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Why we have produced this summary

This is a record of the consultation that was carried out on ideas and options for the Neighbourhood Plan. The consultation took place in late 2015, and allowed us to present options and ideas to the community and gauge there level of support.

We have produced this summary so that everyone can read about and understand what happened and how the outcomes from the consultation will be reflected in the final plan and where further work is needed. Ultimately this report will form part of the evidence base for the plan, detailing how we consulted, the main issues and concerns that people raised, and how these concerns and issues have been considered.

The consultation stage

This was the third main consultation event on the Neighbourhood Plan, following on from the launch event (March 2014) and the vision and aims consultation (Autumn 2014). This consultation centred on a number of topics:

- Protecting aspects important to the local character and enjoyment of our parish from inappropriate development – in particular important views, the green open spaces that we use and value, the important buildings that enhance the character of the area or have an historic significance, and important trees
- Draft Design Principles to be used in new developments - style, layout and quality.
- Potential housing sites suitable for development and the number and types of housing these could accommodate
- Facilities used by the community – which ones are most important and those that we should support
- Improving pedestrian and cycle routes across the area as a whole
- Supporting farming

Other topics, in particular the future of the town centre, were not covered in the consultation as further work was being undertaken on these to identify potential options. Further consultation would therefore take place in early 2016.

How we consulted

The consultation ran for just over two weeks from 27th November to 14th December. There was an event in the Exchange, Sturminster Newton on Friday 27th (until 8pm) on Saturday 28th and on Monday 30th, our Market day, until 1pm. The event comprised information boards and paper questionnaires relating to each of the topics presented. Volunteers were on hand throughout to answer questions and receive feedback. We also placed images of the information boards and questionnaires online on the Group’s website (www.sturminsternewtonplan.com)

Preparations began back in the early summer when we updated the community on our progress and announced our plans for the autumn consultation via our community magazine Unity.com. This monthly magazine is a key vehicle for our publicity. It has a distribution of 3200 copies, is delivered to every household within the Sturminster Newton Plan Area and is also left at key distribution points in the neighbouring villages outside the parish.
We canvassed a large group of volunteers to go out and about collecting the data that would eventually be used in the consultation.

We published an article in the October edition of Unity.com, setting out when and where the consultation would take place, and providing some information about what our community could expect to be consulted upon at this stage in our process.

At the end of October we placed banners at key points in the town, giving the important information about the event, and we also put posters in shop windows and on notice boards in Newton and Broad Oak.

A ‘save the date’ general email was emailed to a database of 300 local businesses and residents who had, in the past, expressed a desire to be kept informed of our consultation process, during October, and again in early November.

On Monday 16th November (our Market day) volunteers, armed with leaflets about the consultation went out and about in town, early in the morning. They stood at key locations, including outside the Primary school and in the main Market Cross. The exercise was repeated on Saturday morning, in the Town Centre, at the Exchange, outside the Supermarket and also at the Leisure Centre in the Town. In total, about 300 leaflets were given to individuals by hand.

At every stage and via all our publicity, members of the community were also directed to our website.

On the morning of the first day of the consultation, our large banner was placed outside the Exchange building welcoming everyone to our event.

In the Unity edition published in early December, we gave the community a short summary of the event and let people know that they could still take part on the website until 14th December.
Who responded

Some 205 questionnaire responses were received, primarily from local residents, but also including some businesses and other organisations. However, the headcount for visits to the exhibition was 287 over three days and fewer people accessed the questionnaire online. Of those completing the questionnaire 71% lived in the DT10 1 area (the town), 14.7% in DT10 2 (Bagber and Broadoak) and 11.7% came from outside the parish mainly from DT11, BH or SP postcodes.

Whilst 205 visitors actually filled out some or all of the questionnaire, generally people did not answer all questions. In some cases questions were answered by under 50. The average response count for Likert scaled type questions (agree to disagree) was 57, whilst free response questions as might be expected, received fewer responses.

Organisations responding included:

- CPRL North Dorset
- Home-Start North Dorset
- North Dorset District Council
- Savills
- Southern Planning Practice on behalf of Hall & Woodhouse Ltd
- Streeters Carpets & Beds
- Sturfit
- Sturminster Museum & Mill Society
- Sturminster Newton High School
- Sturminster Newton Football Club
- Sturminster Newton Youth Centre

As with the previous consultation, the age profile of respondents was heavily skewed to the over 50 age groups, with very few (only about 4%) representing those aged up to 30.

