

Nov 2020 Stinsford NP Consultation

1. Stinsford Draft Neighbourhood Plan - Consultation for Residents, November 2020

Q1 Housing - page 27 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan sets out three options for housing, especially affordable housing, in Stinsford parish, up to a maximum of 16 new homes by 2036. Which option do you prefer? Please use the comments box to mention any particular sites (in option 2) or settlements (in option 3) you think should be considered; or for any other comments.[NOTE: none of our three options can stop Dorset Council from proposing in the Local Plan a strategic development North of Dorchester. The options in the NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN are about small-scale housing development. These options will remain relevant, whatever larger development may be proposed by Dorset Council.]

	Response Percent	Response Total
1 Option 1 - Do nothing. (Apart from strategic sites named in the Local Plan, only very limited housing development will be allowed, e.g. converting existing buildings, or exception sites for ONLY affordable housing.)	53.33%	8
2 Option 2 - Identify one or more specific housing sites, to include affordable housing. (Strategic sites named in the Local Plan could also go ahead.)	20.00%	3
3 Option 3 - Identify one or more settlements where limited new housing, especially affordable housing, would be appropriate, but without choosing specific pieces of land. (Strategic sites named in the Local Plan could also go ahead.)	13.33%	2
4 Don't know / prefer not to choose	13.33%	2
	answered	15
	skipped	0

Comments: (7)

- 1 From past experience, a plan that suggests acceptance of any new housing may unintentionally focus local authorities on the Stinsford area, especially if other neighbourhood plans are against new housing. We should continue to work toward influencing existing housing plans, ensuring this is limited to property repurposing and redevelopment and achieved using designs that are in keeping with the old rural nature of the area. Also, that redevelopment does not exceed the footprint of previous buildings. It should be possible for any rework to provide affordable housing by limiting the size of each property - favouring smaller units.
- 2 Until Dor15 is clarified it is premature to do anything.
- 3 No need , lets preserve what little bit we have left before we drown in the 3500 houses North of the parish.
- 4 Do not want a site or it becomes a development which is not in keeping with our community. A development would cause more traffic which is the issue on country lanes.
- 5 To date, I have not been persuaded of the veracity of the numbers of affordable houses that might be needed to satisfy local need within the parish. Recognising the wider housing need in the Dorset Council area, if the Stinsford Neighbourhood Plan was to identify sites for development, I fear it might attract development rather than satisfy local need. Where there is a genuine need and desire to create an affordable housing opportunity for locals, the proponents of any development are able to argue the case and to justify development on a case by case basis through the planning process. The Neighbourhood Plan could usefully prescribe the maximum size and density of such a development, conditions that must be met (covering, for example, impact on roads and traffic, adjacent properties and the environment) and minimal requirements for the sustainability and continued status as affordable in perpetuity.
- 6 The sites I would identify would be the KMC proposals near Lower Bockhampton and Stinsford Farmhouse. They adjoin existing development. They MUST include some affordable housing, protected in perpetuity (NOT the government's definition of affordable housing).
- 7 (1) Housing = Option 2. I am in favour of small scale expansion (2-3 bedrooms) of both Open Market(OMH) & Affordable housing as I would like to see younger people have an opportunity to move into the area and smaller units would provide opportunities for locals to downsize into. The 'rural scene' in the future will be saved by those who know and love it from growing up in it. However, because there seems to be a grey area between ""Rented Affordable"" & ""Social"" housing - and until this is made clearer to me; I err away from Option 3 (""especially affordable housing""). Reservations I would like to make on any development within the 3 hamlets familiar to me:
STINSFORD: KM's master plan to build houses and agri-industrial centre along Church Lane should stay within existing barn/buildings' footprint and houses to be served by a separate access road other than Church Lane (which should not be urbanised by widening). Reasons= Church & Hardys Trail.
L BOCKHAMPTON: There is already a real traffic problem through village for residents, pedestrians, equestrians, cyclists & mobility scooters. Any increase in housing must be very small (as South route is too tempting to not use) &

car speed controls put in place prior to any expansion of housing.

