



Dorset Council Local Plan Options Consultation August 2025



Dorset is changing – help us shape it.

Dorset Council is preparing a new Local Plan to guide development. The consultation explores how much development we should provide and identifies opportunity sites for new homes, employment land and traveller sites. It also identifies areas of opportunity for wind and solar power.

The Local Plan options consultation is available to view at www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/dorset-is-changing. You can comment on the Local Plan by completing all or part of this survey online or by using this form. You can also view the site options on a map online and make your comments. Alternatively comment on the site options using the site response form. You can view a paper copy of the Local Plan Options Consultation at your local Dorset library or at County Hall, Dorchester.

If you need help with the survey, please contact the Planning Policy team at planningpolicyconsult@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk or 01305 838334.

You are able to give your views between 18 August 2025 and 13 October 2025.

**The consultation will begin on
18 August 2025 and end on 13 October 2025**

How can I make a comment?

To give your views, please:

- Make sure you give your name and either postal or email address along with your postcode so that your response can be considered appropriately.
- Use the official form.
- Make your comments within the consultation period to ensure they are considered.
- If you are part of a group that shares a common view, please include a list of the contact details of each person (including names, addresses, emails, telephone numbers and signatures) along with a completed form providing details of the named lead representative.
- Continue on separate sheets if necessary.

Please note:

- Representations cannot be treated as confidential. By completing a representation, you agree to your name (but not your address) and comments being made available for public viewing.
- The council do not accept any responsibility for the contents of the comments submitted. We reserve the right to remove any comments containing defamatory, abusive or malicious allegations.

You can respond:

Online

View the consultation and submit your response online via the following link:

www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/dorset-is-changing

The benefits of providing your response this way are as follows:

- less impact on the environment as we do not need to use paper or postage
- you will be emailed a copy of your response as confirmation once submitted
- you will be able to start your response, save it, and return to it at a later date - a confirmation email will send you a link to where you left off
- using the online survey greatly assists our analysis of the responses, enabling more efficient and effective consideration of the issues raised

E-mail

We can also accept responses emailed to us, preferably using this form.

planningpolicyconsult@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk

Written responses

There are paper copies of the response form available upon request for those without internet or computer access.

Please telephone **01305 838334** to request a copy.

Responses returned by post should reference the **Dorset Council Local Plan Consultation 2025** and be sent to the **Spatial Planning Team, Dorset Council, County Hall, Colliton Park, Dorchester, Dorset DT1 1XJ.**

Part A

Please complete one part A form

	Individual	Agent (if applicable)
Name*	Antony Wakeling	Click or tap here to enter text.
Organisation	Wimborne Civic Society	Click or tap here to enter text.
Address line 1*	3 Chauc er Close	Click or tap here to enter text.
Address line 2		Click or tap here to enter text.
Address line 3		Click or tap here to enter text.
Town	Wimborne	Click or tap here to enter text.
Postcode*	BH21 1DP	Click or tap here to enter text.
Email address*	antony@wimbornecivicsoc.org.uk	Click or tap here to enter text.

Client's details if applicable:

Name*	Click or tap here to enter text.
Organisation	Click or tap here to enter text.
Address line 1*	Click or tap here to enter text.
Address line 2	Click or tap here to enter text.
Address line 3	Click or tap here to enter text.
Town	Click or tap here to enter text.
Postcode*	Click or tap here to enter text.
Email address*	Click or tap here to enter text.

*essential fields

Group representations

If your representation is on behalf of a group, ensure the lead representative completes the contact details box above. Also, please state here how many people support the representation:

108 members and a committee of 9 who have all approved this submission.

Part B

Consultation questions

Section 2: Vision and Strategic Priorities

2.1. The Local Plan Vision

Question 1: Do you have any comments on the proposed vision for Dorset?

The proposed Vision is laudable and what would be expected.

Sadly, the area bordering the BCP Conurbation will be badly affected by the proposed plans which are unsustainable. Building on most of the proposed sites would destroy the area's environmental quality landscapes, biodiversity, heritage and historic settlements. Negligible additional employment has been proposed and there has been no additional infrastructure to support the recently added large scale building let alone any additional housing. The proposals will result in even more congestion as people have to move through the area for employment, shopping and leisure. This will increase the carbon footprint and ruin the natural environment.