Points to note

Because of the lower response rate and geographic / demographic skew of those responding, although providing a useful check on the potential options for the draft plan, the findings cannot be considered conclusive. Some issues may benefit from further consultations, for example focusing on younger people or in neighbourhoods where change is proposed (where possible using existing groups such as resident’s associations).

The results should be treated with caution particularly where ‘don’t know’ and ‘disagree’ combined come close to the 50% mark.
Action points

Consider use of exhibition/questionnaire format and on line presence, develop strategies for small group consultations located where people will be effected by change.
Local character

Who responded?
Some 70 – 80 people responded to the questions on locally important features (buildings, open spaces, views and trees).

Main findings
The criteria for assessing important buildings were broadly agreed by those responding.

The criteria for assessing open spaces were also broadly agreed, although some were not sure whether level of use of such spaces should be a significant factor in valuing its importance. This may be because issues such as tranquillity are also equally important considerations.
Similarly there was broad agreement on the criteria for important views, but some respondents were not sure whether their importance in helping people find their way about should be a significant factor in assessing their importance (which may be because this concept is difficult to understand).

The criteria for assessing important trees were broadly agreed by those responding.

Suggestions were made for elements to be added to each list, and some that could be taken off each list.

**Important buildings: possible additions**

- All old shop fronts & windows
- Group of 3 cottages LHS Rixon Hill (Old Stores, Barnside,Rixon Cottage)
- Newton Village fine & old buildings
- Streeters - a building with some railway style is required
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- The workhouse on Bath Road?
- William Barnes primary school
- Yewstock

**Important buildings: possible exclusions**

- Barclays Bank ! Please remove
- Sturminster Newton Football Club House - no historic interest-community asset only (x4)
- Montebourg house, Old Market Hill- modern-not good example of design that should be replicated (x2)
- New block of flats in Station Rd out of character
- Gas Works House - ugly and not in keeping with the area / historic relevance outweighed by effect on historic environment (x2)
- Old Stone Cottages, Butts Pond
- Newton House is ugly & quite out of character (x2)
- Old Post Office - building has already been changed, longer recognizable (x3)
- Streeters building has more significance as former agricultural feed depot service by the railway. However, it is a very unattractive building - perhaps better replaced with strict criteria requiring reference to the railway features of the building
- The Gavel, although good, is over-rated

**Open Spaces: possible additions**

- Meadow between Elm Close and Trailway- better as open space than buildings (x2)
- Land at junction of Old Market Hill and Station Road
- Market Fields / Fire station field - newts & relationship with LNR Butts Pond / the "lungs" of the town to remain (x6)
- Badger field
- Hill Fort-Manor House
- Market Place, town centre. This area should be the "heart" of town, not a car park. See examples on continent, town squares are beautiful & preserved / enhanced for everyone's benefit
- Nature reserve opposite the Bull Inn (x2)
- Open Spaces behind Glue Hill

**Open Spaces: possible exclusions**

- Sturminster Newton castle is important. However, there is no access to this so why is it rated so highly. No point without access

**Views: possible additions**

- The land adjoining the Bull PH has the potential to offer an enhanced setting for the town when entering from the east.
- Hambledon Hill from Reddleman House
- Newton Village
- Streetscenes & views within Gavel/Drovers dev.
- View from Rixon across Hambledon Hill
- View from top of recreation ground towards Mill
- View from Trailway as approaching S.N
- View of town/Broad Oak by road from Sherborne
- Views from lane near Banbury Hill, Broad Oak is stunning.
- Views from Newton omitted, especially those from behind Glue Hill
- Views from properties on Bath Road towards river
- Views of Hambledon Hill from Bath Road and views of copse of trees above high school from various directions
- Views of town looking eastward from line of dismantled railway

**Views: possible exclusions**

- Snooks Yard (x2)
- Views from Broad Oak

**Trees: possible additions**

- Ancient oaks in Piddles Wood.
- Butts Pond entrance - recognised as open space but large trees not recognised as "important trees" (x2)
- Conker tree at Filbridge Rise
- Conker tree at Rixon Rec
- Copper beech, corner Green Close / Manston Rd mature specimen (x2)
- Footpath crossing
- Gavel/Drivers there are few trees but they are important
- Gough Close - Lyndens
- The tree at the church
- The trees by the bridge at the bottom of Bridge St. left and right [perhaps already protected].
- Trees around the Mill and trees around the Rec. and down to the river
- Trees at junction of Honeymead Lane & Manston Rd
- Trees in Broad Oak
- Trees in Piddles Wood & along Stalbridge Lane
- Trees of Englefield have TPO

