

Stinsford Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group's Response to KMC Masterplan 2019-2029, Oct 2018 version

General Response

We very much welcome the Kingston Maurward College Board's initiative to share their plans for sustaining the future of the college with us at this early stage. KMC makes a tremendous contribution to the character and economy of our part of Dorset and the Masterplan correctly identifies the college as a "jewel in Dorset's rich landscape". We support its continuing focus on Land Based education, while extending the range and reach of the courses being offered and the opening up of the campus to more tourists and visitors. The Masterplan identifies a number of major developments required to realise the college's education aspirations and to replace some of the buildings nearing their end of life, given the current tight Government funding positions. The Stinsford Neighbourhood Plan will, therefore, want to support a Masterplan that aims to contribute to a thriving future for the College.

The College estate makes up a large and focal part of the parish to the SE of the A35, and so any changes there can significantly affect our area, including the sense of place which is emerging as a clear concern of local people. We are therefore pleased that the College and its consultants welcome our joint engagement with the development of the Masterplan.

Pending consultation with the residents and businesses of the parish, we are broadly in support of the College's proposals, subject to the following detailed concerns:

Planning Issues

Procedure

1. We agree with SPC who would like to see a clear explanation of the status of the Masterplan: "Is it intended to provide a framework for future expansion with planning permission being merely a "rubber stamping" exercise or is it a general direction of travel for the college's expansion and development?"

Parish Character and Facilities

2. As the masterplan says, the centre of gravity of student-based activities at the College is shifting to the north-east part of the Park, towards Bockhampton Cross. At present this area is widely perceived as part of the unspoilt, rural character of the parish. It is therefore particularly important to ensure that development here does not detract from the countryside. We suggest:
 1. Introducing additional landscaping to screen the buildings in this part of the Park, including additional native, evergreen trees and shrubs to the north and west of the Studio School.
 2. Adopting a strict policy on the design of lighting, to reduce current and avoid future light pollution and the impression of urbanisation that this creates.
 3. Provide sufficient car parking to avoid cars parking beside the entrance track to the Studio School, which would continue to detract from the unspoilt views.
1. The views of local residents and of the parish council should be sought on the interesting offer of an extended playground in Lower Bockhampton and if the response

is favourable we would welcome the opportunity to include how this open space can best be used the Stinsford Neighbourhood Plan.

2. We would support the inclusion of 5G Fibre Provision for the whole of Stinsford to encourage the expansion and start up of small businesses.

Traffic

3. With the increase in planned pupil numbers, the traffic at the Studio School entrance will increase and the plan expresses a clear intention to make this entrance a transport hub. We suggest that further consideration be given to traffic flow and road safety on the roads surrounding the college, and:
 1. Consideration be given to moving the transport hub to near the main entrance so the Hollow Hill can return to an unspoilt rural lane.
 2. If moving the transport hub is not feasible, the following changes should be included in the Masterplan:
 1. The bus park that is referred to in the text (p. 48) should be shown on the plan.
 2. The bend at the top of the hill, to the East of the Pump House, is already unsafe, so the road should be realigned, or the visibility improved, and widened to accommodate the expected volume of traffic.
 3. A 30mph speed limit should be imposed on the stretch between the roundabout on the A35 and Bockhampton Cross.
4. The traffic on Cuckoo Lane through Higher Bockhampton has significantly increased as the A35 has become more congested causing many vehicles to use this route as a “rat run”. Following the proposed move of the dairy to Higher Bockhampton the traffic is likely to increase further, as is the noise and light pollution. We, therefore, support Stinsford Parish Council’s (SPC) suggestion to construct an access from Hollow Hill opposite the Studio School.
5. The College should have a 'green travel plan', which should be referenced in the sustainability section. If not, we would like to participate in the development of one as a joint project.

Sustainability

6. There is no indication in the Masterplan that either embodied energy or the life-time energy use of the buildings is being considered in the design. (E.g. profiled steel is mentioned without reference to countering heat loss.) An aim of reducing energy (or carbon) use should surely be referred to in the page on sustainability? And there may be other opportunities for synergy between sustainability and the College's land-based skills – e.g. use of forestry waste for biomass heating ; exploration in the Construction syllabus of sustainable materials, installation of renewable energy sources, etc.

The College Facilities: Farming and Education

7. The possible move to an 11-16 yr old provision would be out of sync with the Dorchester catchment area and could therefore have an adverse financial impact on the middle schools within this area. It would also require more land to expand the provision.
8. The definition of a PAN on p14 is commonly referred to as the Published Admission Numbers i.e. “the number of pupils **in each year group** that the admission authority has agreed will be admitted without causing problems for the school”. The Masterplan states that the Pupil Application Number (PAN) is expected to rise to 375 students which would result in 1875 pupils in an 11-16 yr old school. Is the correct term being used in this Masterplan?
9. The Masterplan highlights the College’s need to be sustainable with non-educational

businesses and identifies the working farm selling milk to M&S as one of the prime examples. However, it appears from the maps that around 50% of the college's farm is on lease from the Ilchester Estate land which is the subject to the DOR 15 development as part of the North Dorchester Land development. The scope and rationale of the future businesses and farm should be included in the Masterplan.

