

Stinsford Neighbourhood Plan - Pre-Submission (Reg 14) Consultation

Written consultation responses received from:

- Dorset Council*
- Environment Agency
- Highways England
- Historic England
- Natural England
- SGN gas network (no comments)
- North Dorchester Consortium (landowner), via Turnberry consultants*
- Barber and Kirby families (landowner), via T O'Rourke consultants
- Keith Bamlet (landowner)
- Kingston Maurward College*
- Carol Shoopman* (British Horse Society)
- Solmaz Tavsanoğlu* (local resident)
- Chris Mervik (local resident)
- Liz Baker (local resident)
- Sally Cooke (local resident)
- Tony Wakely (local resident) (no written comments, broadly supportive)

In addition a number of comments were made verbally via the 'virtual' consultation meetings held during the consultation period, key points from which are included in the summary below. Those asterisked above attended these events

Summary of all main issues raised through the consultation and proposed response:

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
T O'Rourke Turnberry		General	It is not clear from the content of the draft neighbourhood plan that the relationship between policies in the emerging Stinsford neighbourhood plan and the emerging Dorset local plan (and in particular DOR13) has been agreed in accordance with NPPG	The contents of the Neighbourhood Plan have been discussed with Dorset Council - it is accepted that the emerging Local Plan is at an early stage and as such the Neighbourhood Plan will be examined against the existing (2014) Local Plan, and that it would benefit from being reviewed should DOR13 become part of the adopted plan (and in any event the emerging plan would take precedent as it is likely to be adopted after the Neighbourhood Plan is made). <i>Include further clarification on this point in section 8.</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
Turnberry		SEA screening	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal has not assessed reasonable alternatives and is misleading in respect of the relationship of the Neighbourhood Plan to the emerging Dorset Local Plan. The lack of an approved Plan does not absolve the SEA from considering this scenario.</p>	<p>The emerging Local Plan is at an early stage and DOR13 is a proposed strategic policy that includes areas outside of the parish which will in due course be subject to a full sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>There is no requirement to consider reasonable alternatives at the screening stage of SEA. The SEA screening stage requires us to take account of the relevant criteria in Schedule 1 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 when determining whether or not a plan or programme is likely to have a significant effect on the environment. Paragraph 2(b) of Schedule 1 relates to cumulative effects, and it is here that the potential effects of the possible development north of Dorchester is explored. This section concludes that whilst there may be a significant amount of development coming forward in Stinsford through the emerging Local Plan and planning permissions, the neighbourhood plan will not allocate sites for development and is in advance of any decision on the expansion of North Dorchester, which itself will be subject to an SEA as part of the Local Plan process.</p> <p>The Statutory Consultees (who are aware of the proposals in the emerging Local Plan) have also considered the screening determination and have agreed its conclusions.</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
Turnberry			<p>Highlights the technical evidence produced as part of the Consortium’s submission to Dorset Council and that it should be used in the consideration of the Neighbourhood Plan policies.</p> <p>Example of Hardy map included in the report:</p> 	<p>The NPG are thankful for sight of the technical evidence at this stage, although this focuses primarily on the proposed development area, impacts and strategy.</p> <p>It is noted that there is also a heritage impact assessment undertaken by Dorset Council (January 2021) on which Historic England have commented, which could be usefully referenced and would be considered to be a more independent assessment. Having reviewed the Hardy associations in the Turnberry Report, this has helped flag that Ten Hatches should be included within the historic landscape map, together with Rushy Pond (which was noted but not specifically shown).</p> <p>It is disappointing that the sustainable transport appendices in the respondent’s report do not appear to have considered any walking / cycling links to KMC and Stinsford from the proposed strategic site, despite falling within the ‘walking isochrome’.</p> <p>It is also noted that the ecology survey was undertaken in February 2017 (which is not an optimum time for such a survey) and did not include an assessment of the watercourses, and therefore may not comprehensively reflect the range of protected species present in the area. It does note the grassland present is of little biodiversity value, and that the main notable habitat loss (based on the indicative layout) would be woodland.</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
				<i>Include reference to Heritage Study in section 9. Amend historic map and appendices to more clearly reference Hardy connections - in particular Ten Hatches and Rushy Pond.</i>
Chris Mervik	1	1.6	May be useful to annotate Bhompston on Figure 1	Noted <i>Update plan accordingly</i>
Dorset Council	1	1.8	Welcome the proposed Plan period which aligns with the Draft Dorset Council Local Plan - Options consultation (2021).	Support noted. In any event the plan is likely to be reviewed well in advance on this end date.
Chris Mervik	1	1.12	Wording could be improved in Line 4, which would read more easily if it began "This once followed the route..."	Noted <i>Update plan accordingly</i>
Natural England	1	1.13	Welcome reference to the River Frome Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and recognition of the presence of other priority habitats within the parish.	Support noted.
Dorset Council	1	1.14	Suggested re-wording: '...and the parkland around Kingston Maurward is of national importance as a designated Registered Park and Garden.'	Noted <i>Update plan accordingly</i>
Dorset Council	1	1.18	Reference should also be made to the Minerals Strategy 2014, the Mineral Sites Plan 2019 and the Waste Plan 2019 that form part of the development plan for the area.	Noted <i>Update plan accordingly</i>
Dorset Council	1	1.21	Parts of Stinsford Parish are subject to minerals safeguarding, and this could usefully be referred to in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted <i>Update plan accordingly</i>
Dorset Council	1	1.21	There is a safeguarded waste site in the southern part of Stinsford Parish, and other safeguarded waste sites and a site allocated in the 2019 Waste Plan, and this could usefully be referred to in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted - this appears to be the Stinsford House sewage treatment works, with the rest outside the parish off St Georges' Road. <i>Update plan accordingly</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
Dorset Council	2	2.2	Suggested re-wording: ‘to care for its built and literary heritage...’	Noted <i>Update plan accordingly</i>
Dorset Council	3	3.3	Welcome reference to the Government’s draft Environment Bill which is currently suggesting a mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity on all projects and separately the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol.	Support noted.
Natural England	3	3.3	Welcome reference to the need by Dorset Council for a certified Biodiversity Plan in certain circumstances for planning applications to ensure net biodiversity gain.	Support noted.
Chris Mervik	3	3.4	Wording could be improved in Line 4: suggest “an area of local historic...” or “areas of local historic...”	Noted <i>Update plan accordingly</i>
Natural England	3	3.5	Welcome reference to the issues that increased nitrogen levels are having on the Poole Harbour and to the nitrogen reduction SPD. It should be noted that as well as being of national importance, Poole Harbour is also important internationally as a designated Special Protection Area (SPA) for its bird interest and a Ramsar site for its wetland habitats.	Noted <i>Update plan accordingly to reference international (rather than national) protection</i>
Natural England	3	3.6	Welcome reference to the Dorset Heathlands Planning framework SPD. It is also worth noting in this section that the nationally protected heathlands are also internationally designated as SPA, Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar sites.	Noted <i>Update plan accordingly to reference international (rather than national) protection</i>
Chris Mervik	3	3.6	Wording could be improved in Line 2: “Wood) forms is an important...”	Noted <i>Update plan accordingly</i>
Dorset Council	3	SNP1	Welcome reference to “ancient and local historic woodlands” at the end of Policy SNP1 and their depiction in Figure 2.	Support noted.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
Natural England	3	SNP1	Welcomes policy - could add 'internationally' to the penultimate paragraph to recognise that some of the important wildlife sites are of international as well as of national importance.	Noted <i>Update plan accordingly</i>
Elizabeth Baker	3	SNP1	Support policy, would like to see greater protection for Thorncombe Woods, e.g. keeping walkers on designated paths and dogs on leads.	This is already reflected in the second bullet point o SNP6. It relates more to the management of these area, which could be referenced in the third bullet point but would be subject to the practicality and land owner agreement to achieve. <i>Amend final bullet to make reference to "including their management"</i>
Natural England	3	3.9	May wish to reference the two NCA's namely, Dorset Downs and Cranborne Chase (134) and Dorset Heaths (135) to help to inform proposals in your plan.	The plan has drawn more on the local landscape character appraisals which (in comparison to the NCAs) are more locally specific to the area.
Chris Mervik	3	3.9	Could the National Park proposal be supported as a project?	This has not been consulted on specifically through the Neighbourhood Plan and would be more appropriately considered through the Parish Council business.
Chris Mervik	3	3.14	In the discussions of Local Landscape Character, it might help to emphasise / annotate the importance of parkland, woodland and heathland as wildlife habitats linked to the gaps, creating the invaluable wildlife corridors that currently exist particularly, but not only, along the Frome "River Valley Landscape".	A more detailed map on this would be beneficial but is likely to require further research to ensure its accuracy / coverage for the whole plan area, so would be better to scheduled and consider through a future review.
Keith Bamlet	3	3.17 / 3.18 / Table 5 / Appx 4	The description of the fields around Frome Whitfield Farm as Historic Parkland is not correct.	The plan does not claim the land to be designated or registered as historic parkland, but refers to it as locally important parkland. This is similar reference in reports prepared for the Dorset Local Plan (see LUC study https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/planning-