There was general support for tree planting with some specific places mentioned, and for the Matrix suggestion of improved landscaping in the Rixon area in particular.
The suggestion to remove the Conservation Area from around The Exchange and Station road was not generally supported. If this is considered by the NP team to be critical to the development of the town centre a case will need to be made for this which should suggest the preservation of existing significant buildings and appropriate criteria for new buildings.

**Action points**

The criteria for the various landscape character elements (views, open spaces etc) appear appropriate to take forward for use in the plan. The suggested changes (additions and deletions) to the various specific elements need to be assessed against these agreed criteria to see if they would qualify / should be disqualified.

The need to improve the appearance of the area around the Exchange and Station Road needs to feed into the consideration of the policy context for the area. The area around Streeters and Hansons has for many years been identified as a possible development site and a design plan was drawn up to indicate use for shops, offices and housing some years ago. As Streeters is a listed building and is the last remaining building associated with the old railway line, it is thought that any development will need to accommodate its position and prominence.
Draft Design Principles

Who responded?

Of the 205 people who filled in elements of the questionnaire, between 54 and 61 people responded on the Design Principle section to the detailed principles. 32 indicated they broadly agreed with the principles and did not need to comment further. Further detailed analysis could be performed to identify the different age profiles of the respondents and their locations in the town; however, this was not thought to be material to the conclusions since all proposed principles were considered to be mainly independent of age and location in the parish.

Main findings

The results in the table below indicate that the majority of respondents either approved all of the principles – indeed there was a very high level of ‘strongly agree’ against most questions. None were rejected (more ‘not sure’ and ‘disagree’ respondents than those who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’). There were some principles in the housing section where there was a relatively high level of ‘don’t knows’. These were specifically:

- High quality modern architecture and high quality Self-Build housing – It is possible that respondents were unsure what these meant in practice (although earlier consultation indicated support for the images we presented of modern architecture) and probably indicates that context is important in judging acceptability
- Where higher density dwellings are built, use high quality, safe, adjacent, communal managed green space as an alternative to small gardens – this received a relatively high levels of disagrees and don’t knows (although ‘agrees’ reached around 60%) and reflects a desire by many to have their own outside space

Specific comments were made that need to be considered in drafting the policies to implement these principles:

1) Access and Rights of Way

- Gradients for wheelchairs, pedestrian safety on town centre routes (e.g. Lovers Lane, footpath outside Candys, narrow route from town bridge to Rolls Mill, ) and lighting on some of the town centre paths (e.g. the footpath alongside Nazareth House leading to Penny Street) were mentioned.
- Improving access to the Trailway from potential future developments may need to be incorporated into the design policies.

2) Views Visibility and Tree Cover

- Two comments were made about the Butts Pond industrial estate and its unattractiveness. Suggestions were made to move the occupants to Rolls Mill.
- Two comments were made about the need to balance protecting views and landscape with the need for development for jobs and renewables, albeit with appropriate landscaping.
- Comment was made about the need to plant tree species that have a longer life (lime, Oak, Beech) but also about the need to plant species in developments that grow to an appropriate size for their location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you agree with the following design principles?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate existing routes, and link to the footpath network and amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routes to have sufficient width, encourage wildlife, landscaped, retain views, feel safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use landscaping and retain trees and hedgerows to safeguard important views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control the layout, materials, scale and height of buildings facing important views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect trees where they soften or shield buildings from important views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent large renewable or industrial development damaging important views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate existing important open spaces where possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design safe, attractive, fully funded open spaces in larger developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have sensitive and attractive buildings facing onto existing open spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain existing important historic buildings and architectural features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain consistency of key architectural features in important group of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scale of buildings should be subsidiary to adjacent important buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings on prominent sites in the town should provide high quality landmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The design and layout should respect the local character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality modern architecture is welcomed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality, durable materials and detailing are used, local if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid obtrusive colours, claddings and surfaces that would be widely seen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing is designed to be indistinguishable from market housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In higher density housing, use high quality, safe, communal managed green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is sufficient off-road parking to prevent cluttering of main streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality Self-Build housing is welcomed on small in-fill areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for older / less mobile people is located on sites close to amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rows of identical or frequently repeated designs are not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-dwelling buildings avoid repetitious bulky or blank facades lacking detail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) **Open Spaces**
- Comment was made regarding the lack of use of some existing open spaces/play areas in the recent northern developments. Given the cost of their maintenance, we need to consider carefully the design, location and purpose of open spaces to match the needs of the adjacent population.

