Appendix '1'

DORSET COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION – 18th January – 15th March 2021

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
A4A				Alderholt is in a geographically unique position in Dorset; it is bounded very closely on 3 sides by either Hampshire or Wiltshire. Most local Services are based outside the County in which the village lies. The village is also unusually remote from employment opportunities and post-8 education. In transport and climate emergency terms it is the wrong place to put housing growth. It is only accessible by country lanes with a complete lack of regular public transport. Road improvements promised when the village grew in the 1980s have never been delivered. We believe it is a serious mistake for Dorset Council to consider locating a higher percentage growth in Alderholt than any other settlement. Option 1 plus existing approvals would see the village grow by 50%, around 1500 extra people. Option 2 could see it grow by up to 300%. Action4Alderholt is objecting to both Options 1 and 2 in the Alderholt section of the consultation document on the grounds that neither is sustainable and we would like to suggest that an Option 3 is considered in their

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				place, which would limit growth to 30% and guarantee it comes with improvements to transport, employment, services and a SANG which would genuinely mitigate the growing pressures on the protected heathland at Cranborne Common. Existing planning approvals plus applications "in the pipeline" are likely to exceed that 30% before the new plan is adopted. This figure will be more than enough to cater for local housing needs in the plan period. IT IS THE OPINION OF Action4Alderholt THAT BOTH OPTIONS 1 & 2 OF THE DORSET CONSULTATION DOCUMENT ARE UNSUSTAINABLE ON ALL OF THE CONDITIONS TAKEN FROM THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK Option 1 We strongly oppose this option because it will result in Alderholt taking the largest percentage expansion in Dorset without any mitigation of the impact on transport and services. The vast majority of additional residents will travel by car for employment, education, entertainment and services. This is not sustainable development and shows no recognition of the climate emergency; even with electric vehicles the greenhouse gas impact will be excessive. It will leave us as the largest commuter village in the UK served only by narrow, hazardous roads and no bus service

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				frequent enough for commuters or health appointments. The 300 houses in this option are on top of approx. 200 houses that have already been approved on "infill", The Surplus Stores & Pennyfarthing sites. The sluggish housing market in Alderholt and historic slow pace of development suggest that development will drag on piecemeal for many years, offer nothing in terms of community benefits and gradually eroding the character and quality of life of our community. Both Dorset Council and our Parish Council have declared a climate emergency. Development of this type will work totally against that priority. If the option 1 is nevertheless included in the Dorset Local Plan it needs to be mitigated at the very least by:- 1. Phasing of development so employment and infrastructure is provided first 2. Improvements to the B3078 road by both Dorset and Hampshire between Alderholt 3. and Fordingbridge before our population increases by more than 25% 4. A 20mph limit and/or additional pavements within parts of the village such as

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				 5. Ringwood Road to reduce the potential conflict between pedestrians, horse riders, Cyclists and motor vehicles 6. Further road safety measures on all commuter routes around the village Key weaknesses of Option 1 • Most houses would not be within walking distance of shop, pub, village hall, church • It makes shape of village more elongated so hard to locate future amenities/community activities • After existing planning permissions are taken into account this represents 50% growth in village population, most of who will have to commute to work and to access services and education • This puts extra strain on local services which have limited scope to expand, e.g. health and, schools • Road safety and climate emergency concerns would be made even worse • There are no proposals or adequate resources to improve transport or services. Option 2 The option to quadruple the size of the village with substantial development making it a

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				self-sustaining town by adding up to 3000 new houses with the entire necessary infrastructure is simply not achievable in the time allocated and the money isn't available to implement it in any realistic way. Inclusion of the option would merely result in unacceptable, piecemeal, unsustainable development.
				Before even considering this option we believe the planning authority should have produced and published a basic initial feasibility study and project plan answering the questions:-
				 Would Hampshire and New Forest Councils work with Dorset and allocate the necessary resources to evaluate this option in time for the 2023 plan? Is there demand for development on this scale in this area within the next 15 years, even
				in the most favourable market conditions and assuming a swift economic recovery? 3. Is the scale of development likely to fund the necessary infrastructure and services improvements, even in a best case scenario?
				4. If there is any doubt about question 3, can government financial support be secured to bridge the gap?5. Even if all these conditions are met, would this be a sustainable development given the

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				urgent need to reduce transport emissions? We believe the answer to all these questions is no – a problem on any one of them would derail the option. Key weaknesses of Option 2 • There is no evidence of sufficient demand for this scale of location within the plan period • The idea of combining Fordingbridge and Alderholt for service purposes is not practical; the distance between people and services is too great to be accessed by walking, or even cycling on a year round basis. • The high cost of necessary road and transport improvements could not be funded by developers. It would probably entail a new link to the A338, major bridge costs over the flood plain and a lengthy compulsory purchase process. • There is not sufficient time to plan this in a responsible and sustainable manner for the 2023 plan.
				In Conclusion Neither of the options is reasonable. Option 1 breaks the planning department's own guidelines and policies, as rigorously explained in the report drawn up by Jo Withenden for the Parish Council. Option 2 is totally unachievable in

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				the plan time line and we believe it would only be feasible with a level of government investment which is not currently available. Our proposal would be to add a 3rd option. This would be much more likely to actually achieve 300 extra homes OPTION 3 – The facts • There are already approx. 200 homes for which permission has been granted. • There will be more applications before Dorset Council make any firm decision. • Points 2 & 3 will achieve a figure nearer 300 homes than the Council's Option 1 • To avoid piecemeal and poorly located development the present village envelope should be protected from anything other than organic growth. • The land and woods to the north of Daggons Road and Station Road should be preserved as wild life habitat. There are already several legally protected species there • It is highly unlikely that the funding would be available to upgrade the access roads.
1	Option 1, small-scale expansion on Land north of Ringwood Road. Any growth further to this is unfeasible. In reality, no	1) Significant road structure improvements linking Alderholt to the A338. This would require inter-council co-operation	1) There is no detail of, nor indeed any feasible way to deliver the infrastructure needed to countenance even a fraction	I believe that any significant development is unfeasible and undeliverable for the reasons outlined , and suggest that the best position for the Parish Council to take is to oppose Option 2,

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	further homes need to be built in Alderholt in order for Dorset Council to obtain their projected housing targets.	between NFDC, Hampshire County Council and Dorset Council to even begin to implement this. Given that the two Hampshire authorities will flat out refuse this due to the fact that there is already significant proposed development happening in Fordingbridge, and the massive impact any proposed roads would have on the New Forest National Park and surrounding area, combined with the increased vehicle footfall and destruction of countryside these road improvements would entail being in direct contradiction to Dorset Council's Climate emergency strategy, road infrastructure - and thus any large-scale development - is untenable. 2) New local employment opportunities. Unless a serious and detailed breakdown of these opportunities is put forward prior to any further consultation regarding long-	of the growth propositioned in Option 2 (see above). 2) Significant development and the resulting increase in traffic and destruction of natural environment directly contradicts Dorset Council's Climate Emergency Strategy. 3) A large and rapid increase of population resulting from proposals such as Option 2 would lead to a massive increase in footfall - and thus significant threat and erosion - to nearby conservation areas, namely Cranbourne Chase and The New Forest National Park. 4) The woods north of Alderholt are home to several protected and endangered species, such as roosting bats, badgers, and tawny and barn owls, among others. Significant development would have a devastating impact on their natural environment. 5) There is no way to provide local employment and infrastructure for the upwards of 3,000 new residents that Option 2 envisages. This would massively impact on nearby Fordingbridge, which is already undergoing significant development.	at least until a serious project roadmap and feasibility study, including full cost projections, are outlined by Dorset Council in regards to how they would provide sufficient infrastructure and employment to justify any significant growth, as well as detailed case studies and independent consultations regarding the long-term impact on the surrounding countryside (especially Cranbourne AOB and the New Forest National Park) such significant development would have to ensure that any such developments would be in keeping and tone with Dorset Council's Climate Emergency Strategy.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
		term significant growth, residents of Alderholt should not be expected to commit to any long-term proposal regarding significant development.	 6) Wessex Water has already advised against any significant development in Alderholt due to the increased levels of phosphates entering the River Avon this would result in. 7) Dorset Council can meet its projected housing target without further development of Alderholt. 	
2	Neither. Both options are unrealistic given the reasons already identified in the plan. Numerous significant problems/disadvantages with development at Alderholt have been identified already in the plan and it appears that the only advantage is that the 'village is unconstrained', which doesn't exactly make a good case.	None other than those identified already!! Alderholt will never be self-contained. It will never be able to provide adequate retail outlets, employment, education or health service to its residents who will always need/want to travel to service their needs in these areas in the larger hubs of Salisbury, Bournemouth, Ringwood and Verwood, as is the case already.	None other than those identified already, particularly adequate public transport and an improved road network.	
3				It appears to us that it is blatantly obvious that the option for 3000+ houses over the coming years, is totally unrealistic for a number of reasons as outlined below: In order for the village to be expanded by such a large amount, all access roads to Alderholt would need major improvements in order to cope with

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				the massive increase in traffic. This would involve collaboration with the neighbouring local authorities of Ringwood, Fordingbridge, Verwood, Cranborne and also the area authorities of the New Forest District Council and Hampshire Country Council. Some of which we already know are not in favour of such major development to Alderholt due to the subsequent impact on their areas. Fordingbridge High Street already struggles to cope with the existing traffic and size of Lorries driving through the town, and there is no possible way of improving it to deal with yet more vehicles. Even if we put those arguments aside, the cost of improving the access roads for the village would be excessive. The provision of education in the village would require drastic improvement and require the building of new schools for Junior and Senior levels, at present the children have to travel an unacceptable distance to access their schooling, leading to a very long school day. These schools are working at near capacity now and would not be able to accommodate the extra pupils from a development of this size. New Medical facilities would also be needed as
				the current practices at Cranborne and

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				Fordingbridge are already struggling to provide adequate services at to their existing patients. In order to comply with the national sustainability requirements for developments there would need to be work opportunities in the local area; we struggle to understand how this will be achieved. We suppose that perhaps the council could encourage start up businesses in the area or tempt companies to relocate if suitable premises were available? But once again this brings us back to the infrastructure or rather lack of it. Presently there are very poor transport links whether that be, by road or bus (which is practically non-existent!). We cannot see bringing a substantial number of work opportunities to the local area feasible possibility. Also if development of this size were to go ahead, surely it would mean that the utilities supplying the village at present would not be sufficient to cope with the increased level of housing and therefore substantial work would be needed to upgrade them. At present the village seems to be plagued with power cuts, internet issues and mobile signal issues, will these issues improve or become worse with this development?

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				Lastly with regards to the 3000+ homes option, I think you will find if you carried out a poll of the residents of the village a huge majority would not be in favour of extending our Alderholt in such a way that it is no longer a nice rural village, but a small town with constant traffic travelling in and out for work and other of life's necessities; we little or have no faith in the authorities to instigate the infrastructure improvements that the council agree is required. Reference the Option for 300 new houses. We are not NIMBY's and accept that the village needs to accommodate a certain level of new housing, the proposed 300 new homes along with those already approved and yet to be built,
				is sufficient development over the next 5 years. Development of this size over a period of time would enable the village to sustain its community feel and avoid ending up feeling like a suburb of Fordingbridge. It would be preferable if the village envelope remained as near to the existing footprint a possible with the most obvious site for development being the land formerly known and used by the business 'Johnny Junks'; this land was earmarked for development and has remained an empty eyesore for many years. We hasten to add that

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				Alderholt already lacks certain facilities/infrastructure a village of its current size should already have and even if the smaller development option becomes the Council's choice, improvements need to be strived for and not pushed aside just because the village is not suitable for such large scale development. Thank you for listening to our views; we very much hope that our, District Councillor and Parish Councillors put their hearts and souls behind supporting the residents in opposing the 3000+ option and fighting to keep our village a 'village'.
4	None. There is already existing permission for 200 houses and the village will struggle with the impact of that number	Primarily roads as existing roads are rural and narrow which suits the identity of the village.	Many! There is no infrastructure, which is why most of the residents live herelOne shop/ post office, one pub, two churches and one garage. Any large increase in population will lead to massive increase in traffic leaving the village and massive congestion on narrow, often untreated in winter, roads. It's already significantly difficult for the school buses to get through and that is at the time when most people would be commuting out of the village to work. I run a livery yard on Ringwood Road which involves horses being ridden to forestry commissions or common land along Ringwood and some of Hilbury Road. Traffic is already at concerning levels and an increase is not compatible with a rural location.	

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
5				I am writing to again to raise my strong concerns and objections to planned building development in Alderholt. My concerns the implications of large number of vehicles on Alderholts narrow under developed roads as well as the extra burden on the infrasture of the village which at best now only just manages to supports its existing inhabitants. There is one Drs surgery which is already swamped and most people struggle to get an appointment as it is. There is one small co-op in the village and one school. The village copes now with the demands on it but the extra traffic and shopping the store simply is not feasible. There is not enough parking and the road is narrow and residential which is far from workable. I would suggest that any development would be better positioned on brown field sites situated closer to already better established town with more facilities and road which can absorb more people into its infrasture. I hope you will give serious consideration to my concerns and I know I speak for the majority of Alderholts residents.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
6				I write to oppose the proposed development of 2,400 homes in Alderholt village. My reason is that the infrastructure is simply not there and I cannot see when it is going to be in the foreseeable future. For example: There is only 1 shop in the village and it is already busy. There are no (or hardly any) jobs available in the village so everyone has to travel for work, sometimes as far as Southampton and Bournemouth/Christchurch, which necessitates having to use local roads out of the village. Those roads are inadequate at best, and at times positively dangerous! The road that goes past Somerley towards Ringwood is treacherous, with potholes either side at various points and it goes past a quarry with regular lorries coming out on to the road. The other road goes through Fordingbridge and that town already has new developments and will be overloaded by extra traffic. There is no health facility (other than part-time) and so the majority need to travel to Fordingbridge for a GP service that is already very busy, and I cannot imagine how they would cope with the extra volume of patients.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				There is only one small primary school in the village so parents would have to use the inadequate roads to travel to a school elsewhere.
7				Option 1 - to build 300 new homes would result in a 50% increase in the size of the village; Option 2 - would increase the size by four times! The latter would transform the village into a town and both options would change the nature of the place. People choose to live here for its village atmosphere and rural feel. This could be destroyed and is a real concern. However, of greater concern is the effect of either development on roads and services. There are four roads into Alderholt, all of which are narrow, have a number of pinch points and several significant bends. Add to this the state of repair, eg potholes and disintegration of surface edges, and it is clear that they are lacking for even current population use. Increased usage would have an impact upon road safety. Hillbury and Ringwood Roads, where the proposed development would be, are narrow and have no pavements into the village, another safety issue.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
		Settlement?		Because there is virtually no employment available in the village, commuting to outlying areas is necessary meaning that an increase in the population would result in the roads becoming more crowded. The limited amount of services in the village, such as shops and health amenities, puts even more pressure on roads. Cars are necessary as the one bus service operates on only three days a week within a five to six mile radius. Of equal concern is the issue of doctors' surgeries. The practice in Fordingbridge, used by the majority of villagers, is already overstretched. Fordingbridge currently has its own housing development putting even more pressure on this service so how can it be sustained by an increased Alderholt population also wanting to use it? I understand there are no plans to build a new health centre. Education is also affected. Would St James' First School and Cranborne Middle School be able to accommodate a large increase in numbers? In the case of Option 2, I understand that developers would have to provide a considerable
				amount of infrastructure. How binding would this obligation be? What would happen if finance

