
Wimborne St Giles Neighbourhood Plan

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Prepared by: Dorset Planning Consultant Ltd, on behalf of Knowlton Parish Council

This Consultation Statement summarises all the statutory and non-statutory consultation that has been undertaken with the community and other relevant statutory bodies and stakeholders in developing the Wimborne St Giles Neighbourhood Plan (NP). It describes how concerns have been addressed and what changes have been made to the final Plan as a result of the pre-submission consultation.

The purpose of this document is to demonstrate that the Neighbourhood Plan has been developed on the basis of wide and thorough community engagement. More specifically, the neighbourhood planning regulations require a consultation statement to be produced which—

(a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan or neighbourhood development plan as proposed to be modified;

(b) explains how they were consulted;

(c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and

(d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan or neighbourhood development plan as proposed to be modified.

Date of report: April 2024

CONTENTS

Stage 1. Initial Consultation	2
What was done:	2
Who responded:	3
Main findings:	3
Stage 2. Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation	4
What was done:	4
Who responded:	4
Main Findings:	4
Appendix 1. 2016 Consultation – Key Findings	7
Appendix 2. Scoping consultation survey form.....	11
Appendix 3. Scoping Consultation Results.....	17
Appendix 4. Regulation 14 publicity flyer	28
Appendix 5. Regulation 14 response form.....	30
Appendix 6. Regulation 14 responses table	35

Stage 1. Initial Consultation

What was done:

1.1 Prior to the decision to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan, St Giles Estate had sought to generate discussion and ideas for the possible future development in the local area, recognising that getting the right mix of housing, facilities and activities was important in supporting a thriving and inclusive community. This was mainly done through a consultation in 2016, with 62 individuals (from 58 households) responding to the survey – a return rate of just over 40%. Key findings from this early consultation are shown in **Appendix 1**.

1.2 The Scoping consultation therefore sought to build on this earlier consultation and feedback, to check whether the outcomes from that earlier discussion remained valid, the community's thoughts on the main conclusions and also the revised potential development site list (with the 2016 plans having evolved slightly in light of the earlier feedback received). The survey form used for this consultation is shown in **Appendix 2**.

1.3 There was an initial meeting with key members of the village community on 04 June 2021. The consultation was then publicised through the 'round robin' email (an email list for Wimborne St.Giles residents, plus a mail drop to those residents who don't have email) and on the Parish Council website. The response form was made available online, and also on paper, with the options of handing it in at the local Post Office in the village or at the drop-in event that was held on the 12 June 2021 at the Village Hall, manned by members of the steering group and including display boards showing the maps and feedback from the early consultation in more detail.

Round Robin email:

Wimborne St.Giles Neighbourhood Plan Survey

Knowlton Parish Council is starting the process of creating a Neighbourhood Plan for Wimborne St.Giles. A Neighbourhood Plan is a way for communities to have a say about the future of the places where they live and work that carries real legal weight. It allows communities to put forward a vision for their area and protects them against inappropriate development in the future.

To start this process, we are asking residents to complete an online survey which revisits the work that was done in 2016. This is a chance to look at those proposals again and put forward fresh ideas and thoughts if necessary. The information gathered will help guide us to create a positive vision for the village for the future. Results from the survey will be shared in a follow-up session. Thank you in advance for sharing your views.

- The survey can be accessed here: <https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/WSGNP-1>
- The plans can be seen in more detail here: <https://www.tonicarchitecture.co.uk/projects-item/dorset-village-masterplan>
- Knowlton Parish Council has further information on the website here: [http://www.knowltonparishcouncil.org.uk/Wimborne St Giles Neighbourhood Plan 40092.aspx](http://www.knowltonparishcouncil.org.uk/Wimborne_St_Giles_Neighbourhood_Plan_40092.aspx)

The deadline for filling out forms online is 12th June at 6pm. For those that would prefer a physical copy, a few printed out forms have been left at the village Post Office and there will also be some available at the village hall on **Saturday 12th for the Neighbourhood Plan drop-in session (9am-12pm and 2pm-4pm)**.

Please fill out and return the forms to us, either by handing in the completed form to the Post Office before the 12th of June, or by bringing the completed form to the Village Hall on the 12th of June during the drop-in session. Thank you.

Any queries please contact J.Laker: office@allenvue.co.uk

Who responded:

1.4 Some 21 forms were returned (representing 26 individuals), of which two-thirds had taken part in the previous (2016) consultation. The Survey Monkey 'overview' of the consultation responses is shown in **Appendix 3**.

1.5

Main findings:

1.6 The feedback indicated that people were still in broad agreement with the conclusions from the previous consultation, were generally supportive of the proposed development sites close to the village, and those in the wider area. There was also general support for the other suggestions put forward through the consultation, including:

- Woodland walk;
- Walk / bridge across the watermeadows;
- Community-based renewable energy project;
- Community pub
- Community Land Trust
- More local business opportunities.

1.7 Most of the open comments made highlighted local concerns around traffic speeds and school parking.

1.8 The responses from this consultation then shaped the content of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

Stage 2. Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation

What was done:

There was an initial meeting with key members of the village community on 02 December 2022, to update them and discuss progress on Neighbourhood Plan.

The consultation on the draft Plan took place from 17 February through to 31 March 2023, for a period of 6 weeks. A flyer (As shown in **Appendix 4**) was sent to every household in the Neighbourhood Plan area in addition to the ‘round robin’ email, and the consultation was also publicised on the Parish Council website. Drop-in events were also held at the village hall on 18 and 19 March 2023. A survey form was provided to help structure feedback (**Appendix 5**).

Full List of Statutory Consultees:

- Dorset Council
- Edmondsham Parish Council
- Gussage All Saints, Gussage Saint Michael Parish Council
- Sixpenny Handley & Pentridge PC
- Natural England
- Cranborne & West Wilts AONB Partnership
- Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Scottish and Southern Energy
- Southern Gas Network
- Wessex Water
- Bournemouth Water

The consultation was aimed at people who live work or carry on business in the area, and also sent to a range of statutory consultees, including Dorset Council, neighbouring Parish Councils, and organisations such as Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency. As the Plan was also subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment, the draft findings of that assessment were made available for comment as part of the consultation.


Who responded:

Written consultation responses were received from the Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership, Dorset Council, the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England. 19 questionnaires were completed (in full or partially) representing 16 parishioners (including two local business owners) and 3 interested parties (including Sport England).

Main Findings:

The consultation indicated that most people were happy with the policies aimed at preserving the special character of Wimborne St Giles (Policies 1 – 11):

Survey Form Feedback




As a result of the analysis of the more detailed comments, minor changes have been made to Policies 3, 7, 9, 10 and 11:

- Improved reference to wildlife-friendly features as part of the design (Policies 3 and 9);
- Clearer reference to off-road parking requirements in light of concerns raised (Policy 7);
- Removal of reference to the proposed woodland walk in light of concerns raised by local residents regarding possible wildlife and security issues (Policy 10);
- Clearer reference to the limitations placed on external lighting to reflect guidance provided by the Cranborne Chase Partnership (Policy 11).

Dorset Council’s Conservation Team also suggested that the plan would benefit having a specific heritage policy, focusing on non-designated heritage assets such as those evident from their site visit. The Conservation Area Appraisal and site options assessment (with input from AECOM’s heritage expert) also identified a number of assets. This highlighted at least three non-designated heritage assets that fall outside of either the Conservation Area or Register Parkland, notably the Barns at Framptons, Barns at Glebe Farm and North Barn and attached outbuildings. It was therefore felt appropriate to update the plan to recognise that there are many important (unlisted) buildings in the Conservation Area, and also a number of historic, traditional farmsteads, and to include an additional policy that cover these. A list of potential non-designated heritage assets has been included in the Appendix, but recognises that the list is not exclusive and further work is needed to provide a fully comprehensive list of such assets, and therefore further additions and changes to this list may be necessary.

The remaining policies focus on the approach to the amount and location of new development that may take place in the area, including site-specific allocations. The consultation indicated that most residents who responded were happy with these policies, the most controversial being Policy 17 which is the site allocation on land adjoining the Playing Fields (and to a lesser extent Policy 12 which dealt with the overall approach to housing). Policy 25 (the site on the eastern edge of Monkton-Up-Wimborne) also had a degree of negative feedback (about one-quarter of the responses) and was also objected to by Dorset Council.

Survey Form Feedback



As a result of this feedback and consideration of the more detailed comments, Policy 25 has been deleted, major changes made to Policy 17, and more minor changes have been made to other policies, including:

- Reference to phasing included within the policy on housing (Policy 12);

- Reference to small-scale provision strengthened in relation to further employment (Policy 13), as well as acknowledging Green Belt restrictions where these would apply;
- Reference to heritage features / requirements for archaeological investigation included based on the advice of the Conservation Team (Policies 15, 19, 20, 24)
- Reference to barn owls included (Policies 22 and 23)
- Removal of reference to the proposed woodland walk in light of concerns raised by local residents regarding possible wildlife and security issues (Policy 17)

With regard to Policy 17, further work and discussion took place with the Conservation team to better understand how the site could work given its scale and the sensitivity of its setting. This has resulted in the scheme being reducing to up to 10 (rather than 20) new homes, focused on the western portion of the site (not extending beyond the rear edge of properties on Park Lane, opposite), and taking design cues from local farmsteads and similar development in the area in terms of possible scale, layout and design.

All comments were read and considered, and a more detailed breakdown of these, and how they were responded to, is included in **Appendix 6**. Matters relating to the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment were forwarded to AECOM (the consultancy responsible for finalising these) for consideration.

Appendix 1. 2016 Consultation – Key Findings


Wimborne St Giles – Community Feedback Survey Summary of Findings 20th September 2016

Key Findings

- Overall, there is a considerable amount of **support for the consultation process** and the principle of taking the long view around planning for the future of Wimborne St Giles – but with continuing concerns about the potential negative impact on the unspoilt and special character of the village.
- There is consensus over the need to **maintain the village as a viable community** and to this end the various facilities in the village are all felt to be important – Village Hall, shop, school, post office, pub and church.
- However, there is also acknowledgment of the **danger of the village stagnating** and declining and the need to rejuvenate the community in order to secure the future health of the community.
- The key means of achieving this is by **creating a mixed community** – encouraging families and young people to move into the village as well as creating a supportive environment for the elderly. In fact, the goal should be to provide a mix of housing and community spirit which can support all life stages,
- This will require careful planning of housing development as well as providing opportunities for **employment and a positive social and community spirit**.
- The **key issues** for the future are:
 - Providing an **appropriate mix of housing** without damaging the special character of the village
 - Ensuring the **‘right’ mix of residents** to rejuvenate and support the community
 - Create **energy** around initiatives in the village and encourage participation in village life
- Notwithstanding these positive messages, a **degree of concern** remains over the potential for development to have a negative effect on the village – which should be considered in further development of plans.
- **Continuing consultation** and feedback will be important as the plans develop.