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
				buildings-land/planning-policy/dorset-council-local-plan/evidence/north-of-dorchester-heritage-impact-assessment.aspx para 5.145-6) and evident from the 1888 and 1938 as can be viewed on https://maps.nls.uk/os/6inch-england-and-wales/ <i>Include above citations in List of Supporting Documents</i>
Dorset Council	3	SNP2	Supports the principle of Policy SNP2 and have no objection to the phrase 'Tranquil Areas' which is defined in the Planning Portal glossary https://www.planningportal.co.uk/directory_record/552/tranquil_areas/category/7/glossary_of_planning_terms	Support noted.
Turnberry	3	SNP2	Policy SNP2 does not explain / take into account how DOR13 will alter the rural character and setting of the Dorchester.	This will be a matter to pick up through a future review when the allocation has been determined.
Dorset Council	3	SNP3	Supports the principle of Policy SNP3 - should the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan policy DOR13 go forward then the area that is overlapped by the proposed extension may need to be reviewed.	Support noted.
Historic England	3	SNP3	Supports the desire to protect the settings of settlements and the landscapes around them which will help in maintaining their individual integrity and sense of identity.	Support noted.
T O'Rourke	3	SNP2 / SNP 3	The content of Policy SNP2 and SNP3 have not been evidenced by technical studies, nor have the proposals been tested and considered in the context of masterplan options for a Dorset Local Plan DOR13 policy proposal.	Policy SNP 2 has drawn from existing evidence in the local landscape character appraisals which were drawn up by landscape experts (as referenced in para 3.12) and considered further in light of local knowledge and subject to considerable consultation with local residents as part of the plan-making process (with a high consensus of support). The respondent has not

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
				<p>highlighted any obvious anomalies to suggest the evidence and policy is erroneous.</p> <p>There is not requirement for these policies to be considered in the context of masterplan options - however as with policy SNP5 a similar statement could be made to highlight how this matter should be considered.</p> <p><i>Include additional para similar to 3.25 to highlight how these policies may need to be read in light of the strategic allocation being made - ie that it would still be appropriate with reference to the settlement edges / transition and landscape features retained within the site...</i></p>
Dorset Council T O'Rourke	3	SNP4	May be helpful to clarify that should the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan policy DOR13 go forward this Policy may not be practical to apply in full within the urban extension area.	<p>Agreed.</p> <p><i>See also response to this point in relation to SNP2/3 - this should cover reference to minimising light pollution through an appropriate management scheme particular in relation to the settlement edge and connecting routes.</i></p>
Chris Mervik	3	3.25	Wording could be improved in Line 2: "particularly in the long term..."	<p>Noted</p> <p><i>Update plan accordingly</i></p>
Dorset Council	3	SNP5	Supports the principle of Policy SNP5 but are concerns that concerned that the number of view symbols depicted in figure 4 appears excessive and expansive, recommend that only the most important and focused local views are retained.	<p>There is no accepted national standard as to what constitutes an important view, which is therefore a matter of judgement. As shown in Table 4, consideration has been given to the public use of the route/s some which the view is see, why is it important and the presence of notable landmarks within the viewshed.</p>
T O'Rourke	3	SNP5	The relative merits of these views have not been technically assessed. The policy should be replaced with supporting text identifying the need for valued local views to be considered as part of a wider,	