4) **Buildings of Importance and Character**
- Scale of recent public buildings (Exchange and Medical Centre complex) was criticised in two comments – out of scale with the town and need to ensure new buildings don’t detract from our existing character buildings.
- Need to carefully consider prominent sites and the scale/quality of building on them (Montebourg House mentioned as poor example). Avoidance of faceless blocks of flats also mentioned.
- Poor quality of other relatively recent buildings was mentioned (e.g. Barclays mentioned twice, Legion) – do they need to be retained, could they be improved?
- Need to consider own open spaces, even for flats.
- Importance of using local materials and styles were mentioned in one comment, while another mentioned the need to relax some constraints in conservation area (e.g. use of double glazing when renovating old buildings).

5) **Design and Layout of Housing Developments**
- Comments mentioned the need to make all new buildings as ecologically friendly as possible, both when building and in on-going operation (e.g. heat pumps or solar panels, materials so they are built-to-last, compliant with code ‘A’, energy efficient).
- Comments were made about appearance/design –
  - Comments indicating a dislike of 3 storey buildings and bulky blank facades
  - Comment regarding drowning in nostalgia with pastiche designs.
  - Use of colours and cladding – a comment indicated these can be attractive – e.g. new house on Church Lane
  - Density – comment about need to provide space for each dwelling to sit in
- Off-Road Parking comment that we need to avoid resident parking on any street, not just main ones

**Action points**

Need to present the case for design policies in particular relating to high density housing in particular appropriate places

Review clarity in some of the terminology used in the design policies – for instance modern architecture and self build

Policies will need to be refined and tested for practical interpretation and commercial realisation by developers
Potential housing sites

Who responded?

Response rates for this section of the questionnaire were generally higher than for other questions and there were also larger numbers of open response comments against each question.

![Population trends in the Sturminster Newton area](image-url)

Main findings – type and size of housing

People were broadly in agreement with the proposed housing offering and again reflected a desire for a mix of housing. Nearly 50% of respondents were either unsure about or disagreed with the need for building to accommodate elderly / downsizing households and just over 40% could not agree with affordable housing being the top priority. Most people were supportive of housing to help young people remain or locate to the area, and housing for people in the 30 – 50 age group. Interestingly, although the respondent profile was overwhelmingly in the older age group, the comments were more often than not about bringing young people into the town and relating work opportunities with new housing.

There were quite a few comments about the size and type of housing focused on the need for larger plots to better cater for parking and garden requirements, and decent sized rooms.

Main findings – considerations for assessing different sites

There was also broad agreement on the main considerations for assessing different sites and indeed all of these are already used in the assessment of planning applications by the Local Authority and will continue to be so. There is some lack of clarity about how this criteria will be used, whether one is more important than another or if all seven are required to be in place before development is permitted. These kinds of decisions almost always require a balancing of issues and priorities.
Main findings – potential development sites

In terms of issues and choices relating to housing sites, the majority of residents were more supportive of infill sites around the town (telephone and Gas works, Hammonds yard, Primary School site) than building on green field sites. Responses against some of the sites came close to a figure that might be regarded as ‘unsafe’ and indicated that further research was probably needed and that they were possibly controversial locations for building. In this group were sites at the Bull Tavern, Elm Close Farm, Barton Farm House Newton and north of the Livestock Market. However, in all cases except the Bull, the agrees outweighed the disagrees.

Comments relating to sites in the town focussed mainly on increased traffic and access through already congested roads and also queried whether employment uses might be a more appropriate use of the space. For sites out of the main town, the loss of wildlife and green spaces where the main concerns with risk of flooding also being important.

Some comments were negative about any new housing at all, which reflects a percentage of responses in previous consultations. This together with the close scoring of some of the proposed sites, suggest that further work needs to be done to present housing development needs and constraints to residents most closely effected by new building.

Further housing sites are to be proposed in the town centre and these will be identified and consulted upon in the forthcoming town centre report.