Sample

The profile of people who responded to the Survey was as follows:




Sample Obtained
62 Individual Responses
From 58 Households
 Of a total of 142 (2011 ONS) = 41%

We would like to know a little about your work - do you?




What do you think are the most important services/facilities in the village?




5 Point Scale:
 1 = Very important
 2 = Important
 3 = Neutral
 4 = Not Important
 5 = Not at all important
NB: Lower scores are more positive

What additional housing do you think the village needs?



5 Point Scale:
 1 = Very important
 2 = Important
 3 = Neutral
 4 = Not Important
 5 = Not at all important
NB: Lower scores are more positive


Do you support the current review of Housing Needs in the Village?




Why do you say this?

- Create a thriving Community
- Avoid further stagnation
- Engage/Influence outcome
- Generally felt to be a "Good idea"


Do you think you will need a different kind of housing in five years time?




Are there other members of your family who you believe would like to live in Wimborne St Giles if suitable housing was available?




The following criteria are being discussed as being important in thinking about housing development in Wimborne St Giles - please indicate whether you think they are important:



Alongside discussion of housing needs, what other areas should be considered in future thinking about the village?



Do you think that the consultation with the village is a good thing?



How could the process be improved?



Comments on the suggestions shown on Plan – See Over



Many aspects of the Plan receive positive support:

- Opportunity to **discuss possible developments** is welcome
- Overall objective of bringing **new/younger people and families** into the village to rejuvenate the community is positive.
- Anything that creates a more **positive community dynamic** – including social life - would also be welcomed.
- The opportunity to **buy/build or rent (affordable) property** in the village is felt to be a good thing– subject to who would have the chance and on what criteria
- Small development of **Homes for the Elderly** receives the most positive response – a need which is clearly recognised. A 'courtyard style' development could be attractive and create a community feel.
- The mixed style and **design in keeping with current properties** were liked – including linear plots not 'estates'.
- A **mix of different types of housing** is important – private/ estate-owned and rent/buy attractive – but concern over criteria for eligibility
- **Rebuilding on previously occupied plots** is easy to accept – effectively simply reinstating 'lost' housing.

However, for some there are both general and specific negatives:

- **Do not see any need for development in WSG:**
 - Plenty of development elsewhere in local area; Verwood/Wimborne/6D Handley/Cranborne
 - No employment opportunities = no need for housing
- **Do not want development in WSG:**
 - Preserve the village as it is – special qualities
 - Additional development will impact on nature/wildlife
 - Infrastructure/roads not suitable for additional traffic
 - Conflict between farming activity and homes
 - 'Slippery slope' – small scale development leading to more
 - Nature of 'new' residents – transparent criteria needed
- **Specific/Individual concerns:**
 - Ideas/sites which impact on individual homes
 - Risk of flooding
- **Continuing concerns over motivation for development:**
 - "What is the real plan?"
 - "Who will really benefit?"

Initial Ideas for Discussion.



Comments on the specific suggestions shown on Plan:

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Park Lane Extension | ➔ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quite positive – in keeping with pattern of housing • Outside of conservation area makes it easier to obtain planning • Will not bring traffic into centre of the village • Concern over safety of turning into Bottlebush Lane/level of traffic generated by so many houses • As shown, too many houses, could create a mini estate feel • Not an established area – so not ‘organic’ growth of existing village footprint • Slightly isolated from rest of village – would require some access to village – via footpath? • If this would ‘protect’ the centre of the village from development it could be the solution |
| Terrace/West View Extension | ➔ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonably acceptable – but not as many houses as are shown • Will bring significant traffic into the village |
| Baileys Hill | ➔ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a pleasant site – Dairy/Rats/Noise • Quite far out of village • Too many houses as shown • Strong objection from existing resident • Considerable agricultural traffic makes this less desirable for housing |
| Coach Rd/Thick a Thack Extension | ➔ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many houses – but an obvious site to extend along current building line • Strong objection from existing resident • Considerable agricultural traffic makes this less desirable for housing |
| Outlying/Previously Occupied | ➔ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible and not controversial • Isolated, so danger of not contributing to community in village |
| Others | ➔ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monkton – fine – but issues regarding water and flooding of the road • North Barn – would have little impact on village • All Hallows – acceptable – but only one or two additional houses would be sensible • Between Terrace and Mainsail Haul – too many and probably issues over water |

Appendix 2.Scoping consultation survey form

Wimborne St Giles Neighbourhood Plan Picking up from the 2016 consultations...

In 2016 we came together as a community to create a shared vision for Wimborne St.Giles and discuss how it could evolve in a way that would serve its residents and protect its long-term future. There was a recognition that this was essential to save the facilities that are currently enjoyed by residents, sustain a vibrant and growing community and manage a rapidly changing world with different pressures and societal needs, such as: changes to working practices, housing requirements, pressures on the environment, transport and technology. It was also an opportunity to share what we value about life in the village and what aspects are important to protect. The results and ideas from these discussions are included in the plans below.

Please fill out and return the forms to us, either by submitting online <https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/WSGNP-1>, by handing in the completed form to the Post Office before the 12th June, or by bringing the completed form to the Village Hall on the 12th June during the drop in session. Thank you

Village plan




Wider area plan

WIMBORNE ST GILES

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>MARKET HOUSING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + 2 x 4 Bedroom detached houses + 2 x 2.5 Bedroom semi-detached houses + 1 x 1.2 Bedroom detached high-density house <p>RETIREMENT HOUSING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + 8 x 1.0 Bedroom single-storey houses | <p>RENTAL HOUSING-ESTATE OWNED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + 14 x 2.5 Bedroom semi-detached / detached houses + 3 x 3.2 Bedroom detached houses <p>RENTAL HOUSING-COMMUNITY LAND TRUST</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + 10 x 2.1 Bedroom semi-detached / detached houses |
|---|--|

KEY

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Housing Retired Housing (High Density) Retired Housing (Community Land Trust) Retirement Housing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial Area Boundary Commercial Building Public Building Residential Building Agriculture Building or Structure Blowdown Garden | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Green Space Agricultural Land Woodland and Woodland Gardens (noted surface) Trade Public Paths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road/Track Road/Highway Lane River/Alley Fence and Walls Water - Arroyo/streams Regional Parks & Garden Boundaries |
|--|--|--|---|



REVISION A_September 2016
REVISION B_May 2021

View as:
 Standard (display with digital map)
 Overview (display with satellite imagery)
 Street view (display street view)
 Street view history (display history)

RIBA
Chartered Practice

T TONIC
ARCHITECTURE
 Architects | 201 | Tonic Road | Bournemouth, Dorset | BH1 1JG | 0115 9433119
 www.ttonic.co.uk | info@ttonic.co.uk

We are now looking to use these plans as the basis of a Wimborne St.Giles Neighbourhood Plan. A Neighbourhood Plan is a way for communities to have a say about the future of the places where they live and work that carries real legal weight. It allows communities to put forward a vision for their area and protects them against inappropriate development in the future.

The following survey acts as a guide to revisit the ideas from 2016 and a chance to put forwards new ideas and thoughts. The information we gather will help guide us to create a positive vision for the village for the future. Thank you in advance for sharing your views.

1. Please tell us your name (or names if this is completed on behalf of a family)

This is to help check how many people responded and avoid duplication - your names will not be published.

2. Did you take part in the previous consultation in 2016 on the future of our village?

No

Yes

3. We want to check whether people are still in broad agreement with the conclusions from that consultation:

	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree
(a) To sustain local facilities and services, such as the pub, shop, school and village hall	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(b) To allow some small-scale and sensitively located development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(c) To have a mix of house types and tenures (renting and owner occupied) suitable for young families, estate workers, and for the elderly as people's needs change	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(d) To make sure that any development is in keeping with the current style and 'feel' of the current village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(e) To make sure that development is mainly on either previously built-on sites, some gaps in the current village footprint or on outlying sites.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

You can add any comments about the above points here:

4. What would you say are the three best things about living here?

1.
2.
3.

5. What would you say are the three biggest opportunities to improve living here?

1.
2.
3.

We identified a number of possible sites for housing - including affordable housing for people with a local connection. We have narrowed options down the original list to the following. We wanted to take this opportunity to check that there were no fundamental concerns remaining about developing any of the following sites:

6. Sites close to the village:

	Great idea	OK	Bad idea	No opinion
(a) White Cottages (2 dwellings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(b) Plot in front of the Terrace (1 dwelling)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(c) Continuation of Coach Road (2 dwellings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(d) Infill plot Bailey's Hill (2 dwellings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(e) Infill plot on Park Lane (1 dwelling)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(f) New Almshouses (east of Playing Fields)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(g) Garden Housing Development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

You can add any comments here - please include the site reference (a - g)

7. Sites in the wider area:

	Great idea	OK	Bad idea	No opinion
(h) Monkton Up Wimborne (4 dwellings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(i) Framptons (conversion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(j) North Barn (2 dwellings and conversion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(k) Bottlebush Lane 'Bothy' (eco-house)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(l) Glebe Farm (conversion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(m) Brockington Farm (2 dwellings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(n) Cranborne Lodge ('Renyards' Lodge)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

You can add any comments here - please include the site reference (h - n)

8. Are there any other sites you think would be better alternatives? If so, please describe these here:

Possible site/s:

9. Do you think that we need to make any physical changes to the village hall / shop to make it work better for the community?

- No
- Yes (please specify)

10. We also identified two possible projects to improve our green spaces, and would like to know what you think:

	Great idea	OK	Bad idea	No opinion
Woodland walk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Walk / bridge across the meadows	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Are there other ideas you have such as better sporting facilities? Please comment here:

11. Do you think that we should think about a community based project, such as a renewable energy project, to help our village become carbon neutral?

- No - this is a bad idea
- Not sure
- Yes - this is a good idea
- Yes - and I would be happy to help (please include your contact details below)

12. Would you be supportive of the idea of a community pub?

- No
- Yes

13. Do you support the idea of a Community Land Trust to provide some housing?

No

Yes

14. Would you value more opportunities for businesses to locate within the area?

No

Yes

15. Are there any other matters, concerns or issues, including any other types of development that you think could help the village, that you think we should consider in our plan? If so please comment here:

16. Would you like to be more involved in helping us develop the Neighbourhood Plan by joining the Neighbourhood Plan Group? This would mean helping us undertake the necessary work and consultations to take the plan forward.

No

Yes (please give your name, address and email / telephone contact)

And finally...