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
			comprehensive landscape and design assessment exercise for future development, particularly the DOR13 proposals.	This appears similar to the approach taken and endorsed in other Neighbourhood Plans (even involving landscape experts) such as evidenced in the recently made Tetsworth NP https://www.tetsworthparishcouncil.co.uk/neighbourhood-plan.html . The wording in that policy reads “Development should preserve or enhance the local character of the landscape and not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the important views”
Turnberry	3	SNP5	<p>Policy SNP5 gives greater protection to what is a local landscape matter than is accorded to nationally designated landscapes such as the AONB. The policy implies that development is to be ‘stopped’ within the views listed in Table 4, and also proposes sweeping protections for any views from any public footpath.</p> <p><i>NB in the consultation meeting it was noted that all but one of SNP’s protected views would align with proposed open or landscaped areas in the North Dorchester outline plan, although they would still be impacted by being framed by the development.</i></p>	<p>The policy does not seek to prevent any and all development lying within a view but requires that proposals recognise and take account of the importance of these views in their location and design so as to avoid having an unacceptable adverse impact. This is reflected in para 3.25 of the supporting text.</p>
Dorset Council	3	SNP6	Supports the aim of Policy SNP6 - should the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan policy DOR13 go forward then the policy may need to be reviewed.	Support noted.
Natural England	3	SNP6	Welcomes policy - we note that project P3 is intended to investigate new and improved recreational routes and accessible green spaces. Consideration should be given to providing biodiversity enhancements via this policy.	Support noted - the second bullet point in SNP6 refers to effective management for wildlife benefits. Policy SNP1 similarly picks up on the matter of biodiversity gain.
Dorset Council Sally Cooke	4	SNP7	The remains of the deserted medieval village at Frome Whitfield (HER MDO2485) and also Coker’s Frome which is thought to be a (probably early) medieval settlement (HER MDO20966) should be added to the list of non-designated heritage assets owing to their archaeological interest.	<p>Agreed</p> <p><i>Amend Table 5 to include reference to the medieval settlement at Coker’s Frome, add to Figure 5 and Appx 3.</i></p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
Dorset Council	4	SNP7	Suggested re-wording to better reflect the NPPF: 'Development should preserve the significance of non-designated heritage assets and those associated with Thomas Hardy (see Appendices 3-4). Proposals will demonstrate that this significance has been understood and those which enhance or better reveal it will be looked on favourably.'	Noted- NPPF para 197 states that "The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset."
Turnberry	4	SNP7	SNP7 does not align with national policy - it should reference the need to understand the significance of these assets and allow the balancing of harms and benefits.	<i>Amend policy to read as follows: 'Development should preserve the significance of the many non-designated heritage assets and associations with Thomas Hardy (see Appendices 3-4 and Figure 5), taking into account the balanced judgement required under national policy. Proposals which enhance or would lead to a better appreciation of these assets will be looked on favourably.'</i>
Dorset Council	4	SNP8	Supports the aim of Policy SNP8 - clarify the nature of harm (heritage / landscape / both?) Reference to the proximity to established settlements is a particularly important requirement as this criteria reflects the strategic locational principles reflected in criteria ii-iii within the adopted Local Plan Policy ECON5 Tourism Attractions.	The harm is with reference to the cultural / landscape / wildlife qualities referenced in the preceding sentence. This can be clarified. <i>Amend policy to read "In assessing the potential for harm to these qualities, consideration..."</i>
Historic England	4	SNP8	Supports the need to strike a balance between celebration / provision related to the Thomas Hardy connection and ensuring that this respects the area's sensitivity and wider context.	Support noted.
Dorset Council	5	5.1 / 5.2	We broadly agree with paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of the Stinsford Neighbourhood Plan which summarises the proposed methodology for calculating a neighbourhood housing requirement -the figures should be viewed as minimum requirement and, therefore, can be exceeded.	Support noted.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
Chris Mervik	5	5.7	Wording could be improved in Line 8: “not currently have a safe...”	Noted <i>Update plan accordingly</i>