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				dried up? There could be 3,000 new homes with planned infrastructure collapsing to leave inadequate provision. There are many residents with real concerns about their village and how it could change. Of course, change happens but it is the scale of the proposals that is the issue.
8				I once again find myself writing to object to planning proposals that are unsustainable and completely alter the character of the village that my wife and I chose live in some six years ago. When the previous proposals were made Simon Hoare MP spoke of an additional village being imposed on Alderholt, which was bad enough, but now an entire town or more is being proposed, which will dramatically change where we live. EDDC's policy speaks of the need to "maintain the character of local communities". I fail to see how turning a smallish village into a major town respects the commitment in this policy. DDC Policy Objective 6 is to reduce the need for people to travel and to have more travel choices: the current planning proposals fail to provide housing "mainly in areas either close to facilities or with good transport links" and give people no choice other than to travel by car. The

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				roads around here cannot cope with the current volumes of traffic, let alone what is being envisaged. The Harbridge road from the Verwood junction is a mass of cracks and potholes, largely as a result of the aggregates lorries tearing up and down to and from the quarry. Approximately 3,000 homes will inevitably lead to an increase in traffic movements of at least 6,000 car movements a day. Most households these days have two cars, and with family homes being planned it is safe to assume there will three or more vehicles at some houses. Therefore that figure is likely to be nearer 9,000.
				solar panel site, the road on which we live, Ringwood Road, is not wide enough safely to permit the volume of traffic you propose. It is inconsistent in its width, there are no pavements and it can barely cope with the current volume of traffic. The East Dorset local plan notes: "The immediate area is poorly served by roads. There are no 'A' Class roads anywhere near the village. The village currently relies on the recently designated B3078 to connect it with Cranborne to the west and Fordingbridge to the north east. 'C' Class roads, which also serve a number of

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				gravel workings, provide the connections to Ringwood to the south." The laudable aim of encouraging people to travel sustainably is unlikely to amount to anything, as employment in the area, or more accurately the lack of it, forces people to drive to Bournemouth, Salisbury or up on to the M3 towards Winchester, and anyone who has travelled along the A31 and on to the motorway around Eastleigh knows that it is already chronically congested. Hampshire Highways has said it has no plans to improve the roads. The fact that there is only one school in the village will also force potential residents to drive their children to schools outside the area. There is no reliable public transport in the area. The 97 bus runs, I believe, three days a week and I understand that owing to falling passenger numbers the X3 to Salisbury is under threat. EDDC Policy Objective 3—To adapt to the challenges of Climate Change—states that "carbon emissions for transport are to be reduced by locating development in accessible locationsby bike, foot and public transport". Alderholt does not satisfy this criterion in any respect. Does the council intend

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				to take climate change seriously over next 15 years? The infrastructure changes and upgrades to make these proposals work would be substantial and expensive. It is no good promising that doctors surgeries and secondary schools will be developed once homes are built. In the post-Covid world all arms of government are likely to have to make cuts or stretch existing resources and there will not be the funding necessary. All the residents of Alderholt I have spoken to accept the need for some additional development—but development that recognises the character of the village and the capacity of the surrounding area to cope with it, and it should be borne in mind that land has already been identified for this purpose but developers have failed to build on it. We could object on other grounds, but as our children are grown up and no longer live in the area we have not commented on the lack of schools and facilities, but that must also be a concern when this proposal is considered. Finally, I am concerned that these proposals and others in recent years have been going on for so

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				long that some local people might have been ground down and will not bother to object, when they have in the past. I detect a certain fatalism among some owing to the fact that they do not feel that local people are listened to. I hope that I am wrong and that you will accept that however many objections you receive the concerns I have outlined above are shared by the vast majority of local residents.
9				I've perused the East Dorset Functional Area regarding Alderholt. I remain unconvinced that we need even 300 houses (that being on average an additional 1200 people and 600 cars). Infill still seems to be to me the slow way forward for this small community. We are closely surrounded by New Forest District Council and Hampshire Council who would both have to agree to any road improvements - and these would be desperately needed for accommodate the increase in traffic. A cycle way using the old railway line would not be used by commuters to Bournemouth, Poole or Salisbury. Whilst I appreciate that on-line meetings etc., are still ongoing during the pandemic it gives no opportunity for public meetings and smacks somewhat of things being decided behind closed doors.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
10				Having looked at the development options for Alderholt, I find that option one which offers a plan for limited development realistic to the degree that the village has, from the outset of this issue being raised by the former East District Council, not been a NIMBY community and accepts the notion that some development on a modest scale is inevitable. However the proposed 300 houses adds to the existing permissions to build. Accordingly I would support a moderated version that took this fact into account otherwise it could lead to doubling of the village population where some of my objections relating too option2 become relevant. What I find utterly astonishing is that option two proposes an even larger scale development plan than the former one that sought to build over 2,500 houses which met with intense opposition, ridicule and condemnation. I have no background or experience in local government and development planning but it is seems clear to me that Alderholt is too remote from employment, good roads and existing local services to make it suitable for large scale development. I have become aware, for example, that local secondary schools and surgeries are already over subscribed and could not possibly support a large scale increase in

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				population .The proposal therefore to build 3,000 houses into a town development which links with Fordingbridge, thus tripling the village population and traffic density is deeply troubling, unreasonable and poorly thought through: -There is not the infrastructure to support this level of development without massive funding, unlikely to be available, which in its scale seems to envisage cross border co-operation for road development with Hampshire; with all the resource and inter council cooperation issues that would be involved. - Moreover the idea there is growth potential to make the community into a town ignores the historical facts that former businesses such as the butcher, hairdresser, post office, restaurant and newspaper agent all went out of business some 25 years ago because they were not supported. Moreover the internet is damaging the national high street and the notion that a village / town centre could materialise and flourish seems remote and ignores past and current trends. Alderholt will simply become an enlarged dormitory village or town. - The arterial roads into the village are narrow, busy and often dangerous, especially the road to Fordingbridge which narrows to a passing place. Unless there is substantial widening and

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				development of the roads, the village and surrounding areas will become an environmental hell and driving nightmare. I accept there should be some housing development but not on this scale and should be restricted to option one between Hillbury Road and Ringwood Road. This is because the arterial route from Ringwood joining the southern edge would cause less traffic congestion and disruption to the village foot print'.
11	Currently approval has been granted for 190 new homes in Alderholt. With the current major facilities eg: Electricity (frequent power loss) Gas, Water, Sewerage (into Fordingbridge) causing concerns, linked to the poor access roads into and through the village. This current approval leads to a minimum of 400 additional vehicles requiring regular access, and mainly taking the road to Fordingbridge B3078. This approved development, plus infill applications which will be	Major road works. Major improvement to the current sewerage system. Considerable improvement to the Electricity network .A reliable and effective public transport. All tiers of schools. The entire infrastructure serving the area would require huge investment by all services, and in particular Highways.		Policy ALD2 question 1 – Agree Policy ALD2 question 2- Agree subject to changes Policy ALD2 question 3- Not only between Fordingbridge and Alderholt, but through the entire railway line towards Poole. This proposal would allow all cyclists and walkers a safe link and access to adjacent facilities along the route. Policy ALD question 1 - NO to ALD1, and YES to policy ALD2

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	submitted over time, is sufficient for the village.			
12	There are already sites being developed in the village egon the Surplus Store of 80-90 dwellings, off Daggons Road. It has been at least 13years since the land has been vacant. It has recently been worked. Leave any further building proposals to see what the impact of another 200-300+ people have on the village. No infrastructure being planned with this change. Can we absorb all the effects of this on the community?	It is irresponsible to change the village to a small town without many missing elements being put into place BEFORE development. We are not self contained, our senior schools are in Fordingbridge , Ringwood or Wimborne. There is little industry in the village for work. There is NO main bus service. One small shop. Our doctors, vets, chemists are based in Fordingbridge, Ringwood or Cranborne or Wimborne. These areas are also experiencing large developments. The roads to leave the village are often flooded but also narrow. No police nearby.	The villagers don't want it, Tax payers of Dorset Council. Some development is already being actioned. Natural growth is good for a community but a significant expansion would ruin the village. The natural area of the land around the village is a wildlife delight, this would be devastated. The village could not function with large housing numbers. There would be a need to provide better roads, police, schools, medical centres, bus services. More to the project costs than bricks and mortar	Policy ALD1 Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? No I don't agree. Find dis-used buildings in towns (Poole& Bournemouth) where the infrastructure is already in place. Tidy up the town centres, spend budgets on making these deprived areas vibrant again. Post covid-19 more people will be working from home, no need to go into big cities. Revive the south coast, Leave small functioning villages to a lower, natural, paced growth Policy ALD2 Trailway at Alderholt A local bike trail, dog walking area, bridle way would be a good use of this land. Maybe it would attract visitors from the New Forest area to use for sport and recreation.
13				I have been a resident of Alderholt since 1993 and I am a former member of the Parish Council and its Planning Committee. I am objecting to the proposals for development in Alderholt contained in the Dorset Council Local Plan on the following grounds:

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				1. We have been offered two options: one for 300 houses and the other for in excess of 3000 houses - in effect a new town. Why are we not offered the option of no further development except for infill? As I recall this was what was agreed in the East Dorset Local Plan on the grounds of the inadequacy of the road system. 2. There have been no changes to the road system so why is it now deemed appropriate to allow any further development in Alderholt? 3. The access roads to Alderholt are rural and narrow. There are no footpaths and no cycle lanes. There is effectively no public transport. Access through Cranborne is basically a single lane road as vehicles are always parked on the main road though the village. The road to Salisbury through Rockborne is in an appalling condition and is already used as a rat run to Salisbury. Access to Fordingbridge involves navigating a very narrow section of road as well as the High Street which is normally busy with lorries and delivery vans. Access to Ringwood or Verwood is again along a winding B road and is very busy at rush hour periods. Even 300 new houses will generate at least 600 car journeys each morning and evening. Where are these cars intended to go? 4. With respect to village facilities, there is a Coop Express, a small primary school and a small

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
		settlement?		branch of Fordingbridge surgery with very limited opening hours. That's it. In order to buy most food, go to the doctor or dentist or anything else, one has to drive. In any event, where will the new residents find a doctor or dentist or school for their children? 5. I note that in paragraph 4.7.10 of the Local Plan it is stated "The council is proposing some development at Tier 3 settlements that are located where sustainable travel options exist." The proposals are clearly in breach of your own policies. 6. The Local Plan states that, if 3000 new houses are permitted, a new access road may need to be constructed across Ringwood Forest. That doesn't appear to be particularly green or sustainable. 7. The sewage system in Alderholt is already inadequate and is prone to backing up. I did not see any reference to this in the Plan. Who will be responsible for upgrading the sewage system - the developers or the rate payers? I am aware that Alderholt has the disadvantage of being outside the Green Belt and far away from the county town. I wonder if Alderholt has been chosen as the unwilling recipient of a new
				town with 3000 plus houses because no one in Dorchester will really notice or care about the

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				damage this will do to the village and the surrounding area.
14	I believe that a sensible allocation of around 100 – 150 houses would be of benefit to residents, mainly because it enables around 50 or so Affordable Homes for local people. It should be noted that planning permission has already been granted for over 100 house on two sites in Alderholt a number of years ago – this should not only be taken as part of any new allocation, but also provide an indicator of the demand for housing in the village (ie not high). If the choice is strictly between 300 and 3,000, then clearly 300 is the only sensible, justified and reasonable choice. For a village that only contains 1,084 dwellings (according to the electoral role), 300 additional homes (plus the 100 already granted planning) is already a significant increase, but the village would remain a village,	Please refer to my points above.	Please refer to my points 2, 3, and 4.	

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	and should (providing the			
	developments are not high			
	density and feel like a "tacked-			
	on" estate) retain its character.			
	The main points of objection to			
	3,000 homes are as per below.			
	1) Building Density The proposed development of 3,000 houses to be built in the			
	village of Alderholt.			
	Inside the current village			
	envelope there are 1,084 houses on the electoral roll; this			
	proposal would therefore			
	quadruple the number of			
	houses and, pro-rata to houses,			
	the same for the population of			
	the village.			
	The area of the current village			
	envelope is Circa 66 Hectares,			
	building is therefore at a density			
	of approx. 16.5 dwellings per			
	Hectare.			
	There didn't appear to be an			
	indication of the Hectares that			
	the 3,000 house development			
	option would occupy, however			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	I'm going to assume that the			
	density is similar to what was			
	proposed in 2018 by EDDC,			
	which was around 30/Hectare.			
	Note that this is roughly double			
	the current density, and will			
	obviously change the rural village character of the village			
	to that approaching a suburban			
	one.			
	one.			
	2) Transport			
	The roads connecting Alderholt			
	to these larger towns are very			
	poor and constricted in places			
	and would be extremely			
	expensive to improve – and			
	indeed the roads to			
	Fordingbridge and Ringwood			
	are mostly within Hampshire, rather than Dorset.			
	Every road that leads away from			
	the village contains at least one			
	"pinch point" that vehicles must			
	negotiate one at a time. This			
	causes issues at rush hour with			
	the current population – with at			
	least four times the amount of			
	vehicles should the plan go			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	through, then it would become			
	chaotic if no road			
	improvements were made. I			
	think it is fair to say that it is			
	likely that the road			
	improvements would come			
	after the houses were built than			
	vice-versa.			
	Alderholt has very limited public			
	transport, one bus 3 days per			
	week at off peak times only - currently funded in large part by			
	the Parish Council. Cycling from			
	the outlying areas along narrow			
	country roads is potentially			
	hazardous, as indeed is walking.			
	This will add to the strain with			
	vehicles travelling in to			
	Alderholt from outlying areas.			
	3) Education			
	Alderholt has a First School, but			
	currently no provision for older			
	children. The natural Dorset			
	Pyramid would then send			
	children to Cranborne Middle			
	School and then on to QE at			
	Wimborne. Both of these later			
	stages involve children being			
1	bussed several miles every day.			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	Many of our children are			
	actually attending			
	Fordingbridge or Downlands for			
	their primary education, and			
	entering the Burgate Pyramid			
	rather than QE for easier travel.			
	Schools in Fordingbridge will be			
	affected by the development of			
	Alderholt, combined with			
	planned developments in			
	Fordingbridge itself and other			
	surrounding locations.			
	These, in combination, will			
	undoubtedly increase demand			
	for school places in			
	Fordingbridge, which will presumably cater for its			
	Hampshire catchment first –			
	potentially denying this option			
	to Aderholt residents.			
	The plan states that new			
	schooling will be provided			
	across all tiers, but again based			
	on experience in other towns			
	being expanded, it is fair to say			
	that it is likely that the schools			
	would come after the houses			
	were built than vice-versa. Until			
	they were built, our children,			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	and the new families moving to			
	the new homes in the village			
	will be competing for spaces in			
	existing schools, and have to			
	make the journey to			
	Cranbourne and Wimborne			
	along the increasingly busy			
	roads (brought in by the			
	additional homes) that had yet			
	to be upgraded.			
	4) Healthcare			
	Most residents in Alderholt use			
	the Fordingbridge practice, though a few do use Cranborne,			
	Verwood and Sixpenny Handley.			
	Fordingbridge is of course a			
	Hampshire based practice,			
	whilst (I understand) Sixpenny			
	Handley has transferred to			
	Wiltshire.			
	Fordingbridge practice is			
	currently under some strain,			
	being unable to attract as many			
	GPs as it ideally needs. If this			
	development in Alderholt goes			
	ahead, along with the planned			
	growth in Fordingbridge itself,			
	then the practice may be unable			
	to cope with the numbers. It's			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	possible that under such			
	circumstances it would close its			
	doors to new out of county (ie			
	non-Hampshire) patients.			
	Currently the service offered by			
	Fordingbridge is – whilst under			
	some strain, as are most NHS			
	facilities – comprehensive, with			
	access to several GPs if your			
	own doctor is unavailable, and			
	there are excellent nurse			
	facilities, with Nurse			
	Practitioners on site.			
	The plan states that "health facilities" will be provided			
	without indicating what they			
	would entail. I again refer to my			
	point that it is likely that any			
	healthcare would come after			
	the houses were built than vice-			
	versa, and until then current			
	and new families moving to the			
	new homes in the village will be			
	competing for existing services.			
	5) Affordable Housing			
	One of the few benefits that			
	many Residents want from a			
	development like the one			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	proposed is the provision of			
	Affordable Housing.			
	Many of the youngsters who			
	have grown up in the Village are			
	unable to stay and bring up			
	their own children here. Over			
	time the lack of young families			
	in the village has effects on the			
	local schools, nurseries,			
	playgrounds etc., and poorer			
	facilities of this sort then deters			
	others from moving in.			
	Eventually resulting in a			
	community of mainly older			
	people.			
	There is a need for low cost			
	starter homes, and homes for			
	rent at economic prices,			
	including Social Rented housing.			
	However, costs to developers to			
	accommodate the above			
	infrastructure requirements			
	may make provision of			
	affordable housing un-economic			
	for them. We have already had			
	this experience at the Surplus			
	Stores site, where promises of			
	affordable housing were			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	reneged on by developers on			
	grounds of cost.			
	Conclusion:			
	There are several other			
	locations in the District with far			
	better infrastructure already in place. Parley / Longham			
	provides an immediate			
	example.			
	It is also quite likely that			
	without the infrastructure being			
	put in place first, there will be			
	little real demand for the 3,000			
	new houses, in what would be a			
	hard-to-travel-to village with			
	few amenities.			
	Other than the many reasons I			
	have outlined above why 3,000 additional homes would be			
	inappropriate, I feel the			
	planners have duty to			
	understand that 1,084			
	householders have made a			
	choice to live in Alderholt as it			
	currently exists, and that is as a			
	village. I moved here 4 years			
	ago for that reason, because it			
	is a village environment, and			
	that is the environment I have			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	chosen to bring my young children up in. If I wanted to bring them up in a town, I would have moved to one, ie Verwood or Ringwood. If you are stating that to support the needs of a small town of 4,000+dwellings that you need to build a new town centre to support employment, and provide leisure facilities, education, healthcare, etc., then this can be done anywhere as a blank			
	canvas that doesn't impact 1,084 householders choice of home. That being case, the far more appropriate solution to offer that level of housing is to build a settlement in the image of Poundbury, and that can be built in a location with far better transport links than Alderholt offers – ie adjacent to the A338 or A354.			
15	THE ASSO OF ASSA.			I would like to register our objections to the proposed expansion of Alderholt I feel ,like many others that however much new housing is needed to keep up with the country's growing population , buildings need to proportionate to

