

For office use only	
Batch number: _____	Received: _____
Representor ID # _____	Ack: _____
Representation # _____	

MILBORNE ST ANDREW NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2018 TO 2033 Regulation 16 Consultation 18 January to 1 March 2019

Response Form

The proposed Milborne St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan 2018 to 2033 has been submitted to North Dorset District Council for examination. The neighbourhood plan and all supporting documentation can be viewed on the District Council's website via: <https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/planning-buildings-land/planning-policy/north-dorset-planning-policy/local-planning-policy-north-dorset.aspx>

Please return completed forms to:

Email: planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk

Post: Planning Policy (North Dorset), South Walks House, South Walks Road, Dorchester, Dorset, DT1 1UZ

Deadline: 4pm on Friday 1 March 2019. Representations received after this date will not be accepted.

Part A – Personal Details

This part of the form must be completed by all people making representations as **anonymous comments cannot be accepted**. By submitting this response form you consent to your information being disclosed to third parties for this purpose, personal details will not be visible on our website, although they will be shown on paper copies that will be sent to the independent examiner and available for inspection. Your information will be retained by the Council in line with its retention schedule and privacy policy (<https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/privacypolicy>). Your data will be destroyed when the plan becomes redundant.

*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes to the personal details but complete the full contact details of the agent. All correspondence will be sent to the agent.

	Personal Details (if applicable)*	Agent's Details (if applicable)*
Title	Mrs	
First Name	Nicola	
Last Name	Pye	
Job Title (where relevant)	Homeowner/Landowner	
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address	██████████ ██████████ ██████████	
Postcode	██████████	
Tel. No.	██████████	
Email Address	██████████	

Part B – Representation

1. To which document does the comment relate? Please tick one box only.

X	Submission Plan
	Consultation Statement
	Basic Conditions Statement
	Other <i>Please specify:</i>

2. To which part of the document does the comment relate? Please identify the text that you are commenting on, where appropriate.

	Location of Text
Whole document	Yes
Section	
Policy	
Page	
Appendix	

3. Do you wish to? Please tick one box only.

	Support
X	Object
	Make an observation

4. Please use the box below to give reasons for your support/objection or make your observation.

I do not agree with the way that the plan submission deals with the site selection process. I regard it as flawed from the start and that it appears that the NPG settled on the Camelco site as their preferred site at an early stage and this has biased the consultation from that point on.

Figure 2 in 4.3 sets out the criteria for the Site Assessment Criteria. I agree with those criteria, although at the time the NPG undertook the selection process, only 5 headline criteria (in blue) were used in the assessment. Without the subsequent more detailed explanations of the criteria and splitting some of the original criteria, the assessment was much more subjective. It is misleading to suggest that the NPG itself and then the wider community assessed potential development sites on the basis of the criteria as now set out.

Using the much more limited and highly subjective assessment criteria the NPG members selected preferred sites for the initial consultation. The scoring of the sites was not given any publicity in the various consultations. Given that some sites closer to the centre of the village met many of the criteria better than the Camelco site, one has to question the objectivity of the exercise.

Of the 5 sites initially identified as preferred, one site had already been withdrawn from the SHLAA by the landowner and was clearly not developable. The NPG without any consultation with the landowners proposed that the two sites on either side of Blandford Hill should be put forward on the basis of their own idea of a strip of housing fronting onto A354. This was clearly a non-developable proposal in terms of topography, traffic issues and economic viability. The village was presented with these non-deliverable options alongside Camelco and Huntley Down. This led to an unduly biased picture.

At the consultation the displays of preferred sites were given undue prominence in the village hall with non-preferred sites being given little space and little explanation as to why they had been rejected. At the initial consultation almost no consideration was given to the need for employment

opportunities. Had this been done I am confident that the Camelco site would have been selected as a site for commercial and not residential development given its poor siting at the top of a hill, opposite an existing commercial site on a potentially contaminated site on the wrong side of a natural settlement boundary on the road at Lane End.

The next consultation event that has given rise to the biased result was the invitation to owners of the preferred sites to present their plans for development to a village audience. It was clear that the sites were at different stages in the development of their plans, from a detailed plan for Huntley down, to a conceptual design for both Camelco and the North side of the A354, to a purely conceptual plan for the Homefield site. It is unreasonable to present this as leading to a preference for the Camelco site, when much of the feedback from the consultation asked for further information from various sites before a decision could be made. The NPG has failed to address this.

The Plan fails to set a settlement boundary. It is not acceptable to avoid this clear requirement of a Neighbourhood Plan. Have the NPG taken this route as they are aware that many villagers would prefer Lane End to be settlement boundary and that the Camelco site would thus be outside the boundary?

The Plan includes policies which are misleading. The NPG have clearly been told by every landowner that they will not consider extensions to footpaths on agricultural land and yet in 6.23- 6.25 it is suggested that these can be overcome. This is not based on anything other a reluctance to face facts by the NPG.

The Plan also includes MSA Project 1 a Community Land Trust. I consider this completely unworkable and ignores the difficulty that existing Community facilities such as the Sports Pavilion have in finding volunteers willing to devote sufficient time to managing and running these facilities.

Continue overleaf if necessary

5. Please give details of any suggested modifications in the box below.

Continue overleaf if necessary

6. Do you wish to be notified of the District Council’s decision to make or refuse to make the neighbourhood plan? Please tick one box only.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No

Signature: Nicola Pye

Date: 25.2.2019

If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.

Please use this box to continue your responses to Questions 4 & 5 if necessary