*** 17. If you have supplied any personal information (such as your name) we need your consent to hold this.**

The personal information you have provided will be held and used by the Parish Council to prepare the neighbourhood planning policies for the area. It will not be used or published in a manner which would allow identification of your individual responses, or kept for more than 6 months following the completion of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Yes; I consent to any personal data provided on this form being used as described above.

No; I do not consent to your use of the personal data in this manner.


18. Thank you for completing this questionnaire. We will be consulting further as we progress, but if there is anything you want to raise now, please do so here. Then please submit your responses to us.

Appendix 3. Scoping Consultation Results

Wimborne St Giles Neighbourhood Plan - Spring 2021 Survey

Q2 Did you take part in the previous consultation in 2016 on the future of our village?


Answered: 21 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
No	33.33% 7
Yes	66.67% 14
TOTAL	21

Q3 We want to check whether people are still in broad agreement with the conclusions from that consultation:

Answered: 21 Skipped: 0



	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	TOTAL
(a) To sustain local facilities and services, such as the pub, shop, school and village hall	80.95% 17	14.29% 3	4.76% 1	21
(b) To allow some small-scale and sensitively located development	71.43% 15	23.81% 5	4.76% 1	21
(c) To have a mix of house types and tenures (renting and owner occupied) suitable for young families, estate workers, and for the elderly as people's needs change	76.19% 16	14.29% 3	9.52% 2	21
(d) To make sure that any development is in keeping with the current style and 'feel' of the current village	95.24% 20	0.00% 0	4.76% 1	21
(e) To make sure that development is mainly on either previously built-on sites, some gaps in the current village footprint or on outlying sites.	76.19% 16	14.29% 3	9.52% 2	21

#	YOU CAN ADD ANY COMMENTS ABOUT THE ABOVE POINTS HERE:	DATE
1	Shop could be relocated over by Public House and Almshouses to the front of the Terrace (by single house plot)	7/6/2021 8:21 AM
2	We would like to see that any developments be mindful of their impact on the environment and show an awareness and willingness to use eco friendly designs, materials and technology.	6/12/2021 10:15 PM
3	Affordable housing is crucial to the development of the community. We also need to improve the facilities in the village hall. Sunday teas are wonderful but it's a miracle that a serious accident hasn't happened as the same entrance to the kitchen is being used by people helping and people carrying trays with scalding tea on them.	6/12/2021 9:52 AM
4	(e) this means developing 'anywhere'?	6/10/2021 6:39 PM
5	Keep variety of buildings to maintain existing mix of styles in the village.	6/10/2021 10:22 AM
6	I don't feel that clusters of more than 4 new houses in one place will be in keeping with the village ethos.	6/10/2021 8:30 AM
7	Question e) is misleading, I agree to previously built on sites and some gaps in the current village but not to outlying sites. a) yes but not at the sacrifice of the current size and feel of the village.	6/3/2021 5:29 PM
8	A very misleading and confusing question and should be split over three separate questions. If development is deemed to be required then this should be limited to previously built on sites.	5/31/2021 11:51 AM

Q4 What would you say are the three best things about living here?



Q5 What would you say are the three biggest opportunities to improve living here?

1.

Getting the pub up and running

saving the habitats untouched

Perhaps another shop

Road speed reduced to 30mph

Facilities, proper shop and eating establishment

leisure facilities

More community facilities

Develop amenities

Improve facilities at the village hall

Pub reopening

Pub

Central social hub/ cafe

More job opportunities in immediate area

Social and affordable housing

Shop: more goods inc. staples inc local produce + more convenient opening times (poss. including an afternoon opening?)

Having a pub again

Mobile phone signal

Nothing that I can think of, perhaps a pub if not at the expense of the small village feel

Maybe the re-opening of the pub.

2.

Trimming the verges on a regular basis

farm shop in appropriate location

sports club

Somewhere to let dogs run

Future development will be done sensitively as everyone seems to care about the village

pub/restaurant

More people to support community activities


Offer provision to a wider range of people and cater for their needs.

Create affordable housing

Cafe/restaurant
Pub open!
Larger village shop with longer opening hours
job creation. Less spraying of chemicals on crops etc.
Pub or equivalent (even if only Fri & Sat evening opening)
Bringing younger families into the village
Traffic management
None
3.
Improving the quality of road maintenance
transport
For the Bull to reopen or the establishment of a new pub.
local shop with sustainable/ethical produce
Shop/restuarant
Demonstrate and lead environmentally conscious building and development
Create more jobs. Have a business park.
Farm shop
Expand shop
Get more existing residents involved in supporting local facilities such as church, V Hall
Development of pub or other place to eat, drink and socialise in addition to the village hall
Cafe inc. community space (eg with free wifi) that is open daily esp. to cater for weekday lunchtimes
Opportunity for more social events
Any new housing appropriate to current roads
None

Q6 Sites close to the village:

Answered: 21 Skipped: 0




	GREAT IDEA	OK	BAD IDEA	NO OPINION	TOTAL
(a) White Cottages (2 dwellings)	38.10% 8	42.86% 9	14.29% 3	4.76% 1	21
(b) Plot in front of the Terrace (1 dwelling)	55.00% 11	25.00% 5	20.00% 4	0.00% 0	20
(c) Continuation of Coach Road (2 dwellings)	52.38% 11	38.10% 8	4.76% 1	4.76% 1	21
(d) Infill plot Bailey's Hill (2 dwellings)	52.38% 11	38.10% 8	4.76% 1	4.76% 1	21
(e) Infill plot on Park Lane (1 dwelling)	50.00% 10	35.00% 7	15.00% 3	0.00% 0	20
(f) New Almshouses (east of Playing Fields)	57.14% 12	23.81% 5	19.05% 4	0.00% 0	21
(g) Garden Housing Development	47.62% 10	23.81% 5	23.81% 5	4.76% 1	21

#	YOU CAN ADD ANY COMMENTS HERE - PLEASE INCLUDE THE SITE REFERENCE (A - G)	DATE
1	More in front of Terrace What about some bungalows as well!	7/6/2021 8:21 AM
2	These chosen plots are sensitively considered and are much needed in the village.	6/23/2021 12:15 PM
3	g) I don't feel that clusters of more than 4-6 new houses in one place will be in keeping with the village ethos. Also, it will cause problems with traffic access on single-lane road. Development in this area of the village has already been rejected by the Dorset Council SHLAA (site ref: LA/WISG/001) quote: "Site is detached and isolated from the village. Development would extend into open countryside and be uncharacteristic. An unsuitable site"	6/10/2021 8:30 AM
4	I am greatly in favour of all in keeping developments. We need to be looking at Eco building techniques and also moving away from oil as a way of heating the homes.	6/8/2021 9:53 PM
5	White Cottages: to be the otherwise of the small coppice in such a way to be hidden from Mainsail Haul view but the coppice	6/7/2021 3:11 PM
6	f & g - size and extent of development and the additional number of residents as a result will spoil the feel and history of the village. A new development of this size would increase road traffic, noise and pollution in the area. It also sets a dangerous precedent for future development on a similar or larger scale. The noise, disruption and construction traffic created by such a large scheme will be detrimental to the enjoyment of the surroundings currently enjoyed by the village's residents.	5/31/2021 11:51 AM

Q7 Sites in the wider area:

Answered: 21 Skipped: 0



	GREAT IDEA	OK	BAD IDEA	NO OPINION	TOTAL
(h) Monkton Up Wimborne (4 dwellings)	52.38% 11	28.57% 6	9.52% 2	9.52% 2	21
(i) Framptons (conversion)	57.14% 12	28.57% 6	4.76% 1	9.52% 2	21
(j) North Barn (2 dwellings and conversion)	61.90% 13	19.05% 4	9.52% 2	9.52% 2	21
(k) Bottlebush Lane 'Bothy' (eco-house)	57.14% 12	19.05% 4	14.29% 3	9.52% 2	21
(l) Glebe Farm (conversion)	52.38% 11	23.81% 5	19.05% 4	4.76% 1	21
(m) Brockington Farm (2 dwellings)	57.14% 12	23.81% 5	9.52% 2	9.52% 2	21
(n) Cranborne Lodge ('Renyards' Lodge)	47.62% 10	33.33% 7	4.76% 1	14.29% 3	21


#	YOU CAN ADD ANY COMMENTS HERE - PLEASE INCLUDE THE SITE REFERENCE (H - N)	DATE
1	(i) Framptons - the home for the barn owls must be preserved!!!! (j) the same applies at North Barn	6/8/2021 9:53 PM
2	Conversion of current buildings sounds like a good option	6/3/2021 5:29 PM
3	Conversion of existing buildings seems to be a good idea subject to numbers of units proposed and the affect on their surroundings.	5/31/2021 11:51 AM

Q8 Are there any other sites you think would be better alternatives? If so, please describe these here:

#	POSSIBLE SITE/S:
1	Charlton Dairy eco build
2	Large unused garden between All Hallows Cottages and the cemetery
3	Wimborne Lodge
4	Development, if considered necessary and essential should be limited to those sites previously built on or conversion of existing structures.

Q9 Do you think that we need to make any physical changes to the village hall / shop to make it work better for the community?

Answered: 21 Skipped: 0




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
No	38.10%	8
Yes (please specify)	61.90%	13
TOTAL		21

#	YES (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Moving shop overt to the Public House Almshouses in front of Terrace	7/6/2021 8:21 AM
2	Improvement on the village shop definitely required. This could be a real asset to the community.	6/23/2021 12:15 PM
3	shop needs new layout that's brighter and more inviting. At current it feels small and dark and hidden away	6/20/2021 2:31 PM
4	The shop/post office needs to be more visible. The kitchen needs to be bigger	6/15/2021 6:49 PM
5	Consideration should be given to the shop developing into an outlet for local produce and supplies as well as covering basic essentials required by the community on a daily basis, therefore creating a destination for visitors to the village as well as a "hub" and point of contact for residents.	6/12/2021 10:15 PM
6	Change the layout to the kitchen. Perhaps create a servery. Create a more inviting bar area for social events. Have more social events for the community. Publicise the coffee mornings to attract more people. Enlarge the shop.	6/12/2021 9:52 AM
7	Shop. could be more visible.	6/10/2021 6:39 PM
8	Improve bar area to hall. Update shop - more visibility (signage from road) ?	6/10/2021 10:22 AM
9	Expand shop with longer opening hours. Could also include more marketing.	6/10/2021 8:30 AM
10	The shop needs to be more obvious/visible - as not many know it is there - but difficult to know how to do this.	6/8/2021 9:53 PM
11	Village shop needs to be larger to accommodate more goods	6/7/2021 3:11 PM
12	Add on to back of shop so that shop no longer needs use of bar area in the hall. Bar could then be properly used for hiring of hall as it was originally intended.	6/6/2021 9:50 PM
13	Post office to have a couple of afternoon openings and alternate Saturdays.	6/5/2021 8:48 AM