Dorset Council	5	SNP9	Dorset Council is concerned that as drafted the definition of small scale (does not exceed 9 dwellings) may not be sufficiently flexible for Kingston Maurward to deliver their proposed exception schemes. For example, does the Parish Council have evidence that such small affordable housing clusters can be delivered by a local registered provider in this location? Some further evidence and supports from Kingston Maurward College and a Registered Provider would be helpful reassurance.	<p>The policy is not limited to Kingston Maurward College and is based on broadening the current non-strategic policy HOUS2 that refers to ‘small scale sites’. However the sites included within the latest KMC plan are all below the 9 homes limit - as these are for 6 homes (Church Lane), 3 homes (Maurward Close) and 8 homes (Lower Bockhampton). The KMC plan does not specify the proportion of affordable homes proposed on these, but does reference a low cost as well as open market dwellings on these sites.</p> <p>There are examples of schemes of up to 9 dwellings that are being proposed / delivered in the Dorset area, such as the 9 affordable dwellings in Worth Matravers (6/2016/0013) delivered by East Boro (completed March 2020) which provided a mix of 4 low cost and 5 affordable rented homes, proposals for 8 affordable dwellings in Bridport currently under consideration (WD/D/20/002771) and Magna’s proposal for 7 affordable homes in Holwell (based on their response to the Holwell NP Review). Furthermore the provision of affordable housing is not limited to using a RP, and can be done via a private developer - such as the scheme in Tolpuddle for discounted sale built by developer Broadreach (Southern Ltd).</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
Dorset Council	5	SNP9	<p>If the primary purpose of the market element is to fund the college, then the proposal may fall outside the definition of a rural exception site in the NPPF (noting that HOU52 is non-strategic).</p> <p>If it is as a heritage enabling policy then it would need to be considered under Policy ENV5 of the Local Plan. The Kingston Maurward Masterplan is in a draft format and has not been agreed by either Historic England or Dorset Council.</p>	<p>At the current time whilst the strategic aim of the KMC masterplan is to secure the long term future of Kingston Maurward College, there has been no evidence provided in terms of the funding requirements to clarify what is required to be 'enabled' through development (as referenced in 5.7). For this reason (and in line with the community's support for affordable housing) the emphasis of the policy is on affordable housing as the main driver for allowing some open market housing in the area, with the project P4 focusing on exploring the 'enabling element' which could justify a further review to SNP9 when the evidence is clearer. This can be clarified by amending the policy.</p> <p><i>Amend criterion (vi) to delete "or to sustain the long-term upkeep of the education and community facilities within the parish" and update supporting text to clarify the above approach.</i></p>
Kingston Maurward College	5	5.15	<p>The reference to the hub project would be more accurate if worded as follows: "...In 2020 the College were awarded a £3.5 million grant by the Dorset LEP to build a University Centre & Rural Business Development Hub, which would also support wider business use. The building on the Outdoor Activities Centre would be around 400m² comprising a large hall and a small number of separate meeting rooms, and would be available for hire for community uses...."</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p><i>Update plan accordingly</i></p>
Landowner consultation event	5	SNP9	<p>Would prefer 'should' rather than 'must' comprise smaller dwelling types to provide greater flexibility with reference to site viability. It may be uneconomic to build affordable housing at the Maurward Close</p>	<p>Noted - however the current driver for the housing policies is based on meeting local need (para 5.5 refers to the housing needs evidence). The NP does not specifically allocate sites or</p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
			site (mentioned in the KM masterplan), as the cost of improving the access and shared driveway would be prohibitive.	limit the proposals to that shown in the draft KMC, and therefore it would be possible for KMC to suggest a more viable alternative, or to work with the Parish Council as set out in Project P4 which may result in a further review to this plan.
Dorset Council	5	SNP9	In addition, reference to the historic environment could usefully be made e.g. ‘viii) the scheme respects the significance of any affected heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting’	This issue is in part reflected in criterion (vii), but this could be made clearer. <i>Amend (vii) to read “vii) the scheme is of a character, scale and design appropriate to the settlement and location, including any heritage assets whose setting they may fall within, and would demonstrate good practice in terms of its sustainable design”</i>
Environment Agency	5	SNP9	It was not clear from the plan exactly where the KMC sites may be, but there is notable flood risk in this area to the south of Lower Bockhampton which will need to be considered if building is being proposed in locations at increased risk of flooding, which would need to pass the Sequential Test as set out in the NPPF.	None of the potential sites in the KMC plan fall within a fluvial flood risk area (FRZ 2 or 3) or appear to be impacted by surface water flood risk (based on EA maps). The policy would not in any event over-ride the generical flood risk policies contained in the Local Plan / NPPF.
Dorset Council	5	SNP10	Supports the aim of Policy SNP10, however, it would be helpful to map the location of the three employment clusters in the parish: Stinsford Business Centre, Hampton Business Park and also Mellstock Business Park.	Noted - this can be done. <i>Include map showing employment locations</i>
T O’Rourke	5	SNP10	The requirement that additional buildings “should achieve high standards of environmental performance (significantly above that required by Building Regulations)” is ambiguous and does not recognise that the regulations themselves are evolving.	One of the key aims of the plan is to uphold principles of sustainable development and good and climate-friendly building design. Whilst the plan does not set a specific standard above Building Regulations that new business units must meet, it is considered appropriate to encourage developers to consider whether they can go