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				the environment the are built in. Alderholt is small rural village without the infrastructure to support so many new inhabitants one shop one small school a hub surgery and very poor bus links. I understand the argument that some of these issues will be improved on if the expansion goes ahead, but invariably such promises are severely modified once the properties have already been built. Furthermore however much modification is promised I fail to see how issues we face on a daily basis will be addressed we live on Sandleheath Road, a very narrow, winding road where the volume of traffic and very heavy lorries is increasing all the time. We have no pavements, no street lights and actually no mains drainage issues we accepted when we moved here but to expand Alderholt to this extent without putting in place even these most basic infrastructures seems ludicrous
16				My investigations show (and prove) that the general area to the north of Daggons Road and Station Road is home to a wide variety of wild life and, some, like Goshawks, owls, and Nightjars have legal protection. I know that another developer is planning to purchase a bungalow in Station Road with a view to demolishing it and gaining access to the old Cross Farm field which he wants to develop. Here again all the

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				arguments apply and I would like to see the future development of the village saving this whole Cranborne Estates, Lord Seymour's land and Cross Farm land barred from planning applications so as to preserve the country village definition the residents want to uphold. Any support along these lines would be much appreciated by the vast majority of villagers whose common comment seems to be "If I'd wanted to live in a town I wouldn't have bought property in Alderholt!"
17				I would like to portray my deep concern and objection in regards to the planning of housing development in the town of Alderholt currently being proposed. Me and my partner are in the process of purchasing our first home together in Alderholt with some of the mains reasons including its small stature, friendly village culture and it's contrast to surrounding towns thus providing peace and quiet. The green areas and natural areas of beauty are also key for our purchase which would inevitably be built on and destroyed if any proposals were granted. This would be hugely detrimental to the

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				landscape of the area, would effect house prices and impact wildlife in the forest areas.
				We also note the infrastructure is not suitable for any future development with only very basic amenities on hand - 1 doctors, 1 shop and schools already at capacity. The road link and access to the village could also not afford any more growth and with the lack of buses and removal years ago of a train station and links the only method that could be used for travel would be by cars. An increase in cars would have an increased impact on accidents and fatalities in the area which is heavily populated at present with young families with children.
				The proposals state that infrastructure would have to be greatly improved and upgraded to support any housing which I feel will inevitably be an afterthought once housing developments are thrown up without a care for people who have lived and bought up their families in Alderholt for generations. The disruption to their lives and massive change would see them forced to move elsewhere and out of their homes. In a world where house prices are increasing tremendously around the country and at an all time high some may not be

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				able to relocate and will have their quality of life greatly impacted when this is unnecessary for this village and the council can fill their housing quotas in other areas where the infrastructure, travel links and ameneties are already in place. I conclude with reiterating my deep concern for any future planning in this area and urge you to consider the people of this village and their views and quality of life when this can be avoided.
18	NO expansion of Alderholt should take place until the infrastructure has been improved. Without an improvement in roads, public transport, health facilities, drainage, jobs (etc etc) BEFORE new housing is built any development would be a disaster. I have lived in the village for over 30 years and in that time there has been a lot of new housing but no improvement in the infrastructure. Forgive me for being sceptical about promises of future improvement. The carbon footprint of the village would rise hugely if even more	See answer to Q1 - NO SIGNIFICANT EXPANSION SHOULD TAKE PLACE	Its position so close to the Hampshire boundary. Lack of money in the area. Lack of existing facilities. The fact that who would want to live in Alderholt with no local jobs, no public transport, no facilities.	

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	residents had to drive to access work, doctors, shops etc			
19				Having read the proposed expansion plans for Alderholt I would to comment on the plans Whilst I appreciate a limited growth is inevitable it must be done in keeping with the village environment, the need for public transport is a must if we are to keep the road flowing freely. It is a planners dream to create jobs in Alderholt, not a reality. With regard to the plan of using the so called trailway to walk or cycle to Fordingbridge, I ask myself if of the council planners has actually walked from Fordingbridge station into Fordingbridge, Its not just down the road, so again this is a planners fantasy.
20				Option 2 3000 homes is too much would spoil village life. Option 1 is also over and above the 192 house that already have planning. This plan does not include any infrastructure works. Would propose a third option just build the 192 houses which would meet village needs for duration of Dorset plan.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
21				Regarding the proposed expansion of housing for Alderholt, I would like to register my disapproval of both Option 1 and Option 2. Personal reasons: my wife and I moved to Alderholt in 2017 a) to be near our grandchildren, but more importantly we liked the quiet and peaceful feel to the village when we used to visit. We moved from a town in Central Bedfordshire, for the reasons mentioned above also both my wife and I suffer from asthma, my doctor back in Bedfordshire basically said there was no chance of any health improvement living where we were, suggested better to move to the country which we did and there has been a marked improvement. Other concerns: the infrastructure is not here and the Parish & County council are too heavily reliant on outside organisations to deliver. We have all seen pictures on the news of areas flooding, my concerns are that the forest currently provides away for excess rain water to soak away gradually, if this area is filled with houses this facility is taken away therefore increasing the possibility of flooding.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				It would be a total disaster to go ahead with either option, my fear is that the council will be left with a number of unsold properties and all the problems that creates. I appreciate Dorset Council have to meet government targets, however there is documented evidence that this can be achieved without totally devastating Alderholt. Plus there are a number of empty derelict properties throughout the County surely these should be obtained and used first.
				Think of the people who currently live in Alderholt well being and mental health, many who have lived in this Village for a number of years plus those like myself who moved here for medical reasons and enjoy the quiet countryside. That's before we discuss the devastation to the wildlife and ecosystem of the area.
22				Infrastructure - roads No speed limit / derestricted speed limit along Hillbury Road encourages reckless and dangerous driving and speeding. There have been many accidents and near-misses - involving cars, cyclists and pedestrians - along the stretch of Hillbury Road towards Ringwood Road junction and the Drove End car park to woods.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				Lack of pavements and no scope to widen carriageway to facilitate a pavement - this is extremely dangerous for all pedestrians, dog walkers, cyclists, horse riders and runners who literally risk their lives each day to use the woods. An increase in the population will increase road users, this will increase traffic pollution and also noise pollution. There are currently no regular bus routes in/out of the village to Bournemouth, Fordingbridge, Poole, Ringwood, Salisbury & beyond. Ringwood Road - between its junctions with Station Road and Hillbury Road - presently is not wide enough in places to accommodate two passing vehicles, let alone cyclists, walkers and horse riders (there is a riding stables on Ringwood Road). We have ourselves had a wing mirror knocked off by a white van passing at high speed in the 40mph limit, which subsequently did not stop. • Infrastructure - lack of services High water table locally which is prone to surface
				water flooding on roads and surrounding land. Our land regularly floods after rainfall due to surface water run-off from Hillbury Road and adjoining fields. The soakaway taking surface water from surrounding fields through our property to Drove

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				End Farm then on through to Drove End woods has not been fully excavated to alleviate flood issues. The Ringwood Road/Hillbury Road junction has been flooded since the latter part of 2020 and into 2021; work was due to start in February to rectify drainage issues but has yet to commence. No mains drainage - we have a private treatment plant as due to flooding and the high water table a septic tank could not work here. No mains gas to this part of the village. Very poor internet (we are well over 1 mile away from the exchange): our download speed of 10-13mbps at very best & upload speed of 1mbps - with boosters in the house - is bordering on pathetic and apparently there is no fibre available! • Increased population - potential problems Anti-social behaviour is sadly already a problem in the village with regular reporting of incidents on the Alderholt Facebook page. An increase in the population of the village would only exacerbate this problem and increase litter dropping, vandalism, theft and other crime. No local police station or regular police presence. More people in the village will mean an increase
				in numbers of children needing to attend preschool, primary & secondary schools, colleges,

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				etc. This will inevitably also result in an increase in traffic, either by car or school bus. Is there capacity at local schools for such an influx?! Our local doctors' surgery is already at full capacity. There would undoubtedly be an increased burden on the already struggling NHS. • Loss of agricultural land, parks, green space Loss of essential agricultural land, paddock land, parkland, green space, wildlife habitats, oxygen producing trees - all detrimental to farming, our mental health and wildlife. We have been trying for some time now to acquire additional paddock/grazing land for our livestock. This proposed plan to sell off fields in and around the village to build houses on has resulted in farmers selling land to developers instead of to other farmers/smallholders to retain agricultural use. We would contribute to the community by keeping these spaces green, retaining the trees and hedges which produce essential oxygen and provide homes for all manner of wildlife. I am sure we are not alone in having to re-think whether we can now stay in the village or whether we will be forced to move away in order to acquire more land for our livestock to graze

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				• Financial loss due to further development The lure of Alderholt back in 2010 when we moved to the village was that it was rural: surrounded by beautiful countryside, farms and fields - and with plenty of walking literally on our doorstep at Drove End. Having previously worked in the valuation sector, I am only too aware that the rural nature of our property would be directly - adversely - affected by development of hundreds of houses built right opposite where we live and this would certainly have a detrimental effect on the value of our property. Who will recompense us for this loss? Dorset Council?! • Taking the foregoing into consideration, we are strongly against any further development of housing in the village of Alderholt. The negatives significantly outweigh any potential positives. We would urge Dorset Council to look to develop elsewhere where there would be fewer objections.
23	I believe that a sensible allocation of around 100 – 150 houses would be of benefit to residents, mainly because it enables around 50 or so	Please refer to my points in answer to Q1.	Please refer to my answer to Q1 points 2, 3, and 4	

Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
Affordable Homes for local			
people. It should be noted			
that planning permission has			
already been granted for over			
Alderholt a number of years ago			
– this should not only be taken			
I			
_			
II = -			
_			
•			
1			
•			
-			
-			
·			
	affordable Homes for local people. It should be noted that planning permission has already been granted for over 150 houses on two sites in Alderholt a number of years ago	identified for significant expansion should take place at Alderholt? Affordable Homes for local people. It should be noted that planning permission has already been granted for over 150 houses on two sites in Alderholt a number of years ago – this should not only be taken as part of any new allocation, but also provide an indicator of the demand for housing in the village (ie not high as they not yet been built, and other new builds in the village have taken many months to sell). If the choice is strictly between 300 and 3,000, then clearly 300 is the only sensible, justified and reasonable choice. For a village that only contains 1,084 dwellings (according to the electoral role), 300 additional homes (plus the 150 already granted planning) is already a significant increase, but the village would remain a village, and should (providing the developments are not high density and feel like a "tacked-	growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt? Affordable Homes for local people. It should be noted that planning permission has already been granted for over 150 houses on two sites in Alderholt a number of years ago — this should not only be taken as part of any new allocation, but also provide an indicator of the demand for housing in the village (ie not high as they not yet been built, and other new builds in the village have taken many months to sell). If the choice is strictly between 300 and 3,000, then clearly 300 is the only sensible, justified and reasonable choice. For a village that only contains 1,084 dwellings (according to the electoral role), 300 additional homes (plus the 150 already granted planning) is already a significant increase, but the village would remain a village, and should (providing the developments are not high density and feel like a "tacked-