Q10 We also identified two possible projects to improve our green spaces, and would like to know what you think:

Answered: 21 Skipped: 0



	GREAT IDEA	OK	BAD IDEA	NO OPINION	TOTAL
Woodland walk	57.14% 12	9.52% 2	33.33% 7	0.00% 0	21
Walk / bridge across the meadows	60.00% 12	25.00% 5	15.00% 3	0.00% 0	20

#	ARE THERE OTHER IDEAS YOU HAVE SUCH AS BETTER SPORTING FACILITIES? PLEASE COMMENT HERE:	DATE
1	Woodland Walk other side of Power lines away from West View/Terrace and behind allotments or run by brook House through to shell house towards cold harbour and round the lake (as hedgehogs, slow worms, dormice etc)	7/6/2021 8:21 AM
2	We would love to create a community growing, gardening space that could support groups and individuals to access learning, develop skills, engage with people and the environment, manage anxiety and stress, feel connected and valued. We really like a lot of the principles of Permaculture "people care, land care and fair share " and feel that this alongside and eco build would be an incredible achievement.	6/12/2021 10:15 PM
3	All weather football pitch. Tennis courts.	6/12/2021 9:52 AM
4	The woodland walk would create rear access to properties in West View which would greatly reduce security and also destroy privacy. Pathways through a bio-diverse natural woodland area will compromise wildlife and destroy this unique habitat.	6/10/2021 7:33 PM
5	Cricket pavilion improvements	6/10/2021 10:22 AM
6	Woodland walk would destroy peace, tranquillity and security of residents in West View. There is no need for a village "park" when there are already miles of off-road footpaths around the village area. Also, this area is an undisturbed habitat for wildlife and should be carefully preserved and managed. Many species live here including dormice (protected species). Paths through this area would disturb wildlife and destroy this unique habitat. Access should therefore be restricted.	6/10/2021 8:30 AM
7	Bridge: this needs to be very sensitively designed Woodland Walk: this needs to be planted in such a way as to feel 'open' whilst at the same time being 'woodland' - need to consider discouraging littering in a creative way, and making sure that the area feels safe. Maintenance is a key aspect to consider.	6/7/2021 3:11 PM
8	No thank you	6/3/2021 5:29 PM

Q11 Do you think that we should think about a community based project, such as a renewable energy project, to help our village become carbon neutral?

Answered: 21 Skipped: 0




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
No - this is a bad idea	9.52% 2
Not sure	33.33% 7
Yes - this is a good idea	28.57% 6
Yes - and I would be happy to help (please include your contact details below)	28.57% 6
TOTAL	21

#	YES - AND I WOULD BE HAPPY TO HELP (PLEASE INCLUDE YOUR CONTACT DETAILS BELOW)	DATE
1	But where would you put it?	7/6/2021 8:21 AM
2	eco houses	6/20/2021 2:31 PM
3	[name redacted]	6/12/2021 10:15 PM
4	[name redacted]	6/10/2021 10:22 AM
5	[name redacted]	6/8/2021 9:53 PM
6	[name redacted]	6/7/2021 3:11 PM

Q12 Would you be supportive of the idea of a community pub?


Answered: 21 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
No	9.52% 2
Yes	90.48% 19
TOTAL	21

Q13 Do you support the idea of a Community Land Trust to provide some housing?


Answered: 21 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
No	33.33%	7
Yes	66.67%	14
TOTAL		21

Q14 Would you value more opportunities for businesses to locate within the area?

Answered: 21 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
No	23.81%	5
Yes	76.19%	16
TOTAL		21

Q15 Are there any other matters, concerns or issues, including any other types of development that you think could help the village, that you think we should consider in our plan? If so please comment here:

Answered: 8 Skipped: 13

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Consideration should be given to speed limit signage as traffic approaches WSG very quickly from the Glebe side of the village.	6/23/2021 12:15 PM
2	more eco houses, rather than the traditional brick and mortar	6/20/2021 2:31 PM
3	Ways to support the Church	6/15/2021 6:49 PM
4	It would be incredible to see an eco build that could demonstrate the possibilities of conscious building and renewable technology. The opportunity to create such a home could inform future development in Dorset and hopefully offer a more sustainable way of ensuring the village has a future.	6/12/2021 10:15 PM
5	We should allow this development to proceed first and look at it afterwards to see if anything else would be beneficial to the village.	6/10/2021 6:39 PM
6	Re the location of businesses in the area: I am in favour of helping businesses to locate in renovated farm buildings (eg office/workshop space at Bailey's Hill) and similar. I am NOT in favour fo the construction of new spaces for businesses	6/7/2021 3:11 PM
7	designated school parking to allow parents children and farm traffic to be safe. Currently school parking is often dangerous	6/5/2021 8:48 AM
8	Introduction of a mandatory speed limit through the village.	5/31/2021 11:51 AM

Q18 Thank you for completing this questionnaire. We will be consulting further as we progress, but if there is anything you want to raise now, please do so here. Then please submit your responses to us.

Answered: 3 Skipped: 18

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Possible footpath extensions---Baileys Hill to join the existing footpath at Reservoir Clump, 'YCorner' to join footpath at Beech Lodge Brockington. This makes 2 circular routes avoiding any road walking.	6/10/2021 6:39 PM
2	As much Eco housing as possible, affordable and social housing - so that WSG can lead the way to show how to become part of the solution to the housing crisis and climate crisis. Thank you for this consultation - we value the opportunity to give our opinions!	6/8/2021 9:53 PM
3	The Parish Council needs to consider very carefully the implications of wide scale development within the village of Wimborne St Giles. These changes will be irreversible and potentially damaging to the historic village 'feel'. Wimborne St Giles is unique in many ways and increasing its size in terms of footprint and resident numbers is detrimental both short and long term to its attractiveness to both residents and visitors alike. The village lies in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Conservation Area and it's soul should not be sold for commercial and business benefit.	5/31/2021 11:51 AM

Appendix 4. Regulation 14 publicity flyer

WIMBORNE ST.GILES NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Consultation 17th February to 31st March 2023



In 2016, we came together as a community to create a shared vision for Wimborne St.Giles and discuss how it could evolve in a way that would serve its residents and protect its long-term future. There was a recognition that this was essential in order to sustain the facilities that are currently enjoyed by residents and to address changing societal needs, such as new working practices, housing requirements, transport and technology.

A steering group of Parish Cllrs. and residents have taken the ideas from these discussions and subsequent meetings, and drafted a Neighbourhood Plan to 2036, and we now want your comments please. This is very important for the future of Wimborne St.Giles. It is based on the results of surveys carried out in Wimborne St.Giles in 2016 and more recently in 2021, and an independent housing needs assessment.

This Neighbourhood Plan when adopted will set out the local planning policies for Wimborne St.Giles, which together with the Dorset Local Plan will be used to determine planning applications as they come forward. This will mean that, when applicants apply for planning permission, their plans are more likely to get approved if they meet the requirements set out in this Neighbourhood Plan, and more likely to be refused if they do not.

WE WANT YOUR COMMENTS

You can view the draft Plan and supporting documents from February 17th at: <http://www.knowltonparishcouncil.org.uk> and respond via the online form. Hard copies will be available from the Wimborne St.Giles shop.

You can also see a hard copy of the draft Plan, talk to steering group members in person, and complete a response form **AT WIMBORNE ST.GILES VILLAGE HALL, 10AM TO 12.30PM** on the following dates:

- **SATURDAY 18TH MARCH**
- **SUNDAY 19TH MARCH**

OUR Vision

Wimborne St. Giles is and will continue to be a unique and unspoiled village set within the beautiful countryside of the Cranborne Chase AONB. Over the next 13 years there will be some limited new development - housing, business premises and infrastructure – to help sustain and support a thriving and inclusive community of all ages, designed and located in a manner that it in keeping with the character of the village and surrounding countryside.

OUR Objectives

- To sustain local facilities and services, such as the pub, shop, school and village hall
- To allow some small-scale and sensitively located development
- To have a mix of house types and tenures (renting and owner occupied) suitable for young families, Estate workers, and for the elderly as people's needs change
- To make sure that any development is in keeping with the current style and 'feel' of the current village
- To make sure that development is mainly on either previously built-on sites, some gaps in the current village footprint or on outlying sites.

OUR Policies

1. Preserving the special character of Wimborne St.Giles

- Physical and visual connections
- Aspect and orientation, building lines, roof lines and boundary treatments
- Building design and detailing, including materials and colour palette
- Accommodating the need for cars, storage etc within designs
- Landscape features, wildlife and sustainable drainage

2. Development Needs

- Housing
- Employment
- Community Facilities
- Renewable Energy

3. Potential Development Sites



PLEASE DO LOOK AT THE PLAN AND SEND US YOUR RESPONSE FORM FULL DETAILS ARE ON THE RESPONSE FORM

If you have any queries or require explanation about the draft Neighbourhood Plan contact: Cllr Mr Jerry Laker, Wimborne St.Giles Ward, tel: [REDACTED] email: [REDACTED]

Appendix 5. Regulation 14 response form

Wimborne St Giles

PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Pre-submission consultation - February and March 2023

This form is to help you respond to the pre-submission consultation. You can choose to comment on any or all of the policies, and there is a section at the end for general comments.

We are happy to hear from anyone who lives, works or has an interest in the area and either wants to let us know if they think the plan is fine, or if not what changes they would like to see and why. Please make sure you return this form by **31 March 2023**. You can:

- > Complete and submit the form online (<https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/WSGNP-Reg14>)
- > Email your comments to jo@dorsetplanning.co.uk
- > Complete a paper form and hand it into the Village Shop in Wimborne St Giles, Dorset, BH21 5LZ

Copies of the draft Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents can be viewed at the Village Shop, and online at the Parish Council website <http://www.knowltonparishcouncil.org.uk/>. There are also drop-in events planned for the Village Hall between 10am - 1pm on the weekend of the 18th/19th March. If you need help completing the form, please speak to Jerry Laker 01725 517697.

About you - your details

Your interest in the Neighbourhood Plan

- I live in Wimborne St Giles, Wimborne Up Monkton or other areas covered by this Neighbourhood Plan
- I am responding for a business or other organisation (please specify below)
- I don't live here, but I do work in the area covered by this Neighbourhood Plan
- None of the above - but I have an interest in the plan area

Business / organisation (if applicable)

Please note: we are asking for your name and contact details to help us have a clear audit trail of who responded on what issues, and so that we can contact you for further clarification if necessary. We will not publish your email or address. If you are responding as an individual, we do need permission under data protection laws to hold any identifying personal information for the purposes of finalising this Neighbourhood Development Plan – so if you do not give your permission please leave your details (below) blank.