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
				further than the minimum requirement at that time, and encourage them to do so. This is particularly relevant in the context of an 'additional' building (to which this criteria relates) which would not normally be permitted under the Local Plan policies (as ECON1 limits development away from settlements to existing premises / replacement unless a rural location is essential).
Sally Cooke	5	SNP10	Do not support the addition of new buildings in the business parks - it is unlikely that further business space can be created without adding to the traffic load on the lanes, and it should be sufficient to limit change to retaining / replacing existing business premises.	The issue of the adverse impacts of traffic on rural road users is covered in criterion (iv) and proposals that would result in a reduction in motor vehicle traffic levels (particularly lorry movements) to achieve a safer highway network are encouraged. The inclusion of the maps (above) will further clarify the limited extent of the area to which this policy would apply in relation to "additional new buildings within the existing developed area of the business parks"
Natural England	6	Table 7	Welcomes reference to the enhancement of biodiversity through the use of sustainable drainage schemes such as swales, ponds and reed beds.	Support noted.
Chris Mervik	6	Table 7	Wording could be improved. Parking provision: is "low energy" the correct descriptor for electric cars, or is it "low emission", or something else?	Noted <i>Update plan to reference electric cars which are the main technology likely to be used</i>
Highways England	6	SNP10	We have noted policy SNP10 with regards to employment sites, and the need for proposed development to be supported by an assessment of traffic impacts. We would expect any large scale development that has the potential to impact upon the SRN to be supported by a transport assessment and if necessary mitigation measures in line with	Noted - the plan is not proposing large scale development that has the potential to impact upon the SRN.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
			the requirements of DfT Circular 02/2013 The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development.	
Dorset Council	6	SNP11	Supports the broad intention of Policy SNP11.	Support noted.
Dorset Council	6	SNP12	Supports the aim of Policy SNP12.	Support noted.
Dorset Council	6	SNP13	Supports Policy SNP13.	Support noted.
Sally Cooke	6	SNP13	Unsure whether this is achievable through planning.	It is envisaged that this would be a matter that could be conditioned where permission is required for the installation of such systems.
Sally Cooke	6	addition	Would like to see stronger policies in relation to climate change, e.g. a policy supporting the installation of *appropriate* renewable energy generation (could include investigation of hydro power on the Frome hatches, subject of course to assessment of effects on wildlife, fishing, avoidance of flooding, etc.).	Noted - this is already covered (to a degree) by LP Policy COM11, and at this stage is considered more appropriately dealt with in the first instance via the Parish Council's climate action plan, with any further policy implications noted for a future review.
Chris Mervik	7	7.4	Wording could be improved in 3rd bullet, line 1: "Traffic inappropriately diverting..."	Noted <i>Update plan accordingly</i>
Dorset Council	7	7.9	Para 7.9 provides useful clarification of how specific local issues are to be considered in a Transport Assessment.	Support noted.
Dorset Council	7	SNP14	Supports the proposed objective of Policy SNP14.	Support noted.
Highways England	7	SNP14 - 16	These policies and related projects have been noted and shared with operational colleagues	Noted
Elizabeth Baker	7	SNP14 / 16	The B3143 should be included - it has become a rat-run when the Stinsford roundabout is congested. It is a popular route for leisure cyclists but the speed of traffic is terrifying and the size of some vehicles even more terrifying. Access from the B3143 onto the	This is already reflected in part under Table 8 which references issues with the B3143 under entries (12) and (18), although the problem associated with the speed of traffic on London

