



**Intelligent Plans**  
and examinations

# **Report on Upper Marshwood Vale Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2033**

**An Examination undertaken for Dorset Council with the support of the  
Upper Marshwood Vale Parish Council on the Regulation 15 submission  
version of the Plan.**

Independent Examiner: Andrew Mead BSc (Hons) MRTPI MIQ

Date of Report: 12 December 2019

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 29 Monmouth Street, Bath BA1 2DL  
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

## Contents

	Page
<b>Main Findings - Executive Summary</b>	3
<b>1. Introduction and Background</b>	3
• Upper Marshwood Vale Neighbourhood Plan 2018–2033	3
• The Independent Examiner	4
• The Scope of the Examination	4
• The Basic Conditions	5
<b>2. Approach to the Examination</b>	6
• Planning Policy Context	6
• Submitted Documents	6
• Site Visit	7
• Written Representations with or without Public Hearing	7
• Modifications	7
<b>3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights</b>	7
• Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area	7
• Plan Period	7
• Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation	7
• Development and Use of Land	8
• Excluded Development	8
• Human Rights	8
<b>4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions</b>	9
• EU Obligations	9
• Main Issues	9
• Community Facilities and Green Spaces	10
• Local Wildlife Areas	11
• Important Local Landscape Features	11
• What Development Where?	12
• Overview	14
<b>5. Conclusions</b>	14
• Summary	14
• The Referendum and its Area	15
• Comments	15
<b>Appendix: Modifications</b>	16

## **Main Findings - Executive Summary**

From my examination of the Upper Marshwood Vale Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan/UMVNP) and its supporting documentation, including the representations made, I have concluded that, subject to the policy modifications set out in this report, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- The Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – the Upper Marshwood Vale Parish Council;
- The Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – the whole of the Upper Marshwood Vale area shown on page 18 of the submitted Plan;
- The Plan specifies the period in which it is to take effect: 2018-2033; and
- The policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to Referendum on the basis that it has met all the relevant legal requirements.

I have considered whether the referendum area should extend beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates and have concluded that it should not.

## **1. Introduction and Background**

### *Upper Marshwood Vale Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2033*

- 1.1 Upper Marshwood Vale Parish is described by Dorset Council as a group parish which includes four separate parishes: Marshwood, Bettiscombe, Pilsdon and Stoke Abbott, with a total population of 584<sup>1</sup>. Set in steeply undulating and exceptionally scenic countryside, the majority of which is in the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the rural parishes extend 10 km westwards from the western edge of Beaminster to the county boundary with Devon. The two main settlements within the Plan area are Marshwood in the west, with a population of about 150, a small village which straggles along or close to the B3165 which links Crewkerne to the area around Lyme Regis. In addition, Stoke Abbott, in the east of the Plan area has a population of about 100.
- 1.2 The UMNVP process began in 2014 with a series of meetings and the formation of a steering group. The Plan Area was designated by the then West Dorset District Council (now Dorset Council) in 2015. The preparation process continued throughout 2016 and subsequent years,

---

<sup>1</sup> Strategic Environmental Assessment May 2019 quoting 2011 Census.

culminating in consultation on a pre-submission draft Plan in May/June 2019 and submission to Dorset Council in July 2019. Those involved in the preparation of the Plan have now worked on it for over five years.

### *The Independent Examiner*

- 1.3 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the UMNVP by Dorset Council, with the agreement of the Upper Marshwood Vale Parish Council (UMVPC).
- 1.4 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector with previous experience of examining neighbourhood plans. I am an independent examiner and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

### *The Scope of the Examination*

- 1.5 As the independent examiner, I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
  - (b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
  - (c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 1.6 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) ('the 1990 Act'). The examiner must consider:
- Whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions;
  - Whether the Plan complies with provisions under s.38A and s.38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ('the 2004 Act'). These are:
    - it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body, for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
    - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
    - it specifies the period during which it has effect;
    - it does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development';

- it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area;
- whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the Plan proceed to referendum; and
- Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) ('the 2012 Regulations').

