Policy 8	Agree		0
Policy 9	Agree		0
Policy 10	Agree		0
SVI 1	Disagree	Unless improvements are made I have concerns that relocating the sports pavilion will simply cause more traffic congestion and parking problems on Wareham Road. In addition having sports played in the village centre on the current site adds to the 'village' feel and encourages passers by to watch, or even get involved. Moving these facilities to the proposed new site would make them remote and 'hidden away' from residents of the village. Could the current facilities not be redeveloped?	
SVI 2	Agree		0
SVI 3	Agree		0
SVI 4	Agree		0
SVI 5	Agree		0
SVI 6	Agree		0
SVI 7	Agree	Agree that it is very important to preserve the green belt around the village as this adds so much to the feel and charm of the area, and gives residents much needed green spaces to walk around.	
SVI 8	Agree		0
SVI 9	Agree	Wareham Road between the Rose and Crown and the Primary school is already extremely busy, especially during school drop off times. I walk my daughter to school and back every day and would note the following: 1) The pavements are very thin which means you are very close to the passing traffic. I feel my daughter and I are vulnerable to passing vehicles and often have to stand back until they have passed. This road is not suitable for lorries/HGV's and desperately needs better pavements and traffic calming measures 2) The sheer traffic congestion on this road makes one question whether it is sensible to permit any new developments that would increase traffic volumes. 3) At quite times traffic often travels too fast on this road. 4) Plans to increase drop-off parking and to remove the bus shelter would be big improvements	

SVI 10	Agree	Very good idea that will improve road safety for Children walking to school. There is no need for most large vehicles to be using the village as a 'cut through' route	
SVI 11	Agree		0
SVI 12	Agree		0
SVI 13	Agree	The pavement from the rose and crown to Eldons drove is also used by parents dropping children to school. This area should also be considered when looking to make walking routes safer	
SVI 14	Agree		0
SVI 15	Agree		0
SVI 16	Agree		0
Additional Comments		Whilst I accept some development is probably necessary I would urge everyone involved in this process to preserve the 'village feel' that still exists in Lytchett Matravers. Whilst some facilities and infrastructure may appear 'old' it does not mean it automatically needs replacing. I would hope any redevelopment retains the village character and minimizes further traffic volumes. Finally I am aware that the primary school already runs to maximum capacity - has this been considered against the backdrop of further houses being built?	

ID		G
Name	Ralph Watts	
Address	Kit Robins, Jenny's Lane	
Post Code	BH16 6BP	

Policy 1	Disagree	<p>The title of this document contains a tension, in the intent " To retain the essence of village life in a growing community....". So the challenge is to support growth, and at the same time sustain the characteristics of village life. It is also worth saying that there will inevitably come a time when growth of the community will lead to a dilution of the village characteristics, as has clearly taken place over the history of this settlement to date. The King Canute fable needs to be born in mind.</p> <p>The continued improvement in living standards that we in the UK have benefitted from can only be sustained through economic growth and productivity growth. Key components of economic growth in the UK to date have been through population growth and a continued influx of peoples from other countries over the centuries. The Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan should support continued improvement in living standards in the UK, and therefore support economic growth and productivity growth. Therefore the Development Management Policies need to be phrased more positively in support of these objectives. To have Policy 1 as a statement of what will not be supported is exactly the opposite. It would be overwhelmingly more fruitful to say that development will be supported to achieve the objective of supporting a growing community.</p>	
Policy 2	Disagree	Policy 2 seeks to put yet another hurdle in place of developments, this at a time when Government policy is to stimulate economic growth through relaxing the burden of the planning process. As per my comment on Policy 1, a more positive approach to development in Lytchett Matravers is needed.	
Policy 3		0 This introduces the matter of who acts as the arbiter of good design. Judgements as to what will "Preserve or Enhance the appearance of village" are a matter of fashion and the opinions of individuals. Will these judgements seek to keep the village character as it is, or improve the village character through developments in building technology and design? The village already reflects substantial changes in design judgements over recent decades. Future similar changes must be anticipated.	
Policy 4	Disagree	I object in the strongest possible terms to further restrictions in speed limits below the existing national speed limit and the 30mh limit for urban areas. My arguments are set out in my response on Roads and Traffic Management.	
Policy 6	Agree		0
Policy 7		0	0
Policy 5	Agree		0
Policy 8	Disagree	I object in the strongest possible terms to further restrictions in speed limits below the existing national speed limit and the 30mh limit for urban areas. My arguments are set out in my response on Roads and Traffic Management.	
Policy 9	Agree		0
Policy 10	Agree		0

SVI 1	Disagree	I object in the strongest possible terms to further restrictions in speed limits below the existing national speed limit and the 30mh limit for urban areas. My arguments are set out in my response on Roads and Traffic Management. I make this comment here to respond to the penultimate bullet point in the list of "key elements of the Village Centre redevelopment". This bullet point is not taken up in any of the subsequent SVIs.	
SVI 2			0
SVI 3			0
SVI 4			0
SVI 5			0
SVI 6	Disagree	My comments under "Safeguarding our Assets" at Policy 1 above apply here also. I strongly believe that the Parish Council should take a more positive view on development, in order to stimulate continued improvements in the standard of living through economic growth and productivity growth. This positive view should extend to a consideration of the potential for development on Green Belt land. Inevitably such consideration will entail judgements on the balance of benefits.	
SVI 7			0
SVI 8	Disagree	My comments under "Safeguarding our Assets" at Policy 1 above apply here also. I strongly believe that the Parish Council should take a more positive view on development, in order to stimulate continued improvements in the standard of living through economic growth and productivity growth. This positive view should extend to a consideration of the potential for additional housing development.	
SVI 9	Disagree	I object in the strongest possible terms to further restrictions in speed limits below the existing national speed limit and the 30mh limit for urban areas. My arguments in support of this are as follows: 1 The efficient and effective use of the roads network are essential factors in supporting economic growth and productivity growth. 2 Further restrictions in speed limits have significant negative impacts including adding cost, reducing productivity (both through the reductions in speed themselves and also through the potential to redirect traffic to longer routes), and increasing emissions of greenhouse gases and pollutants that are harmful to human health and the environment (both through higher fuel consumption and reduced vehicle emissions performance at lower speeds, and also through the potential to redirect traffic to longer routes). 3 The existing urban speed limit of 30mph was set at a time when automotive technology was far less developed than it is today. There have been substantial improvements in automotive technology, including more effective braking systems, improved steering, better bodywork design to reduce the harm caused through impact, protective measures such as air bags and crumple zones, increased warnings to drivers on proximity, improved all round visibility, and more recently automated braking on close proximity as part of the trend towards driverless cars. As a result of these trends in technology, all of which have been driven by a desire to improve road safety, further restrictions in speed limits represent an attempt to reduce risks to an excessive extent, given the grater need to support continued improvement in the standard of living through economic growth and productivity growth. 4 Even if arguments to reduce urban speed limits to 20mph are accepted (with which I would not agree), further reductions to 10mph deliver minimal incremental benefit.	