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NP Group Response (<i>italics = to change</i>)
			London Road is difficult and dangerous (particularly difficult when traffic is stacked up on its approach to the roundabout).	Road for cyclists accessing onto London Road is not specifically highlighted. <i>Add this issue into the Table 8 and to map showing Traffic Safety Concerns.</i>
Sally Cooke	7	SNP14	Consider adding reference to working with public transport providers to improve access to the parish by public transport, in line with the climate change objective of the plan.	Agreed <i>Add as a separate project</i>
Resident consultation event	5	SNP16	Include improving access across A35 to help connect the two parts of the parish that this road severs.	This issue is already mentioned in para 7.5, but perhaps could be more clearly reflected in Project P5 <i>Amend P5 to include additional criterion: "Supporting measures to make access across the A35 where it bisects existing footpaths / bridleways safer to navigate."</i>
British Horse Society	5	SNP16	Include better access for horse riders. Improve bridleway network (Snail Creep; Stinsford church)	This is covered generically under Policy SNP6, which would benefit from including reference to horseriders. Specific improvements may be better progressed through contact with the Parish Council. <i>Amend first bullet of SNP6 to add 'and options suitable for horseriders'.</i>
Dorset Council	8		Welcomes the Parish Council's intention to review the Plan as set out.	Support noted.