H BOCKHAMPTON: with its 2 Business Parks, Holiday Park & multi-purpose Visitors Centre as well as OMH - there may be pockets where Tourism & residents would be minimally impacted by a small development of new housing which has such good access to A35 in either direction.

Potential Brownfield sites might be site next to the driveway of Birkin House at Stinsford, and the 2 Business parks at H Bockhampton.

Q 2. Employment - page 28 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan sets out two options for employment land in Stinsford parish. Which option do you prefer? Please use the comments box to name any business park(s) or other employment sites you think should be expanded; if so, to name any checks or restrictions the policy should include; or for any other comments.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Option 1 - Do nothing. (The Local Plan allows extensions, conversions and replacements but no new-build.)	66.67%	10
2	Option 2 - Expand one or more existing business parks or employment sites.	33.33%	5
		answered	15
		skipped	0

Comments: (7)

- 1

There is plenty of space in the current Kingston Maurward Farm area and the Higher Bockhampton business park for business.
It is assumed extending buildings within the existing site boundaries could provide new business units and is allowed in option 1.

In addition, the introduction of speed limits may help dissuade the use of the local lanes as 'shortcuts'.
- 2

Until DOR15 is clarified it is premature to do anything
- 3

Utilise buildings at western side of Kingston Maurward College as the occupants then have excellent road access off the Stinsford roundabout, few local residents to be affected, income for the college and they are buildings that are being used for employment currently.
- 4

Due to the current situation of mass unemployment expected due to COVID19 in the near future I cannot see a need, there are industrial estates around Dorchester that could serve many if units needed, however if more sites are needed, in order to not create any more issues with traffic, option 1 allows expansion which and the business parks are fairly close to the A35.
- 5

Is there a quantifiable appetite for businesses to move into this rural area? Do the working-age residents of the parish wish to see jobs created so that they do not have to travel outside of the parish to go to work? Is there any advantage to the residents, to the infrastructure, or for the environment of the parish, to be gained by the expansion of existing sites? To date, I believe the answer to all three questions is no.

Hampton Business Park strikes me as an example of reasonably sympathetic conversion of farm buildings to business units, with a diverse range of businesses on the site. Within the site there appears to be room for similar buildings on land where older buildings no longer exist. Perhaps, additional units within the existing site would be sufficient to satisfy any small increase in businesses wishing to relocate to the parish.

The views of the residents of Higher Bockhampton with regard to the potential impact and acceptability of expansion outside of its current footprint should be paramount in the absence of any evidenced need for the migration of employment opportunities into this otherwise rural economy.
- 6

Any changes to employment sites should be used to bring about (a) improved landscaping (b) carbon neutrality (c) no harmful environmental emissions (d) no additional car / van / lorry traffic on the lanes.
- 7

(2) Employment= Option 1. While there are un-filled units at H Bockhampton Business Parks, I wonder is there is a real demand for a further industry-park at Stinsford and would there be restrictions to prevent any Business Park reverting to a Supply Hub / Storage facility with v. large haulage vehicles on the lanes - will Highways improve roads for these weights & sizes of vehicles? The old road through Yellowham woods, where Claas Farm machinery is, would seem a better location for any further agribusinesses.

Q 3. Community Facilities - Stinsford Parish currently has no indoor community facilities. Kingston Maurward College's 2019 Masterplan proposes a multi-use building which would, at times, be available for community use. Draft Policy SNP 11 (page 29) could support this proposal. Do you, in principle, support the development of a new multi-use building at Kingston Maurward, if it includes provision for community use? Please use the comments box to mention any checks or restrictions the policy should include; or for any other comments.