SVI 10	Disagree	See comments made above on SVI9.	
SVI 11	Disagree	See comments made above on SVI9.	
SVI 12	Agree		0
SVI 13	Agree		0
SVI 14	Agree		0
SVI 15	Agree		0
SVI 16	Agree		0
Additonal Comments			0

ID		H
Name	Brian and Mary venison	
Address	17 scutts close	
Post Code	bh166hb	

Policy 1	Agree	0
Policy 2	Agree	0
Policy 3	Agree	0
Policy 4	Agree	0
Policy 6	Agree	0
Policy 7	Agree	0
Policy 5	Agree	0
Policy 8	Agree	0
Policy 9	Agree	0
Policy 10	Agree	0
SVI 1	Agree	0
SVI 2	Agree	0
SVI 3	Agree	0
SVI 4	Agree	0
SVI 5	Agree	0
SVI 6	Agree	0
SVI 7	Agree	0
SVI 8	Agree	0
SVI 9	Agree	0
SVI 10	Agree	0
SVI 11	Agree	0
SVI 12	Agree	0
SVI 13	Agree	0
SVI 14	Agree	0
SVI 15	Agree	0
SVI 16	Agree	0
Additional Comments		0

ID		I
Name	Anne and Stuart McGill	
Address	Blue Hills, Eldons Drove, Lytchett Matravers	
Post Code	BH16 6HH	

Policy 1	Agree	However we worry that developers could use their money to influence "the village", ie by effectively bribing the Parish Council with offers of "enhancing" the amenities of the village, against the owners of sites and their neighbours causing conflict that did not exist before.
Policy 2	Agree	see Policy 1 (above)
Policy 3	Agree	But good design should never be a reason for building on Green Belt land.
Policy 4	Agree	But please no new roads (for cars) which cause traffic congestion and parking difficulties in existing quiet lanes eg Eldons Drove.
Policy 6	Agree	0
Policy 7	Disagree	This runs contrary to the existing policy of using brownfield sites for residential development in preference to green fields. A building which was used in the past for commercial purposes or employment (including shops, churches, farms) should be free from this restriction once it has fallen out of use or no longer pays business rates, particularly where it has been used solely for residential occupation over a number of years.
Policy 5	Agree	Native trees can grow extremely large over time. They should not be placed where there is inadequate space for them to grow or where they will affect the light and view of existing properties. They should be maintained and replaced when they are past maturity or are causing a nuisance, ie they should not be subject to Tree Preservation Notices.
Policy 8	Agree	Presumably buses will be able to drive down the High Street. How many new traffic signs and markings on roads will be generated? This could be regarded as urbanisation.. Please consider safe access for delivery vehicles.
Policy 9	Disagree	This policy should read "any proposal... will be considered". The 2nd paragraph is a duplication of Policy 7. Residential development of green sites around the village was "sold" to villagers in the past on the grounds that it would keep shops and school open. In fact the number of shops has decreased due to the growth of supermarkets in the surrounding area and to the advent of internet shopping which supplies many people with their "daily needs" and which is on the increase in the aging population.
Policy 10	Agree	0

SVI 1	Disagree	<p>We think that the playing of sports on the recreation field at weekends is an integral part of village life in Lytchett Matravers, even if the pitches are not perfect! SV1 will surely result in more traffic using Eldons Drove at weekends, with spectators and parents parking on unspoilt verges and across gateways, especially when there is a competition or tournament. We would be very opposed to use of the track from Eldons Drove to the fields behind the school being used at weekends, or in development of the track to take cars and you will find these views expressed in letters sent to the parish, district and county council in 2003 when an attempt was made to do this under the guise of creating a cycleway.</p> <p>At present local shops benefit from the trade at weekends of participants and spectators. This would probably not be the case if the sports were moved to the school or would create more local car journeys as parents would drop off their kids and then drive to the shops in or out of the village.</p> <p>While children could play on the school pitches, youth and adult matches should be held on the Recreation Field to promote both sport and village life.</p>	
SVI 2	Agree	Generally agree, but the use of the Recreation Field for weekend sport will promote this (see comments for SV1 above).	
SVI 3	Disagree	This proposal is too restrictive.	
SVI 4	Agree	Consider expanding the village hall to include the library and associated facilities. This would release the library site for redevelopment and prevent duplication.	
SVI 5	Agree	but see comments for SVI 4 (above)	
SVI 6	Agree		0
SVI 7	Agree		0
SVI 8	Agree		0
SVI 9		0 No new roads (for cars) connecting to existing quiet lanes (pedestrian and cycleways acceptable.)	
SVI 10	Disagree	You need to allow for the passage of buses, delivery lorries, removal vans, horseboxes. Gateways would detract from the rural views in these roads.	
SVI 11	Agree		0
SVI 12	Agree	Village needs to be connected to the bus routes to Wareham and Dorchester.	
SVI 13		0 While we are happy with the idea of schoolchildren passing to and from school via the track from Eldons Drove, please address the possibilities of vandalism, litter and antisocial activity around the school and playing fields when the school is not open. Also how will you prevent the track being used as a drop-off and turning area with all the associated safety issues? We would be very opposed to any measures (eg yellow lines etc) that would spoil our lane. Could parents be asked to use the parking area off the North of Eldons Drove (as they did for a recent football tournament).	
SVI 14	No Comment		0
SVI 15	Agree		0
SVI 16	No Comment	Resolve this issue quickly and if hall cannot be used, release the land for residential development.	

Additional Comments		<p>Wessex Water site (area not reserved for amenity) - develop asap for housing for older people and/or young couples ie small dwellings close to shops.</p> <p>For too long the village has been seen as a soft option to solve housing needs throughout the Purbeck area: development throughout the area should be proportionate. No new houses should be built until the infrastructure has caught up. The catchment area for the school should be reduced to prevent it expanding further (this happens in other parts of the country and results in some very fine schools) and village children should always be given preference for admission.</p>
---------------------	--	---

ID		J
Name	Gwyneth Harrop	
Address	Annaberg, Middle Rd, Lytchett Matravers	
Post Code	BH16 6HJ	

Policy 1	Agree		0
Policy 2	Agree		0
Policy 3	Agree		0
Policy 4	Agree		0
Policy 6	Agree		0
Policy 7	Agree		0
Policy 5	Agree		0
Policy 8	Agree		0
Policy 9	Agree		0
Policy 10		0	0
SVI 1	Agree	Excellent proposal to move the sports pitches to allow the creation of more leisure space on the 'rec' .	
SVI 2	Agree		0
SVI 3		0	0
SVI 4	Agree		0
SVI 5	Agree		0
SVI 6	Agree		0
SVI 7	Agree		0
SVI 8	Agree		0
SVI 9	Agree		0
SVI 10	Agree	I would like to suggest that Middle Rd is included in the roads with weight restrictions, unless access is required. It is narrow and has sharp bends which make it dangerous for heavy traffic. Wareham Rd is much wider and straighter so is much more appropriate for heavy traffic coming into the village.	
SVI 11	Agree		0
SVI 12	Agree		0
SVI 13	Agree		0
SVI 14	Agree		0
SVI 15	Agree		0
SVI 16	No Comment	I would question how useful the British Legion building would be as a community centre given its location on the edge of the village.	
Additional Comments		I should like to thank the Parish Council for producing such a carefully considered and detailed report which is excellently produced. The village will be a much more attractive place to live if its suggestions can be accepted and funded.	

ID		K
Name	Jamie Holland	
Address	Sandpipers Eldons drove llytchett Matravers	
Post Code	Bh166hh	

Policy 1	Agree		0
Policy 2	Agree		0
Policy 3	Agree		0
Policy 4	Disagree	No building on Middle Road	
Policy 6	Agree		0
Policy 7		0	0
Policy 5	Agree	Need to protect valley in Middle road . No building	
Policy 8	Agree		0
Policy 9	Agree		0
Policy 10	Disagree	No building middle road My Favorite dog walk Would spoil the whole open feel of the village and amazing views to Purbecks	
SVI 1	Agree		0
SVI 2		0	0
SVI 3		0	0
SVI 4		0	0
SVI 5		0	0
SVI 6	Disagree	No building middle road Road too small land slopping valuable part of village as gives man view to The Purbecks	
SVI 7		0	0
SVI 8		0	0
SVI 9	No Comment		0
SVI 10	No Comment		0
SVI 11		0	0
SVI 12		0	0
SVI 13		0	0
SVI 14		0	0
SVI 15		0	0
SVI 16	Agree		0
Additional Comments		No building Middle Road Would spoil whole feel of village Amazing views to Purbeck loved by all Popular recreation area walkin out of village on quiet road	