Your name and contact details:

Name:

Email:

Address:

Your thoughts on the Neighbourhood Plan policies

The first 8 policies deal with general matters on design - please let us know whether you agree with them. You can expand on any comments by using the space at the very end if you need to.

	Agree	Disagree	Neither / not sure
Policy 1. Physical and visual connections	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 2. Aspect and orientation, building and roof lines	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 3. Boundary treatments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 4. Scale and massing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 5. Architectural composition and detailing, materials and colour palette	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 6. Incorporating low carbon energy solutions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 7. Accommodating the motor vehicle	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 8. Storage for waste, recycling etc	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			

Questions 9 - 11 focus on landscape character and important green spaces...

	Agree	Disagree	Neither / not sure
Policy 9. Landscape features, wildlife and drainage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 10. The Watermeadows and other important Green Spaces	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 11. Dark skies and external lighting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			

The final 14 policies deal with proposals for development...

Please note that any development on these sites would still require a planning application, but would be guided by the policy for the site (and the other general policies on design).

	Agree	Disagree	Neither / not sure
Policy 12. Location and Types of New Housing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 13. Employment opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 14. Valued Community Facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 15. Land east of Bottlebush Lane (White Cottages)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 16. Plot in front of the Terrace, adjoining No. 13	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 17. Adjoining the Playing Fields, opposite Park Lane	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			

	Agree	Disagree	Neither / not sure
Policy 18. Barn at Glebe Farm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 19. Infill plot on Park Lane	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 20. Infill plot on Baileys Hill	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 21. Land off Coach Road	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 22. Land at North Barn	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 23. Framptons	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 24. Former chicken sheds, Monkton Up Wimborne	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			
Policy 25. Land east of Monkton Up Wimborne	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you want the policy altered or deleted, please explain what change you want and why			
<input type="text"/>			

Your thoughts on the Neighbourhood Plan projects

The Plan includes a number of Projects, which set out some actions that will be taken forward during the Plan's lifetime. Please can you indicate whether you think the projects are a good idea?

	Agree	Disagree	Neither / not sure
Project 1. New Permissive Paths	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Project 2. Investigating whether a Community Land Trust should be set up	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Project 3. School Parking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Project 4. Investigating the feasibility of a community renewable energy scheme	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you don't like one or more of the projects, please say what change you want and why

And finally...

To help us understand at this stage whether we have got the plan 'broadly right', please tick one of the following:

- I would support the plan at the referendum as drafted
- I would support the plan as drafted, but would like some minor changes
- I would not support the plan as drafted, it needs major changes

If you have any comments on the draft Strategic Environmental and Habitats Regulations Assessments, you can comment here:

Please use the space below to add to or make any other comments about the Neighbourhood Plan, if you so wish:

Appendix 6. Regulation 14 responses table

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Cranborne Chase AONB		General	There is not a satisfactory explanation in the current draft NP as to why the boundary of the Neighbourhood Area has been drawn where it is, why it only includes parts of parishes, and why other parts of those parishes have been excluded. It does seem strange that the boundary specifically excludes Knowlton Henge but specifically includes Brockington Fish Farm.	The boundary was subject to consultation and its basis is touched upon in para 1.1 – as it links to area covered (but not exclusively owned) by the St Giles Estate. Whilst it would have been possible to include Knowlton Henge, no development was being considered for that area given its clear heritage status, and having agreed the boundary it would not be possible to revise it without further consultation.
Cranborne Chase AONB		General	Suggests reordering the plan so that the character area descriptions and proposed development sites / selection process precedes the general (and more detailed) design principles	Noted – and whilst this would be possible, it is not considered necessary. Should the examiner consider it necessary then this can be addressed post-examination.
Dorset Council	1	Para. 1.6	Although it is agreed that the adoption of the Dorset Council Local Plan is a good trigger for a Plan review, the group may wish to consider other triggers such as Planning Decisions, Project and actions, Infrastructure, Changes to national or local policy and Changes in the local area.	Noted – the possible triggers can be expanded to reflect this. <i>Amend 1.6 to include reference to other possible factors that could trigger a review</i>
Dorset Council Cranborne Chase AONB	2	General	Provides overview of considerations for this section – including relevant National Planning Policy (including NPPF para 176, 177 and 185), the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Management Plan 2019-2024 (in particular Policies PT22 and PT23), and the Conservation Area Appraisal Supplementary Planning Guidance that could be referenced here	Agree that it would be helpful to reference these points, although a more thorough appraisal of the context in relation to the plans is to be provided through the Basic Conditions Statement. <i>Amend section 2 to include brief reference to key NPPF policies, the AONB Management Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance.</i>
Dorset Council	3	General	The village does have Community Transport Services, currently the Plus Bus services run by Dorset	The bus service can be mentioned briefly.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			Community Transport (with bookings having to be made in advance) serves Wimborne St Giles - to Blandford every Thursday; to Wimborne every Friday and to Salisbury fortnightly on Tuesdays.	<i>Amend para 3.3 by adding footnote to “relative lack of sustainable transport options” to refer to the current Plus Bus service.</i>
Historic England	3	General	Whilst reference to the Registered Park & Garden is included (para 3.5, page 6), this does not include Drive Plantation. It would be good to still make reference to this in para 3.6, where the wider area is referred to.	Noted – this omission can be rectified. <i>Amend 3.6 to refer to the wider extent of the Registered Park & Garden.</i>
Dorset Council	3	Para. 3.9	The heritage considerations have been spread over several policies in a piecemeal fashion - the plan would benefit having a specific heritage policy. No non-designated heritage assets have been nominated as part of the plan. During our site visit the following potential assets were identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1&2 Bailey’s Hill; • 13 Bottlebush Lane; • 3 Coach Road; • 45 Coach Road; • Barns at Framptons; • Barns at Glebe Farm; • Estate Cottages along Park Lane; • Gardeners Cottage; • Harriet Cottages; • Houses in the Terrace; • North barn and attached outbuilding to the south at North Barn Farm; • Telephone box fronting Bottlebush Lane; • The Bull; • The Estate Sawmill and Timberyard; • The school building; • Village Hall 	The Conservation Area Appraisal and site options assessment (with their heritage expert) also identifies a number of assets. From an appraisal of these buildings and the list suggest by Dorset Council, the main non-designated heritage assets that fall outside of either the Conservation Area of RPG appear to be the old traditional farmsteads, i.e: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barns at Framptons • Barns at Glebe Farm • North barn and attached outbuildings The plan could therefore be updated to recognise that there are many important (unlisted) buildings in the Conservation Area, and also a number of historic, traditional farmsteads. <i>Include further section and policy at end of chapter 5 to provide an overview of the heritage interests, and highlight the many non-designated assets, and include an additional policy that covers these.</i>
Dorset Council	3	Para. 3.9	Wimborne St Giles benefits from several important local views. The Neighbourhood Plan group may therefore wish to identify key views in a specific policy within the Plan.	Whilst paragraph 5.5 and Policy 1 acknowledges that there are views of local landmarks, such as the church tower and almshouses in Wimborne St Giles, that are important and help people orientate themselves, it

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				would require further work and consultation to identify all possible keys views. The CAA references the fine unspoilt views of the water-meadows (from the listed hump-back bridge near French’s Farm) and elevated views across the valley from West View, and these could be specifically referenced in Policy 10 which seeks to regard the open character of the watermeadows. <i>Amend Policy 10 and supporting text to highlight the importance of views along and across the watermeadows.</i>
Dorset Council	3	Para. 3.9	The area also has several Site of Nature Conservation Interest sites (SNCIs) and there are numerous records for protected species in the locale. Among these are rare European Protected Species such as Hazel dormice and bats. In particular, the area is known to support a population of the very rare Greater horseshoe bat –habitat features such as watercourses, hedgerows and meadows provide important foraging and commuting resources for a range of protected and priority species.	Noted – these can be mentioned in the overview. <i>Amend para 3.9 to acknowledge SNCI and protected species.</i>
Cranborne Chase AONB	5	General	The ‘village gateway’ character area seems a bit of a misnomer. Neither the road and hedges nor the land on either side of the road constitute a gateway in physical or perceptual terms.	It is considered to be the main entrance into the village, therefore whilst the point is noted, the wording is considered to be reasonable.
Dorset Council	5	Para. 5.1	To aid the reader it would be helpful if the full name of the report could be referenced in this section and where appropriate cross references made to specific sections in the Design Guidance and Codes.	There is no intention to give the separate design code any planning status (as the key elements have been embedded in the neighbourhood plan) in a manner that does not readily cross-reference.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			The Design Guidance and Codes could also be given additional weight in decision making should they be specifically referenced in Policy text, for example a specific design code policy.	
Dorset Council	5	Policy 1	<p>The policy approach is supported.</p> <p>May wish to consider specifying that new routes are BS8300 compliant to ensure that they are equally accessible for all.</p> <p>Could also consider possible project to help reduce vehicles speeds, by installing village entry signage with 'drive slow through our village' signs or something along these lines. It may also be worth considering introducing a 30mph speed limit through the village, especially as the school and nursery are next to the road. Obviously being a Conservation Area, any new signage would need to be sensitively designed and positioned and not create signage 'clutter'.</p>	<p>The BS 8300 is one set of standards (but not freely available), there is also other guidance and therefore it may be appropriate to instead reference the DoT's Inclusive Mobility - A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure published in 2021.</p> <p><i>Amend 5.6 and Policy 1 to refer to safe, and reasonably direct routes that, where possible, are accessible to all, and reference latest DoT guidance.</i></p> <p>The prospect of a 30mph speed limit has been previously discussed within the community and on balance the general consensus was that it would not be practical. Should residents wish this to be reconsidered, this can be raised with the Parish Council outside of the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p>
Local resident	5	Policy 1	Hedgerows and verges should not be altered as this may spoil the original feel of the village and the narrow country lanes whilst also disturbing natural habitat for wildlife	<p>The rural character of the area is recognised (as covered in para. 5.7) and the policy aims to retain this character whilst creating a safer environment where local residents feel they can get about safely on foot and cycle.</p> <p><i>(Correct typo in first bullet of 5.7)</i></p>
Local resident	5	Policy 1 / 7	Improve passing bays on Parsonage Lane.	Agree that this could be helpful to enable a car and lorry to pass (and would be much more in keeping that widening the whole road) and has been suggested in relation to the development at Bailey's