2.2. Strategic priorities

Question 2: Do you have any comments on the proposed strategic priorities for the Local Plan?

Four Strategic Priorities:

1. Provide affordable and high-quality homes - Working with partners to deliver homes that meet Dorset's diverse needs is right. Unfortunately, it has not worked recently. Very large numbers of houses have been built many of which are not selling. The prices are too high for wages in the area. The wrong kind of houses are being built by developers who claim higher proportions of affordable houses are not viable.
2. Grow our economy - Supporting sustainable economic growth, creating jobs, and regenerating town centres is right. But the plans do not provide for more employment in the area to match the housing that has recently been built let alone the new proposals. The town centres are blocked by transiting traffic
3. Communities for all - Building strong, healthy communities with accessible essential services is right. But the recent developments have not provided local facilities such as shops and community spaces. There are no more doctors surgeries, pharmacies public transport etc. This means even more travelling; usually by car.
4. Responding to climate and nature emergency - Protecting lives, ecosystems, and strengthening community resilience is good. But The proposals to use Green Belt land destroys this, means loss of green spaces, wildlife corridors and places for the community to enjoy these.

Section 3: The strategy for sustainable development

3.2. The Strategy for Dorset

Question 3: The proposed settlement hierarchy lists the towns and villages that will be the focus for new homes. Are there other settlements where we should plan for new homes? Do you have any comments on whether a settlement is in the right Tier or not?

We do not see the reasoning in using tiers to allocate housing space. Housing space should be allocated on the basis of real local need for housing – not government directives; the benefit of providing the housing in that area versus the effect on the local environment and the existing residents of those areas.

3.3. South Eastern Dorset area

Question 4: Do you have any comments on the proposed strategy for the south eastern area?

The proposed Site Allocations for Housing in Appendix A will turn BCP and all the surrounding areas of Dorset into one large mega conurbation losing the historical distinctiveness of communities such as Wimborne and destroying the open land between them.

Wimborne Civic Society are very concerned by the proposed allocations in the area surrounding BCP. The Census data for the number of households in Wimborne and Colehill in 2001 shows 3275 and 2855 respectively. In 2011 the figures are 3298 and 2857, and for 2021, 3900 and 3656 or total numbers of 6130, 6150 and 7556. There is very little change in the first 10 years but an increase of 1406 or 23% in the 10 years to 2021. Over this period there has been almost no change in the infrastructure.

There are fewer GP surgeries and pharmacies. The schools are almost at full capacity. There are now no banks in Wimborne and one must travel to Poole or Bournemouth for many everyday items. The provision of public transport is largely unchanged, less if anything. The only major road network change has been the construction of the Doughnut roundabout on the A31 at Canford bottom and the construction of largely unused cycle lanes.

In the 2021/2 consultation the number of homes planned and to complete between 2011 – 2026 was quoted as: Cranborne East & West 603, Cuthbury 203, Saxonbury (Parmiter) 81, Quarter-Jack Park (Leigh Rd) 174 and Leigh Road (A31) 305. Adding the 650 houses in the BCP Oakwood Park Estate – these will naturally turn to Wimborne as a centre – makes a total of 2173, of which, at the time of the consultation, 1131 were still to be built.

In these developments, no additional facilities have been built in the way of local shops or community spaces. One planned retail development was changed to a care home in an approved Variation of Conditions Planning Application. At the same time there has been no additional employment space. The consequence has been a massive increase in traffic coming into Wimborne and passing through it to reach BCP for shops and employment. But the roads out of Wimborne go over either one of three narrow bridges or the Canford Bottom roundabout. Internally traffic blocks at the Rodway roundabout, Hanham Road and Pie Corner. There are no plans to improve the road network.