1.7 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

### *The Basic Conditions*

1.8 The 'Basic Conditions' are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the UMVNP must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
- be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations; and
- meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.

1.9 Regulation 32 and Schedule 2 to the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 ('the 2017 Regulations').<sup>2</sup>

## **2. Approach to the Examination**

<sup>2</sup> This revised Basic Condition came into force on 28 December 2018 through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

## *Planning Policy Context*

- 2.1 The Development Plan for this part of Dorset Council, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, is the Joint West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan adopted in 2015, henceforth referred to in this report as the “Local Plan”.
- 2.2 In June 2019, Dorset Council cabinet agreed to stop work on the Local Plan Reviews for the former District Councils, of which West Dorset was one, with the exception of the Purbeck Local Plan which is currently undergoing examination. Dorset Council has begun work on a new Dorset-wide Local Plan which is at a very early stage of preparation with no draft policies yet in circulation.
- 2.3 The planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers guidance on how the NPPF should be implemented. A revised NPPF was published on 19 February 2019 and all references in this report are to the February 2019 NPPF and its accompanying PPG.<sup>3</sup>

## *Submitted Documents*

- 2.4 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents which are relevant to the examination, including those submitted which comprise:
- the Upper Marshwood Vale Neighbourhood Plan 2018–2033;
  - the map on page 18 of the Plan, which identifies the area to which the proposed UMVNP relates;
  - the Consultation Statement: July 2019;
  - the Basic Conditions Statement: July 2019;
  - all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation;
  - the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Environmental Report prepared on behalf of UMVPC, dated May 2019; and
  - the request for additional clarification sought in my letter of 7 November 2019 and the responses dated 15 November provided by the UMVNP Steering Committee and 19 November 2019 provided by Dorset Council, which are available on the Dorset Council website.<sup>4</sup>

## *Site Visit*

---

<sup>3</sup> NPPF: paragraph 214. The Plan was submitted under Regulation 15 to Dorset Council after 24 January 2019.

<sup>4</sup> View at: <https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/planning-buildings-land/planning-policy/west-dorset-and-weymouth-portland/neighbourhood-planning/neighbourhood-plans/upper-marshwood-vale-neighbourhood-plan.aspx>

- 2.5 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 12 November 2019 to familiarise myself with it, and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidential documents.

#### *Written Representations with or without Public Hearing*

- 2.6 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. I considered a hearing session to be unnecessary as the consultation responses clearly articulated the objections to the Plan and presented arguments for and against the Plan's suitability to proceed to a referendum. As noted in paragraph 2.4 above, the Councils helpfully answered in writing the questions which I put to them in my letter of 7 November 2019.

#### *Modifications*

- 2.7 Where necessary, I have recommended modifications to the Plan (**PMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have listed these modifications separately in the Appendix.

### **3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights**

#### *Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area*

- 3.1 The UMNVP has been prepared and submitted for examination by UMNPC, which is a qualifying body. The Plan extends over the whole of Upper Marshwood Vale Parish, a group parish comprising the Parishes of Marshwood, Bettiscombe, Pilsdon and Stoke Abbott which constitutes the area which was designated by West Dorset District Council in August 2015.
- 3.2 It is the only neighbourhood plan for Upper Marshwood Vale Parish and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

#### *Plan Period*

- 3.3 The period of the Plan, displayed on the front cover of the document, is between 2018 and 2033.

#### *Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation*

- 3.4 The Consultation Statement of the UMNVP provides a comprehensive summary of the preparation process of the Plan. Preliminary meetings were held about the preparation of the Plan in 2014, with the formation of

[Intelligent Plans and Examinations \(IPE\) Ltd, 29 Monmouth Street, Bath BA1 2DL](#)

[Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84](#)

a steering group on 23 October. The Neighbourhood Plan Area was designated by West Dorset District Council in August 2015 and drop-in events for the community were held in various locations across the parishes in early 2016. The UMVNP web site was established in mid-2016. The quarterly publication, "Beneath the Vale" (BTV), was used to keep people in all four parishes informed about the progress of the Plan.