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				Farm. This can be included as a project for the Parish Council to raise with Dorset Highways. <i>Include project as outlined above.</i>
Dorset Council	5	Policy 2	No issues raised.	Noted.
Dorset Council	5	Policy 3	No issues raised.	Noted.
Natural England	5	Policy 3	This policy could make reference to the need to ensure a degree of permeability for species such as hedgehogs which have declined significantly recently	This is mentioned in the supporting text to Policy 9, but agree that this would be relevant for inclusion in Policy 3. <i>Amend policy 3 and supporting text to specifically reference hedgehog-friendly features in boundary treatments</i>
Local residents	5	Policy 3	There may be exceptions where high fencing is required, for instance for screening or privacy purposes.	The supporting text (5.13) explains that high fencing should be avoided adjoining public areas and backing on to the countryside, but if necessary then it should be set back from the lanes / paths that they border, to enable a verge or planting to be incorporated.
Dorset Council	5	Policy 4	No issues raised.	Noted.
Local resident	5	Policy 4	Height of buildings should not exceed two storeys.	The policy makes clear that heights should generally not exceed two storeys other than in exceptional circumstances.
Local resident	5	Policy 4	Views from existing buildings should be taken into consideration and not impeded at all	It would not be possible to avoid obstructing views from all private properties, given how widespread some of these views are (and that the retention of private views is not a material planning consideration). The policy seeks to take a balanced approach and takes into account the expectation for privacy and amenity of adjoining land uses.
Dorset Council	5	Policy 5	No issues raised.	Noted.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Dorset Council	5	Policy 6	No issues raised. However there is emerging interim guidance on 'Listed buildings: what you can do for climate change', and this could be considered and referenced.	The interim guidance appears to use the same Historic England guidance used to underpin this section of the plan.
Local residents	5	Policy 6	Solar panels can be unsightly and heat pumps can be noisy	Whilst this may sometimes be the case, there have been advances in technology, such as the photovoltaic slates shown in the photograph on page 16.
Dorset Council	5	Policy 7	No issues raised.	Noted.
Local resident	5	Policy 7	1-2 spaces will not be enough for family-sized housing with teenage or older children who may also have cars.	Whilst there is limited evidence to justify standards that deviate from the current Dorset Council guidelines, it is notable that, according to the 2021 Census data, 29% of homes in the area (based on E00103314) had three or more cars (twice the Dorset average). This can be reflected in the policy in respect of larger (family) homes. <i>Update supporting text and policy to suggest that larger (family) homes with 3+ bedrooms should seek to include at least 3 parking spaces to avoid the likelihood of overspill parking into the rural lanes.</i>
Dorset Council	5	Policy 8	The latest (October 2022) validation checklist requires that all new development and uses that produce domestic and commercial waste and recycling the plan must show arrangements for storage and collection of waste., and references to the Guidance notes for Residential Development October 2022 produced by the recycling and waste department. There could be merit in adding a cross references to the valuation checklist and recycling & waste guidance to raise awareness.	Agreed. <i>Amend supporting text to include reference to the valuation checklist and recycling & waste guidance</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Cranborne Chase AONB	5	Policy 9	In May 2022 the AONB adopted a Position Statement on Biodiversity Gain that means that each property should have at least one bird box, one bat box, and one bee brick incorporated into the structure	Noted – this can be referenced in the plan and Policy 9. <i>Amend Policy 9 and supporting text to refer to the expectation that all new buildings should have at least one bird box, one bat box, and one bee brick incorporated into the structure.</i>
Dorset Council	5	Policy 9	<p>The requirement that applicants must replace mature trees and hedgerows goes further than saved Policy DES7 however this policy is not considered strategic. Nevertheless, the Policy DES7 wording usefully recognises that it may not be possible to replace trees in all scenarios, stating “where the opportunity exists”. It is recommended some flexibility is added to the policy wording.</p> <p>The requirement to incorporate biodiversity and sustainable drainage measures, reflects local requirements. We would recommend adding reference to “biodiversity net gain” to further align wording with the Natural Environment advice note. References could also be included to the Dorset Ecological Network, Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol and advice produced by DC NET</p> <p>Para. 5.36 could highlight that consideration should also be given to natural regeneration opportunities</p> <p>Para. 5.37 could be strengthened particularly in relation to ancient trees and the veteran trees recorded in the Plan area</p> <p>Para. 5.38 could reference ensuring that proposals meet the Mitigation Hierarchy (National Planning</p>	<p>Points agreed. Replacement planting should be possible, but may need to be off-site if the opportunity does not exist within the site.</p> <p><i>Amend Policy 9 to clarify that replacement planting to compensate for the loss should be on-site where possible. Amend Policy 9 to refer to biodiversity net gain.</i></p> <p><i>Amend supporting text as suggested as far as possible without creating too much duplication / overlap.</i></p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			Policy Framework) and comply with nature conservation legislation.	
Local residents	5	Policy 9	Particular interest in the protection of Barn owls in the area e.g. around Monkton and All Hallows / at Framptons and North Barn	Noted – the incorporation of barn owl boxes as part of wider mitigation measures can be included as an example. <i>Add reference to barn owl boxes.</i>
Local residents	5	Policy 9	This must be stringently policed to ensure mature trees etc are not lost unnecessarily.	Noted – many of the trees are protected as a matter of course due to being within the Conservation Area. <i>The need to obtain consent for works to trees can be highlighted in the supporting text.</i>
Natural England	5	Policy 9, 10 and 11	Policies supported.	Noted.
Environment Agency	5	Policy 9 and 10	We are pleased to see the draft plan includes sections and policies on protecting and increasing biodiversity and green/blue infrastructure. Your plan should consider opportunities for how the biodiversity net gain requirements can be met and preferably where your plan can go beyond any minimum requirements.	Noted.
Dorset Council	5	Policy 10	No concerns raised. The six proposed local green spaces are all close to the community they serve, are demonstratable special and are not extensive tracts of land. The four objectives required to improve and expand the public rights of way network are supported.	Noted.
Local resident	5	Policy 10	I would have thought the green in front of the Terrace would have been an ideal space for infill building as it is not used. However, this is in front of Estate properties and is therefore not desirable to the Estate.	This site was not put forward by any other local residents in the 2021 consultation.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Local resident	5	Policy 10	The hatched area should extend north to the road. There is no obvious reason for the area to stop where shown on the plan ie. in line with the northern boundary of the cress beds.	The watermeadows broadly reflect the priority habitat inventory map (Natural England).
Local residents	5	Project 1	Woodland walk would impact the privacy & security of all properties that back onto the woodlands, and could also damage the biodiversity and wildlife of the area	The project is not intended to provide full access to the entire area, and would have been subject to further discussion – however given the concerns of local residents this element is unlikely to be progressed. An alternative option – providing an off-road alternative to part of Bailey Hill, can be included instead. <i>Remove reference to woodland walk project and include potential exploration of alternative routes to Baileys Hill.</i>
Cranborne Chase AONB	5	Policy 11	The section on dark skies and Policy 11 both need to be amended to show that the criteria of Environmental Light Zone E0 apply [not E1], and that in this International Dark Sky Reserve the obligation on the local authorities is to reduce light pollution year on year and not simply minimise the increase in light pollution. The current CCT criterion is 2,700K. Roof lights / lantern lights should be avoided in dwelling designs, as should floor to ceiling glazing. If integral blinds or louvres cannot be readily operated, for example in high level roof lights or gable glazing, they should be fitted with power operated systems that are actuated at dusk by light sensitive switches. The final line of the policy should be amended to read ‘Where lighting is considered necessary, its design should comply with the AONB’s dark sky criteria.’	Agreed that the policy and supporting text should be updated to take account of the latest guidance – however in some cases it is not considered appropriate to reference supplementary guidance (that may change outside of the examination process of the Neighbourhood Plan) as part of the policy, and therefore it would be better to include the actual tests within the policy. <i>Amend supporting text to refer to Environmental Light Zone E0 and CCT criterion of 2700K, and incorporate the additional guidance points.</i> <i>Amend Policy 11 to require compliance with the dark sky criteria.</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Dorset Council	5	Policy 11	In addition to the consideration of dark skies and light pollution, given the area is known to be used by a range of bat species, including very light adverse Greater horseshoe bats, it would be desirable to see a strong emphasis on the need to avoid impacts on nocturnal wildlife and bats in particular, possibly referencing guidance published by the Bat Conservation Trust and the Institute of Lighting Professionals is applied under the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol.	Agreed. <i>Amend supporting text to reference the need to avoid impacts on nocturnal wildlife and bats in particular, and reference guidance as suggested. Include reference to dark corridors within policy.</i>
Dorset Council	6	Policy 12	Dorset Council’s draft Neighbourhood Housing Requirement figure for Wimborne St Giles is 20 (made up of 4 existing commitments and a windfall of 16 dwellings on minor sites projected forward to 2038) which should be viewed as minimum requirement and, therefore, can be exceeded. However, the cumulative impact of this scale of development currently proposed in such a rural area will also need to be carefully considered against the objective of the adopted Core Strategy and AONB Management Plan. The proposed mix of dwelling types seems appropriate and the cross reference to the Dorset Housing Allocations Policy is welcomed	Noted – the sites have been carefully considered and further changes made in light of the feedback from this consultation.
Cranborne Chase AONB	6	Policy 12	As currently worded, the policy does not actually identify sites for development. Whilst welcoming the provision of affordable housing on sites of 5 or more units, provision on the smaller sites should still be considered.	The sites are identified in the following chapter. This can be more clearly cross-referenced in the supporting text. Given the higher standards of design required for this area it is unlikely that individual sites would be viable, and are anticipated to help cross-fund the delivery of affordable housing on the large site (where

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				50% affordable housing is proposed, well in excess of the latest viability evidence). <i>Amend supporting text to cross-reference policies in section 7..</i>
Cranborne Chase AONB	6	Policy 12	Paragraph 7.2 refers to phased development but there is no policy to support it which seems to be a serious omission. As the NP is currently drafted there is nothing to prevent the village suddenly becoming one big building site!	This point is covered in para. 7.2. The phasing of the large site will be subject to viability. The small sites / individual plots can be brought forward incrementally. At this stage it is too premature to be specific about which sites would come forward earlier than others. <i>Policy 12 could be adapted to indicate that the small sites will be phased through the plan period.</i>
Local resident	6	Policy 12	Phasing is important. If too many affordable houses are released at the same time it is inevitable that there will not be sufficient local demand and units will be offered to outsiders	
Local resident	6	Policy 12	There is no need for affordable housing in the village.	This is not the case as evidenced in the earlier housing needs survey (see paragraph 6.3).
Local resident	6	Policy 12	40 dwellings proposed for such a small and historic village is disproportionate and will negatively impact on its historic character	The sites have been carefully selected with careful regard to heritage features and the character of the area, and the plan includes design guidance to ensure that what is built should be in keeping with the area. Furthermore, it is unlikely that all of the sites will be development at the upper limit of their estimated capacity.
Local resident	6	Policy 12	What about self build?	The potential for self / custom build single plots as part of the open market homes has been considered, but is not at the current time considered likely to be practical, given the importance of any design in retaining the area's character which the Estate can better manage through taking a lead in the design and build. Whilst self-build plots remain a possibility, it