On top of this, the List of new sites in the 2025 Dorset Plan would add a further 3494 or 46% more than the 2021 census numbers. That is twice the increase in the 10 years to 2021 and excludes those still to be completed. All of these new sites are further from the centre of Wimborne, too far for pedestrian access. So they would add to the traffic to and through Wimborne adding yet more to the congestion problems. All the housing allocation sites around Wimborne and Colehill are in the Green Belt and within 5km of the natural heathland. This would displace the wildlife from these areas, break the wildlife corridors through the area, force residents to travel further to reach any countryside. Land is designated as Green Belt for very good reasons: to protect the countryside and the wildlife that it supports, to provide buffer zones between communities and the distinctiveness of those communities.

The NPPF states that Green Belt land should only be used for housing in exceptional circumstances. Unfortunately, the lack of housing is not exceptional. It is a fact of life now. So other solutions must be found. This must include, amenities and employment as well as housing on sites like that proposed at Crossways. The Dorset Council Local Plan 2025 is totally unsustainable in the area around Wimborne and Colehill.

3.4. Central Dorset area

Question 5: Do you have any comments on the proposed strategy for the central area?

No comment

3.5. Northern Dorset area

Question 6: Do you have any comments on the proposed strategy for the northern area?

No comment

3.6. Western Dorset area

Question 7: Do you have any comments on the proposed strategy for the western area?

No comment

3.7. Infrastructure Delivery

Question 8: Is there any important infrastructure that needs to be delivered alongside new homes in the Western/Central/South Eastern/Northern area?

Yes. Despite a 23% increase in the number of houses in Wimborne & Colehill since 2001 there has been no commensurate improvement in infrastructure. The road network is substantially unchanged. the number of GP surgeries and pharmacies has reduced. Housing developments have been built out without shopping or community facilities. Public Transport has not improved to match the housing. New residents were promised buses services which have not come. Developers have been allowed to build a care home instead of a retail outlet for an estate, depriving the new resident of the promised local shops.

There has been almost no additional employment. Consequently, new and existing residents have to travel through the now inadequate road network for shopping and employment causing delays and worse pollution. Access to and through Wimborne is over one of 3 narrow bridges or the bottleneck of Canford Bottom roundabout. The East – West route of the A31 is at capacity and there is no North – South route. The building of cycle paths between Wimborne and Ferndown has had minimal impact on cycle journeys across the route with on average one cyclist every 5 minutes.

All this would be made significantly worse if further housing were brought to the area unless improvements are made to the infrastructure BEFORE the proposed further 43% increase in housing is added

Section 4: Housing Delivery Strategy

4.2. Local Housing Need and Housing Delivery

Question 9: The Local Plan sets out a strategy to meet the area's housing needs through allocating sites for new homes, the flexible settlements policy, new settlements and the efficient use of land. Are there any other measures could help to meet housing needs?

There is a serious lack of affordable housing in Dorset. This applies both in the built up and in the rural areas. Planners have accepted developers' pleas that building more than small proportions of affordable housing is unviable. There needs to be an insistence that they should be built even if it requires financial incentives from the public purse. This would mean they were scattered within other new communities. A numbers only based allocation method cannot address the shortage of affordable housing. There has to be some control over the type of housing approved. This may require the public sector to take up the provision of 'affordable' housing?

4.3. Housing supply

Question 10: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Plan including a lower housing target for the first few years and a higher figure towards the end of the plan period to meet housing needs?

- a. Agree ☐
- b. Disagree ☐
- c. I have another suggestion ☒

Any plan which does not include concomitant infrastructure is unsustainable. The last few years have significantly increased the supply of housing in the area surrounding BCP without the necessary improvements in infrastructure. Upgrades to the road network, employment opportunities, additional shops, medical facilities and community spaces are essential BEFORE any more housing is added. It would be far better to build new communities complete with all the necessary infrastructure as is suggested around Crossways.

4.4. Meeting housing needs of specific groups

Question 11: Where should a policy allowing sites for only affordable homes apply?

- a. All of Dorset ☒
- b. Only around those towns and villages listed in the proposed settlement hierarchy ☐
- c. Only in the Green Belt ☐

See answer to question 9.