	Response Percent	Response Total
1 Yes, I support the principle of a new multi-use building at Kingston Maurward, if it includes provision for community use	46.67%	7
2 Yes, I broadly support the principle of a new multi-use building at Kingston Maurward, if it includes provision for community use, but with reservations	13.33%	2
3 No, I do not support the principle of a new multi-use building at Kingston Maurward, regardless of whether it includes provision for community use	40.00%	6
4 Don't know / prefer not to choose	0.00%	0
	answered	15
	skipped	0

Comments: (4)

- 1 The appearance of and New Buildings must be sympathetic to the nearby listed houses and views.
- 2 We have halls locally ie. Puddletown, Charminster, Chalton Down, in the town is Trinity Club and Colliton Club and by putting up another facility you are taking necessary business away from already established facilities.
- 3 The mulit-use building should be carefully assessed so as to achieve (a) no detriment to landscape, including dark skies ; (b) carbon neutrality ; (c) no additional car / van / lorry traffic on the lanes. There should be a legal agreement between KMC and Stinsford PC to secure the community use, at reasonable or concessionary cost.
- 4 (3) Community Facilities = KM future appears a bit uncertain and hotchpotch: chasing funds for buildings with no longterm strategy/direction.
What is ""community use""? - just for PC meetings?
Also, I understood that St Michaels intends to become more relevant by serving the community in more secular ways.

Q 4. Local Landscape - In Policy SNP2 (page 12) the Draft Neighbourhood Plan tries to say what is special about Stinsford's landscape, and how it should be protected. Do you agree with Draft Policy SNP2? Please use the comments box to mention any points in the policy that you disagree with, or that we have missed.

	Response Percent	Response Total
1 Yes, I agree with draft policy SNP2	93.33%	14
2 I broadly agree with draft policy SNP2, but have suggestions on how it can be improved	6.67%	1
3 No, I disagree with draft policy SNP2	0.00%	0
4 Don't know / prefer not to choose	0.00%	0
	answered	15
	skipped	0

Comments: (4)

1 *no comments recorded, although field activated*

2 definitely the water meadows path near Lower Bockhampton is neglected and due to the increase in walkers, cyclists and horse riders the path needs to be strengthened. also at the start of the path below St Michael's church the floods have washed the gravel into the river. I have seen two people fall over at the big ledge that has now formed. This needs attending to.

3 Insert 'since' before 'historic times' in 2nd bullet point of SNP2.
An excellent policy.

4 (4) Local Landscape = agriculture is changing - fields may disappear under plantations, views change. The surrounding flood meadows and network of walks are very important to those living inside Dorchester as well as for the village residents.

Q 5. Important Local Views - In Policy SNP5 (page 15) and Figure 4, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan identifies important local views, which should be protected from intrusion. Do you agree with Draft Policy SNP5? Please use the comments box to mention any important views we have missed, or ones we have included that you disagree with.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes, I agree with draft policy SNP5	86.67%	13
2	I broadly agree with draft policy SNP5, but have suggestions on how it can be improved	13.33%	2
3	No, I disagree with draft policy SNP5	0.00%	0
4	Don't know / prefer not to choose	0.00%	0
		answered	15
		skipped	0

Comments: (3)

- 1 Development should minimise adverse impacts on views, however, to protect a business (security of premises) a dwelling may be required to ensure this security, ie put in an entrance for better access but if you did this you may need a property at the entrance in order to secure the premises as you could become a target to thieves as they have an easy access in with no buildings/people for some distance, given them an open ticket to come and go as they please.
- 2
 1. In Table 4, R Frome Walk, the woodland fringing the path in the KMC stretch should also be mentioned.
 2. In Fig 4, how have 'key footpaths' been chosen? Shouldn't they form complete circuits? e.g. path from Rushy Pond to Hardy's Cottage is part of a 'Hardy' circuit. Path past Pigeon House Farm to Cokers Frome is part of a loop to N of Dorchester.
 3. Views - the view at the entrance to Higher Kingston Farm surprises me (the one slightly to its west, towards KM, seems to cover the point here).
 4. Views - there is a good view to the W (toward Dorchester and Black Down) from N part of Bhompston track.
- 3 (5) Important Local Views= Dorchester has been ringed with developments to the South, East and West. The only side that has retained its original border - due to the river, is to the North and the "" northern bypass"" gives opportunities to look down on old Dorch with its skyline of the prison, spires and clutter of old roofs and see how snugly it fits into the landscape. What a shame to loose this forever - I'd much rather see the buffer between I. Bockhampton and Stinsford developed (Kingston Maurward) sympathetically to become a large residential community with school, village hall & GP and pedestrian bridge over the KM roundabout (using the existing Machine Track).