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
				makes sense to delete reference to this in order to manage expectations. <i>Delete reference to self-build.</i>
Local residents	6	Policy 12	Development of this scale in a small peaceful village will undoubtedly add more traffic and cars to the village. This is a real shame and the roads are not built for this	40 houses would be expected to generate less than 20 trips per hour at peak times (1 car movement every 3 minutes), which would be spread across the highway network. This level of traffic would not have a material impact on the safe and efficient operation of the local highway network.
Local residents	6	Policy 12	The definition of "affordable housing" must be carefully defined as must the criteria for prioritising people with local connections.	The policy makes specific the need to prioritise people in housing need who have a local connection to the Neighbourhood Plan area
Cranborne Chase AONB	6	Policy 13	This could be interpreted as supporting major development when that does not appear to be the intention. The AONB does, therefore, strongly recommend that 'small scale' is inserted in the first line before 'offices,'. On a point of detail in relation to the supporting text, PetAir has been operating from its base for at least a decade.	Agreed. <i>Amend policy by inserting 'small scale (appropriate to the rural character of the area)' in the first sentence.</i> <i>Delete reference to PetAir</i>
Dorset Council	6	Policy 13	The policy approach is supported.	Noted.
Local resident	6	Policy 13	This is a small peaceful village with no need for commercial businesses to be attracted to the area. Most people work away from where they live, and to suggest that an increase in commercial businesses based here would add to the 'community feel' does not make sense to me. One of the main points raised in the previous survey was that people like living in the village because it is peaceful. An increase in	Whilst it is not possible to ensure that people take up job opportunities close to where they live, providing local job opportunities at a scale appropriate to the rural character of the area will ensure that such opportunities remain available, and can improve the self-sufficient of the area. See also response to CC AONB regarding reference to 'small scale'

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			commercial business does not maintain the rural feel of the village.	
Local resident	6	Policy 13	Traffic has been noticeably greater during the last couple of years and the road network is not suitable for further vehicles, particularly large commercial vehicles	This point / concern is covered in the second criteria of Policy 13, that seeks to ensure that the potential increase in vehicular traffic would not have a significant adverse impact on the rural character of the local highway network.
Local resident	6	Policy 13	Better wifi (particularly if more people are to be encouraged to work here) and a good mobile signal should be prioritised	Noted – however this is beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to achieve. The Parish Council has been in discussions with the providers to improve the mobile phone signal, please contact the Parish Council for the latest on this.
Dorset Council	6	Policy 14	The retention of community facilities is supported and the support for new facilities or existing facilities to modernise and adapt also reflect national policy and local policy LN7. It is suggested that the three proposals listed are moved from the policy text and to a separate projects section, like Project 3.	Noted. These have been discussed and supported by the community and are considered appropriate to retain as policy.
Local resident	6	Policy 14	The Jolly Day at WSG Hall is at max capacity and we could do with more space	Noted. The refurbishment and additional storage capacity should go some way to assist.
Local residents	6	Policy 14	It should be accepted that many facilities not sustainable in a small village / small community	Whilst the viability of rural services is difficult, the Neighbourhood Plan does look specifically at actions to help ensure that these may continue, through enabling changes and supporting a small increase in the population base.
Dorset Council	6	Project 3	The use of an existing car park i.e. the village hall would be preferable to constructing a new car park.	Noted – however as referenced in the supporting text, the village hall car park is limited in size.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Dorset Council	6	Project 4	At this stage, no policy is proposed but should a scheme emerge, it should have regard to national policy and be in general conformity with strategic local policies.	Noted. Para 6.25 refers to the Local Plan policy providing an adequate framework at this time, and this can be expanded to reference the NPPF. <i>Amend para 6.25 to refer to national policy as well as the Local Plan policy.</i>
Environment Agency	7	General	We advise you undertake appropriate consultation with your, local planning authority, emergency planners and the emergency services to determine whether the proposals are safe in accordance with paragraph 167 of the NPPF and the guiding principles of the PPG. You should consider the implications for access/egress with respect to flooding on any allocations including those where the development site may itself be at low risk.	Dorset Council have been consulted, although they have not specifically included a response from their emergency planners / flood risk team. Flood risk has also been considered as part of the SEA process.
Historic England	7	General	It would be helpful if it was made clear whether and how the heritage expertise (as referenced in the Design Guidance report) has informed the site selection process. Nonetheless, given the need for local and detailed knowledge to the sites, we will defer to the expertise of Dorset Council's heritage team on the appropriateness of the proposed site allocations	Noted. The introductory paragraphs in Section 7 can be expanded to provide more detail on the site assessment process. <i>Amend / expand para 7.1 to refer to the site options assessment and SEA process, including the involvement of relevant experts.</i>
Dorset Council	7	Policy 15	New development on this site is located some distance from the centre of Wimborne St Giles and may be considered an isolated dwelling, with no justification in light of the NPPF criteria. It is a sensitive site on the southern fringe of the village and is an important green buffer which forms the direct setting of the conservation area. Limited development could be accommodated on this site from a heritage	This plot is in the short gap between The Terrace / West View and the Manor House, and is not considered isolated or any more distant from the historic core than the site off Coach Road. Whilst it may have been more logical to build in the area immediately adjoining The Terrace (an option considered earlier), concerns were raised regarding

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			<p>perspective in keeping the size, design and plot size and depth of other estate cottages plots on the outskirts of the village. However,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from Coach Road and listed buildings along Bottlebrush Lane, the footpath to Bailey Hill should be a consideration for any development on the southern fringes of the village. • Any development on this site should respect the setting of neighbouring listed buildings close to the site along Bottlebush lane • Careful consideration of boundary treatments and materials should be mindful of the open, green character of the site and on the setting of the existing historic field boundary and setting of the conservation area boundary. • Any development would need to respect the vernacular character of Wimborne St Giles in terms of scale, massing, materials, layout and design. 	<p>localised flooding and therefore this more modest infilling of the gap was considered preferable. The supporting text and policy already highlight the expectation that the roadside hedge should be retained as far as practical, with new hedgerow planting along the site perimeter to the north and east sides.</p> <p>Views from Bottlebush Lane have similarly been considered, with the policy wording also referencing the more elevated elements of Hardy Way and footpath E57/40 to the fields beyond, and the need to retain gaps to allow glimpses through the site. Similarly there is reference to the scale and design of development taking into account the local context, in addition to the wider design policies that would apply.</p>
Local resident	7	Policy 15	No mention of possible damage to the bridge by increased traffic	2 houses would normally be expected to generate no more than 1 trip per hour at peak times, which would be spread across the highway network.
Local residents	7	Policy 15	This green space is important and adds to the beautiful views.	The development of this site was broadly supported in the 2021 and this consultation. It has not been suggested as a Local Green Space.
Dorset Council	7	Policy 16	The plot is located at the end of an existing row of terraces and is considered a suitable infill plot. There would not be any demonstrable harm to any known designated and non-designated heritage assets and there are therefore no substantive heritage issues with this site however,	Noted. Include reference to suggested heritage matters within the policy. <i>Amend supporting text and Policy to reference relationship with neighbouring buildings of local historic interest and views from Coach Road.</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is within the CA and development would need to respect the vernacular character of Wimborne St Giles in terms of scale, massing, materials, layout and design. • Consideration of building heights, design, materials, siting, soft boundary treatments and distance with neighbouring buildings of local interest important. • Views from Coach Road should be a consideration for any development on the east side of the river valley. 	
Local resident	7	Policy 16	This proposed dwelling will impact views for the surrounding houses & remove a valuable unmanaged plot which is used by wildlife.	The development of this site was broadly supported in the 2021 and this consultation. It has not been suggested as a Local Green Space. Policy 9 would also apply with regard to wildlife and biodiversity mitigation.
Local residents	7	Policy 16	If this plot was built on it would add to the lack of privacy as some West View houses would be looking into the back of the new house. Will also increase traffic into the cul-de-sac coming out of the car parking area at the rear of Martins Cottages.	West View houses are likely to be some 40m distant from the new house and therefore would not have an undue impact on privacy. The additional traffic movements created by a single dwelling would be minimal and would not create congestion on the local highway network.
Cranborne Chase AONB	7	Policy 17	The elevated position of site 006 seems to be passed over, along with narrowness of the road beside the site and the tight hedge that would need to be removed to create visibility sight lines for traffic entering and leaving. All that would significantly change the character of that lane and the entry to the village. The effects of including a major development site [006], the need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances and the public interest, together with	There are limited options for a larger site to accommodate some affordable housing as part of the mix. Other sites were considered in 2016 – such as extending further along Coach Road, or further up Baileys Hill, but were discarded. This site has the benefit of being more removed from the historic parkland, not immediate adjoining Listed Buildings, and outside (albeit adjoining) the Conservation Area.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			the three criteria, of NPPF 177 are not discussed. The 'if necessary' caveat seems too vague to ensure the character of the lane is sustained or enhanced. The landform is likely to mean that development will be very obvious, and more explicit consideration is likely to be needed to specify lower buildings, 1½ storey and single storey, included in the supporting text or policy, or both.	The NP Group has worked with the Conservation Team to consider appropriate site layouts / capacity in more detail, taking on board the comments made. As a result, the site area has been reduced (with the eastern portion removed) and the site capacity reduced to 'up to 10'. This will have a knock-on impact on the amount of affordable housing (4 – 5 affordable homes)
Dorset Council	7	Policy 17	The Council Conservation Team have raised significant concerns regarding the site's location on a sensitive fringe of the village where there is potential for development to cause harm to the setting of listed buildings in the village and St Giles House, impacting on views into and out from the conservation area and historic parkland. This is such a rural location that the urbanisation of the setting of the buildings would be obvious and uncharacteristic. There is considered to be limited, if any scope for development from a heritage perspective on this site given the constraints identified. These concerns should be explored further to determine whether there is any potential on the site.	The Conservation Officer has commented on the revised sketch scheme and considered that this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – responds to locality and scale of development in the area – retains more open space on the boundary of the village – reflects farmstead arrangements in the area – incorporates variety of built form and size of footprint to suggest hierarchy of building and variety of functionality as would be the case with a farmstead <i>Amend Policy and related supporting text / map / sketches to reflect the smaller site area and capacity based on the positive Conservation Team comments. Update other references to overall quantum of housing (across the plan area) as appropriate.</i>
Local residents	7	Policy 17	Ruining of the view of the church tower when entering the village from Parsonage Lane <i>NB one comment was made against Policy 18 but is considered to refer to Policy 17 as that proposed new building on Parsonage Lane.</i>	
Environment Agency	7	Policy 17	As your plan proposes a major development allocation (WSG006), you should consider the implications for foul drainage, particularly as your plan area includes	Noted – this can be made clear through an amendment to the supporting text which already notes the need for an FRA