Section 5: Flexible Settlements Policy

5.2. Proposed approach – Flexible settlements policy

Question 12: We have suggested that the Local Plan will not include clear boundaries to define the edges of towns and villages. Instead, the flexible settlements policy would allow new homes to be built around certain towns and villages. How much do you agree or disagree with this approach?

- a. Agree ☐
- b. Partially agree ☒
- c. Neutral ☐
- d. Partially disagree ☐
- e. Disagree ☐

Please provide any further comments or reasoning...

If building is allowed outside the boundaries of these settlements through the flexible homes policy, it should be for the benefit of existing residents looking for homes. Any building must provide enough affordable housing and the necessary additions of infrastructure.

5.3. The scale of development

Question 13: We propose that the flexible settlements policy will include a limit of 30 homes per site. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this threshold?

- a. The limit of 30 homes is about right ☒
- b. There should be less homes ☐
- c. More homes per site should be allowed ☐

Please explain your reasoning

The decision on the limit has to be site dependent.

5.4. Number of sites at each settlement

Question 14: At a town/village, should one flexible settlement policy site be started, before another one is permitted?

- a. Yes ☒
- b. No ☐

Please provide any further comments

Infrastructure must keep up with and preferably precede the construction of housing.

5.5. Settlements where the flexible settlements policy would apply

Question 15: We have suggested that the flexible settlements policy will only apply to the areas around certain towns and villages, these are those ranked as 'Tier 1, Tier 2 or Tier 3' in our settlement hierarchy. What do you think about the locations where we have suggested that the flexible settlements policy should apply?

We believe that the allocation to tiers has to be and has been somewhat arbitrary. Flexible housing schemes should not be treated differently from other planning decisions and should be on a per site basis. We agree that it should not apply in the Green Belt.

5.6. Continuous built-up areas and edge of continuous built-up areas

Question 16: We have suggested that the flexible settlement policy should only be applied around the 'continuous built-up areas' (i.e. 'densely populated areas with high concentrations of buildings, infrastructure and paved roads') of certain towns and villages. Do you have any comments on our definition of this 'continuous built-up area'?

As in the answer to question 4: The proposed allocations in Appendix A will turn BCP and all the surrounding areas of Dorset into one large mega conurbation losing the historical distinctiveness of communities such as Wimborne and destroying the open land between them. It will displace the wildlife from these areas, break the wildlife corridors through the area, force residents to travel further to reach any countryside.

The proposed allocations in Appendix A for East Dorset where there are areas with "high concentrations of buildings" have inadequate "infrastructure and paved roads". The allocations and any "flexible settlements" here also would result in serious damage to the environment and the loss of distinction between existing settlements. However, "flexible settlements" do not apply in most of this area because it is and must remain Green Belt.

5.7. Green Belt

Question 17: We have suggested that the flexible settlements policy should not be applied in the Green Belt. What are your thoughts on this?

Very small numbers of additional houses built on the edge of existing settlements can provide housing for local people from that settlement, but they must not be allowed to change the nature of the settlement or result in the merging of settlements. This plan proposes wholesale annihilation of the Green Belt in the area around BCP and this is both unsustainable and unacceptable. .

5.8. Approach to countryside development and urban intensification

Question 18: Away from the towns and villages listed in the settlement hierarchy, there may be types of development that we could support. Do you have any comments on this approach and on the types of development that could be supported in the countryside?

Brownfield sites within the country may be suitable for employment to provide jobs for those that live locally and minimise travel.

5.9. Neighbourhood plans and the flexible settlements policy

Question 19: We have suggested that the flexible settlements policy should not be applied in places with a recently made neighbourhood plan which includes allocations for new homes. What are your thoughts on this?

If they fit within the neighbourhood's wishes, why not. There is a dearth of affordable homes for local people in some areas. Any such new homes should be preserved for locals.

Section 6: Employment Strategy

6.3. Employment allocations

Question 20: The Local Plan will retain and protect existing key employment sites, identify new employment sites at locations close to more sustainable settlements, allow for expansion of existing employment sites and allow for new employment sites in suitable locations. Do you have any comments on this approach?