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	The main points of objection to 300 or 3,000 homes are as per below. 1) Building Density The proposed development of 3,000 houses to be built in the village of Alderholt. Inside the current village envelope there are 1,084 houses on the electoral roll; this proposal would therefore quadruple the number of houses and, pro-rata to houses, the same for the population of the village. The area of the current village envelope is Circa 66 Hectares, building is therefore at a density of approx. 16.5 dwellings per Hectare. There didn't appear to be an indication of the Hectares that the 3,000 house development option would occupy, however			
	I'm going to assume that the density is similar to what was proposed in 2018 by EDDC,			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	which was around 30/Hectare.			
	Note that this is roughly double			
	the current density, and will			
	obviously change the rural			
	village character of the village			
	to that approaching a suburban			
	one.			
	2) Transport			
	The roads connecting Alderholt			
	to these larger towns are very			
	poor and constricted in places			
	and would be extremely			
	expensive to improve – and			
	indeed the roads to			
	Fordingbridge and Ringwood			
	are mostly within Hampshire,			
	rather than Dorset.			
	Every road that leads away from the village contains at least one			
	"pinch point" that vehicles must			
	negotiate one at a time. This			
	causes issues at rush hour with			
	the current population – with at			
	least four times the amount of			
	vehicles should the plan go			
	through, then it would become			
	chaotic if no road			
	improvements were made. I			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	think it is fair to say that it is			
	likely that the road			
	improvements would come			
	after the houses were built than			
	vice-versa.			
	Alderholt has very limited public			
	transport, one bus 3 days per			
	week at off peak times only -			
	currently funded in large part by			
	the Parish Council. Cycling from			
	the outlying areas along narrow			
	country roads is potentially			
	hazardous, as indeed is walking.			
	This will add to the strain with			
	vehicles travelling in to			
	Alderholt from outlying areas.			
	3) Education			
	Alderholt has a First School, but			
	currently no provision for older children. The natural Dorset			
	Pyramid would then send			
	children to Cranborne Middle			
	School and then on to QE at			
	Wimborne. Both of these later			
	stages involve children being			
	bussed several miles every day.			
	Many of our children are			
	actually attending			
	Fordingbridge or Downlands for			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	their primary education, and			
	entering the Burgate Pyramid			
	rather than QE for easier travel.			
	Schools in Fordingbridge will be			
	affected by the development of			
	Alderholt, combined with			
	planned developments in			
	Fordingbridge itself and other			
	surrounding locations.			
	These, in combination, will			
	undoubtedly increase demand			
	for school places in			
	Fordingbridge, which will			
	presumably cater for its			
	Hampshire catchment first –			
	potentially denying this option			
	to Aderholt residents.			
	The plan states that new			
	schooling will be provided			
	across all tiers, but again based			
	on experience in other towns			
	being expanded, it is fair to say			
	that it is likely that the schools			
	would come after the houses			
	were built than vice-versa. Until			
	they were built, our children,			
	and the new families moving to			
	the new homes in the village			
	will be competing for spaces in			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	existing schools, and have to			
	make the journey to			
	Cranbourne and Wimborne			
	along the increasingly busy			
	roads (brought in by the			
	additional homes) that had yet			
	to be upgraded.			
	4) Healthcare			
	Most residents in Alderholt use			
	the Fordingbridge practice,			
	though a few do use Cranborne,			
	Verwood and Sixpenny Handley.			
	Fordingbridge is of course a			
	Hampshire based practice,			
	whilst (I understand) Sixpenny			
	Handley has transferred to			
	Wiltshire.			
	Fordingbridge practice is			
	currently under some strain,			
	being unable to attract as many			
	GPs as it ideally needs. If this			
	development in Alderholt goes			
	ahead, along with the planned			
	growth in Fordingbridge itself,			
	then the practice may be unable			
	to cope with the numbers. It's			
	possible that under such			
	circumstances it would close its			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	doors to new out of county (ie			
	non-Hampshire) patients.			
	Currently the service offered by			
	Fordingbridge is – whilst under			
	some strain, as are most NHS			
	facilities – comprehensive, with			
	access to several GPs if your			
	own doctor is unavailable, and			
	there are excellent nurse			
	facilities, with Nurse			
	Practitioners on site.			
	The plan states that "health facilities" will be provided			
	without indicating what they			
	would entail. I again refer to my			
	point that it is likely that any			
	healthcare would come after			
	the houses were built than vice-			
	versa, and until then current			
	and new families moving to the			
	new homes in the village will be			
	competing for existing services.			
	5) Affordable Housing			
	One of the few benefits that			
	many Residents want from a			
	development like the one			
	proposed is the provision of			
	Affordable Housing.			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	Many of the youngsters who			
	have grown up in the Village are unable to stay and bring up			
	their own children here. Over			
	time the lack of young families			
	in the village has effects on the			
	local schools, nurseries,			
	playgrounds etc., and poorer			
	facilities of this sort then deters			
	others from moving in.			
	Eventually resulting in a			
	community of mainly older			
	people.			
	There is a need for low cost			
	starter homes, and homes for			
	rent at economic prices, including Social Rented			
	housing.			
	However, costs to developers to			
	accommodate the above			
	infrastructure requirements			
	may make provision of			
	affordable housing un-economic			
	for them. We have already had			
	this experience at the Surplus			
	Stores site, where promises of			
	affordable housing were			
	reneged on by developers on			
	grounds of cost.			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	Conclusion: There are several other locations in the District with far better infrastructure already in place. Parley / Longham provides an immediate example. It is also quite likely that without the infrastructure being put in place first, there will be little real demand for the 3,000 new houses, in what would be a hard-to-travel-to village with few amenities. Other than the many reasons I have outlined above why 3,000 additional homes would be inappropriate, I feel the planners have duty to understand that 1,084 householders have made a choice to live in Alderholt as it currently exists, and that is as a village. I moved here 4 years	Settlement:		
	ago for that reason, because it is a village environment, and that is the environment I have			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	chosen to bring my young			
	children up in. If I wanted to			
	bring them up in a town, I			
	would have moved to one, ie			
	Verwood or Ringwood. If you			
	are stating that to support the			
	needs of a small town of 4,000+			
	dwellings that you need to build			
	a new town centre to support employment, and provide			
	leisure facilities, education,			
	healthcare, etc., then this can			
	be done anywhere as a blank			
	canvas that doesn't impact			
	1,084 householders choice of			
	home. That being case, the far			
	more appropriate solution to			
	offer that level of housing is to			
	build a settlement in the image			
	of Poundbury, and that can be			
	built in a location with far			
	better transport links than			
	Alderholt offers – ie adjacent to			
	the A338 or A354.			
24	There should be no growth at		As per Q1, no public transport, no buses,	Policy ALD2 question 1 – Disagree
	Alderholt village. The village is		no trains, so cars must be used by	Policy ALD2 question 2 – Disagree
	much loved by locals despite		everyone. The local roads are rural,	Policy ALD2 question 3 - The trailway sounds like
	the following everyday		narrow and hazardous. There are no	a good idea in principle, but the reality of walking
	problems. There are no		pavements out of Alderholt, and the	3 miles of rural tracks in all weathers all year

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	transport links. There is no public transport, no buses, no trains, for either workers or young people. There is only a tiny primary school. There is no GP and no dentist. There is no employment in the village, and getting about without a car is very difficult. Everyone in Alderholt has to drive, leading to every family household having a minimum of 2 cars, with constant driving problems in the narrow lanes. There are at least two 90 degree bends next to each other, also a very narrow lane to the nearest town of Fordingbridge, and a narrow lane north towards Harbridge. There are already 200 houses approved in this area, which is enough to meet local demand, although even this will add car congestion to already difficult village roads. This area is a bad choice for further planning and should remain a village.		local town is too far to either walk or cycle. There is no choice other than to travel by car. The village has no employment and is remote from employment. One tiny primary school, no secondary school. No GP, no dentist. This plan has not taken into account that the village has no transport links, and therefore it does not maintain the character of the local community.	round to get to Fordingbridge is unrealistic. It would in practice only be used for recreational purposes, eg walking on a weekend. Everyone in Alderholt would still need a car to get anywhere, so this wouldn't be used for commuting, only for recreational purposes.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
25	There should be no further growth or expansion in Alderholt, as permission has already been granted for 192 homes to be built in the coming years. This is a big expansion in itself, and no infrastructure is being planned to support the increase in the village population. All of the proposed expansion/growth in this plan mean that the village will inevitably lose its identity as a village, and therefore the community spirit which runs deep and is valued by the village dwellers.	Everything. Education - We would need a library, large secondary school, and an increased capacity in the primary/first school. This would mean more traffic coming into the village, as it would draw folks from other areas, as well as support families in the village. Potentially increasing bus movement, undoubtedly bringing more pollution due to the traffic it attracts. Transport - The roads are currently in a bad state of repair, and we rarely see a gritting lorry when temperatures drop. The local roads are treacherous at times in winter, prone to flooding in certain places, with significant potholing due to the weather and the local quarry vehicles. This would only be exacerbated further by increase traffic volume. There is currently a very limited bus service to Fordingbridge, bus service would have to be increased,	We have significant issues with drainage in the fields surrounding the village and roads are regularly impacted by water flowing from the fields outlined for development. I would nor personally want to buy a property on land that has such propensity to flooding and bad drainage. We also suffer regular power outages (refer to SSE for details), meaning whole streets are without power for hours at a time. Unless SSE infrastructure is significantly improved these issues will impact a greater number of people.	

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
		again bringing pollution issues with it and damaging already fragile roads. Health Services - The GP surgery would be completely overwhelmed if the village increased in size, our current service is very good, and we are very grateful for the support we receive, however the current offering could not sustain the growth planned here, and would also mean that those currently using the service would see a significant degradation in support available to them. Sports and leisure facilities for the whole community - we currently have a recreation ground which is well maintained, and is used extensively by the current community for various sports, family and leisure activities. This facility would need to be properly extended and increased in size to support the		
		significant growth discussed in		

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
		the plan. Sewerage - I understand that Wessex Water have expressed concern regarding the level of phosphates entering the river in Fordingbridge, should there be ANY expansion in Alderholt. This would surely be in contradiction of local government attempts to support environmentally sustainable projects. Although the plan addresses some of these concerns, history tells us that what is promised, and what happens in actuality are very different things, with no recourse for the existing population.		
26	Any increase in size would need to involve significant infrastructure improvements for access to employment destinations Salisbury, Bournemouth, Poole, Wimborne, Southampton. This would affect Fordingbridge in particular, which is already considering expansion. Planning	Most Alderholt inhabitants use GP services in Fordingbridge or Cranborne. We are told there are no plans for a GP practice to serve Alderholt. Middle and Upper schools are outside Alderholt, do they have sufficient capacity to cope with increased population, or is there a plan for another school	Access to centres of employment, medical care, education, shopping and entertainment.	Policy ALD2 question 1 – Agree subject to changes Policy ALD2 question 2- Disagree Policy ALD2 question 3- Nice idea, but I see it as a leisure feature, not as a viable way into and out of the village for commuters. And it's only to investigate the feasibility. If it is feasible, when will there be funds to bring it to pass?

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	permission has already been granted for 192 homes which are yet to be built, in itself a considerable increase in potential population and traffic. Each home would require 2 earners, therefore two cars, plus whatever children they have. Current public transport provision is inadequate and promotes use of private cars.	in the village? Employment opportunities in the village. Stroud Firs is a significant amenity, for children and dog walkers, but a very damp one. It also supports significant wildlife. It seems to be the area into which all old ditches in the village drain. Any development which reduces the number of trees and therefore increases water in this low -lying area would need very significant drainage work. How does the removal of a significant number of trees fit in with government plans to reduce carbon by planting millions of trees?		
27				Please be advised that my household is opposed to ANY further housing development beyond that which has already been granted planning permission. You have heard the many varied and very substantial reasons for villager's opposition to the absurd proposals being made by Dorset Council. My repeating them here serves no extra purpose but please be aware that we are strongly opposed to the plan.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				Anecdotally, I understand that developers have suspended building work in Wimborne because homes already built have not been sold and demand is insufficient. If this is the case, I doubt that Alderholt would have more appeal, especially on the scale suggested.
28				A few years ago I had meetings with both Dorset and Hampshire highways and the extraction company concerning the state of the road from Ringwood/ Verwood road to Alderholt. It took some persuasion to get the 2 Council departments to agree and finally one mile was re-structured. Now it is falling into disrepair again The reason that it keeps deteriating is because the road is built on a rubbish tip and thus it will never be a good base to build a road. Who will carry the cost of totally rebuilding the road because that is what will be needed with the development in the pipeline and increased traffic.
29				I understand that "Action4Alderholt" has submitted documents showing the concerns of nearly all the residents in Alderholt and would like to make it known that we are all very concerned at the alternatives being looked at

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				here. I see from our letter and your own comments that any excessive building in the village will change the village for good and its is a fact that each new building will bring an extra 2-3 cars to each household as you have got to have a car when you live in a remote village like this, all of which at a time when we are being told there is a CLIMATE EMERGENCY which there is and that we cannot carry on in the same way we are heading, which given the planning document for Dorset and neighbouring county's a very concerning read. We all use the exit roads from the village, all of which are minor roads and all have an effect on neighbouring towns and villages, especially Fordingbridge which has a small entrance road from the west. In Spring time to Autumn I myself cycle to work to Ferndown Industrial Estate, although I would never contemplate cycling in the winter months given the surroundings we would live in, with or without a cycle lane/path. The Somerley road in the winter months is a dangerous road and given the amount of extra traffic these plans would bring this will increase fatal accidents on this road given the road structure and the animals crossing the road all year round. I expect most of us have had an accident or near accident with the wildlife, especially the deer in the surrounding area. I would also comment on

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				employment opportunities for the area, opening three of four shops will not bring significant employment in the area, all the extra people will have need to travel outside the village whichever way you look at this. Village life is not for everyone and I support Action4Alderholt with their case, these plans for Alderholt and the surrounding area need to be looked at very carefully before we destroy the beautiful part of Britain we are lucky enough to live in and in addition to this destroy the tourism business within Dorset. Is there no way we can support Action4Alderholt in any other way as we only appear to hear from Action4Alderholt and nothing from the Parish Council who we should hear from. If it was not for a supporter of this group a 100-200 year + Oak tree would have been felled on Saturday, one of a number leaving another plot of nature taken away to house development if it was not for the savvy of a committed member getting a preservation order on these protected oak tree's on the left following Alderholt Motors. This, one of many concerns for the future of the Village & Dorset is something we should be standing up to Government with their bully boy tactics, house building in not the answer to all the problems in this country.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
		improvements would be needed to improve the self-		
		containment of the		
		settlement?		
30	I understand from government	I don't feel significant	There are several factors which inhibit	
	that more housing is needed,	expansion to be appropriate as	the (village changing to a town)	
	200 homes have already been	we are a rural village with no	expansion of Alderholt.	
	granted planning permission in	centre, little employment and	1. The impact of so many houses will	
	Alderholt and feel an extra 100	rural narrow roads totally	lead to extra cars which will have a	
	on top off this would be the	unsuitable for the extra traffic	negative effect on the environment	
	maximum for this village	which option1 and 2 would	which we are suppose to be reducing	
		bring. We have lovely	greenhouse gases.	
		countryside, woods north of	2. Continuing with the extra cars theme,	
		Daggons Road and Station Road	roads around Alderholt are total unsuitable for the extra traffic which	
		which should be preserved as a wild life habitat not to mention	would be on the roads. The road	
		Cranborne common, which as a	infrastructure is simply not achievable in	
		dog owner I regularly enjoy	the time allocated and who is going to	
		along with many other	pay for the roads changing? developers	
		Alderholt residents. Once the	wouldn't pay for this cost, would	
		countryside is dug up its gone	Hampshire and New Forest Councils	
		for ever, is there really demand	work with Dorset providing the	
		for more houses in this	resources to fund it? how many years	
		location? as I see houses up for	would that take? Promises were made	
		sale for a long time before they	for road improvements when the village	
		sell.	grew in 1980 they have never been	
			delivered.	
			3.After existing planning permissions are	
			taken into account this represents 50%	
			growth in Alderholt, most of who will	
			have to commute to work and to to	
			access services and education.	