Q. 6. Appropriate recreational access to the countryside - In Policy SNP6 (page 17), the Draft Neighbourhood Plan supports an access network based on existing rights of way and open spaces, and requires new recreational space to be provided for any substantial new development in the parish. Do you agree with Draft Policy SNP6? Please use the comments box to mention any changes to the policy that you would like to see; or any other comments on it.

	Response Percent	Response Total
1 Yes, I agree with draft policy SNP6	73.33%	11
2 I broadly agree with draft policy SNP6, but have suggestions on how it can be improved	13.33%	2
3 No, I disagree with draft policy SNP6	0.00%	0
4 Don't know / prefer not to choose	13.33%	2
	answered	15
	skipped	0

Comments: (4)

- Yes, the Stinsford river path is suffering, but this may be more to do with the waterways poor maintenance than the level of use.
 Many small trees collapse into the streams, diverting flow and affecting water levels. Can improvements be made to the river and woodland maintenance ?

Crossing of the A31 near Higher Kingston Farm is dangerous - this would be improved by a 'bridleway friendly' footbridge. The council might consider this as preparation for 'other' development plans.

The gates on the River Frome Way where it passes under the A31 have no latches. Is there a agreed channel for reporting such issues to the council ?
- Bridleways/footpaths go across land owned by someone and they have to agree to this.
 Security, litter and leaving gates open are all an issue to a landowner. COVID19 has highlighted to the public the issues of the spread of disease, however to farmers this is always an issue, in the past has been Foot and mouth etc. however, with COVID 19 the public go for a walk, open gates etc that farmers and farm workers have to also open/close to attend to livestock, public may be enjoying their recreational time whilst the farming is trying to continue to work during this pandemic.

By having lovely walks ie. Puddletown Forest it does attract a lot of people which is good to share the resource but the flip side is the erosion to paths, car parks etc.

Any substantial new development however, I do agree needs to provide countryside access.
- In SNP6, under ""additional provision at a level appropriate..."" , reference could be made (or in the text) to the standards for Accessible Natural Greenspace set by Natural England in their 2010 document ""Nature Nearby"".
 Also under Project P2, mention could be made of the woodland idea I've put on the last page of this form; and of the gap in the RoW network between Cuckoo Lane overbridge and Waterston Ridge.
- (6) Appropriate recreational Access to the Countryside: Keeping paths well maintained (cleard and signposted) is one thing - widening and surfacing is quite another which I don't wish to support and a waste of time if likely to flood. How would you ""reduce pressure ... most vulnerable to overuse""? I would suggest by not improving them i.e. leaving them wild. Effective management for wildlife would be to restrain dogs.

Q 7. The historic environment - In Policy SNP7 (page 24), the Draft Neighbourhood Plan seeks to strengthen the protection and awareness of Stinsford's historic assets, including those with no legal designation. Do you agree with Draft Policy SNP7? Please use the comments box to mention any changes to the policy that you would like to see; or any other comments on it.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes, I agree with draft policy SNP7	80.00%	12
2	I broadly agree with draft policy SNP7, but have suggestions on how it can be improved	0.00%	0
3	No, I disagree with draft policy SNP7	0.00%	0
4	Don't know / prefer not to choose	20.00%	3
		answered	15
		skipped	0

No comments.