**Detailed comments by site – issues that may require further investigation**

| Land north of Northfields | Traffic / access issues from Honeymead, particularly if the school is located here
Flooding - the lower part does get very wet |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Land north of the Livestock Market | Importance for wildlife, particularly green links to / from nature reserve
Provision for Jubilee Path
Potentially better site for the school |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land south of Elm Close and Friars Moor</td>
<td>Traffic / access issues - including junction with Rixon Hill, Provision for access to trailway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Exchange and Gas Works</td>
<td>Traffic / access issues along Penny Street - particularly need to include sufficient off street parking, Potential ground contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammonds Yard</td>
<td>Traffic / access issues along Penny Street, Design / scale crucial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Barnes Primary School Site</td>
<td>Impact on landscape - elevated nature of site / potential prominence, Traffic / access issues onto Bridge Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council offices off Stour View Close</td>
<td>Potential to re-use existing buildings, and may lend itself readily to other types of development (other than housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yewstock Field, Bath Road</td>
<td>Traffic / access issues – parking off road, Impact on landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Northfield adjacent to Manston Road</td>
<td>Impact on landscape - potential prominence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Elm Close Farm, Bull Ground Lane</td>
<td>Traffic / access issues – including junction with Rixon Hill, Sewage works / odours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar charts showing the percentage of agreement with potential and issues for housing on various sites.](chart.png)
Main findings – sites to be excluded

In addition to the sites mentioned above, other sites had also been submitted to the District Council by landowners with the hope that they could be allocated for development. All of the had been assessed by the District Council as unsuitable for development. The Neighbourhood Plan group did looked at all these sites to see if there may be some potential for development that would not be controversial, but had concluded that there were good reasons for these sites to remain outside of the development plans for the foreseeable future. The aim of the question was to check whether local people were also in agreement, which appears to be the case from the responses. Where people had given comments on why sites should be included instead, 3 of the 7 were suggesting that no further sites should be developed, which suggests that the question was not fully understood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copse Hill Farm Broad Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land off A357 and Hillcrest, Glue Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land East of Elm Close Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Field at Northfields adjacent to Manston Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land east of Manston Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to Gotts Corner and Ham Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action points

Include information on the type of housing that should be delivered as part of the housing sites in the plan.

Contact landowners of the potential sites that were supported, to highlight the potential issues noted in the review and through the consultation, as they may have investigated these issues and have evidence or possible design solutions that could provide reassurance on how these concerns might be overcome. They may also have identified other factors that should inform the plan’s policies.

Finalise the scoping for the Strategic Environmental Assessment and appraisal of alternatives, to inform the plan drafting.
Community Assets

Who responded?

Main findings

39 people were broadly happy and did not comment further, with the remaining respondents broadly in agreement but adding some further feedback. 3 respondents disagreed more fundamentally with the points made.

The main reasons for safeguarding an asset were broadly agreed, though quite a few people were unsure about whether meeting local / national standards was particularly relevant.

| Do you agree with the following criteria to select local important buildings? |
|-------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| They have been used at or close to full capacity for the last 10 years | 0% | 20% | 40% | 60% | 80% | 100% |
| They are the only one of their kind we have in that local area | 0% | 20% | 40% | 60% | 80% | 100% |
| They are close to the people who most want to use them | 0% | 20% | 40% | 60% | 80% | 100% |
| They meet national or local required standards of provision (where these apply) | 0% | 20% | 40% | 60% | 80% | 100% |
| They are close to other facilities that would also benefit from their provision | 0% | 20% | 40% | 60% | 80% | 100% |

Detailed comments on assets and priorities requires further scrutiny

Action points
Pedestrian and cycle routes across the area

Who responded?
There were 55 responses to questions concerning pedestrian and cycle routes

Main findings
Respondents were presented with maps showing eight key routes across the town which people were likely to use for everyday journeys going about their normal business and as access to more rural routes for leisure purposes. Descriptions of all the proposed routes were available and these highlighted existing known problems that need to be rectified. These routes would be highlighted in the Neighbourhood Plan and brought up to acceptable standards so they could be used confidently and safely by all potential users and thus encourage more people to walk when making journeys within the town, with provision for cyclists along closely aligned routes.