- 3.5 A household questionnaire was circulated to each household in the group parish in December 2016. The circulation list also included a small number of properties just beyond the parish boundary. 101 replies were received by mid-February 2017, a response rate of 34% based on the electoral register. Having established the need and possible support for development through the questionnaire, a "call for sites" was issued in January 2018 with publicity in the BTV magazine, the UMVNP web site and the local press. An Options consultation commenced in July 2018, including two further drop-in events.
- 3.6 Consultation on the UMVNP under Regulation 14 of the 2012 Regulations took place for six weeks between 7 May and 18 June 2019. Six responses (including two from different departments within the newly formed Dorset Council) were received from statutory consultees, another four confirmed receipt but did not respond, and a further 60 responses were received from local residents and those with an interest in the Plan area. The UMVNP was then submitted to Dorset Council on 19 July 2019 and was subject to consultation under Regulation 16 between 19 August and 14 October 2019. Seven representations were received. I am satisfied that a transparent, fair and inclusive consultation process has been followed for the UMVNP, that has had regard to advice in the PPG on plan preparation and is procedurally compliant in accordance with the legal requirements.

#### *Development and Use of Land*

- 3.7 The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with s.38A of the 2004 Act.

#### *Excluded Development*

- 3.8 The Plan does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development'.

#### *Human Rights*

- 3.9 The Basic Conditions Statement comments that no issues have been raised in relation to the possible contravention of Human Rights in preceding consultations. Furthermore, given the conclusions on the Plan's general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan and the regard to national planning policy, it is reasonable to conclude that the making of the Plan should not breach human rights. Dorset Council has no comments about any breach of, or incompatibility with, EU Obligations



and Convention rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998). I have considered the matter independently, including the potential impact of Policies UMV5 and UMV7 which restrict the use of the residential development proposed, and I have found no reason to disagree with those positions.

#### **4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions**

##### *EU Obligations*

- 4.1 The UMVNP was subject to a full SEA undertaken on behalf of UMVPC, the report of which was submitted with the Plan in accordance with the legal requirement under Regulation 15(e)(i) of the 2012 Regulations. The Environment Agency (EA), Historic England (HE) and Natural England (NE) were consulted for a screening opinion and on the scope of a SEA, should the decision be taken to proceed with one. The Parish Council took the decision to progress with a full SEA, although neither HE, NE nor the EA, when consulted, responded that one should be required. The SEA concluded that there would be no likely significantly adverse impacts identified as a result of the assessments of the Plan's objectives and proposed policies. Having read the SEA and considered the matter independently, I agree with that conclusion.
- 4.2 The UMVNP was further screened on behalf of UMVPC for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). NE advised that the UMVNP would be unlikely to have a significantly adverse effect on designated sites and therefore HRA was not required. NE had no adverse comments to make when consulted under Regulation 14 and made no further substantive comments when consulted under Regulation 16. Based on my independent consideration on the information provided, I support the above conclusion.

##### *Main Issues*

- 4.3 Following the consideration of whether the Plan complies with various procedural and legal requirements, it is now necessary to deal with whether it complies with the Basic Conditions. I shall test the Plan against the Basic Conditions by considering specific issues of compliance with all the Plan's policies.
- 4.4 As part of that assessment, I consider whether the policies are sufficiently clear and unambiguous, having regard to advice in the PPG. The policies of the UMVNP should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply them consistently and with confidence when determining

planning applications. They should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.<sup>5</sup>

- 4.5 Accordingly, having regard to the UMNPN, the consultation responses, written evidence<sup>6</sup> and the site visit, I consider that the main issues for this examination are whether the UMNPN policies (i) have regard to national policy and guidance, (ii) are in general conformity with the adopted strategic planning policies and (iii) would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development? I shall assess these issues on the basis of considering the policies within the topics in the sequence in which they appear in the Plan.
- 4.6 In setting the context for the policies, the Plan describes four elements of its vision, the gist of which are: to allow some housing growth at a rate which reflects local needs and the rural nature of the area; to support home working, rural workshops and small-scale tourism; to support a range of community facilities which can be sustained given the sparse local population; and to protect the landscape and features which contribute to the area's unique character.