Section 6.3 contains warm words but little in the way of concrete suggestions as to how they could be achieved. Appendix B does not identify any employment sites in Wimborne. Indeed Appendix A suggests using an existing one for housing. So residents have no choice but to seek work in a café or travel to BCP or Ferndown.

There is a dearth of employment and employment sites in the Wimborne Area. Only 2 new small sites are proposed (EL/FERN/013 & 014) and these are both in the Ferndown area. The nearer one is 3 ½ miles from the centre of Wimborne and though a possible cycle commute, would probably mostly be done by car adding to congestion in Wimborne and at Canford Bottom roundabout.

6.4. Employment development away from allocated sites

Question 21: The Local Plan will enable employment land to be developed outside identified sites at certain towns and villages, subject to certain considerations. Do you agree with this approach?

Yes

6.5. Mixed use development

Question 22: We have suggested that larger scale housing sites should be required to provide land for employment uses. Proposals for 300 homes or more would be mixed residential and employment developments, with a ratio of 0.25ha of employment space for every 100 homes. How much do you agree or disagree with this approach?

- a. Agree ☒
- b. Partially agree ☐
- c. Neutral ☐
- d. Partially disagree ☐
- e. Disagree ☐

Please provide any further comments or reasoning...

There need to be more employment opportunities and public transport to make it possible for residents to live, work and relax without travelling distances by car.

6.6. Protecting employment sites

Question 23: We have suggested that the Local Plan should include policies to protect the most important existing 'key' employment sites.

a) Do you have any views on the strategy we have suggested for protecting employment sites?

Good words but no indication of compliance in the proposals for the Wimborne Area or suggestions for how to achieve the aims.

b) What criteria should we consider when defining 'key' and 'non-key' employment sites?

- a. Site size ☒
- b. Location ☒
- c. Employment use type ☒
- d. Accessibility ☒
- e. Contribution to meeting economic objectives/needs ☒
- f. Market attractiveness ☒
- g. Opportunities for growth/expansion ☒
- h. The site's status in previous local plans ☒
- i. Other ☐

Section 7: Town centre development

7.1. Town centres

Question 24: How do you think we should plan to support town centres in the future?

The centre of Wimborne needs to provide shops, offices, cultural and community spaces for its residents to keep it live and to limit the amount of travel out of the direct area. Already all banks have been lost and many items are not available from the shops that remain.

The Historic heritage of Wimborne still makes it a draw for visitors. It is important that this is protected both for its own sake, but also because it provides some employment.

Question 25: What types of use do you think will be most important for the future of our town centres?

- a. Shops ☒
- b. Cafes/restaurants ☒
- c. Leisure (e.g. cinemas) ☒
- d. Offices ☒
- e. Cultural (e.g. museums) ☒
- f. Community (e.g. libraries) ☒
- g. Hotels ☐
- h. Other ☒

Car parks are needed because too many houses have been built around Wimborne without

7.2. Managing town centre development

Question 26: We are suggesting that retail impact assessments should be undertaken for retail development proposals outside the town centres defined in the Plan, that are over the size of a small food store (280 square metres net). How much do you agree or disagree with the introduction of a threshold of 280 square metres for retail impact assessments?

- a. Agree ☐
- b. Partially agree ☒
- c. Neutral ☐
- d. Partially disagree ☐
- e. Disagree ☐

Please provide any further comments or reasoning

When housing is added around the edge of existing developments, it is important that facilities are provided within them to minimise the amount of travelling needed. Additional traffic from those recently built around Wimborne has overloaded the road network and made it unsafe for pedestrians trying to cross the roads. 280sqm seems a low figure for this threshold.

Question 27: Should the threshold also apply to leisure uses that are net 280 square metres?

a. Yes ☒

b. No ☐

Question 28: We are considering whether the Local Plan should include a policy which supports interim or temporary uses pending a permanent use for a vacant town centre building - we have called these 'meanwhile uses'. To what extent do you agree with the introduction of a meanwhile uses policy?

a. Agree ☐

b. Partially agree ☒

c. Neutral ☐

d. Partially disagree ☐

e. Disagree ☐

Please provide any further comments or reasoning

Temporary uses are better than boarded up shop fronts. There are often opportunities to convert upper floors of shops and business premises for accommodation. These should be used before taking more land for building.