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
			Please consider is there demand for houses on this scale for Alderholt? is the a sustainable development which won't impact on greenhouse gases and environment? is the beauty and habit of wildlife of little importance? The riding stable on the Ringwood road would have to go as all the extra traffic would make its position unfeasible.	
31	It is important to limit development to small scale growth because the well documented transport limitations of the village already place restrictions on the movement of people about the area. A large scale expansion would require a large investment in infrastructure which I am sure the authorities would not fulfill.	There would need a large increase in local services for the inhabitants. These would have to take account of education, social, recreation, health and welfare needs. Again I think the authorities would at best pay lip service to providing these as a sweetener to make the increase in housing palatable to local people. Links to nearby of settlements Fordingbridge, Ringwood, Verwood and Salisbury would need to be made more accessible and safer.	In addition to the transport and accessibility problems already mentioned, has sufficient examination of the water supply and sewage disposal facilities been conducted? This would include, I believe, the present pumping station at Alderholt and the capacity of the sewage works at Fordingbridge. There has already been anecdotal evidence of sewage problems relating to the Augustus Park residential area in Fordingbridge.	Policy ALD2 question 1 – Agree Policy ALD2 question 2- n/a
32				The level of development in Alderholt should be restricted to that which occurs through the village's own organic growth and should be restricted to houses numbering in the low

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				hundreds over the next fifteen to twenty years. Moreover, more creativity should be used to minimise the impact of developing housing on any farmland or the green buffer around the village. In reality, planned properly, small, well-built affordable homes to meet growth from within the village can be accommodated on a much smaller amount of land than is ear marked for the small scale expansion 01_ALDE let alone the potential largescale plans under Significant Expansion 02_ALDE. The council is taking a very binary approach to growth and development of areas. The approach to Alderholt seems to be along the basis that it is relatively unconstrained in which case, lets significantly add to the amount of housing there regardless of how sustainable it is. The council is falling into the trap of not really assessing all the available options and taking a very all or nothing approach. In terms of the evidence base the council have produced a sustainability appraisal (as is the requirement for local plans). Looking at p 141 which shows the thoughts on general direction for growth of Aderholt and then at each option as

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				assessed against the SA objectives, it is gravely worrying that the only benefits of the growth of any of those areas is on Housing and Economy SA objectives. It has Significant Detriment for Community on all options; Negative for Climate and Biodiversity on all and neutral on all other SA objectives!
				When the council then looks at the two options of small scale expansion 01_ALDE or Significant Expansion 02_ALDE within the document, worryingly, the SA for both of those options is much the same i.e. the only benefits of the growth are in Housing and Economy SA objectives. Again, it has Significant Detriment for Community on all options; Negative for Climate and Biodiversity on all and neutral on all other SA objectives! Again, a real lack of any tangible benefits! On thoroughly reviewing the proposals as they impact Aderholt, the more pressing point is that the council have failed to look at any reasonable alternatives.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				The Planning Practice Guidance sets out consideration on how a Sustainability
				Appraisal should assess alternatives and
				identify likely significant effects as follows:
				The sustainability appraisal needs to
				consider and compare all reasonable
				alternatives as the plan evolves, including
				the preferred approach, and assess these
				against the baseline environmental,
				economic and social characteristics of the
				area and the likely situation if the plan were not to be adopted. In doing so it is important
				to:
				outline the reasons the alternatives
				were selected, and identify, describe and
				evaluate their likely significant effects on
				environmental, economic and social factors
				using the evidence base (employing the
				same level of detail for each alternative
				option). Criteria for determining the likely
				significance of effects on the environment
				are set out in schedule 1 to the
				Environmental Assessment of Plans and
				Programmes Regulations 2004;as part of this, identify any likely
				significant adverse effects and measures
				significant adverse effects and measures

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				 envisaged to prevent, reduce and, as fully as possible, offset them; provide conclusions on the reasons the rejected options are not being taken forward and the reasons for selecting the preferred approach in light of the alternatives.
				Any assumptions used in assessing the significance of the effects of the plan will need to be documented. Reasonable alternatives are the different realistic options considered by the plan-maker in developing the policies in the plan. They need to be sufficiently distinct to highlight the different sustainability implications of each so that meaningful comparisons can be made.
				The development and appraisal of proposals in plans needs to be an iterative process, with the proposals being revised to take account of the appraisal findings. Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 11-018-20140306 Revision date: 06 03 2014

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				It clearly cannot be argued that a binary approach as this, is looking at all reasonable alternatives and that would inevitably be a key matter of soundness going forward. The lack of any real benefits outside of housing and economy should be of key concern.
				Additionally having spent thirty one plus years working in the built environment including a number as a Developer and house builder, it concerns me greatly that the Significant Expansion 02_ALDE option neglects to take account in any way, shape or form, the obvious impact on the following:
				1. The infrastructure which would be required to sustain a major new development would not be available quickly or more realistically, would be 'watered down' piecemeal as developers argue over 'affordability', seek to renegotiate the requirements or use all available tactics to obviate themselves from their liabilities; in reality, this is common practice and the planning authorities in Dorset are just as

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				there are countless examples of communities receiving far less than originally intended within a planning consent.
				2. The sense of community should not be underestimated in a small community such as Aderholt, if ever evidence of this were required then look no further than the efforts seen during the pandemic to help people, act civilly, provide support and not least of all, 'closeness' of the community, neighbours and the like - all of which would be destroyed with any significant increase to the size and nature of the village.
				3. The impact on the roads and adjacent Fordingbridge area and in particular the area between the two which suffers terribly from the fact it falls between the two councils - the repairs, maintenance, gritting etc will need to be significantly improve and remain improved which is unlikely.
				4. It is highly questionable that any amount of boost to employment by creation of 'town square' or more shops, even office space etc. will realistically meet the increased

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				employment demand resulting from the doubling of the village into a town and in reality the great majority of people living in Aderholt will inevitably drive to Bournemouth, Salisbury, Southampton and Winchester etc. as they currently do, not least of all because they need well paid jobs to finance mortgages on houses costing £300,000 and upwards! the sort of local jobs being created will not provide the necessary level of income to offset the impact of travel on the road network locally.
				5. There will need to be a huge increase in school, medical and associated facilities which will as with point one above, are unlikely to be fully realised, or will take a significant time to deliver, in the meantime, the additional needs locally will force an overburden on the adjacent areas for schools etc. further increasing the impact on the road network! 6. Given the very real problems of global warming and food security, it seems extremely naive to promote the wholesale

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				areas which presently contribute to carbon capture and as importantly, provide input into the food chain thus reducing local food miles as well as reducing carbon resulting from importing foodstuffs.
33				I am not sure that in the original consultation I was aware that there was more than two alternatives with regards to the planning around Alderholt. So I am writing to ensure you are aware of my thoughts. No scale of development of the size that you have identified is appropriate for this area. I appreciate that this figure came from the East Dorset original consultation which was resoundingly rejected by the village at the time. The suggestion of 300 or 3000 houses goes against aspects already mentioned regarding the limitation of nearby heathlands and wooded areas and therefore would require further land outside of Dorset and within the New forest District council boundary. This would never happen regarding a strategic approach by both authorities especially as the village lays within

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				the catchment area of the River Avon special area of conservation and increased use from development will have an adverse impact. The village has a limited range of facilities and infrastructure and adding 300 extra housing (on top of the already 194 house that have already received permission) nearly 500 homes without any additional infrastructure to the roads (a real issue) new employment, new schools, health facilities would be catastrophic for the residents new and old. Accepting 300 new homes from the council comes with no extra infrastructure as the developers will have to fund this and it wouldn't be viable for them. Excepting 3000 homes is the only way that we would get any form of additional infrastructure, but do we want to live in a town the size of Shaftesbury rather than a village? Are we truly representing our young children who will grow up into this environment. I appreciate that there is a lack of housing but is a small village on the boundary of two other authorities, with no transport infrastructure, employment, etc the correct place. Or are you better building a new town completely near main transport rail and road where employment can be made a priority.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				To conclude, my real worry is we are at the moment open to speculative development from at least three sites in the village. Behind the Reading rooms, Next to the Garage and Ringwood Road. We appear to have little defence from the developers after the Gladman development appeal. So before 2023 when a plan is agreed, we can be forced to accept housing with little control and no additional infrastructure. Regarding the planning application already put in for 34 homes off Hillbury Road in the last two weeks, I have more confidence that it will actually be affordable and social housing as the local Housing Authority are involved, and accept that this type of housing is needed in the village but indiscriminate full scale housing with little thought is not the way forward.
34	A detailed report was commissioned by Alderholt Parish Council relating to earlier plans to expand the village. This was published in February 2020. Many of the findings and much of the research are pertinent to the latest local plan. I understand the need for increased housing stock and do	Massive road improvements. Significant parking. Medical facilities. Schools. Business & Retaill development. Public transport.	The lack of : Massive road improvements. Significant parking. Medical facilities. Schools. Business & Retaill development. Public transport	I do not know how many responses there have been to the Dorset Council Local Plan. I found out from a local free paper. Please try to get local engagement. I found the report commissioned by APC on the website and the key conclusions are still valid.

Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
not wish to be considered a			
NIMBY, however I feel that any			
plans implemented without			
suitable consideration given to			
the issues identified in this			
report need to be questioned.			
Research in the report shows a			
_			
·			
9			
The state of the s			
The state of the s			
* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	not wish to be considered a NIMBY, however I feel that any plans implemented without suitable consideration given to the issues identified in this report need to be questioned.	identified for significant expansion should take place at Alderholt? not wish to be considered a NIMBY, however I feel that any plans implemented without suitable consideration given to the issues identified in this report need to be questioned. Research in the report shows a distribution of approximately 800 cars / vehicles associated to dwellings. If the numbers are extrapolated to include 300 more dwellings this might add another 350+ cars. If the number of dwellings was increased by 1000 the additional number of cars might be 1200 or more. The road and parking infrastructure would require significant expansion and improvements. To support the necessary local employment I assume that the number of HGV movements would also significantly increase, putting further pressures on the road infrastructure. What are the plans for public transport to reduce the number	growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt? Intervention of Alderholt?

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	provide the investment and			
	funding required to support a			
	bus service?			
	I have included a link to the			
	report should you wish to			
	challenge / verify any of the			
	research or sources.			
	I draw your attention to a			
	couple of the key conclusions.			
	"9.2. The proposal put forward			
	through the East Dorset Local			
	Plan Review, which was to			
	develop at least 1,000 further			
	dwellings in this location, is in			
	complete contrast to the plan's			
	stated strategic objectives.			
	Alderholt appears to have been			
	targeted on the basis that it has			
	no Green Belt or AONB status			
	(both designations run up to but			
	do not cross the parish boundary). The level of housing			
	proposed is completely			
	disproportionate to (a) the			
	settlement size, (b) its position			
	in the settlement hierarchy (c)			
	the housing needs of the local			
	area which Alderholt serves. It			
	is not balanced by any			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	employment provision (which is			
	particularly important given the			
	unsustainable balance between			
	local jobs and residents of			
	employment age in the parish).			
	The scale of growth proposed			
	through the East Dorset Local			
	Plan Review would bring			
	Alderholt's population in line			
	with many of the smaller towns			
	across Dorset, but without the			
	facilities those towns benefit			
	from. Furthermore, there are			
	obvious difficulties in creating a			
	vibrant local centre for			
	Alderholt, given that the			
	existing facilities are scattered			
	and the potential areas of			
	growth do not readily coincide			
	with a natural 'High Street', or attracting any significant level			
	of employment. "			
	or employment.			
	"9.5. A more proportionate			
	level of growth for Alderholt			
	(taking into account the wider			
	strategic need for Dorset),			
	would be closer to 15 dwellings			
	per annum (i.e. in the region of			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	225 dwellings over a 15 year period), accompanied by investment to support employment growth and improved sustainable transport links. There are already extant planning permissions that can deliver the majority of this housing growth, although they will only bring about limited affordable housing provision and no employment. "			
35				I understand you have requested residents' responses to the local plan consultation prior to next Monday's council meeting. I will be writing to Dorset Council to raise concerns with the plan but am awaiting some further information before completing this but outline my concerns below. Option 1, taken together with speculative development, is likely to result in more like 500 new homes. I agree that some development is sure to be needed for local people, but not development on this scale, which would amount to about a 60% increase in the housing stock, much of which would be too expensive for local people on local pay rates.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				There are several issues of concern besides affordability: sustainability, access to employment, education, healthcare, leisure, etc., but no infrastucture would be provided or significantly improved under this proposal. 500 new homes will probably result in between 500 and 1000 extra vehicles - public transport is virtually non-existent here. There would be a significant increase also in HGV traffic and delivery vans. The road network would not be upgraded to cope and so road safety would be compromised. Opportunities for non-motorised transport are severely limited by the state of the roads, the lack of pavements and the sheer distance from Alderholt to other settlements and to essential services. Furthermore, there would be an increase in emission of greenhouse gases to consider, resulting in adverse impacts on health as well as being damaging to the environment and especially the local protected heathland. Discharge of treated sewage into the River Avon catchment area is likely to result in increased harm to the environment and has already caused a moratorium recently on development in some parts of Hampshire.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				The proposed location of the new development, accessed from Hillbury Road, would in effect create a self-contained sub-village, not a properly integrated development with safe and easy access to what services do exist. This is not good for creating a sustainable community or for integrating incoming residents. I do not believe this proposal is compatible with either the requirements of the NPPF for sustainable development, nor with the climate emergency declared by both Dorset Council and Alderholt Parish Council. Option 2 is not fully explained and is therefore harder to comment on in detail. Whilst the documentation states 3000 homes, Cllr Walsh last night made reference during the livestreamed discussion to a development of 5000 houses. This is in line with what EDDC finally admitted to looking at, having asked Highways to investigate the implications of a development of this size. This gives the impression that the figures in the consultation documents are not to be relied upon.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
		Settlement?		The NPPF states that sustainable development should "support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure" There is no detail of the suggested infrastructure improvements, nor of funding and timescale. Alderholt residents have been hearing promises of upgraded infrastructure since the 1970s when the Earlswood Drive development went up. Infrastructure improvements were promised and not delivered. Alderholt residents made clear their opposition to large scale development during the recent EDDC consultation and our MP Simon Hoare agreed with this. It is difficult to understand why DC have brought this proposal forward despite claiming to be listening to residents' concerns especially given the failures in the past to resource infrastructure to match growth. The EDDC local plan from the early 2000s correctly identified that Alderholt is unsuitable for large-scale development. Nothing has changed since then in terms of infrastructure, connectivity, access to services etc. or the local protected landscapes, yet this proposal is massive; it would quadruple the size of the village.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				Upgrading the road network to cope with a development on this scale would require major funding and input from Hampshire County Council, who made clear during the EDDC consultation that they had no such plans. Upgrading the Somerley Road linking to the A31 would help southbound traffic only, and have no impact on traffic to Salisbury, Wimborne and Poole. It would also increase the already significant rush hour congestion at the Verwood Road / A31 junction west of Ringwood and the notorious Bakers Hanging junction. The recent survey by the Parish Council revealed that residents commute in all directions and so there would be a significant traffic problem on the Fordingbridge and Cranborne roads as well. I believe I'm right in saying that in their response to EDDC's consultation, one of the Hampshire councils referred to the route between Alderholt and Fordingbridge, with all its pinchpoints and blind bends, as suitable for horse and cart traffic. There is already a post-covid-vaccine move towards a return to the workplace, so it should not be assumed that traffic levels will remain low and any proposal that does not give regard to replacing traffic in all directions with

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				decent, reliable and covid-safe public transport is essentially unsustainable. This against a background where East Dorset has the highest rate of private car commuting in the country.
				3000 homes would mean that a great number of new jobs would be required, which, due to the costs of commuting and the environmental issues, ought to be genuinely local. Whilst there would be construction jobs, this only provides for one sector of the workforce. The 2011 census indicated that residents work in a wide range of sectors of trade and industry and a wide level of skills/pay levels. It is difficult to see how Alderholt could employ so many residents in the small amount of employment land considered in the plan.
				Both of the proposals would be damaging to the character of the local area, option 2, which would turn Alderholt into a town, obviously more so than option 1.
				Whilst there might be "affordable housing" in either of the two proposals, it was clear from Cllr Walsh's response, when pressed on the price level for the proposed developments, that he either could not or was unwilling to answer the question with a number, which I take to mean he