ID		L
Name	Matt Holland	
Address	Sandpipers. Eldons drove	
Post Code	Bhq166hh	

Policy 1	Agree		0
Policy 2	Disagree		0
Policy 3	Agree		0
Policy 4	Disagree		0
Policy 6	Agree		0
Policy 7		0	0
Policy 5	Disagree	Not enough - no building middle road as would destroy the valley with stream and wildlife	
Policy 8	Agree		0
Policy 9	Disagree		0
Policy 10	Disagree	No building on green belt	
SVI 1	Agree		0
SVI 2		0	0
SVI 3		0	0
SVI 4		0	0
SVI 5		0	0
SVI 6	Disagree	No building Middle road - my Favorite dog walk around the village	
SVI 7		0	0
SVI 8		0	0
SVI 9	Disagree		0
SVI 10		0	0
SVI 11		0	0
SVI 12		0	0
SVI 13		0	0
SVI 14		0	0
SVI 15		0	0
SVI 16	Agree		0
Additional Comments		No building Middle road Would destroy vilage open aspect and viesws to Purbecks Favorite walk Middle Road Bartons lane would be destroyed by traffic Land too sloping	

ID		M
Name	Dr Sue Warren	
Address	Sandpipers Eldons drove Lytchet matravers	
Post Code	Bh166hh	

Policy 1	Agree		0
Policy 2	No Comment		0
Policy 3	No Comment		0
Policy 4	Disagree	No building of Middle Road - poor access as country road - sloping land -wildlife disruption ie orchids butteries deer - souls spoil the whole countryside and feel of the village. Beautiful location sloping towards Purbecks - distrust common walking route down Middle road with fabulous views	
Policy 6	No Comment		0
Policy 7	No Comment		0
Policy 5	Disagree		0
Policy 8	Agree		0
Policy 9	Agree		0
Policy 10	Disagree	As above no building off Middle Road - totally unsuitable as would totally disrupt the whole village and views to the Pubecks	
SVI 1	Agree		0
SVI 2		0	0
SVI 3		0	0
SVI 4		0	0
SVI 5		0	0
SVI 6	Disagree	No Buliding a Middle Road	
SVI 7		0	0
SVI 8		0	0
SVI 9		0	0
SVI 10	No Comment		0
SVI 11		0	0
SVI 12		0	0
SVI 13		0	0
SVI 14		0	0
SVI 15		0	0
SVI 16	Agree		0
Aditonal Comments		No building Middle road Sloping land Totally spoil the feel of Lychtett as a country village Special area views to Purbecks Middle Road too narrow for mor traffic Destroy wildlife in valley with stream	

ID		N
Name	Justin Rush	
Address	The Glade, Flowers Drove, Lytchett Matravers	
Post Code	BH16 6BX	

Policy 1	Agree	Stongly agree, all developments of a certain size should be required to enhance assets/infrastructure otherwise the already overloaded village system will deteriorate further.	
Policy 2	Agree		0
Policy 3	Agree	Agree, however Policy 3 refers to Section 4.I which doesn't appear in the LMNP...should this be Section 4 (SVI)?	
Policy 4	Agree		0
Policy 6	Agree		0
Policy 7	Agree		0
Policy 5	Agree		0
Policy 8	Agree	Strongly agree. The High Street is not entirely safe adjacent to Tesco Express and the Rec due to parking levels. Also the parkign outside of Reservoir House in Limekiln Road is completely unsafe so close to a junction and bus stop. I fail to see how a 4 bedroom house like this obtained planning permission given that it has no off road parking. Therefore the owners, who appear to have 3 cars, park int he road right next to the bus stop and within 10m of the junction. I have seen countless near misses her ein the last year as people cannot maneuvre safely near the junction. The buses even have to stop in the road to drop off passengers....how is this allowed to happen? We need to ensure this doesnt happen in future and is also resolved to a safer standard.	
Policy 9	Agree	Generally agree although would like to see exclusion of any ptoential for edge-of-village superstore developments which would promote large scale development. Also, shops should be 'small scale' and promote local businesses as opposed to the large corporations such as Tesco etc.	
Policy 10	Agree		0
SVI 1	Agree		0
SVI 2	Agree		0
SVI 3	Agree		0
SVI 4	Agree		0
SVI 5	Agree		0
SVI 6	Agree		0
SVI 7	Agree		0
SVI 8	Agree		0
SVI 9	Agree		0
SVI 10	Agree		0
SVI 11	Agree		0
SVI 12	Agree		0
SVI 13	Agree		0
SVI 14	Agree		0
SVI 15	Agree		0
SVI 16	Agree		0

Additional Comments		<p>The LMNP is a very good document, professionally prepared and a good basis for ongoing consultation.</p> <p>However, I believe village residents need to know more about the current status of the 5 proposed development areas in Appendix B....what is the feedback from PDC's consultation in Jan/Feb 2015, what is likelihood of any or all of these areas being developed and when? It would be useful to have feedback on current status as these development areas are no doubt one of the main reasons we now have the LMNP.</p>
---------------------	--	---

ID		0
Name	Brendan Mullany	
Address	Higher Loop Farmhouse, Loop Farm Rd	
Post Code	BH16 6BU	

Policy 1	0	0
Policy 2	0	0
Policy 3	0	0
Policy 4	0	0
Policy 6	0	0
Policy 7	0	0
Policy 5	0	0
Policy 8	0	0
Policy 9	0	0
Policy 10	0	0
SVI 1	0	0
SVI 2	0	0
SVI 3	0	0
SVI 4	0	0
SVI 5	0	0
SVI 6	0	0
SVI 7	0	0
SVI 8	0	0
SVI 9	0	0
SVI 10	0	0
SVI 11	0	0
SVI 12	0	0
SVI 13	0	0
SVI 14	0	0
SVI 15	0	0
SVI 16	0	0
Additional Comments		0

ID		P
Name	John WAITE	
Address	38 old pound close	
Post Code	bh166bw	

Policy 1	Agree	Strategically essential	
Policy 2	Agree		0
Policy 3	Agree		0
Policy 4	Disagree	All land capable of contributing to food security should be protected. Existing green belt must not be given up unless and until all brownfield and small infill sites have been used. As an alternative then perhaps unproductive and visually unattractive landscapes I.e abutting the A35, with appropriate infrastructure already close by could be considered for medium sized development with no or minimal threat to DORSET villages	
Policy 6	Agree		0
Policy 7	No Comment		0
Policy 5	Agree		0
Policy 8	Agree		0
Policy 9	Agree		0
Policy 10	No Comment		0
SVI 1	Agree	Very progressive approach that I think would have very wide support	
SVI 2	Agree		0
SVI 3	Agree		0
SVI 4	Agree		0
SVI 5	Agree		0
SVI 6	Disagree	Strategic gap must be maintained and there must be no incursion into and onto the outstanding landscapes that surround our village	
SVI 7	No Comment		0
SVI 8	No Comment		0
SVI 9	Agree		0
SVI 10	Agree		0
SVI 11	Agree		0
SVI 12	Agree		0
SVI 13	Agree		0
SVI 14	Agree		0
SVI 15	Agree		0
SVI 16	Agree	Superb vision and to be fully supported	
Additional Comments			0



Marine
Management
Organisation

Lancaster House
Hampshire Court
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE4 7YH

T +44 (0)300 123 1032
F +44 (0)191 376 2605
www.gov.uk/mmo

By email: alfbush@lmpn.org.uk

Our reference: 1135

25 June 2015

Dear Alf,

Re: Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you for inviting the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to comment on the above consultation. I can confirm that the MMO has no comments to submit in relation to this consultation as it is not within our remit.