#### *Community Facilities and Green Spaces (Policies UMN1 and UMN2)*

- 4.7 Policy UMN1 seeks to retain thirteen important community facilities which are listed in the policy. Subject to two reservations, the policy generally conforms with the Local Plan Policy COM3 and has regard to national guidance.<sup>7</sup> The first reservation is that the policy requires consultation with the local community in the event that a proposal is received to remove, diminish or replace an important facility. The Parish Council, as representative of the local community, would already be a statutory consultee where planning applications are made to change the use or redevelop such a facility which would lead to its loss. The diminution of an important facility or its removal are terms which are too vague to be used in effective development management and, in any event, unless within a conservation area with respect to removal, would probably be beyond planning control. Therefore, I shall recommend the deletion of that sentence from the policy. Nevertheless, in recognition of the desirability to avoid or mitigate the loss of important community facilities, I shall recommend an alternative. **(PM1)**
- 4.8 The second reservation is that not all the facilities which are listed in the policy are identified on a map. Furthermore, those which are listed are fairly indistinct. Each important facility should be clearly named on one of

---

<sup>5</sup> PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

<sup>6</sup> The other evidence includes my letter to the Upper Marshwood Vale Parish and Dorset Councils seeking clarification and the replies referred to in paragraph 2.4 above.

<sup>7</sup> NPPF: paragraph 92.

the maps. Therefore, in the interests of clarity, the names of the facilities on the Marshwood Area and Stoke Abbott Area maps should be in a larger font and the facilities and names should be added to maps of a similar scale for the other settlements or locations where those facilities occur.

**(PM2)**

- 4.9 Policy UMV2 supports the retention and improvements to public rights of way and other access to the countryside and to protect the enjoyment of three important public open spaces. The policy generally conforms with Local Plan Policy COM5, and has regard to national guidance, including contributing to the achievement of sustainable development, subject to one clarification.<sup>8</sup> The three open spaces are shown on the Policies Map on page 18 of the Plan, albeit at a small scale. However, they are untitled. Two of the open spaces are shown at a larger scale on the Stoke Abbott area map and partly on the Marshwood area map at the beginning of the Plan, immediately following the cover. In order to have the necessary clarity for development management purposes, I recommend that a map is compiled showing all three open spaces, labelled, at an appropriate scale, similar to the two aforementioned area maps. Map extracts could be assembled to fit on a single A4 sheet, which would be consistent with the current format of the Plan. **(PM3)**

*Local Wildlife Areas (Policy UMV3)*

- 4.10 Policy UMV3 aims to safeguard the local ecological network and, where development is proposed, to achieve a net gain in biodiversity. Dorset Council commented in the Regulation 16 representation that the policy should include reference to a biodiversity appraisal for development affecting rural barns. I shall recommend a modification to the Policy to include the need for an appraisal consistent with paragraph 2.2.19 of the Local Plan. **(PM4)** The need to refer to a barn is unnecessary because the final phrase of the policy includes any development likely to give rise to an adverse impact on biodiversity, which would include redevelopment of a barn. Subject to the modification, the policy generally conforms with Policy ENV2 of the Local Plan and has regard to national guidance, including contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.<sup>9</sup>

*Important Local Landscape Features (Policy UMV4)*

- 4.11 Policy UMV4 states that development should respect and enhance local landscape character and the policy includes sixteen examples of key characteristics. Although long and detailed, I consider the list identifies many significant elements of the countryside in this area which contribute to its unique character. Other sections of the policy support improvements

---

<sup>8</sup> NPPF: paragraphs 96 & 98.