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				cannot guarantee affordability of any new homes for local people. I believe the reality is that these homes would be mostly built by development companies that pay huge salaries and dividends to directors and owners, resulting in a price level to the buyer / tenant that is above what many local people, especially young people can afford. So, I would like to request the Parish Council to be particularly searching in their response to the consultation on the subject of affordability. If this point is not addressed, the village will probably just become a large community of Covid-refugees from the home counties, to the detriment its ability to meet the needs of the local population. I believe that neither of the two proposals would be likely meet the social sustainability objective detailed in NPPF, i.e.,— to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
		Settlement:		communities' health, social and cultural wellbeing; This was an area of concern highlighted by MP Simon Hoare when he pointed out that the sustainability of the community is one of the most important factors to consider. The issue of accessible services is significant - it is important to look beyond whether there is a pub or post office and consider healthcare, leisure, employment, socialising needs. Cultural wellbeing doubtless covers a wide range of services that would not be available in the village. I would just make mention here of Cranbrook new town in East Devon: it has the worst antisocial behaviour problem in Devon because there is nothing for people to do in their spare time, but it at least is on the railway into Exeter/London. There is no way that Alderholt will get a rail link; turning the old railway line into a trailway is not going to help with commuting, shopping, accessing hospital care.
				It is clear from previous research that some 20000 new residents would be needed to bring forward a new doctors' surgery. Children from

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				the village would still need to spend over an hour a day on the school bus - that's if the catchment school can even accommodate them. The NPPF states that "Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision12 for: a) housing (including affordable housing), employment, retail, leisure and other commercial development; b) infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); c) community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure); and d) conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation" I believe it is very unlikely that Dorset Council would be able to provide sufficient infrastructure of the types mentioned at Alderholt. The costs would be prohibitive especially in the post-

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				Covid19 landscape, where councils have massive budget deficits. Developer contributions would be unlikely to meet the funding needs, and therefore it would be so much more sensible to place larger developments where infrastructure already exists, in order to reduce the burden on the taxpayer. It is contrary to the NPPF requirements for sustainability to place major development such as either of these proposals this in the least accessible place in East Dorset, and it is against the purposes of the green belt to push development away from the conurbation out beyond the green belt into our semi-rural area that is extremely close to protected heathland. So, my response is a clear objection to both these unless and until the negatives can be overcome. I believe that growth in Alderholt should be organic and limited to numbers that the local job market can absorb, local schools can accommodate and such as will not compromise access to essential services such as healthcare. I would also like to see the character of the area preserved and the unique heathland environment properly protected.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				All of this could be achieved by putting development in areas that already have far greater infrastructure provision. For example, Wimborne has excellent links to the nearby industrial / trading estates in Ferndown. Verwood has at least got a town centre with a supermarket, cafes and shops and the excellent leisure provision of Moors Valley and Potterne Park as well as a much better road to the A31 than Alderholt. West Moors is also far better connected. It is illogical to concentrate development in Alderholt.
36	Neither of the above options as 192 houses have already been passed for building. By the time further properties have been built on parcels of land sold by existing home owners, the number will be an increase of 10% of the number of residents already here. We are a village and I want to keep it that way! Because of our size, many of the residents know or at least recognise others and there is a real feel of community here. Towns cannot say the same, can they. There are many activities which go on, either through the	I do NOT want 'significant expansion'. If I had wanted to live in a town, then I would be. I love the charm of semi-rural living.	Yes. Our village borders Hampshire county lines and neither county has the funds for significant road improvements, especially after the Covid pandemic. It'll be some while until the shocking state of the roads have been repaired as it is. Local garages keep commenting on how many broken wheels need welding due to the numerous huge potholes - we've had to have 2 wheels mended (at a cost which the county will never pick up).	Trailway to Fordingbridge - How could the policy be amended to reflect your concerns? A: I've tried walking the route but failed. A brilliant idea, but as much of the railway track land was sold to more than 1 private landowner after the line was closed, I doubt it would happen as the land would be far too expensive to buy and develop.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	Chapel, Church, village hall, Reading Rooms or privately. During this pandemic, people have rallied round to support those that need it through a local community fund. I feel very privileged to live here.			
37				My wife and I generally agree with the submission which has been made by Action for Alderholt, for it seems to cover all the implications relating to your two options, indeed you also draw attention to some of these points. However I would like to submit a few notes of my own I wrote to you in 2018 regarding the proposal to build up to 1000 houses in Alderholt, and now the possibility of a much larger development has increased to up to 3000, I think this needs some explanation as to why such a huge increase in 2 years. The general feeling of the Alderholt residents is very much in opposition to this possibility. The local demand certainly is far below this figure and with Government expectations or housing within the next 10 years, Alderholt would be taking on board 10% of the whole

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				of Dorset's allocation. This is considered by residents as totally unfair, and they do expect to be treated with fairness. Just in publishing a local map showing where the development would take place has prompted a lot of activity and there are lots of rumours now circulating that within certain boundaries there will be a 'land grab' and many planning applications will be agreed within the next two years, under the present rules, before any local planning structure is agreed. I am afraid that local trust of being treated fairly has now evaporated, and Dorset Council has now got to make every effort to restore some of that trust. It is so important that until a Plan is agreed in two years time any development is limited to only local demand of perhaps 200 dwellings, and affordable homes are given a high priority.
				There certainly is no shortage of demand for housing in this area, and the pandemic over the past year has increased this demand with people now wanting to leave the cities for the country. Personal safety from the virus and the possibility of working from

are other reasons. Speaking recently		Other Comments	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Res No
London some years ago and who stil lot of friends and family in London, that this exodus has got a lot of mon Some of the reasons should be unmentionable, such as 'immigration' for someone who has no prejudice whatsoever! I find this intolerable. O reasons include 'crime', 'congestion' 'getting a nice new house', and now price differentials makes it possible from the city, buy a house in the could and pay off the mortgage, or put some money in the bank. Maybe it would possible to carry on working from he only a visit to the office once or twice week, and there is always the possible finding a local job. I am attaching a copy of my 2018 let (appendix2), because all the points I then are still very much relevant, on traffic situation around Alderholt/Fordingbridge/Ringwood I	ntly to from still has a n, told me nomentum. tion' and re . Other on', ow house le to move country, some uld be home with wice a ssibility of letter ts I made only the	unmentionable, such as 'immigration' for someone who has no prejudice whatsoever I find this intolerable. Oth reasons include 'crime', 'congestion', 'getting a nice new house', and now h price differentials makes it possible to from the city, buy a house in the coun and pay off the mortgage, or put some money in the bank. Maybe it would b possible to carry on working from hom only a visit to the office once or twice week, and there is always the possibilifinding a local job. I am attaching a copy of my 2018 letter (appendix2), because all the points I m then are still very much relevant, only				

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				of last summer. We tried to go to the coast at Bournemouth only twice last year, once in June and again in July, but unfortunately on both occasions we had to turn back after we met with traffic which was almost stationary, at the junction with the A31 near Ringwood. The traffic last summer in this area increased tenfold, and we felt that the world had descended upon us. Even going to Ringwood we made the mistake of going via lbsley and the A338 and we queued for half an hour just to get to Ringwood.
				We have lived in Alderholt for 43 years, brought up 3 children here, and I retired 19 years ago. Our children had all moved away to the Bath area, and started their own families. We did consider moving ourselves to North Somerset, and looked extensively among the commuter villages to the south of Bath. There are a lot of similarities in that there has been much development within these villages and small towns to meet the growing needs of Bath. However all these villages and towns lie within 10 miles of Bath with the exception of Midsomer Norton which is 11.5, and most development is

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				within this 10 mile ring. Alderholt is 17.5 from Bournemouth, Poole 21, Salisbury 15, Southampton 29, and most commuters from this village travel to one of those destinations.
				We, however, decided to stay in Alderholt. I suppose familiarity was important along with friends and neighbours, being close to the coast, being fairly rural and close to the New Forest and Cranborne Chase, both areas we love so much. It is a nice area, and a lot of people would like to live here. But
				things are starting to go wrong. Last summer the Forest car parks were overflowing by 9 in the morning, and the nature reserve at Martin Down, 5 miles north of Alderholt was the same. Even throughout the winter these areas have seen
				a huge increase in people and cars. The Forest, Martin Down, and rural walks have suffered, and especially the Forest where some narrow paths have trebled in width and now look more like roadways. This is concerning, and you are right in highlighting certain areas as a concern with an ever increasing population. Traffic through this

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				village also increased significantly as cars came through the Forest from Cadnam to Wimborne in order to avoid the A31 Ringwood bottleneck. This village is a very friendly village; it is not a 'pretty' village, not an affluent village, but a mixture of mainly retired and working families, most of whom have to leave the village on a daily basis to commute to work. It seems though that it is a village that works
				well; there is very little crime or anti-social behaviour and I feel that people go that extra mile in order to keep it that way. One of the reasons for this might be that families tend to make great use of the outdoors and surrounding countryside. The village has two natural boundaries, the woods adjacent and to the north of Station Road, and the woods to the east of Hillbury Road. These are used extensively by local people for exercise, dog walking, and in the last 12 months for retaining their sanity. These are also used a lot by children; my children grew up playing in the woods, and I have friends in the village who are now in their 70's who also spent their childhood in the woods. The

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				woods along the old railway line are littered with makeshift camps, 'wigwam' shelters and cycle tracks, all built by children, and so important to their development. Providing football pitches, play parks and skate board tracks does not fit in with all children; sometimes children need to develop their own adventure parks. These wooded areas are also important wildlife sanctuaries. They are full of birdlife; although not a bird watcher I can recognise most garden birds; there are two sorts of woodpecker, cuckoos, owls and I was told that nightingales were in the woods behind Hillbury road last spring, but I never heard them. There are also many badger sets, fox earths and hedgehogs, rabbits and of course deer. I do notice that both these areas under option 2 will go to development. I think it would be such a disaster to lose these important areas. Also the woods immediately adjacent to Station Road grow out of a very swampy area. This is a natural drainage area for the village, and removal of the woods, and replace them with houses, tarmac and concrete would mean that the natural drainage would be interfered with and the surface water would

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				have to be directly into the stream, running into Ashford Water, which joins the River Avon at Fordingbridge. Ashford water flooded this winter, for the first time that I have seen, and this might be a problem for the future.
				My major concern regarding any development is with regard to Global Warming. Are the consequences of this development a plus or a minus in the requirement to minimise emissions, and if it is a plus, is it possible to keep this as small as possible. Global Warming has in the last couple of years certainly moved up the agenda, and the UK is hosting a World Climate Change conference this June. The signs of accelerating change are all around us; I don't need David Attenborough to tell me about it, or see video footage of glaciers falling into the sea, forest fires, floods, droughts, etc. I see it for myself every day; I see plants and trees coming into leaf two months early, clouds of insects on a warm day in January and February which have hatched two months early and consequently there is no food for the young birds when

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				they hatch in April and May. The garden bird population has generally dropped by 50% over the last 30 years. The examples of visible climate change are too numerous to list.
				You may think I am a bit of a 'crank', but I certainly am not; I worked in the aviation industry most of my working life, and if I had been told about Global Warming 30 years ago, I would have completely disregarded it, and incidentally aviation has been one of the largest contributors to this problem. Scientists are now warning of us of a possible future climate pandemic, and if nature gets all the ducks in a row, at the same time across large parts of the world, it would cause catastrophic food shortages, and there is no vaccine for this pandemic. We all have to ask ourselves as to what contribution we can all make, and regulatory bodies, such as yourselves, need to consider
				how you can spread the message and set an example. Electric cars are not going to solve the commuter problem, they use almost the same amount of energy as a conventional

needed to improve the self- containment of the settlement?	
I suppose thoughts developm beginning for Alderi most con in Alderin Fordingbun nearby vi seriously traffic when People had year, espunot over the for the function of the fun	and that energy has to come from ere. e I could ramble on with my a regarding this possible ment in Alderholt, but as I said at the g, I think the response from Action cholt covers the points which are of incern to the local residents, not just nolt, but it is a major concern to oridge residents, and many of the illages feel that they also will be affected from the amount of road which will pass through their villages. There are still lots of concerns uture, regarding jobs and the way be not appear very clear at this time. I would beg you to take these to account, people do not need any sery inflicted upon them, and if any le development was to go ahead sery might go on for 10 years or lease act fairly and any development spread equally across the whole of

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the selfcontainment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				Thank you for listening to me.
38				With 35 yrs experience in British Airways, mostly spent in Long Term Economic Planning, I strongly question the need for large scale additional housing. The Office of National Statistics, forecast for 2031 shows a UK population of 70.05 million, 1.93 million up on current estimates of 68.12 m, or an increase of 2.8%. This represents about 56 additional houses in Alderholt where I live. With the dip in population growth, which is bound to happen from Covid, long term Covid and over a year where people have resisted going to doctors and hospital due to fear or difficulty in making appointments. The above forecast is likely to be lower. Large scale building of houses hardly equates with the essential low carbon (Green) policy. Encouraging people to travel further for jobs is also at odds with the Green policy. The Ministry of Housing puts the number of empty homes in England alone at 648.000, with second home ownership at 252.000. Council tax penalties on houses empty for more than 6 months and on second homes may well reduce these numbers.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				We may also see a rise in people seeking employment overseas in the future due to our economy suffering from Covid effects. Young people in Dorset often find houses are too expensive to purchase and therefore rent, frequently paying more per month than a mortgage would cost. Therefore, what new housing allowed in the future should be affordable or a part ownership housing scheme to help keep young people in the area.
39				I am writing in response to the proposal within the local plan for 300 or 3,000 new homes in Alderholt. I object to both proposed figures for the following reasons: • Sites within the village, including the former surplus stores site, have been approved for development, but these houses have not been delivered. These houses when built could meet the needs of the village. • The roads around Alderholt are not adequate for the increased traffic that would result from additional development. Assuming 2 cars per household (and many households with teenagers may have more than two

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				vehicles) an increase of 600-6,000 vehicles on the roads would be unsustainable. There are pinch points on the B3078 towards both Cranborne and Fordingbridge; Harbridge Drove towards Ringwood is narrow in places, poorly maintained and often not gritted due to the change in local authority part way along it. There are frequently accidents on Batterley Drove into Verwood, and lanes via Sandleheath and Rockbourne used for access to Salisbury are totally unsuitable for that level of traffic. The routes to the north and east lead into Hampshire so Dorset cannot have control over how those routes are managed. Fordingbridge is already under pressure from new development within the town and there are consequences in terms of traffic, pressure on health and other services and environmental issues relating to the River Avon. Schools, shops and a doctors surgery in a largescale development of Alderholt would relieve the pressure on these services in Fordingbridge, but largescale development cannot be sustained

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				without completely upgrading all the road networks, and would be damaging environmentally to important areas within Alderholt and Fordingbridge. • Even if the 3,000 house development were to go ahead with provision for business and retail, it is likely that Salisbury, Ringwood and Bournemouth would remain as the main employment and shopping centres. The result would simply be to increase the traffic on the roads to these towns. The A338 already suffers from major traffic issues in both directions. • Potential new residents cannot be restricted to using SANGs instead of the heath at Cranborne Common. There will be adverse effects on this internationally important heathland. I believe 3,000 houses is unacceptable and 300 is too many, although I do accept that some development is needed. If more housing is approved for the village and is located around the recreation ground area, a shop should be incorporated into the

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				development to reduce car journeys within the village. The conversion of the disused railway into Fordingbridge is a good idea and would give a safe route where there is currently none. The route could also be extended in the other direction to Verwood, as Verwood has many employment and recreational opportunities but Batterley Drove is a dangerous route for pedestrians and cyclists. Overall I believe the majority of development should be shared between existing urban areas which already have good transport links, shopping, health, education and other facilities, rather than small communities where these facilities do not exist or require massive investment to provide them at the required level. Otherwise a new town development along the lines of Poundbury, in an area close to existing A roads and/or rail links would be a more sensible approach.
40				Here we go again, yet again, and yet again, again; same 'ol, same ol' for the umpteenth time. "THE (latest)PLAN!!!