- 10. Dairy:** If this is relocated to the proposed site adjoining Hampton Business Park & the "Hardy Heritage Footway" bridleway towards Hardy's Cottage, the layout of the new dairy site and the height of the buildings (max 9m as stated) should minimise the impact (visual, noise, smell, traffic) on the Footway and on the Business Park, as well as minimising its impact in the wider landscape. The proposed band of trees should be extended to the south of the site. It's not possible to tell from the existing plan if these aims are achieved, and so further comments should be included in the detailed plans. We endorse the SPC's support of this proposal for the Footway and would also be keen to work with the college to promote the various heritage assets and routes around the parish.
- 11. Sports pitches near Hollow Hill:** these are clearly a benefit for the College in providing for its students; however this will introduce a more urban land use where the present use is farmland. The new tree belt alongside the road is essential, and conditions should be included to ensure that any lighting used conforms with the Dark Skies code.

Housing

- 12. Design:** The Masterplan should state that the design and appearance of the houses proposed should complement the houses nearby, be sustainable and innovative, with the aim of enhancing the character of Stinsford.
- 13. Quantity:** The number of houses proposed (23 houses) exceeds the likely needs of the parish, therefore needs to be justified. A financial projection should be made available (in confidence if need be) to demonstrate that the housing proposed will deliver the expected financial benefits. It is important to establish that the proposed housing is necessary and sufficient to avoid additional enabling development at a later date.

14. Housing

1. Each proposed location needs to be examined in turn to understand the impact of the additional housing upon the sense of "quiet, countryside, rural, wildlife, walks etc" of the parish.
2. **Housing Proposals:** We agree with the SPC "that the housing proposals must be treated as any other residential planning application, and whilst we understand the concept of "enabling development", this does not mean planning considerations can be ignored. For example: the proposed sites are outside of current development boundaries and the numbers proposed represent significant increases to small rural settlements with unique characteristics."
3. **Affordable Housing:** We agree with the SPC that "We would like to see affordable housing included in these proposals (at least 30%) and consideration given to non-car journeys. There are no facilities close to these proposed developments and any access to shops and amenities will require additional car journeys on already busy roads. Currently, pedestrian and cycle access is possible but limited and there needs to be more detail on how traffic is managed with these developments."
4. **Housing at Maurward Close:** We have no objection in principle, but adding 9 houses to a site which now has 4 seems questionable, and we agree with the SPC that "As any development here would be totally car dependent, the provision of pedestrian and cycle access would be vital for this development to succeed. This road currently has a 60-mph speed limit and is not at all safe for

pedestrians/cyclists highlighting the need for a 30mph restriction.”

5. **Housing at Church Lane / Stinsford Farm:** We have no objection, but agree with the SPC that “Housing development here needs careful thought regarding the use of Church Lane by cars and pedestrians. The existing turning area and regular use by tourists visiting Stinsford Church needs to be carefully considered.”
6. **Housing at Lower Bockhampton:** We are concerned that the band of trees adjacent to the river is well maintained to ensure that the two southern groups of houses will not adversely affect the view from the river path. We also agree with the SPC that “the access onto Bockhampton Lane from Knapwater is problematic – narrow and often congested with resident’s parked cars, poor sight lines and high levels of “cut through” traffic avoiding the A35. Thus, we would like you to give greater thought to access/egress through the college road network.”

15. College Buildings

1. We acknowledge to need to improve the current state of the buildings and make them “fit for purpose” and therefore agree with the SPC comments on:
 1. Animal Park
 2. Replacement teaching building
 3. Relocation of stabling and new workshops at current stable site
 4. New teaching block (inc. Studio School ext.) at current dairy site
 5. Materials science
 6. Sports facilities
 7. Business Units at Stinsford site
 8. Student accommodation
 9. Multipurpose hall
 10. Sports Hall: However, the location of the proposed sports hall should be included clearly on the diagrams.

Presentation

18. The Masterplan would benefit from a single, clear index plan showing all the proposals on one map.
 1. A manageable digital file size would be easier to review (this has now been achieved by the parish clerk – 5 Meg).
 2. All diagrams should have North compass points; Some have not and this makes them hard to interpret.
 3. The text on some pages ends mid-sentence; presumably there is more text somewhere, which has got lost in the formatting?