If you have any questions or need any further information please just let me know. More information on the role of the MMO can be found on our website www.gov.uk/mmo

Yours sincerely,

Susan Davidson
Communications Assistant

Email: stakeholder@marinemanagement.org.uk



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

David Bevan

From: Alf Bush <alfbush@lmpn.org.uk>
Sent: 18 November 2015 08:58
To: David Bevan
Subject: Fwd: RE: LYCHETT MATRAVERS DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Stuart, David" <David.Stuart@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
> To: Alf Bush <alfbush@lmpn.org.uk>
> Cc: dbevan <dbevan@hlfplanning.co.uk>, alfbush <alfbush@hotmail.co.uk>
> Date: 14 October 2015 at 10:37
> Subject: RE: LYCHETT MATRAVERS DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
>
> Dear Mr Bush
>
> Thank you for getting back to me.
>
> You are right that high level policy is set at Local Plan level and
> that neighbourhood plans can add detail to those if they wish but not
> contradict them. Nor is there much value in duplicating them.
>
> The issue I raised about the area's historic environment is based on
> whether the community wishes to finesse the application of high level
> strategic policy by identifying specific local issues which the plan
> might wish to address through its own policies. This could mean using
> an understanding of what is significant about the area to inform
> development criteria or those sites, such as undesignated buildings or open spaces, which it wishes to preserve.
>
> Our role is not to impose upon the plan process as a locally
> democratic activity; merely to identify where opportunities for added
> value might exist in case these had not already been thought of and so
> the community can decide for itself whether it wishes to embrace them
> in any way. How you do that is up to you but obviously Purbeck
> District Council is there to advise and ensure that policies comply with best drafting practice.
>
> If you have no additional concerns or objectives for your historic
> environment then, as you say, high level policies provide generic protection.
>
> I will ask colleagues to email you the schedule of designated heritage
> assets in your area. I should add that this information is available
> through your Historic Environment Record or local authority as
> outlined in my original letter.
>
> Kind regards
>
> David
>
> David Stuart | Historic Places Adviser South West Direct Line: 0117

> 975 0680 | Mobile: 0797 924 0316

>

> Historic England | 29 Queen Square | Bristol | BS1 4ND

>

> We have launched four new, paid-for Enhanced Advisory Services,
> providing enhancements to our existing free planning and listing
> services. For more information on the new Enhanced Advisory Services
> as well as our free services go to our website:
> HistoricEngland.org.uk/EAS

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Alf Bush [mailto:alfbush@lmnp.org.uk]

> Sent: 14 October 2015 08:43

> To: Stuart, David

> Cc: dbevan; alfbush

> Subject: Re: LYCHETT MATRAVERS DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

>

> Dear Mr. Stuart

>

> First, many apologies for this late reply.

>

> My understanding of the NP process is that it seeks to build parish
> wishes on top of existing PDC policies. We know that an NP cannot be
> in contradiction with any local plan or policy. So for example, the
> LMNP does not include a policy on Social Housing or Building
> Standards. For both these issues PDC advised that unless we wanted to
> go above and beyond their current policies, there was no benefit to
> just repeating the same policy. Since our NP is subordinate to their
> plan and policies, all of their policies will continue to apply.

>

> I assume that the current PDC and other 'higher' policies related to
> the protection of historic buildings would similarly continue to
> apply. As a parish council we would certainly support protection of
> such buildings, but we do not have any additional requirements to supplement existing policies.

>

> I will check with PDC to verify if this the right approach. We could
> add a paragraph similar to D2 and D3 to state that.

>

> Would that be satisfactory or do you have suggestions as to where the
> parish council could be more specific?

>

> You mention the list of 25 sites that are on your records. Would it be
> possible to have a copy of that list for reference?

>

> Regards, Alf Bush

>

>> On 05 August 2015 at 15:21 "Stuart, David"

>> <David.Stuart@HistoricEngland.org.uk> wrote:

>>

>>

>> From: Stuart, David

>> Sent: 05 August 2015 15:19

>> To: 'alfbush@imnp.org.uk'

>> Subject: LYCHETT MATRAVERS DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

>>

>> Dear Mr Bush

>>
>> Thank you for your consultation on the Lychett Matravers Draft
>> Neighbourhood Plan.
>>
>> We note the Plan does not have any policies allocating sites for
>> development and restricts its proposals to setting out objectives
>> and the criteria for their realisation.
>>
>> We are pleased to see that a key objective of the Plan is to
>> maintain the distinct village atmosphere (P17) and this is
>> reinforced through the provision of Policy 3 which, inter alia,
>> requires development proposals to preserve or enhance the appearance
>> of the village. (We were not sure what the reference to design
>> principles in section 4.1 might be alluding to).
>>
>> At the same time we are perhaps surprised that the Plan does not
>> promote any specific policies for the protection and enhancement of
>> its distinctive historic built environment, to complement Policies 1
>> & 5 for example.
>>
>> Appendix G - Sustainability Check List (P58) suggests that there
>> are no relevant heritage considerations when assessing Objective 1.
>> "To maintain or enhance features of historic and cultural
>> importance" but our records indicate that the Plan area has 1 Grade
>> I, 1 Grade II* and
>> 21 Grade II Listed Buildings, 3 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 1
>> Grade II* Registered Park and Garden. There may also be locally
>> valued but undesignated historic buildings or structures which the
>> community wishes to highlight and protect and include as an
>> expanded, or addition to, Appendix E.
>>
>> We wrote to Purbeck District Council at the time of the designation
>> of the Neighbourhood Development Area to highlight how an area's
>> heritage can add value to a community's aspirations. We asked that
>> this advice be shared with your community but I am attaching it again for information.
>>
>> It is of course for the community to determine for itself the extent
>> to which it wishes specifically to formulate policies for the
>> protection and enhancement of its distinctive local environment.
>> But given how important this aspect of the area is stated as being
>> to the future of the village we wonder whether there is benefit in
>> giving further thought to the matter.
>>
>> We would encourage liaison with the historic environment service at
>> Purbeck District Council or archaeological service at Dorset County
>> Council if this has not already taken place.
>>
>> Kind regards
>>
>> David Stuart
>>
>> David Stuart | Historic Places Adviser South West Direct Line: 0117
>> 975 0680 | Mobile: 0797 924 0316
>>
>> Historic England | 29 Queen Square | Bristol | BS1 4ND
>>

>> We are the public body that looks after England's historic
>> environment. We champion historic places, helping people to
>> understand, value and care for them, now and for the future.
>> Sign up to our enewsletter to keep up to date with our latest news,
>> advice and listings.

>>
>> HistoricEngland.org.uk Twitter: @HistoricEngland

>>
>> This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain
>> personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless
>> specifically stated.

>> If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system
>> and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the
>> information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information
>> sent to Historic England may become publicly available.

> We are the public body that looks after England's historic
> environment. We champion historic places, helping people to
> understand, value and care for them, now and for the future.
> Sign up to our enewsletter to keep up to date with our latest news,
> advice and listings.

>
> HistoricEngland.org.uk Twitter: @HistoricEngland

>
> This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain
> personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated.

> If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system
> and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the
> information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent
> to Historic England may become publicly available.



Gladman House, Alexandria Way
Congleton Business Park
Congleton, Cheshire
CW12 1LB

T: 01260 288800

F: 01260 288801

www.gladman.co.uk

17th July 2015

Re: Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan: Pre-submission Consultation

(Representations submitted via email to consult@lmnp.org.uk)

Introduction

Gladman Developments Ltd (Gladman) specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development and associated community infrastructure. From this experience, we understand the need for planning to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made to delivering the housing and economic needs of an area, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth.

This letter provides Gladmans' representations in response to the draft version of the Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan (LMNP) under regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Through these representations, Gladman provide an analysis of the suite of policies proposed by the Plan highlighting areas where the document currently lacks clarity or there is insufficient justifications for the policies it seeks to adopt. Certainly, we consider a number of policies need to be amended so that they can be found consistent with national planning policy, guidance and the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions.

Importantly we consider that it would be more appropriate if further work on the LMNP is delayed until the review of the Purbeck Local Plan has reached a more advanced stage, and for that document to be submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination and successfully tested by the Inspector. Only once the Local Plan Review has been adopted by the Council should the LMNP proceed.