Section 8: Brownfield Land

8.3. Brownfield land delivery

Question 29: How else can we encourage development on brownfield land, whilst also planning positively to meet our needs for homes and employment land?

The existing Brownfield First policy should be used wherever possible. It should be available for either housing or employment.

Section 9: Green Belt Review

9.2. Our approach to Green Belt release

Question 30: To what extent do you agree with taking land out of the Green Belt to help meet our development needs?

- a. Agree ☐
- b. Partially agree ☐
- c. Neutral ☐
- d. Partially disagree ☐
- e. Disagree ☒

Please provide any further comments or reasoning...

The Green Belt has been set up for specific good reasons – the protection of wildlife and the environment, to maintain the lifestyle of residents of adjoining built environments and to stop urban sprawl and to maintain the distinctiveness of communities. It is far better to create purpose built communities with the employment, services and amenities required within easy walking or cycling distance, rather than perpetuating urban sprawl causing traffic jams and poorer quality of life for existing residents.

The existing rule that Green Belt should only be released in exceptional circumstances should be adhered to. Government quotas do not constitute exceptional circumstances.

Section 10: Self-build and custom-build housing

10.3. Self-build plot delivery

Question 31: We have suggested that the Local Plan should include a flexible settlements policy which would allow new homes around certain towns and villages. What impact, if any, do you think the proposed flexible settlements policy might have on opportunities for self-build homes?

- a. High impact ☐
- b. Some impact ☐
- c. No impact ☒

Please provide further comments or reasoning.

Self build opportunities should be available on any approved site.

Question 32: Is there anything else we should do to increase the supply of self-build plots?

See answer above.

Section 11: Neighbourhood Plans

11.3. Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plans

Question 33: We have suggested that housing requirements for neighbourhood plan areas should be finalised at the next stage of preparing the Local Plan. This is likely to involve consideration of sites with planning permission, local plan allocations and unplanned development. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach?

- a. Agree ☐
- b. Partially agree ☒
- c. Neutral ☐
- d. Partially disagree ☐
- e. Disagree ☐

Please provide any further comments or reasoning...

Housing requirements must be agreed in consultation with the neighbourhoods not just imposed, based upon a clear understanding of the needs of the neighbourhoods to maintain and improve their identities.

11.4. Flexible Settlements Policy

Question 34: Should the housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas outside the Green Belt, include an allowance for sites that could come forward through the flexible settlements policy?

a. Yes ☒

b. No ☐

Please provide any further comments or reasoning.

Flexible Settlements should be treated as any other planning proposal – on their merits. They should not be restricted to Tiers 1, 2 & 3 – Tiers should be abandoned see answer to Q3

Section 12: Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

12.3. Strategy for meeting Traveller needs

Question 35: We have suggested that our Local Plan objectives for Travellers should be:

- to reduce the numbers of unauthorised sites,
- to provide opportunities for sites to expand,
- to encourage new Traveller sites in sustainable locations, and
- to provide opportunities for Travellers to deliver their own sites.

Do you have any comments on the objectives for meeting the need for Traveller sites?

These objectives seem reasonable. However the allocation and approval of sites should be subject to the same scrutiny as other uses.

Question 36: To help ensure that enough pitches are provided to meet Dorset's needs, Traveller pitches could be delivered alongside homes for the settled community on large scale residential development. Are there any issues which you think we need to consider in locating Traveller

Traveller pitches need to be located with direct access adequate roads – similar to GT/CMUL/001 though it might be better to locate this one further west on Candys Lane or Brog Street to provide even closer access to A31.

pitches alongside new built homes for the settled community?

Question 37: We are suggesting that 5 Traveller pitches should be provided for every 500 homes on large development sites. Is this threshold correct?

- a. Yes ☐
- b. No-it should be higher ☐
- c. No-it should be lower ☐

Please provide any further comments or reasoning.