<sup>9</sup> NPPF: paragraph 174.

to the local landscape character by the removal of large-scale intrusive structures and the minimisation of adverse impacts of views over open countryside from public rights of way. I consider the policy generally conforms with Policy ENV1 of the Local Plan and has regard to national guidance, including contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.<sup>10</sup>

- 4.12 However, I note that although not included in Policy UMV4, paragraph 2.7 in the preceding justification contains a statement akin to policy by commenting that the small part of the Plan area which is outside the AONB should be treated “with similar respect” to land within the AONB so far as planning applications are concerned. I agree that this peripheral land is in the setting of the AONB but, to be accurate, it should not be treated equally to land actually within the AONB. I shall recommend an appropriate modification. **(PM5)**

*What Development Where? (Policies UMV5, UMV6, UMV7 and UMV8)*

- 4.13 The UMVNP allocates two sites for housing, both at Marshwood. The village does not have a development boundary. Local Plan Policy SUS2 states that outside defined development boundaries, development will be strictly controlled, having particular regard to the need for the protection of the countryside and environmental constraints, and be restricted to several categories of residential development such as that which is essential for rural workers and affordable housing. However, Policy SUS2 also states that settlements with no defined development boundary may have some growth to meet their local needs.
- 4.14 One allocation is defined by Policy UMV5 on land at the Colmer Stud Farm. The Plan describes it as an allocation for a village shop, community hub with adjacent green space, community parking and up to four dwellings. There is evidently an unsatisfied demand for a shop to serve the area and I note the recent closure of the Marshwood Stores, and the discussions about a new shop at the Bottle Inn. The helpful note from the UMVPC allayed any concerns I might have had about the deliverability of the scheme.<sup>11</sup> Local facilities appropriate to a rural area or close to an existing settlement may be allowed under Local Plan Policy SUS2. Therefore, I consider that the provision of the village shop, the community hub and community parking would generally conform with the strategic policies of the Local Plan and would have regard to national guidance, including contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> NPPF: paragraph 172.

<sup>11</sup> Email from UMVNP Steering Committee dated 15 November in response to my questions.

<sup>12</sup> NPPF: paragraph 92.

- 4.15 So far as the part of the allocation for up to four dwellings is concerned, Policy SUS2 supports specific allocations in a development plan document. In legal terms, whilst the UMNVP will become part of the Development Plan if it is made, it is not a development plan document under the terms of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). Nonetheless, I consider it is entirely legitimate for such allocations to be made through the Neighbourhood Plan. The test is one of the Plan's general conformity (as a whole) with the strategic policies of the Development Plan for the area, which does not require strict conformity with every relevant strategic policy.<sup>13</sup>
- 4.16 The allocation was the subject of scrutiny in the SEA, with no objections from statutory undertakers or other consultees. The criteria in Policy UMN5 recognise the need to address the landscape impact in the AONB and to limit the size of the dwellings by the number of bedrooms. Accordingly, in addition to the community facilities, the housing element of the allocation also generally conforms with Local Plan Policy SUS2 and has regard to national guidance.<sup>14</sup>
- 4.17 The second allocation is at The Three Counties Nurseries under Policy UMN6 for up to five live-work units. Dorset Council suggested making the business and housing aspects of the application separate entities, so as to avoid costly monitoring and enforcement issues. However, Policy ECON1 of the Local Plan states that proposals for live-work developments will be supported in locations considered suitable for open market residential development and, similar to the Colmer Stud Farm site above, the allocation has been the subject of SEA with no identified significantly adverse effects. Therefore, notwithstanding the reservations of Dorset Council, the allocation would generally conform with the strategic policies of the Local Plan and would have regard to national guidance including contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.<sup>15</sup>
- 4.18 Policy UMN7 supports the conversion of existing buildings to residential use subject to six criteria. The policy generally conforms with Policy SUS2 iii) of the Local Plan and has regard to national guidance.<sup>16</sup> Policy UMN8 supports small scale employment enterprises subject to four criteria and generally conforms with Policy SUS3 of the Local Plan and has regard to national guidance including contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Paragraph 29, judgment in *R (Crownhall Estates Ltd) v Chichester DC [2016] EWHC 73 (Admin)*.

<sup>14</sup> NPPF: paragraph 77 & 78.

<sup>15</sup> NPPF: paragraph 81 d).

<sup>16</sup> NPPF: paragraphs 79 d) & 118 d).

<sup>17</sup> NPPF: paragraph 83 a).