National Planning Policy and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans and the role these should take in setting out policies for the local area. The guidance set out in the Framework has now been supplemented by the recently published Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Neighbourhood Plans.

Paragraph 16 of the Framework sets out the positive role that Neighbourhood Plans should play in meeting the development needs of the local area. Its states that:

"The application of the Presumption (In Favour of Sustainable Development, set out in paragraph 14 of Framework) will have implications for how communities engage in neighbourhood planning. Critically it will mean that neighbourhoods should:

- *Develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development;*
- *Plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside of the strategic elements of the Local Plan"*

Further guidance on the relationship between Neighbourhood Plans and strategic policies for the wider area set out in a Council's Local Plan is included in paragraph 184 of the Framework:

"The ambition of the neighbourhood should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area. Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. To facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area and ensure that an up-to-date plan is in place as quickly as possible. Neighbourhood Plans should reflect these policies and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them. Neighbourhood Plans...should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies".

Before a Neighbourhood Plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and further detailed in paragraph 065 of the Neighbourhood Plan PPG. These Basic Conditions are:

- a) *Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan*
- b) *Having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, it is appropriate to make the order*
- c) *Having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area, it is appropriate to make the order*
- d) *The making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development*
- e) *The making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained within the development plan for the area of the authority*
- f) *The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations*
- g) *Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood plan*

If a Neighbourhood Plan is not developed in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions then there is a real risk that the Plan will fail when it reaches Independent Examination.

Relationship with Local Plans

To meet the requirements of the Framework and the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, Neighbourhood Plans should be prepared to conform to up-to-date strategic policy requirements set out in Local Plans. Where an up-to-date Local Plan has been adopted and is in place for the wider authority area, it is the strategic policy requirements set out in this document that a Neighbourhood Plan should seek to support and meet. When a Local Plan is emerging or is yet to be found sound at Examination, there will be lack of certainty over what scale of development a community must accommodate or the direction the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan should take.

The Council adopted the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1 (PLP1) in November 2012 which covers the period up to 2027. The PLP1 is required to deliver approximately 2,520 dwellings over the plan period. As the Parish Council will be aware, an early review of the Plan is required in order for the Council to identify their Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for housing. Lytchett Matravers was identified in the Inspector's report as a settlement which is capable of accommodating future sustainable growth. The amount of will be determined through the review and the Council's green belt assessment.

The Council are currently undertaking a partial review of the PLP1 and have undertaken an issues and options consultation in March 2015. The Framework requires local planning authorities to deliver their full OAN for market and affordable housing, Gladman note that GL Hearn published the Interim Findings of the Eastern Dorset SHMA, however these will need to be updated to take account of the 2012-based Household Projections published on 27th February 2015.

Given that the Council has yet to identify its full OAN for housing, Gladman question the ability of the Parish Council to produce a Neighbourhood Plan at this time. We recommend that the Parish Council should delay the progression of the Neighbourhood Plan at this time until there is greater certainty over the level of development Lytchett Matravers will be required to accommodate.

Although the Neighbourhood Plan PPG indicates that Neighbourhood Plans can be advanced before an up-to-date Local Plan is in place, Gladman would strongly question the ability to progress the Neighbourhood Plan on this basis. If a Neighbourhood Plan is progressed prior to an up-to-date Local Plan being prepared, or the strategic policies and development requirements set out in an emerging Local Plan change, then work on the Neighbourhood Plan is likely to be abortive representing both a waste of Parish Council and local planning authorities' time and resources. A Neighbourhood Plan cannot be consistent with the requirements of the Framework or meet the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions if it is progressed on a development plan that is out-of-date.

Neighbourhood Plan Policies

The LMNP does not allocate sites for residential development due to Green Belt surrounding Lytchett Matravers, this will be dealt with by the review of the PLP1. Instead, the LMNP is reliant on a suite of development management policies that will guide development over the plan period. However, we submit that a number of these policies may act to unnecessarily restrict growth and may affect the ability of future sustainable growth opportunities being delivered viably.

The development management policies contained within the LMNP seek to establish a series of design requirements. Whilst recognising the contribution that high quality design can have in providing sustainable development, these policies should not be overly prescriptive in detail and should not place a constraint on sustainable development being delivered viably.

Gladman's specific comments to the development management policies as proposed is as follows:

Policy 3

This policy states that new development proposals will be expected to clearly identify the materials that will be used in the construction process, preserve or enhance the appearance of the village and adhere to the design principles set out in section 4.1 of the LMNP.

The LMNP needs to apply greater flexibility through its design policies, this policy and alternative policies contained throughout the LMNP, are to prescriptive in detail and inconsistent with the requirements of national planning policy. Any design policies contained in the LMNP should avoid any unnecessary prescription or detail and should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes that they should stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles.

The design policies contained in the LMNP should be made in strict accordance to paragraphs 59 and 60 of the Framework. Failure to do so may result in the LMNP placing undue policy burdens that may affect the viability and deliverability of future sustainable growth opportunities coming forward. Gladman note paragraph 173 of the Framework which states, *'the sites and scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.'*

In light of the above we consider it appropriate that the design policies contained throughout the LMNP be reviewed to ensure they are compliant with the requirements of national planning policy and guidance. Failure to do so will result in the LMNP being found inconsistent with Basic Conditions (a) and (d).

Policy 4

This policy states that the creation of new internal roads should seek to introduce home zones, with shared spaces and strict speed limits. Gladman consider that the application of this policy is better dealt with by the local planning authority based on national standards.

We recommend policy 4 be deleted from the LMNP.

Policy 5

This policy states that development which provides open spaces and green assets will be encouraged. Important hedgerows and trees are to be protected and wherever possible enhanced.

Gladman submit that future development proposals can often be successfully integrated into existing natural assets through the use of high quality design. However, in some instances the loss of these assets may be required i.e. for access. It should be remembered that new development will often compensate for any losses caused by development and in some instances the removal of some biodiversity features as part of the development of a wider scheme will likely result in greater improvements to green infrastructure overall.

As proposed, this policy is unduly restrictive and does not identify any hedgerows and trees which are considered to be important. It would be useful if these assets were identified on a proposals map so to provide a clear indication of the location of these important assets to ensure that the decision maker can make a properly informed decision.

Strategic Village Improvements

SVI 7

This policy states that the Parish Council will seek to preserve the character of the village as a hilltop settlement and its wide landscape context. This policy goes over and above the requirements of Neighbourhood Planning and is a matter more suited to be dealt with by the local planning authority based on up-to-date and robust evidence.

We therefore recommend that SVI 7 be deleted from the LMNP.

SVI 8

This policy states that the Parish Council will resist additional housing development over that already identified and accepted in the absence of significant improvements to village infrastructure and amenities or the site is outside a 800m walking distance of the village centre.

Gladman contend that this policy is too restrictive and inconsistent with the positive approach of the Framework, specifically the need to boost significantly the supply of housing. At present, the Council do not have a full understanding of what their OAN for housing is, the level of housing that Lytchett Matravers will be required to accommodate will be dealt with through the review of the Local Plan. If this policy is progressed it would therefore pre-empt the strategic priorities for the wider area and is therefore inconsistent with basic conditions (a), (d) and (e).

Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal

The adequacy of a Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal (SEA/SA) goes to the core compliance of basic condition (f) which requires strict adherence to the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive and implementing UK Regulations.

Gladman note that no scoping opinion is available at this time, the absence of this information significantly comprises this recent consultation and may jeopardise the Plan's legal compliance.

Gladman question why the Parish Council would progress its Neighbourhood Plan without first identifying whether the LMNP is required to undertake an SA/SEA.

Legislation from the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programs Regulations 2004 makes clear at paragraph 12 (2) "The report shall identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of – (a) Implementing the plan or programme; and (b) reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme (our emphasis)."