Q. 8. The Thomas Hardy connection - In Policy SNP8 (page 24), the Draft Neighbourhood Plan seeks to encourage tourism initiatives relating to Stinsford's heritage and its cultural associations with Thomas Hardy. Do you agree with Draft Policy SNP8? Please use the comments box to mention any changes to the policy that you would like to see; or any other comments on it.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes, I agree with draft policy SNP8	80.00%	12
2	I broadly agree with draft policy SNP8, but have suggestions on how it can be improved	13.33%	2
3	No, I disagree with draft policy SNP8	6.67%	1
4	Don't know / prefer not to choose	0.00%	0
		answered	15
		skipped	0

Comments: (5)

- 1 As long as traffic to the area does not increase as the roads would become congested.
- 2 But not to use Kingston Maurward as a parking site for Thomas Hardy Cottage.
- 3 Increase in tourism causes an issue with traffic coming to/from Bockhampton. Roads are unable to take an increase in capacity of traffic.
- 4 important not to commercialise the Hardy heritage whilst allowing access for visitors to enjoy the historic sites associated with him. Especially retain the rural nature and avoid creating car parking etc.
- 5 I suggest a change to the wording, e.g. ""Proposals for development of facilities for tourism, including those related to the history and cultural associations with Thomas Hardy, should be accompanied by an assessment of the economic and educational benefits they will bring and the environmental impact they will cause, including any measures to mitigate that impact. Only proposals with minimal impact and significant benefit will be permitted.""

Q 9. Better Building Design - Draft Policy SNP12 (page 32) seeks to guide the design of any future development in the parish so that it fits in visually, is convenient to live in, and has a minimal carbon footprint. Do you agree with Draft Policy SNP12? Please use the comments box to mention any changes to the policy that you would like to see; or any other comments on it.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes, I agree with draft policy SNP12	73.33%	11
2	I broadly agree with draft policy SNP12, but have suggestions on how it can be improved	20.00%	3
3	No, I disagree with draft policy SNP12	0.00%	0
4	Don't know / prefer not to choose	6.67%	1
		answered	15
		skipped	0

Comments: (3)

- 1 As long as carbon footprint reduction items fit in with the landscape and don't end up looking odd against the rest of the dwellings in the area.
- 2 Need to ensure all renewables etc are sympathetic to its position in community i.e. solar panels covering a roof can look out of place situated next to thatched cottages - seen from road, i.e. it may be better to position on just back of the property.
- 3 I would put the sustainability paragraphs first!

Q 10. Traffic Management - Draft Policies SNP14 and SNP15, and Project P3 (page 38) seek to improve highway safety in Stinsford parish. Do you agree with Draft Policies SNP14, SNP15 and Project P3? Please use the comments box to mention any changes to the policies or project that you would like to see; or any other comments on them.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes, I agree with draft policies SNP14 and SNP15, and Project P3	66.67%	10
2	I broadly agree with draft policies SNP14 and SNP15, and Project P3, but have suggestions on how they can be improved	20.00%	3
3	No, I disagree with draft policies SNP14 and SNP15, and Project P3	6.67%	1
4	Don't know / prefer not to choose	6.67%	1
		answered	15
		skipped	0

Comments: (6)

- 1 Introduction of speed limits and zones may help dissuade the use of the local lanes as 'shortcuts'. However, Road modification Traffic calming measures cause more trouble and damage than they are worth. I do not condone Introduction of speed humps, chicanes and other traffic calming - this would adversely affect the rural nature of the area.
- 2 Cyclists & walkers are covered by point 11 for safety. By putting up signage etc. you are going against SP2, network of lanes and tracks to remain rural in character and not become urbanized when developing so not required now either. The main issue is from Stinsford Roundabout to Hollow Hill with the buses and traffic to Studio School, the college has been running for years and the Studio School for some years now, the Studio School could sort the traffic problem with dropping off the students at the entrance to the college. The college is generating the income from these students so should deal with the traffic issues associated with them.
- 3 Flooding on the A35 needs to be tackled as a high priority, rather than closing the road all the time.
- 4 No urbanisation i.e. signage, this is the country.
- 5 The policies should identify roads which are already at capacity, or unsafe, and require any future development that will add to their traffic load to contribute financially to improvements that increase safety, e.g. passing places or other traffic management measures.
- 6 Pedestrian crossing on KM (roundabout) improved please.