Traveller sites should not be provided on large development sites.

12.5. Criteria based policy for Traveller sites

Question 38: To encourage Travellers to deliver their own sites, we are suggesting that the Local Plan should include a criteria policy which takes account of the site's

Those seem sensible but see the answer to Q35

location, access, neighbouring development, environmental impact and management of the site. Do you think we need to add or change any of the suggested criteria?

Section 13: Strategic Heathland Recreation Mitigation

13.1. Background

Question 39: We have identified opportunity sites which could deliver more homes to help meet Dorset's housing needs. Do we need to change the approach to mitigating impacts on protected Dorset Heaths habitat sites as part of planning to meet increased housing needs?

a. Yes ☒

b. No ☐

Please provide further comments or reasoning.

Whilst SANGs divert (dog) walkers from the most sensitive land they are greenwashing the loss of agricultural and Green Belt land. They are taking natural greenspace and re-allocating it and therefore losing much of its function as space for wildlife.

"Mitigation" is well intended. Heathland Infrastructure Projects (HIPs) such as SANGS do not create any Natural Greenspace. They only make developers and planners feel good because they have provided a hectare of SANG while destroying 4 hectares of agricultural or Green Belt land. The change of approach would be not to build the housing where mitigation is otherwise required.

13.3. Shapwick, Kingston Lacy and the Stour Valley Park

Question 40: To what extent do you agree or disagree with development at Shapwick to enable the delivery of public benefits from investment in the Kingston Lacy Estate?

a. Agree ☐

b. Partially agree ☒

c. Neutral ☐

d. Partially disagree ☐

e. Disagree ☐

Please provide any further comments or reasoning

A masterplan to demonstrate how the village would change and the public benefits that would be realised would be required if this approach is taken forward.

Section 14: Onshore Wind, Solar, and Battery Energy Storage

14.2. Identifying suitable areas

Question 41: We have outlined some areas which could be appropriate for wind turbines, ground mounted solar panels and battery energy storage. To what extent do you agree or disagree with identifying broad areas of opportunity for wind, solar and battery energy storage?

- a. Agree ☐
- b. Partially agree ☐
- c. Neutral ☒
- d. Partially disagree ☐
- e. Disagree ☐

Please provide any further comments or reasoning

The allocations in Appendix D seem totally arbitrary. What is the reasoning? Otherwise they are meaningless.

Section 15: North of Dorchester Masterplan

15.3. Matter 1: Eastern edge

Question 42: Since Roman times, the centre of Dorchester has had a prominent position in the landscape. One of the threats to this identity is at the eastern edge of the potential development area (near the A35). Would you support keeping this eastern area more green and open, even if that means fewer homes, facilities and jobs?

- a. Agree ☐
- b. Partially agree ☐
- c. Disagree ☐
- d. Partially disagree ☐
- e. Neutral ☐

Please provide any further comments or reasoning...

Click or tap here to enter text.

15.4. Matter 2: Employment locations

Question 43. Supporting jobs, homes and services all in one place is an essential part of the health of a town. Do you see new workspaces that are integrated into walkable neighbourhoods and local centres as an attractive part of Dorchester in the future?

- a. Agree ☐
- b. Partially agree ☐
- c. Disagree ☐
- d. Partially disagree ☐
- e. Neutral ☐

Please provide any further comments or reasoning...

Click or tap here to enter text.

15.5. Matter 3: Pigeon House Farm neighbourhood

Question 44: We believe that the valley at Pigeon House Farm can play an important role in encouraging access to nature and celebrating local landscape – What type of development, if any, do you think could help support this in a sustainable way?

- i. A smaller scale of development ☐
- ii. A larger scale of development ☐
- iii. The use of the area as an undeveloped landscape buffer, for recreation, education and nature interpretation, without any housing development. ☐
- iv. A mixture of the above ☐

Please provide any further comments or reasoning...

Click or tap here to enter text.

15.6. Matter 4: Main east to west route

Question 45: What are your priorities for a new east–west route?

Click or tap here to enter text.