We submit that the LMNP should be tested with significant SEA level scrutiny.

Conclusion

Gladman recognise the role of Neighbourhood Plan's as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community, however it is clear from national guidance that Neighbourhood Plan's must be consistent with national planning policy and the up-to-date strategic requirements of the wider local authority area. If a Neighbourhood Plan does not meet all of the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions then there is a real risk that the Plan will fail at Independent Examination.

Through these representations, Gladman has highlighted a number of concerns with the LMNP as proposed. In a number of instances the LMNP lacks clarity and requires further justification to the policies it proposes. We are concerned that the progression of the Neighbourhood Plan at this time will effectively pre-empt the strategic priorities for the wider local authority area and therefore cannot be seen to be in conformity with basic conditions (a) and (e).

A number of policies seek to establish prescriptive design requirements which might hinder the Plan's ability to deliver future sustainable development, and is therefore contrary to basic condition (d).

The adequacy of an SEA/SA goes to the core compliance of basic condition (f). To progress with a Neighbourhood Plan under regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 without first undertaking a scoping report to identify whether the LMNP should be subjected to an SEA/SA gives rise to fundamental legal issues and is therefore contrary to basic condition (f).

Gladman submit that there is critical need review to the suite of policies contained in the LMNP, if the Neighbourhood Plan is progressed to examination in its current form it may be found unable to meet Basic Conditions (a), (d), (e) and (f). We recommend that further work on the LMNP be postponed until there is greater certainty over the strategic policy requirements for the wider area.

I hope you have found these representations constructive.

Yours Faithfully

John Fleming

Gladman Developments Ltd

David Bevan

From: alf bush <alfbush@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: 18 November 2015 11:39
To: David Bevan
Subject: FW: Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

> Date: Wed, 18 Nov 2015 09:02:10 +0000
> From: info@lmnp.org.uk
> To: alfbush@hotmail.co.uk
> Subject: Fwd: Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan

>
>
>
>> ----- Original Message -----
>> From: Zoe Hughes <Zoe.Hughes@sportengland.org>
>> To: "'info@lmnp.org.uk'" <info@lmnp.org.uk>
>> Date: 26 June 2015 at 09:09
>> Subject: Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan
>>
>> Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan
>>
>>
>> Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above Neighbourhood Plan.
>>
>> Planning Policy in the National Planning Policy Framework identifies how the
>> planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction
>> and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become
>> more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and
>> formal sport plays an important part in this process and providing enough
>> sports facilities of the right quality and type and in the right places is
>> vital to achieving this aim. This means positive planning for sport,
>> protection from unnecessary loss of sports facilities and an integrated
>> approach to providing new housing and employment land and community facilities
>> provision is important.
>>
>> It is important therefore that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects national policy
>> for sport as set out in the above document with particular reference to Pars
>> 73 and 74 to ensure proposals comply with National Planning Policy. It is also
>> important to be aware of Sport England's role in protecting playing fields and
>> the presumption against the loss of playing fields (see link below), as set
>> out in our national guide, 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of
>> England - Planning Policy Statement'.
>> <http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/>

>>
>> Sport England provides guidance on developing policy for sport and further
>> information can be found following the link below:
>> <http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/>
>>
>> Sport England works with Local Authorities to ensure Local Plan policy is
>> underpinned by robust and up to date assessments and strategies for indoor and
>> outdoor sports delivery. If local authorities have prepared a Playing Pitch
>> Strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports strategy it will be important that the
>> Neighbourhood Plan reflects the recommendations set out in that document and
>> that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure
>> Levy, are utilised to support the delivery of those recommendations.
>> <http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/>
>>
>> If new sports facilities are being proposed Sport England recommend you ensure
>> such facilities are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design
>> guidance notes.
>> <http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/>
>>
>> If you need any further advice please do not hesitate to contact Sport England
>> using the contact details below
>>
>> gary.parsons@sportengland.org<<mailto:gary.parsons@sportengland.org>>
>>
>>
>>
>> Kind Regards
>>
>> Zoe
>>
>>
>>
>> Zoe Hughes
>> Senior Planning Administrator
>> T: 02072731761
>> M: 07919994793
>> F: 01509 233 192
>> E: Zoe.Hughes@sportengland.org
>> [Sport England]<<http://www.sportengland.org/>>
>> Creating a sporting habit for life
>> [This girl can]<<http://www.thisgirlcan.co.uk/>>
>>
>>
>>
>> Sport Park, 3 Oakwood Drive, Loughborough, Leicester, LE11 3QF
>>
>> The information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure
>> under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Additionally, this email and any
>> attachment are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual
>> to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised
>> that you have received this email and any attachment in error, and that any

> > use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying, is strictly prohibited.
> > -----
> > This email has been scanned for email related threats and delivered safely by
> > Mimecast.
> > For more information please visit <http://www.mimecast.com>
> > -----



TERENCE
O'ROURKE

Sent by email to:

consult@lmnp.org.uk

17 July 2015

Our Reference: 151047

Dear Sir / Madam

**Lytchett Matravers Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan
Response of behalf of Bloor Homes**

Bloor Homes is supportive of a neighbourhood planning process that provides a positive vision for the future.

It has a strategic interest in land adjoining Lytchett Minster, including land that lies within the parish of Lytchett Matravers and is covered by the boundaries of the emerging neighbourhood plan.

Attached to this letter are representations to the emerging plan.

I confirm that Bloor Homes is keen to remain engaged in the neighbourhood plan making process and would welcome further updates on next steps.

Please do contact me if you require any further clarification on the attached.

Kind regards

Yours faithfully

Andrew Elliott
Technical Director

cc Ron Hatchett Bloor Homes

LONDON
Linen Hall
162-168 Regent St
London
W1B 5TE

BOURNEMOUTH
Everdene House
Deansleigh Road
Bournemouth
BH7 7DU

TELEPHONE
020 3664 6755

www.torltd.co.uk



Lytchett Matravers Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Response of behalf of Bloor Homes

Bloor Homes is supportive of a neighbourhood planning process for the parish of Lytchett Matravers that provides a positive vision for the future.

Bloor Homes has a strategic interest in land adjoining Lytchett Minster, including land that lies within the parish of Lytchett Matravers and is therefore covered by the boundaries of the emerging neighbourhood plan.

Policy SVI 6 on page 32

Policy SVI 6 proposes “to resist development on green belt land”. This is a somewhat sweeping statement and is contrary both to the national planning policy framework and the adopted Purbeck local plan part one which would otherwise allow some specific forms of development in green belt, for example playing fields, outdoor recreation, or minor extensions or alterations to existing buildings. It is noted that the planning definition of ‘development’ is wider than the construction of new buildings.

In addition to addressing the above point it is further recommended that SVI 6 makes clear the relationship of the neighbourhood plan to the local plan partial review process, in particular that the partial review preparation process has not concluded, and that the national planning policy framework confirms at paragraph 84 that green belt boundaries can only be altered, if required, through the local plan preparation and review process.

Policy SVI 7 on page 32

Policy SVI 7, and the diagram on page 34, refer to preserving the distinct character of the village and protecting an arc of countryside to the south by seeking to have it designated “for its particular landscape quality”.

Purbeck Townscape Character Appraisal work undertaken in September 2012 reports that:

“Lytchett Matravers is situated on a broad ridge of relatively high ground...the character of the village, and particularly its boundaries, is...greatly influenced by its landscape setting. Most notably, the broad, elevated ridge on which the village is situated allows many views and glimpses south towards Poole Harbour.”

It further states at 2.2.5:

“in contrast to the general containment of the village to north, west and east, the land to the south of the village is markedly different in character. Not only is the topography more uniform, but beyond the southernmost extent of the village the pattern of small irregular and organic field boundaries suddenly gives way to an



area of large rectangular arable fields... This change in landscape character has the effect not only of opening up views from the southern part of the village, but of allowing views back towards the village from the south including Wareham Road, Foxhills Road and the A35 that is more than 1km distant. Development near the southern edge of the village is therefore quite widely visible, as are its lights at night."