People were asked to comment on the detail of the routes and to identify any particular problems. No-one was fundamentally opposed to the proposals and all the suggested routes were well supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Bridge to Rolls Mill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange to Town Bridge via Coach Road and Church Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange to Leisure Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rixon recreation ground to The Exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailway link through the Town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rixon recreation ground to the High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange to North Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library to the High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 people commented on the detail of the proposals and additional ideas and issues from these were:
- six commented adversely of the continued closure of Jubilee Way, south of Station Road, one was concerned that there should be a buffer between the Jubilee Path and any new development.
- four responded concerning the town centre area
two commented on the Trailway, one proposing the extension to Stalbridge should be routed via Colber Bridge and the other complaining that surface was poor on the existing stretch.

- two complained that the kissing gate was missing at Bridge Street end of the Coach Road.
- one was keen that we avoided sleeping policemen in the areas we are proposing traffic calming

Respondents were asked if they considered the Trailway to be the most important route and just under half agreed with this suggestion. People were asked to put forward additional ideas and two further key routes are under consideration as a result.

**Action points**

It can be seen that there is strong support for an extension of the route of the Trailway over the Stour to the west of the town. The route needs to be defined (or the potential options safeguarded).

The replacement of the kissing gate at the end of the Coach Road is a safety issue and this will be added to the requirements for Route 2 (Exchange – Bridge). The provision of a gate would be suitable for use by cyclists is under investigation.

The provision of routes through new estates is covered in the Design Principles.

A route between the Recreation Ground and the Police Station will be added to the key routes.

The route between Newton and Recreation Ground via Colber Bridge is really more of a leisure route and these two locations are linked by Route 1 (Bridge – Rolls Mill). Further consideration should be given to routes to the west of the town once the path of the Trailway is settled and if there is further development at Rolls Mill.
Supporting farming

Who responded?

Only 4 farmers responded to the consultation, 77 people responded to this section of the questionnaire.

Main findings

There was overall support for the proposals put forward (with only around 10% in disagreement), but quite high levels of ‘don’t know’ responses particularly where questions involved more complex planning terminology – for instance ‘current permitted development rights’. The results of this question and reducing or removing floor space limits. The respondents reflect some degree of concern in respect of widening the approach to all former farm buildings and lifting the limits on the number or size of conversions.

Additional comments included concerns about the potential abuse of the planning powers (for example live work consents used only as homes), with some questioning the need for the neighbourhood plan to make any changes to the existing system, and how making a ‘positive impact’ could be assessed. Some pointed out that more modern farm buildings would not be suitable for residential conversion, and that in practice it may be more sensible to rebuild rather than allow the conversion or extension. The practicality of people living near to noisy or smelly farms was also highlighted (and the impact of noise or smells from other businesses on the wider enjoyment of the countryside).

Action points

Develop policies for the Plan around use of former farm buildings

Review wording for clarity and pay particular attention to make clear planning abuse whilst still allowing flexibility of development where there is real ‘positive impact’.
Conclusions

Consider use of exhibition/questionnaire format and on line presence, develop strategies for small group consultations located where people will be effected by change.

The criteria for selection of significant landscape character elements (buildings, views, open spaces and trees) are appropriate to take forward for use in the plan.

Suggested additions and deletions to the above list need to be assessed against agreed criteria.

Need to improve the appearance of the area around the Exchange and Station Road to be fed into consideration of the town centre. The situation concerning the listed building housing Streeters needs to be taken into consideration.

Need to present the case for design policies in particular relating to high density housing in particular appropriate places.

Review clarity in some of the terminology used in the design policies – for instance modern architecture and self build – and determine how these will be presented in the plan.

Draft design principles will need to be refined and tested for practical interpretation and commercial realisation.

Housing sites presented as being suitable or not for inclusion in the plan are agreed apart from land next to the Bull and Elm Close Farm where further consultation needs to take place.

Type of housing on each agreed site to be determined.

Finalise the scoping for the Strategic Environmental Assessment and appraisal of alternatives, to inform the plan drafting.

Eight new routes identified can be included in the plan and a further route between the Recreation Ground and the Police Station added.

Evidence that there is strong support for an extension of the Trailway over the Stour to the west of the town. The route needs to be defined for inclusion in the plan (or potential options safeguarded).

Develop policies for the plan around use of former farm buildings which cautiously encourage reuse in particular make clear what constitutes planning abuse whilst still allowing flexibility of development where there is real 'positive impact'.
Appendix A: Questionnaire

*Insert here copy of questionnaire*