Q 11. Cycling - Draft Policy SNP16 and Project P4 (page 41) seek to improve the cycle network in Stinsford parish. Do you agree with Draft Policy SNP16 and Project P4? Please use the comments box to mention any changes to the policy or project that you would like to see; or any other comments on them.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes, I agree with Draft Policy SNP16 and Project P4	73.33%	11
2	I broadly agree with Draft Policy SNP16 and Project P4, but have suggestions on how they can be improved	13.33%	2
3	No, I disagree with Draft Policy SNP16 and Project P4	6.67%	1
4	Don't know / prefer not to choose	6.67%	1
		answered	15
		skipped	0

Comments: (4)

- 1 Encouraging cycling is important but care should be taken not to materially change historic routes, for example the pathway described by Thomas Hardy in 'Under the Greenwood Tree' along the stream between Stinsford and Lower Bockhampton.
- 2 I would like to be able to safely cycle from Bhompston Farm into Dorchester and around Stinsford; please extend the cycle routes to allow this.
- 3 Beware of creating 'fast' tracks for cyclists - the paths are shared with horse riders, walkers and families (all of whom rub along quite happily). However, although still a minority, an increasing number of cyclists are cycling 'against the clock' without regard for other users.
- 4 (11) Cycling= I do not want to see the cross country Ref 1 route (underpass route to 3 Bears cottage and L. Bockhampton) to be up-graded/urbanised because it is better to direct both commuting and leisure non-mountain bikes to existing cycle path from Max Gate to west Stafford and along an upgraded off-road path from Greys Bridge to KM Roundabout.
These 2 existing hard surface routes do not flood and interfere less with walkers and dogs & horses are better for heavier e-bikes and we do not need a 3rd hard surface route.

Q 12. Which part of Stinsford do you live in?

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Frome Whitfield	0.00%	0
2	Cokers Frome area	6.67%	1
3	Stinsford hamlet	40.00%	6
4	Upper Stinsford (Birkin House area)	6.67%	1
5	Higher Kingston	13.33%	2
6	Kingston Maurward Estate	6.67%	1
7	Higher Bockhampton	6.67%	1
8	Lower Bockhampton	6.67%	1
9	Bhompston and Pine Lodge	13.33%	2
10	I do not live in Stinsford parish	0.00%	0
11	If you do not live in any of the areas listed above, please say where you do live.	0.00%	0
		answered	15
		skipped	0

Q 13. Have you attended any of the Neighbourhood Plan consultation events in November 2020 (Zoom meetings or the drop-in event at Kingston Maurward)? *(the planned drop-in event was cancelled because of the re-imposition of a Covid lockdown)*

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	46.67%	7
2	No	53.33%	8
3	Not sure	0.00%	0
		answered	15
		skipped	0

Q 14. Any comments you would like to make on other parts of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, or on the consultation process.

- 1 It is a generally well presented and thought through plan
- 2 Thankyou for the time and effort you have all put into the very informative plan and for the opportunity for us all to have our say in the zoom meetings.
- 3 A very well written plan; there are a few words missing/incorrect that would be picked up by someone reading it afresh.
- 4 The reasons for living in the country is live a quite life with nature, away from the majority of people, but the people you live with are a community, without urbanisation. If road markings etc are done that is urbanising the countryside.
- 5 To whom ever pulled together the history part, well done to them, it made for interesting and informative reading.
- 6 Its excellent and very well researched and compiled. Thanks for all the very hard work by all involved in compiling it.
- 7
 1. I see that you do not invite comments specifically on some policies, e.g. SNP1, SNP3.
 2. In SNP1, I suggest you delete ""European and ..""(post-Brexit).
 3. In SNP3, I support the conservation of open gaps. For clarity, they should be numbered in Table 3 and Figure 2.
 4. I support Project P1, the woodland survey.I would also like to see a new project added, ""to enhance biodiversity, carbon sequestration, and recreational access to greenspaces, and to reduce public pressure on the Local Nature Reserve at Thorncombe Woods, Stinsford PC will seek to establish one or more substantial additional areas of publicly accessible native broadleaved woodland in the parish, preferably in the area north of Dorchester which is currently sparsely provided with tree cover.""
 5. Please add a glossary of acronyms.
 6. I support policy SNP4, Dark Skies.