In view of the above it is queried whether it is the landscape to the south of the village that is of special merit, or rather that there are longer distance views into and out of this area, the top of the green slopes provide an obvious edge to the settlement, and that any further development in this location could be particularly intrusive from a landscape perspective.

Bloor Homes supports the principle of preserving the distinct character of the settlement but would suggest that the focus of policy should be on limiting the further southern extension of the settlement due to the sensitivity of this area in wider views, rather than the protection of broad swathes of farmland across the southern undeveloped parts of the parish without any rationale relating to the relative landscape sensitivity of specific fields/landscape parcels.

It may be more appropriate, for example, for the policy to be re-worded to clarify that any further expansion to the southern edge of the village would normally be resisted, subject to further landscape and sustainability analysis.

Policy SVI 14 on page 37

Policy SVI 14 proposes a safe walking and cycling route to Lytchett Minster school, with extended routes to Poole and Wareham.

Bloor Homes is supportive of this route in principle, which may primarily involve improvements along Huntick Road.

It is recommended that further work is undertaken with the county highways authority to define a preferred route for this link within the plan area, including confirmation that land in the public highway and along public rights of way is available to deliver the proposed improvement.

Policy SVI 15 on page 38

Bloor Homes welcomes proposals to improve access to countryside.

However it is important to manage potential conflicts between public access and farming activities and it is recommended that closer engagement with local farming interests takes place prior to finalising policy.

Bloor Homes is currently exploring the potential to improve public access to land through the introduction of a strategic 'SANG' or country park in the Lytchett Minster area. This is intended to offer recreational benefit to residents in Lytchett Minster, Lytchett Matravers and further afield, as part of wider strategic approach to change in the locality.

Direct Dial: 01929 557384**Email:** dianebermand@purbeck-dc.gov.uk**Date:** 17 July 2015

The Chairman
Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
Council Office
Vineyard Close
Lytchett Matravers
BH16 6DD

Dear Chairman

Response to the Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan pre-submission consultation 8 June – 19 July 2015.

Purbeck District Council welcomes the opportunity to make representations on the draft Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan. The Council is fully supportive of the concept of Localism and Neighbourhood Planning and has welcomed the opportunity to engage closely with Lytchett Matravers Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group during the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Council has no significant issues or concerns with the Development Management Policies in the Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan. However, two minor points have been raised by Council Officers that the Parish Council may wish to address. These are set out below.

Lytchett Matravers has an allocation of 50 dwellings in the Purbeck Local Plan: Part 1 (PLP1). However, as Lytchett Matravers is surrounded by Green Belt the Neighbourhood Plan is unable to allocate land as extension sites. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the possibility of additional growth in Lytchett Matravers following the adoption of the Partial Review of the PLP1.

Section 1.D.2. Page 8. Use of the term social housing

There is sometimes confusion over the terms social and/or affordable housing but in planning 'Affordable Housing' has a very specific meaning. You may wish to consider changing the term 'social housing' to 'affordable housing' and possibly include an explanation of the term in a footnote or in the glossary.

Section 3.I. Page 25 Development Principles

The Neighbourhood Plan states it, '....will support minor developments that conform to the guidelines specified in Building for Life (BfL) 12'. As BfL12 is based on a traffic light system, the Neighbourhood Plan may wish to set criteria for new development to meet.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Diane Bemand'.

Diane Bemand Senior
Neighbourhood Planner

FAO: Cllr Alf Bush
Lychett Maltravers Neighbourhood
Plan Group

Our ref: WX/2006/000006/OR-
02/PO1-L01

Your ref:

Date: 17 July 2015

Dear Mr Bush

Lychett Maltravers Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above mentioned document. We have no objection to your plan and policies and have the following advice.

Flood Risk and Drainage

The local neighbourhood plan should consider whether there is any desire for growth in areas known to be at risk of fluvial, surface water, or groundwater flooding. If there is development proposed in any area of risk then the Sequential Test / Approach need to be considered, and only water compatible uses considered in the flood risk areas. This is in accordance with [National Planning Policy Framework and its associated Practice Guidance](#).

You can find a copy of our Flood Maps and other environmental information on our [‘What’s in Your Backyard’](#) website

Please note that whilst a development site may not be within a mapped Flood Zone or Surface Water Flooding it may still be at risk from other sources of flooding e.g. groundwater and overland run-off. Therefore, the plan should acknowledge and consider any known surface water problems and allow for this within any proposed development strategy. Please note that since the 15 April 2015 matters relating to surface water are now dealt with by the Lead Local Flood Authority. This is Dorset County Council, so please consult with them if any issues arise on this aspect.

Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible with sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). This reduces flood risk through the use of soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, grassed swales, ponds etc. SuDS can also increase groundwater recharge, improve water quality and provide amenity opportunities. A SuDS approach is encouraged by the Building Regulations.

We support the planting of trees within catchments, especially headwaters, to reduce surface water runoff too. Therefore, opportunities for increasing the amount of tree planting, in appropriate locations, is considered beneficial.

There should also be consideration about the foul drainage network in the area to understand if there may be existing capacity constraints on the system. This can be done by contacting the sewerage undertaker for the area.

Biodiversity / Green Space

We note that the Neighbourhood plan acknowledges the need for green spaces to be preserved and enhanced to improve the rich biodiversity of the area. We would highlight the important especially for any area that includes wetlands or water bodies (e.g. rivers, streams, ditches) as these provide ecological interest and diversity. We would promote opportunities to enhance any wetland feature should they be identified and delivered through development, as this approach is promoted in the National Planning Policy Framework and is desired outcome of the Water Framework Directive.

We would recommend that Natural England are consulted if any proposed developments may impact on any conservation designations and / or [protected species](#).

Please contact me if you have any queries.

Yours faithfully

MR MICHAEL HOLM

Planning Advisor - Sustainable Places

Direct dial 01258 483380

Direct e-mail michael.holm@environment-agency.gov.uk



Health and Safety Executive

Lytchett Matravers Parish Council
Council Office
Vineyard Close
Lytchett Matravers
Dorset
BH16 6DD

Email info@lmp.org.uk

Date 29 June 2015

Hazardous Installations Directorate

John Moran

CEMHD5
2.2 Redgrave Court
Merton Road
BOOTLE L20 7HS

Tel: 01519514551

LOCAL.PLANS.CEMHD.5@hse.gsi.gov.uk

<http://www.hse.gov.uk/>

Howard Harte – Head of Unit

Dear Sir/Madam

CONSULTATION ON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS – REPRESENTATIONS BY HSE

LYTCHETT MATRAVERS NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION

Thank you for your request to provide a representation on the ***Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan*** consultation document. When consulted on land-use planning matters, the HSE where possible will make representations to ensure that compatible development within the consultation zones of major hazard installations and major accident hazard pipelines (MAHPs) is achieved. HSE acknowledges that early consultation can be an effective way of alleviating problems due to incompatible development at the later stages of the planning process.

HSE gives advice on neighbourhood plans with reference to the condition that neighbourhood plans or Orders must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan, and that neighbourhood plans or Orders must be compatible with European Union obligations, as incorporated into UK law, in order to be legally compliant (Planning Practice Guidance – Neighbourhood Planning – Para 065). Our advice therefore is given with consideration to the following.

1. Paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that planning policies should be based on up to date information on the location of major accident hazards and on the mitigation of the consequences of major accidents.
2. Regulation 10(b) of the town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England)Regulations 2012 requires that in local plans and supplementary planning documents, regard be had for the objectives of preventing major accidents and limiting the consequences of such accidents by pursuing those objectives through

the controls described in Article 12 of Council Directive 96/82/EC(Seveso II)¹. Regulation 10(c)(i) requires that regard also be had to the need in the long term, to maintain appropriate distances between installations and residential areas, buildings and areas of public use, major transport routes as far as possible and recreational areas.