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				Conditions in Alderholt remain either as before, or worse. The local roads continue to deteriorate, ever more once-upon-a• time pavements have become obstacle courses, youngsters continue to group at the side of the road waiting for school buses completely unprotected from the elements, there are still no street lights up Hillbury Road, though Station Road still has thirty two at the last count, and still no pavement on the east side of Hillbury Road. There are still only a handful of jobs in Alderholt, and still no prospect of more to come. Local facilities become ever more straitened. You can still buy any amount of hard liquor in Alderholt, but you still can't buy a pair of socks. Alderholt is not a pretty, chocolate box village; far
				from it. The brutal fact is, Alderholt is nothing more than sea of concrete, a run-down, overblown dilapidated personalized car park for commuters. Still, you can always escape on a bus, can't you? Might take a heap of planning to get out and back, though. So, whadda we need? How many youngsters queue for school buses, and where are the pick up points? The Council no doubt has a plan to provide shelters

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				for them; there must be a problem, though, because they still haven't managed it after all these years. I know, I know, youngsters have no disposable income and no vote; and no shelters.
				What's the Coucil's plan for the repair of pavements? A laugh and tear up file? I'm an octogenarian and I find it more and more safe to walk in the roads rather than pick my way, head down, forced to watch where my feet are next planted.
				Street lights? Not the Council's direct problem, I know. The allocation of street lights depends on arcane conditions; mainly how many dead or injured on said unlighted streets. But, no doubt, the Council is protesting the illogicality of this. All those well-lighted streets in the village, and not a corpse to be counted; why don't they take away their street lights? I'm old enough to remember when, among other "lackings", Alderholt had no street lights and no pavements whatsoever but, strange to relate, did have a caged fox behind the Churchill Arms and a
				petrol filling station. Progress. So, whadda we really need? More concrete, more road congestion, more pollution, facilities straitened even further, more and bigger personalized car

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				parks, larger groups of drenched and frozen youngsters waiting for buses! Not forgetting, the thrill of the filth, distraction, stench, noise and disruption of said concrete distribution. More progress. Like a hole in the head. Bring back the caged fox.
				Of course, let's not forget a cost/benefit analysis. Remind me, I forget; is it ninety five or ninety six percent of the revenue raised by local Council Tax that is returned to Alderholt? Only kidding, I know it's ninety eight.
				I suspect that Dorchester has a favourite expression of our transatlantic cousins glued to every planning department wall: "Never give a sucker an even break." And a map with large arrows showing where to look. As no doubt, with other areas, Alderholt bears the cost, Dorchester accrues the benefit.
				Of course, in the not too-distant future, none of this matters. There's another common expression both sides of the Atlantic: "There's no such thing as a free lunch." And as with lunch, so with COVID and CLIMATE CONTROL (for which read carbon emission).
				Read the Government's fiscal runes. Someone's gotta pay for the pandemic and the bucket loads of

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				carbon, and pay really, really big. Of course, there's the standard go-to favourites: a penny or two on VAT, tuppence on a pint of beer, threppence on crisps, ten pence on a packet of fags. Big Deal; no! They're going to need shed-loads of cash for years to come, and carefully brung in well ahead of the next-due general election. Now, those with a less well developed sense of civic duty, and those enlightened with sheer blind cussedness, may well reduce or even stop completely their consumption of alcohol and cigarettes; the suckers' rebellion! So where do you find your trapped suckers who can be milked with impunity? Dead right: commuting by train (see the subsidies dry up), and especially, behind a steering wheel. Road tax; obviously fuel duty: ching-ching, hear it great politics, anybody driving rattle in. Plus, and a motor vehicle, especially diesel or petrol, is an enemy of mankind, poisoning the planet(and Dorchester, so it might not be all bad news) for their own selfish reasons, just to get between here and there and back. They could save the planet, could walk, ride a bike, invest in roller skates, catch a monthly bus (on which the fares will mysteriously climb stratospherically).

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				You may have read that more and more cities/towns are planning on bringing in clean-air zones that you have to pay to enter (Bath, Bristol, Portsmouth, etc), and the money-raising idea is bound to catch on (are you listening, Cranborne, SandleHeath, Much Binding in the Marsh?) Motoring is going to become ever more expensive (but, I hear you claim, here in Alderholt we already have a plan to plant a forest of subsidized electrical charging points for battery• powered pennyfarthings, just as soon as we've sorted out the
				pavements and youngsters' shelters, so no problem). Virtually every household in Alderholt needs at least two vehicles; one for each bread-winner, and another for every other need, from the trivial to the vital. But commuting is going to become a major financial burden; living in Alderholt is going to cost more and more and more, and who knows how much? Knowing this, who'd want to come here to live,
				given that the major attraction of Alderholt is just another personalized stretch of car park. Who could afford it? Why even bother? There's always someplace else more worthwhile. Just stick a pin in a map.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
		settlement?		For those already here, this leads inevitably to the prospect of negative equity: will their property actually start to lose its value as the cost of commuting rises? Are they already trapped? For those considering a move here; would they shackle themselves in properties they may not be able to sell on? The prospect of all this must already be well known by the concrete spreaders and will become common knowledge soon enough. Can the concrete spreaders start soon enough to con the less aware before they're trapped? Or will they fold their tents and decamp from a poisoned chalice as so many have done before? The Alderholt Council should be working flat out to prevent more people being sucked in; anything else is shameful. The Council already lacks the means to properly maintain what we have; yet more parking
				spaces is unconscionable. If needs must, Dorchester would surely welcome the opportunity to spread a mantle of well laid-out personalized car parks. It would be selfish to deny them the chance to "do their bit" for the common populace and enjoy such progress.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				And lo and behold, it will never come to pass. They've got maps, with arrows, on all the right walls, and that's less an accident than a master planning achievement. More memories: I remember when the commonest query I used to hear from passing motorists when I was out and about was; "Where's the Surplus Store?" And I would explain. Later years, same question, different response; "The Surplus Store had relocated to a landfill, and the site was going to be restored to a haven of milk and honey by a DEVELOPER, who was so enthralled by the prospect that he was actually going to build Alderholt's FIRST ROUNDABOUT to provide access to this wonderland. Yeah, right. More folded tents. Maybe this developer could be lured back in the future to convert Alderholt's coming mountain of redundant motor vehicles into a dry ski-slope training attraction, with locals in smocks sucking straws, and optional roundabout. I wish you all well, but I fear you're outgunned unless you can foment a Suckers' Rebellion. Go down fighting. "Up the Suckers!"
41	Option 1 is a manageable and viable expansion of the village. Option represents an excessive,	There are so many, but of most importance would be the road infrastructure inadequacies	As per Q 1& 2	

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	unnecessary, impractical and expensive expansion into a Town framework - so much would have to be expended to preserve a cohesive and community environment that would work. Alderholt is an easy target for redevelopment being on the eastern edge of the county, but it makes no sense when there are more suitable areas with ready made infrastructure and employment areas readily available. It necessarily involves Hants CC too, adding complications - eg the road into Fordingbridge and the sewerage volumes.	currently to cope with the resulting car movements. In addition, employment opportunities, retail outlets, including inns, restaurants, leisure facilities (including open space, sports fields) - a 'centre' to the Town (as it would become). There are sewerage (volumes and excessive phosphates?) and other service questions to be overcome too, as well as environmental (the meadow at the rear of the Reading Room should be preserved, for instance). An extended community and identity would have to be created and that is unlikely.		
42				I do not agree with either Option 1 (300 new homes) or Option 2 (up to 3000 new homes). There is already approved planning for an additional 192 new builds in Alderholt. Also a planning request has just been submitted for 34 new affordable homes to north of Hillbury Road. If the later is approved, that would equate to 226 new builds. We certainly do not want another 300 new homes on top of this figure. Alderholt is a quiet rural village. Many of us chose to live

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				here for that very reason. 300 new homes in total, could be accommodated but to build a further 3000 would completely change the charm of the village and make it an urban sprawl. I cannot see any plan to improve the infrastructure. The roads are dark and dangerous at the best of times, always on the lookout for wildlife. There is no alternative to the private vehicle for transportation. The new residents would need to travel to the major towns of Bournemouth, Poole, Salisbury, Southampton etc for work as there is little opportunity locally. There will be on average an additional 2 vehicles per household and the current infrastructure would struggle with that. Also there is only one Primary School in the village, a part-time Doctor's surgery, one general corner grocery store and a vet. Shopping, education and medical needs all require the use of transportation to get to the nearby towns. Now that we have left the EU, the UK can only produce approximately 60% of the food that we consume. Why then are we turning farmland into housing. Do not spoil our village. Build no more than 300 new homes, including the 192 already approved.
43				I would to strongly disagree with any additional housing in Alderholt. I moved to this lovely village because it is a close knit, friendly community

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				which already has more than enough houses based on the current infrastructure. Building more housing would not only ruin this lovely, rural village but would also put a huge strain on local services and create so much more pollution with more vehicles travelling in and out, as well as overcrowding classes in our lovely school.
44				There is not sufficient infrastructure in Alderholt to accommodate further housing developments. All access roads to the village are extremely narrow and even now can become dangerous with limited width especially when meeting oncoming HGV's which are delivering or passing through the village. Also further development of the village would detract from the current compact rural location.
45				We have only recently moved to Alderholt, having moved from Verwood due to that area being over populated with lots of new houses. We we're attracted to Alderholt for the small village feel, the lovely community spirit and the amount of green space and walks for our family and to walk our dog. We we're aware that there was already limited shops and facilities in Alderholt but felt it was enough for the population of Alderholt. I have big concerns that Alderholt will become like Verwood and other

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				areas whose population has grown yet no facilities were added. I do not believe there is the space for new facilities or houses without spoiling the village how it is and the community that has been grown here by hardworking individuals. I am also concerned about pollution of more cars and buses on our roads for people who are going to have to travel for work and school, as well as crime levels increasing as well as noise levels. This is already a concern of mine as there are more dog thefts and burglaries in and around the local area. I want my children to be able to safely go in and around Alderholt, as they now approach their teenage years. Too many areas are being over populated and villages are being spoilt. This is exactly the reason we moved from Verwood and it appears we are going to be in exactly the same situation if plans get agreed.
46	Ideally, none at all, but the village could do with a little updating, so if we have to take one for Dorset, we should aim for less than 200 dwellings. Therefore, the Gladman site and various other small developments would suit, alongside the Surplus Stores site	I don't think Alderholt suits self- containment. It's been tried here before; we had our own butchers, hairdressers, estate agents, paper shop, pet supplies, tea rooms, post office, surplus store, undertakers and petrol station, all of which are gone, because all those needs	Yes! All roads leading in and out of Alderholt are B roads, some not much more than lanes. These would need extensive widening, at the cost of miles of ancient hedgerow, which are not just part of our national heritage but provide homes for a myriad of birds, endangered hedgehogs, field and dormouse. It would mean the loss of ancient deciduous trees,	

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	that is crying out for	are met by our satellite towns of	at a time when the planet is in need of	
	improvement. As kids, we used	Fordingbridge, Ringwood and	them most, each one absorbs 21 kg of	
	to fish in the lake, perhaps that	Verwood.	carbon dioxide every year. Too larger	
	could be a reinstated to offset		increase in housing would put a huge	
	the destruction elsewhere, I'd be		demand on our local chalk streams, you	
	keen to help with that		may have guessed by now that I am a	
			huge conservationist, not one of those	
			tree hugging hippies, nor ecological gate	
			leaner, just a little more open eyed.	
			Of the 210 chalk streams worldwide,	
			England, is home to 160 of them. The	
			ones that concern us are the Avon, Stour,	
			Test, Itchen and Frome, there are others	
			in our region, but let's concentrate on	
			those. These chalk streams are unique	
			ecosystems that for millennia worked in	
			harmony, but not anymore. All of those	
			rivers are fed by subterranean aquifers,	
			huge reservoirs below ground. As the	
			demand for homes has increased, so the	
			demand for drinking water has risen	
			exponentially and that water is stolen by	
			water companies, at source, draining the	
			very lifeblood from our rivers, destroying	
			those ecosystems, to the point where	

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
			nearly all are failing their ecological status.	
			Just one more thought while on this thread. I understand there is a desire to develop the green field site behind the Reading Rooms. As a kid I used to cross those meadows in the hot summer holidays and remember running through, and lying in, the knee-high grasses, grasses interspersed with meadow flower, both perennials and annuals. I remember the clouds of insects and the cacophony of sound, once you down at bug level. It's a shame if that meadow where to go the same way as 90% of all flower meadows since the end of the Second World War and once they're gone, they are lost forever.	
			I guess no matter where you build in Dorset, especially if it's largescale expansion, these precious ecosystems will continue to be destroyed, but please	

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
			don't let it be Alderholt, and on my doorstep.	
47	There should be no more than the current 192 new builds that have already been granted planning permission. The current road links, service provision and general facilities do not meet the requirements of the current level of development	1. Improved road links adequate for size of development. There would still be many people commuting to and from other main employment areas. 2. Services - water, gas, electricity, drainage, telephone coverage. These would all need to be put in place before any development started. There is already concern about increased levels of phosphates entering the River Avon through the sewage plant in Fordingbridge and therefore any significant development in Alderholt would exacerbate this concern. 3. Greater need to increase the level of policing and other emergency services consistent with the level of growth implemented. Who would deliver his service - Dorset or Hampshire?	There is a planned development of the town of Fordingbridge, so, with an added 'significant' development of Alderholt this would add to the already congested routes converging on the town of Ringwood and the A31 in general. The M27, A31, and the A338 are already heavily congested during peak hours. With the level of development over the last 25 years added to the 192 houses that have already been granted planning permission, Alderholt has already been subject to its fair share of development.	

Res	Q1 - What level of small scale	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be	Q3 - Are there any factors that may	Other Comments
No	growth and major expansion	identified for significant	inhibit the deliverability of significant	
	should take place at Alderholt?	expansion, what	expansion of Alderholt?	
		improvements would be		
		needed to improve the self-		
		containment of the		
		settlement?		
		4. The provision of a larger		
		health service to accommodate		
		the needs of the increased		
		population.		
		5. At present, children from		
		Year groups 5 and upwards		
		must travel, on minor roads, up		
		to 15 miles out of the village for		
		their education.		
		The current feeder school in		
		Wimborne is already reducing		
		their catchment area due to		
		large developments currently		
		being built around the		
		town. Therefore, Alderholt,		
		with a proposed increased		
		population would require		
		dedicated secondary education		
		facilities to be provided.		
		6. Current levels of shopping		
		and leisure facilities would not		
		meet the demand for any		
		further significant increase in		
		development.		
		7. Any proposed development		
		on existing woodland would be		
		seriously detrimental to the		
		fabric of village life.		