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			groundwater source protection zones. The discharge of domestic sewage associated with any future development may require an environmental permit under the Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016 from the Environment Agency	<i>Amend para 7.18 to acknowledge that the need for an FRA is also triggered as a result of the site size, and reference the need to consider surface water and sewage disposal.</i>
Local residents	7	Policy 17	Vehicular access will be difficult on to a single track road. Traffic will be increased by some 40 or so cars entering and leaving the village several times a day	22 houses (if the maximum number of homes were built) would be expected to generate less than 10 trips per hour at peak times (1 car movement every 6 minutes), which would be spread across the highway network. This level of traffic would not have a material impact on the safe and efficient operation of the local highway network. NB see also proposals for passing places along Parsonage Lane in earlier comment.
Local resident	7	Policy 17	More car parking is needed on the development at the end of Park Lane	Parking provision will need to take into account the current Dorset Council standards.
Local residents	7	Policy 17	The large-scale and concentration of development will have a negative impact on dark skies and will also affect neighbouring properties.	Policy 11 would apply with regard to dark skies and lighting design.
Local residents	7	Policy 17	The scale of this particular development will impact on the enjoyment of certain West View properties given the proximity.	West View houses are likely to be some 40m distant from the new house and therefore would not have an undue impact on privacy.
Local residents	7	Policy 17	Access from the proposed development to the woodland behind will mean that a valuable wildlife habitat (e.g. owls, slow worms and other threatened species) will be destroyed for the sake of a few unnecessary paths when there are already many footpaths around the village. It will also impact	<i>As per the earlier comment on Project 1 – this is no longer proposed for inclusion.</i> <i>Delete reference to woodland walk proposal.</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			negatively on the privacy of West View residents and pose a security risk.	
Sport England	7	Policy 17	Care needs to exercised on the boundary to prevent ball strike form the various sports which can impact the new residents.	Noted – this can be specified in the supporting text and policy. <i>Amend Policy 17 and supporting text to highlight the need for the layout and boundary treatment to consider this impact.</i>
Cranborne Chase AONB	7	Policy 18	This site was not assessed in the Site Options and Assessment document. It was removed from consideration for conversion to dwellings when the equine centre was approved and therefore should be carefully evaluated. In view of the lack assessment of the site, and its history, Policy 18 should be omitted.	Page 22 of the Site Options assessment explains that as the proposal is for a change of use of an existing building, it was not considered necessary to undertake a full assessment – however the site was considered as per the summary on page 26. See also Dorset Council response.
Dorset Council	7	Policy 18	The barns are no longer suited to agricultural use and the Conservation Team agree that their conversion to residential accommodation or work / studio space would help to conserve and enhance their character. As this is clearly a farmstead, development would need to respond to this character.	Noted – the Policy refers specifically to the need for the design and layout to conserve and enhance the character of these traditional rural barns.
Dorset Council	7	Policy 19	The plot is located within an existing row of terraces and is considered a suitable infill plot. There are no substantive heritage issues with this site however, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from St Giles Estate, the Church, Park Lane and the Play area should be a consideration for any development on the fringe of the village. • The site is within the CA and development would need to respect the vernacular character of Wimborne St Giles in terms of scale, massing, height, materials, layout, siting and design. 	Noted – the latter two points are broadly covered in the Policy’s second paragraph as currently worded. Reference to views can also be made in the supporting text. <i>Amend supporting text to include reference to the consideration of views from St Giles Estate, the Church, the Play area and along Park Lane.</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of soft boundary treatments and distance with neighbouring buildings of local interest important. 	
Local resident	7	Policy 19	I disagree with this as Park Lane is a beautiful lane. <i>NB this comment was made against Policy 18 but is considered to refer to Policy 19 as that is the plot on Park Lane.</i>	The development of this site was broadly supported in the 2021 and this consultation.
Dorset Council	7	Policy 20	<p>The plot is located within an existing row of terraces and is considered a suitable infill plot. Existing trees and boundary hedging are considered important contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and boundary of the Registered Park and Garden opposite offering screening and enclosure of the site at present.</p> <p>Limited development of an appropriate scale set back within the plot from the lane with soft boundary treatments could help mitigate any harm caused as a result of development within this site. The site is within the CA and development would need to respect the vernacular character of Wimborne St Giles in terms of scale, massing, height, materials, layout, siting and design.</p>	<p>Noted – the need for the development to be set back from the lane within the plot with soft boundary treatments can be made more explicit, with reference to the points made about the relationship of this site with the Registered Park and Garden opposite.</p> <p><i>Amend supporting text to include reference to the set-back and boundary treatment as highlighted in the Dorset Council's response.</i></p>
Dorset Council	7	Policy 21	<p>The plot is located at the end of an existing row of terraces and is considered a suitable infill plot. Limited development of an appropriate scale set back within the plot from the lane with soft boundary treatments could be appropriate. However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from across the river valley, listed buildings along bottlebrush lane, the footpath to Bailey Hill and Coach 	<p>Noted – the plot and boundary treatment, set-back and views can be made more explicit.</p> <p><i>Amend supporting text to include reference to the plot pattern, set-back and boundary treatment, and consideration of views, as highlighted in the Dorset Council's response.</i></p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			<p>Road should be a consideration for any development on the southern fringes of the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is within the conservation area and therefore any development would need to respect the vernacular character of Wimborne St Giles in terms of scale, massing, materials, layout and design. • Careful consideration of boundary treatments, plot depth and materials and should be mindful of historic field boundaries in the conservation area. 	
Local resident	7	Policy 21	The view over the paddocks and open fields will be lost for walkers and riders of the country lanes and development should not be considered on open fields	Only a limited area of the field is proposed for development, adjoining the built-up area, and the development of this site was broadly supported in the 2021 and this consultation. It has not been suggested as a Local Green Space.
Dorset Council	7	Policy 22	<p>There are concerns that development in this location has the potential to erode the isolated location and setting of the barns (non-designated heritage assets) and existing (later) estate cottages on site. The barns could be considered as non-designated heritage assets and their repair, redevelopment, and re-use in any proposal for the site would be positive for the character and appearance of the area. However, additional new residential units on the adjoining agricultural land associated with the barns has the potential to harm the setting of the barns and estate cottages.</p> <p>It is advised that these concerns are explored further should the site be taken forward. Should heritage concern be resolved, it is recognised that the policy could fulfil NPPF guidance either as development that would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting (if the link between the housing and existing barns is strengthened by including the barns within the site area</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Suggest amendment of the policy to focus on the retention and re-use of the farm buildings for either employment or residential (if they are / may become redundant).</p> <p><i>Amend policy, map and supporting text to more clearly reference the retention and re-use of the farm buildings for either employment or residential (if they are / may become redundant).</i></p>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			and making specific reference to their maintenance and enhancement within the policy text) or as a rural worker's dwelling (if an agricultural or similar tie could be applied to the nearest house and made a requirement).	
Local residents	7	Policy 22	Barn owls nest here	This is correct, and will need to be referenced should the site be developed. <i>Include reference to presence and protection of barn owls as part of the supporting text and revised policy.</i>
Dorset Council	7	Policy 23	It is noted that the agricultural barns are no longer suited for agricultural purposes and that the Conservation team agree that their re-use would conserve and enhance their character. The buildings could be considered as non-designated heritage assets, subject to condition and the quality of fabric remaining on site and their redevelopment and re-use in any proposal for the site would be positive for the character and appearance of the area. The subdivision of the site should be avoided.	To discuss tightening of policy to refer only to conversion and, if appropriate, extension.
Environment Agency	7	Policy 23	In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 159-164, we remind you that the Sequential Test/Exception Test (select as appropriate) should be undertaken if your plan is proposing development or promoting growth in a flood risk area. The only site where this may apply appears to be WSG014 which is right on the edge of the mapped flood zones. We do note this is primarily the conversion of existing barns, but you should still consider whether the sequential test needs to be applied.	NPPF requirement for sequential test for site allocations in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding. Both buildings are within Flood Risk Zone 1. The recent groundwater information does not indicate that the area is prone to flooding, and any future application would need to comply with the need for an FRA if required.
Local residents	7	Policy 23	The road is narrow and regularly floods further down the lane. It would therefore not be sensible to develop this for business u	Noted – however the flooding occurs to the west and the road has remained passable to the east, which would enable safe access via the village.

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
Local residents	7	Policy 23	Barn owls nest here	This is correct, and will need to be referenced should the site be developed. <i>Include reference to presence and protection of barn owls as part of the supporting text and revised policy.</i>
Dorset Council	7	Policy 24	It is noted that the existing chicken sheds are no longer suited for agricultural purposes and that the Conservation team agree, that their demolition would enhance the setting of the listed buildings from the lane and the landscape. This would be in line with the NPPF requirement for development that would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting. Any development on this site would need to be subject to an archaeological watching brief to avoid any demonstrable harm to any known designated heritage assets.	Noted – reference can be made to the need for an archaeological watching brief. <i>Amend Policy and supporting text to include requirement for an archaeological evaluation.</i>
Dorset Council	7	Policy 25	New development on this site is located some distance from the centre of Wimborne St Giles and may be considered an isolated dwelling, with no justification in light of the NPPF criteria. The Councils Conservation Team have raised concerns regarding the site’s location given the archaeological interest, open views of the Allen Valley, historic field boundaries, small scale pocket of adjacent to the site and proximity of the listed building. There is limited, if any scope for development from a heritage perspective on this site given the constraints identified. However, further archaeological investigation of the site may be required. Any development on this site would need to be subject to	Concerns noted. Agreed deletion of this site allocation may be the best option. <i>Delete policy and supporting text, amend housing needs text to reflect reduction in housing numbers.</i>

Respondent/s	§	Para / Policy	Matters raised (summarised)	NPG Response (<i>italics = change to NP</i>)
			an archaeological watching brief to avoid any demonstrable harm to any known heritage assets. Any development on this site should respect the setting of the listed building and associated farm buildings would need to respect the vernacular character of existing dwellings in terms of scale, massing, height, materials, layout, siting and design, plot and boundary treatment.	
Local residents	7	Policy 25	This development is on a green field, too far out of the village. The road here is unsuitable for additional traffic and floods regularly. I	
Cranborne Chase AONB	8	General	Recommends that a more detailed presentation of the village character areas, supported by larger plans, is included early in the NP (rather than banished to an appendix and then not fully explained or described with appropriate scaled plans).	Whilst this may be desirable, this would require considerable additional work. The AECOM Design Code will remain available for reference.
Cranborne Chase AONB	8	Glossary	The Glossary definition of AONB should make clear that it is a national landscape designation that relates to the national status of the area.	Agreed. <i>Amend Glossary definition to refer to the national status / importance of AONBs.</i>