4.19 Policies UMV5 and UMV7 each include a proviso that the residential development so enabled would restrict its use to a primary residence, thereby avoiding the main use of the dwelling or conversion as a second home or holiday let. The 2011 vacancy rate for homes in UMV Parish was 23% compared to 10% for Dorset as a whole.<sup>18</sup> In addition, 300 household questionnaires were distributed in December 2016, together with a further 100 to other properties within UMV Parish with no name on the electoral register.<sup>19</sup> I consider that these facts are indicative of a widespread use of residential properties as non-primary residences and, therefore, I am satisfied that the need to control the proliferation of second homes in the parish is justified. However, in order to assist in the effective control of development and to enable interested parties to be aware of the details associated with the implementation of the policy, I recommend an explanation of “primary residence” should be provided in the Plan. A suitable insertion could be made on the relevant page of the Plan, e.g. page 10, similar to that given for live-work units on page 11. I shall recommend a form of words as **PM6**.

### *Overview*

4.20 Accordingly, on the evidence before me, with the recommended modifications PM1, PM2, PM3, PM4, PM5 and PM6, I consider that the policies within the UMVNP are in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan, have regard to national guidance, would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and so would meet the Basic Conditions.

## **5. Conclusions**

### *Summary*

- 5.1 The Upper Marshwood Vale Parish Neighbourhood Plan has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has investigated whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements for neighbourhood plans. I have had regard to all the responses made following consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan, and the evidence documents submitted with it.
- 5.2 I have made six recommendations to modify two of the eight policies, maps and text to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum.

---

<sup>18</sup> UMVNP: Appendix 1.

<sup>19</sup> UMVNP: Consultation Statement page 3.

### *The Referendum and its Area*

- 5.3 I have considered whether or not the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. The Upper Marshwood Vale Neighbourhood Plan, as modified, has no policy which I consider significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated Neighbourhood Plan boundary, requiring the referendum to extend to areas beyond the boundary of the Plan.
- 5.4 I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Plan should be the boundary of the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

### *Comments*

- 5.5 In conducting the examination, I enjoyed visiting the Parish and reading the Plan. The Plan is concise, imaginatively presented and shows effective communication between the Parish Council and Dorset Council. The Consultation Statement, the Basic Conditions Statement and the SEA Environmental Report were extremely helpful. The Parish Council, the supporting steering group and the volunteers are to be commended for their efforts in producing a succinct document which, incorporating the modifications I have recommended, will make a positive contribution to the Development Plan for Upper Marshwood Vale Parish and will assist in creating sustainable development.

*Andrew Mead*

Examiner



## Appendix: Modifications

Proposed modification number (PM)	Plan reference	Modification
PM1	Policy UMV1	Delete the second sentence: "The local community ... important community facility".  Substitute: <b>"Every effort should be made to work with the local community to investigate potential solutions to avoid any unnecessary loss of these valued facilities and services."</b>
PM2	Policy Maps	Add the names of the facilities referred to in Policy UMV1 to the policy maps in a clearly readable font.
PM3	Policy UMV1	Compile a map showing the three public open spaces defined in the policy, labelled and at an appropriate scale.
PM4	Policy UMV3	Amend the third sentence to: <b>"A Biodiversity Appraisal, Mitigation and Enhancement Plan must be submitted..."</b> .
PM5	Paragraph 2.7	Final sentence: delete "treated with similar respect"; substitute <b>"treated with the care appropriate to landscape of such high quality"</b> .
PM6	Page 10	Add as an informative box, alongside Policy UMV5:  <b>"A primary residence is defined as one occupied as the residents' sole or main residence, where the residents spend the majority of their time when not working away from home. A condition or obligation on new homes will require that they are occupied only as the primary residence of those persons entitled to occupy them.</b>  <b>Occupiers of homes with a primary residence condition or obligation will be advised to keep proof that they are satisfying the requirements of the policy. Proof of primary residence is via</b>



		<b>verifiable evidence which could include, for example (but not limited to) residents being registered on the local electoral register and being registered for and attending local services (such as healthcare, schools etc)''.</b>
--	--	--