Scope of Advice

At this early stage HSE can give a general opinion regarding development compatibility based only on the outline information contained in the plan. This opinion takes no account of any intention to modify, relinquish or revoke hazardous substances consents². Planning authorities are advised to use HSE's Planning Advice for Developments near Hazardous Installations Information Package (PADHI+) to verify any advice given. Further information on PADHI+ is available on the HSE website:

<http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/padhi.htm>

PADHI+ cannot be used for developments around nuclear sites, explosive sites or quarries. In these cases you must consult the appropriate HSE directorate for advice. Guidance on consulting the HSE about developments that could encroach on specialist major hazard sites is also available on the website:

<http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/padhi/faqs.htm#hazardous-substances-consent>.

Encroachment of Plan Boundaries and Consultation Zones

The following consultation zones are within the proposed neighbourhood plan boundary.

The neighbourhood plan boundary encroaches upon the inner, middle and outer consultation zones associated with a MAHP operated by Southern Gas Networks:

*HSE Reference Number: 8064
Transco Index Number: 2323
Pipeline name: East Morden/Fleets Bridge (PO29)*

*HSE Reference Number: 8082
Transco Index Number: 2341
Pipeline name: Wytch Farm/Sopley (PO58)*

Compatibility of Development with Consultation Zones

The compatibility issues raised by developing housing and workplaces within the inner middle and outer zones are summarised below.

Housing Allocations

Inner Zone – Housing is not compatible with development in the inner zone. PADHI+ would normally give an Advise Against decision for such development. The only exception is developments of 1 or 2 dwelling units where there is a minimal increase in people at risk.

Middle Zone – The middle zone is compatible with housing developments up to and including 30 dwelling units *and* at a density of no more than 40 per hectare.

Outer Zone – Housing is compatible with development in the outer zone including larger developments of more than 30 dwelling units and high-density developments of more than 40 dwelling units per hectare.

Workplace Allocations

Inner Zone – Workplaces (predominantly non-retail) providing for less than 100 occupants in each building *and* less than 3 occupied storeys are compatible with the inner zone. Retail developments with less than 250 m² total floor space are compatible with the inner zone.

Note Workplaces (predominantly non-retail) providing for 100 or more occupants in any building *or* 3 or more occupied storeys in height are compatible with the inner zone where the development is at the major hazard site itself and will be under the control of the site operator.

Middle Zone – The middle zone is compatible with workplaces (predominantly non-retail). Retail developments with total floor space up to 5000 m² are compatible with the middle zone.

Outer Zone – Workplaces (predominantly non-retail) are compatible with the outer zone. Workplaces (predominantly non-retail) specifically for people with disabilities (eg sheltered workshops) are *only* compatible with the outer zone. Retail developments with more than 5000 m² total floor space are compatible with the outer zone.

This is a general description of the compatibility for housing and workplaces. Detail of other development types for example institutional accommodation and education and their compatibility with consultation zones can be found in the section on *Development Type tables* (page 9) of *PADHI – HSEs Land Use Planning Methodology*, which is available at : <http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/padhi.pdf>

Mixed use Allocations

Because of the potential complexity when combination use classes are proposed, advice regarding mixed-use allocations is outside the scope of the general advice that can be given in this representation. Please refer to PADHI+ to determine HSEs advice regarding mixed-use developments.

Verification of Advice using PADHI+

The potential for encroachment is being brought to your attention at an early stage so that you can assess the actual extent of any incompatibility on future developments. Information on the location and extent of the consultation zones associated with major hazard installations and MAHPs can be found on the HSE extranet system along with advice on HSEs land-use planning policy. Lists of all major hazard installations and MAHPs, consultation zone maps for installations, and consultation distances for MAHPs are included to aid planners. All planning authorities should have an authorised administrator who can access the HSE *Planning Advice for Developments near Hazardous Installations Information Package* (PADHI+) on the extranet, further information is available on the HSE website: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/padhi/htm>. When

sufficient information on the location and use class of sites comes available at the pre-planning stages of the neighbourhood plan, the use of PADHI+ could assist you in making informed planning decisions about development compatibility. We recommend that for speculative testing of advice that the PADHI+ training database is used. This is accessed on the land-use planning extranet services screen.

Identifying Consultation Zones in Neighbourhood Plans

The HSE recommends that where there are major hazard installations and MAHPs within the area of the neighbourhood plan, that you mark the associated consultation zones on a map. This is an effective way to identify the development proposals that could encroach on consultation zones and the extent of any encroachment that could occur. The proposal maps in site allocation development planning documents may be suitable for presenting this information. We particularly recommend marking the zones associated with any MAHPs and the HSE advises that you contact the pipeline operator for up to date information on pipeline location, as pipelines can be diverted by operators from notified routes. Most incidents involving damage to buried pipelines occur because third parties are not aware of their presence³.

Identifying Compatible Development in Neighbourhood Plans

The guidance in *PADHI – HSEs Land Use Planning Methodology* available at <http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/padhi.pdf> will allow you to identify compatible development within any consultation zone in the area of the neighbourhood plan. The HSE recommends that you include in the plan an analysis of compatible development type within the consultation zones of major hazard installations and MAHPs based on the general advice contained in the PADHI guidance. The sections on *Development Type Tables* (page 9) and the *Decision Matrix* (page 17) are particularly relevant and contain sufficient information to provide a general assessment of compatible development by class within the zones.

There are a number of factors that can alter a PADHI+ decision, for example where a development straddles 2 zones. These factors are outside the scope of the general advice in this letter. HSEs final advice on development compatibility can only be determined through use of PADHI+

Development Proximity Zones (DPZ)

Following the Buncefield incident in 2005, HSE reviewed the consultation distances of all sites which met the criteria for large-scale petrol storage sites, and an additional zone (DPZ) was introduced 150 metres from the boundary of the relevant storage tanks bunds. PADHI cannot be used to determine HSE's advice on developments within the DPZ and LPAs must refer any planning applications or pre-planning enquiries on developments within DPZ to HSE. Further guidance is available on the HSE website: http://www.hse.gov.uk/foi/internaops/hid_circs/technical_general/spc_tech_gen_43/index.htm

Provision of Information to Interested Parties – Pipeline Operators

The pipeline operator/s referred to will be sent a copy of this representation to make them aware of HSE's preliminary advice on this matter.

If you have any questions about the content of this letter, please contact me at the address given in the letterhead.

Yours faithfully



John Moran

HM Specialist Inspector of Health and Safety (Risk Assessment)

¹ Article 12 provides that the objectives of preventing major accidents and limiting the consequences of such accidents are taken into account in land-use policies and these objectives should be pursued through controls on the siting of new establishments, modifications to existing establishments, and new developments in the vicinity of existing establishments such as transport links, locations frequented by the public and residential areas where the siting or development is such as to increase the risk or consequences of a major accident.

² Hazardous substances consents are granted by the Hazardous Substances Authority (HSA) which is the planning authority. The consent process is regulated by the HSA under the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 1992 (as amended). The HSA must consult the HSE on consent applications. In assessing the application for consent, HSE will produce a map with risk contours (or zones), representing the risk to a hypothetical house resident. Should the HSA grant consent this map defines the consultation distance within which HSE must be consulted over any relevant future planning applications

³ The HSE does not hold detailed versions of pipeline maps. Therefore you are advised not to rely solely on the information contained in this representation as reflecting the current status of MAHPs that could affect the plan. Please refer to the sources of information eg to local authority pipeline records, as pipeline operators have a duty to supply information on pipelines including location to local authorities for emergency planning purposes. To further assist planning authorities in identifying the location and ownership of MAHPs the HSE has provided a source of pipeline information on the HSE extranet pages at: @ <http://extranet.hse.gov.uk/Land%20Use%20Planning/padhi/pipelines.htm>