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
48				With reference to the expansion of Alderholt, we feel that the 192 new build homes and the 34 affordable new builds behind the chapel if planning is granted is sufficiant development for Alderholt. So we are saying no to option1&2 and would prefer no further devolpment. We do not think we have sufficiant infurstructer including shops public transport and health care to support a large expansion of the village. Also a large expansion of the village will have a detremental effect on our wildlife which is really important for our mental health. We have lived in Alderholt 43years and feel any more development and your going to lose that village feeling
49				As a resident of Alderholt for the past 42 years I feel that I am reasonably well qualified to comment on the development of the village over the years and the proposed options for its future. To date the steady growth of the village, whilst not without its critics, has generally worked fairly well notwithstanding the lack of any meaningful investment, or interest, in our village's infrastructure, amenities or wellbeing by Dorset Council. Our sustainability as a successful village is exclusively down to local involvement so please don't destroy the village by excessive and unnecessary development.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				Firstly, looking at Option 2; significant development of up to 3000 new homes! This surely can't be a serious proposal? There is absolutely no detail as to the essential infrastructure requirements i.e., access road improvements, public transport needs, increased schooling, increased health care requirements, shopping needs, leisure facilities and so on?? Have you worked out the cost of providing all of this as a pre-requisite for any mass development? And apart from Dorset Councils involvement there would need to be the full agreement and financial support from Hampshire County Council and the co-operation of New Forest District Council. How likely is that going to be? Option 1 suggests 300 new homes in addition to the 192 homes where planning has already been given making the total 492. This proposal does not include any real improvements to the village's infrastructure or access roads. So, we are looking at in the region of 1000 extra cars trying to negotiate a totally inadequate road network and an increase in population of circa 1500 / 2000 with just one shop and inadequate amenities i.e., health care, schooling, public transport.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				Common sense dictates that any further development within Alderholt should be restricted to the current planning approvals of 192 new builds which can, just about, be accommodated without placing excessive strain on our current infrastructure and amenities. Furthermore, I understand that the overall Dorset housing plan can be achieved without ruining our village.
50			Yes, no public transport, narrow roads, no local jobs.	No, the proposals would result in vastly increased traffic levels in roads that are already clogged at commuter periods from new residents dumped in Alderholt with no additional and guaranteed infrastructure
51				I am writing today because I am concerned about the expansion plans for Alderholt. I am concerned about the developments placing extra strain on local services and journeys to employment opportunities. Also, I am worried about the effect to wildlife and extra phosphates entering the river avon. Action for Alderholt advise introduction of option 3 and I feel that this would be the preferred option.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
52	192 new builds for which for planning permission has already been approved.	Major improvement to the roads, employment opportunities and public transport.	Alderholt is served by two roads of which only one is a B road classification. The other road is nothing more than a drove track with tarmac. This road would not be able to cope with the increase in traffic if the proposed 3000 homes were approved. As for Ringwood Rd it is impractical as not wide enough at the moment for cars in some places to pass each other. Alderholt is a village we do not want it turned into another Verwood.	
53				The Environment and Climate Change At Table 3.1 it states "We will take actions to minimise the impact of climate change" and this will be achieved by "managing where and how development takes place, the Local Plan can minimise the distance travelled and focus travel onto active travel and public transport options". This is welcome, but for t to be meaningful it must be followed through in selection of development options. Section 3.10 Environmental Performance 3.10.3. Requiring a BREEAM Communities assessment is in and of itself is meaningless. BREEAM is an assessment methodology and gives a range of assessment outcomes (unclassified up to outstanding). It is essential that the required rating is specified, ideally a high standard.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				3.10.6. It is noted that the Future Homes Standard will not be implemented until 2025 at the earliest, but the plan should indicate that developers will be encouraged to bring forward designs which implement this emerging design advice, and not simply wait a few more years. Policy ENV9: Achieving high levels of environmental performance This draft policy is far too vague and appears to be only for large developments if based on foregoing text. All developments should be designed to achieve high levels of environmental performance and those standards need to be quantified. Section 18 Alderholt Some additional housing in Alderholt is both necessary and desirable. The recent growth has been about 15 homes per year, generally delivered on minor sites. Over the period of the plan this organic growth would be in the order of 225 homes. The stainability of Alderholt (and indeed any village community) relies on the viability of community facilities such as the Coop and Post Office, the Churchill Arms and the village hall. The pandemic has accelerated the move to on- line shopping and there is little evidence to show that this will change after the pandemic. Thus, the viability of these village facilities is best

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				ensured by locating new residential developments where the new residents are likely to find using them attractive. DC rightly states to reduce the impact on the climate by locating and designing developments to reduce distances travelled and minimise energy use (Table 3.1, Environment chapter). Option 1 It is questionable whether 300 houses in Option 1 are necessary. It is more than required for organic growth. It is disproportionate and a significant number of permitted developments already exist. A proportionate allocation of the DC housing need based on population is 247 Local Plan Options Report
				homes. It must be noted that there is currently planning permission granted for at least 137 houses on sites where no building has taken place. In particular the Surplus Stores site was first granted permission in 2006 and is still awaiting 89 homes to be built and permission was granted in 2017 for a further 44 homes on the Ringwood Road site. Deliverability clearly is a major issue for larger sites, while many minor sites have been developed during the lifetime of these permissions. While DC is not allowed to reduce its overall calculated housing allocation by these permitted but unbuilt houses, it can

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				recognise that the local housing need is already satisfied. If, however, 300 houses are to be allocated in Alderholt they can and must be on land within walking distance of the existing facilities and thereby contribute to the viability of these facilities. It should not create an unconnected community that is only accessible from Hillbury Road. This will effectively be a dormitory estate. The proposal is vague about community facilities – what exactly are these? A community of 300 houses cannot support any shops – Fordingbridge struggles to keep shops open so a new one in a slightly enlarged Alderholt is pure fantasy given the way retail trends are going. In reality all people in the proposed development will, at best, drive to the Coop creating significant extra car journeys. A round trip to the Coop is at least 3.5 km, however once in their cars residents may prefer to take advantage of the wider shopping opportunities in Fordingbridge (8 km) or Ringwood (16 km). These car journeys would be unnecessary if the Coop was in easy walking distance of the new development. It is therefore contrary to the DC stated aim of reducing distances travelled and fails to mitigate the impact on climate change. The provision of 0.25 ha of employment land could make a difference to the employment in

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				the village, but there is no indication of how many jobs could be created. There is of course a danger that it would just draw new car journeys into the village. The DC documents do not identify any planning issues against the site chosen for Option 1 except that it is less than 5 km from Dorset heathland. However, their analysis fails to acknowledge its unsustainable impact on climate change due to increased car journeys. The documents identify reasons against each of the other sites offered in Aderholt (including being within 5 km of Dorset Heathland); however, such issues appear to be minor or easily solved since all of the sites have been included on Option2. Option 2 Option 2 Option 2 Option 2 is also unrealistic in terms of community facilities. Healthcare services cannot be supported in a community of this size as a minimum of 20,000 patients is the requirement for a new surgery, although some expansion of the part time surgery may be possible. Even when fully built it is unlikely that there will be sufficient children of school age to justify three new schools. The village survey showed an average occupancy rate of 2.2, which would result in about 880 children of school age. It is therefore hard to believe that schools would be provided unless they are also to meet the needs

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
		settlement?		of the growing Fordingbridge community too, but they have a 2 stage system and Dorset has a 3 stage one. It talks of new retail space, but Local Plan Options Report it is unlikely any business will actually want to open given the changing retail landscape. The significant expansion of Fordingbridge offers hope for the shops there, but an expanded Alderholt can only serve to give some support to the existing retail and will be insufficient to encourage new retail developments. It is stated that "The newly expanded settlement should deliver local road improvements as well as improvements on the wider road network". This acknowledges that all access roads and not just the road to Fordingbridge will need improvement. It also appears to say that the development should fund these improvements rather than DC providing the cash in return for providing a solution to the housing allocation issue. A development of this scale cannot be expected to provide sufficient funds to make adequate improvements to all of the access
				roads serving Alderholt and of course there are the added difficulties that 3 out of 4 of these roads are in Hampshire. Climate change necessitates a significant switch to public transport, but this is not realistic for

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				Alderholt. The X3 bus service runs through Fordingbridge, but cannot be rerouted via Alderholt as this would be (a) unacceptable to current users and (b) would require additional buses and drivers to maintain the existing schedule. At best a small shuttle service to Fordingbridge could be introduced to connect with the X3, but this could not properly be described as an attractive proposition. There is no realistic chance of introducing public transport for those needing to travel in any direction other than Fordingbridge and therefore this development would generate significant numbers of additional car journeys. Why is Option 2 silent about the area allocated for employment? If Option 1 has 0.25 ha surely Option 2 will need 2.5 ha? Sustainable Growth of Alderholt The APC planning consultant's report identified that 225 homes would be a proportionate allocation of the EDDC Local Plan requirement. This was broadly in line with the independent A4A analysis. It was also represented a proportionate allocation based on village population. This growth remains the same using DC population data. Two critical issues are (a) how can this growth contribute to the sustainability of the village community and (b) how can it be done in a way

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				that minimises its impact on climate change. NPPF remains the government policy on development planning, however, the weight given to the impacts will inevitably change. The weight given to effects on climate change will be given ever greater weight and by 2023, when it is likely that an Inspector will judge the Local Plan, it is inconceivable that it will be major factor in decision making.
54	There is already planning permission for 192 new homes in Alderholt. I believe that for the foreseeable future there should only be permission granted for up to 100 new homes on top of the 192 already granted. This will still mean a sizeable expansion of the village, but without the need to hugely improve the services to the area.	Significant expansion is ridiculous for Alderholt. It will not be possible to upgrade the roads, water supply and sewerage systems etc. Expansion should take place on brownfield sites in cities and towns first, and then in towns that have decent road and rail links.	As mentioned in previous answer, It will not be possible to upgrade the roads, water supply and sewerage systems etc.	
55	None. There are limited amenities & services available in the village, one small school, no dental or medical practices, one shop & no employment. As there are no public transport links the only way to get anywhere is by car & any	Vastly improved roads, serious investment in infrastructure & amenities all of which would ruin the village	Lack of amenities & public transport links. Unsuitable local roads. Fordingbridge also has limited services which would not cope with any increase in numbers.	Policy ALD2 question 1 Disagree Policy ALD2 question 2 Disagree Policy ALD2 question 3 It is approximately three miles from Alderholt to Fordingbridge (each way) &, a rural track would only be used in good weather & by a limited number of people. It would be not help to reduce current traffic let alone traffic to & from an expanded Alderholt.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	expansion would result in an increase in traffic on already busy roads & many narrow lanes. Alderholt is an unsuitable choice for expansion.			
56				Supports Neighbourhood Plan Committee Response agreed at meeting 3/3/21
57				very poor access roads, highlighting pinch points and that HCC are doing nothing about improving the road to Fordingbridge, insufficient school accommodation and lack of a proper GP surgery
58	The 192 new builds that planning has been approved for are sufficient to satisfy the Dorset plan with out spoiling the existing village environment	The infrastructure of the village would need the following. 1 Access road improvements. 2 New schools. 3 A doctors surgery. 4 A regular bus service.	Any development in Alderholt puts a huge strain on local services and employment opportunities many of which are outside Dorset.	
59	Neither the 300 or the 3000 are suitable for Alderholt. By the time the Plan comes into being in 2023 there will probably aready be more than 300 houses either built or in the pipeline. There are already around 200 houses which have been approved, with other developers preparing to get planning permission for various sites, including 34 affordable dwellings. I think Alderholt will	Alderholt would need all services,major road infrastructure improvement, public transport, massive shift for employment oportunities. I cannot see how there could ever be enough employment for the working population of Alderholt quite frankly. Currently Alderholt is a commuter village, every house has at least 2 cars on average, out of necessity. People work in	The delivery of the 3000 would need significant co-operation and money from Hants CC to upgrade the road infrastructure. At present all roads from the village are narrow country lanes, a good deal of which are in Hampshire. No detail has been provided of potential infrastructure, there are environmental concerns about phosphates entering the River Avon, also impacts on the RAMSAR sites. Many people who live in Alderholt do so because they like village life. This	

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant	Other Comments
	should take place at Alderholt?	expansion, what	expansion of Alderholt?	
		improvements would be		
		needed to improve the self-		
		containment of the		
		settlement?		
	already have more than its fair	areas such as Salisbury,	major expansion will force a lot of	
	share of building without any	Bournemouth, Poole,	people to leave the village they love!	
	additions from the Local Plan	Southampton, Winchester		
60	In regards to option one for 300	I believe this is a non starter.	There are many factors that inhibit the	
	houses and option 2 for 3000	There is no way that the current	delivery of either of these options.	
	houses I can not support either	infrastructure could cope with	Roads, Schools (Dorset have a 3 stage	
	option. While there is a need	any where near this amount of	system and Hampshire a 2 stage system,	
	for some housing for the village,	additional people and cars.	Lack of health care. No sustainable bus	
	certainly affordable, I believe	Dorset Council declared a	service. Lack of amenities	
	that the current amount of	climate emergency and yet they		
	housing that has been approved	are proposing to increase the		
	already for the Alderholt area is	housing where there is little		
	quite sufficient to meet the	employment and little future		
	future needs of the village,	potential for employment		
	which on past history is in the	growth. This means that there		
	region of 15 new houses per	would be considerable increase		
	year and these should be	in traffic and carbon footprint		
	affordable houses for first time	as there is no sustainable		
	buyers to help keep the village	alternative. Alderholt does not		
	alive. Permission for 89 homes	have a bus service that could		
	at the surplus stores site was	marry up with Fordingbridge or		
	granted many years ago and	Ringwood at times required to		
	permission for 44 homes at the	permit people to travel for		
	Gladman site approx 4 years	work or education. In option 1		
	ago, but not a single brick has	it states that there would be a		
	been laid at these sites, and in	requirement of 0.25 ha of		
	respect of the surplus stores	commercial land but no		
	site I believe the council then	mention of what would be		
	withdrew the need for social	required for 3000 houses in		

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
		needed to improve the self-		
		containment of the		
		settlement?		
	houses for that site. Surely the	option 2. I cannot see industry		
	fact that no developer has built	wanting to come to Alderholt		
	on these sites in all this time	with the roads the way they are		
	must show that the need for these size developments are not	anyway. There is currently only a part time surgery and the		
	needed and not deliverable.	number of people occupying		
	needed and not deliverable.	3000 houses would not be		
		sufficient for Alderholt to have		
		a stand alone surgery. The		
		Fordingbridge surgery has		
		difficulties coping at present		
		and the current growth of		
		housing in Fordingbridge will		
		only add to their current issues.		
		In respect of the current road		
		infrastructure the main roads		
		out of Alderholt are within		
		Hampshire and it would be down to them to finance any		
		improvements which naturally		
		they will not do, and the size of		
		the developments will mean		
		that the developers will not be		
		able to finance the required		
		improvements.		
61	The level of growth for	A limited number of	The most viable road upgrade	
	Alderholt should be limited	additional retail facilities	options for improving access to	
	to the development of	would be required to serve	Alderholt are from the New Forest	
	around 200 houses already	Alderholt, but these	District council area and they may	

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	planned and not sought to	shouldn't become a	not agree to the plans. The	
	be expanded any further by	destination for visitors from	environmental impacts on adjacent	
	the Local Plan. Option 1 - The	wider afield as this will	areas of Cranbourne AONB, Avon	
	local plan doesn't take into	further increase traffic	Valley, New Forest and Ringwood	
	account of existing plans for	volumes. More local school	Forest are likely to outweigh the	
	approximately 200 houses to	facilities would be required.	justifications for Alderholt village	
	be built in the village, so with		expansion.	
	option 1 expansion is almost 500. Such a level of increase			
	in population to the area would have a significant and			
	negative impact on traffic			
	and strain on local services			
	which are very limited. More			
	children above Key Stage 1			
	will need to be bused to			
	schools outside the village.			
	Option 2 - An expansion of			
	houses in Alderholt as set			
	out in Option 2 is completely			
	disproportional for this rural			
	area, that would require			
	significant development of			
	road access. This in turn,			
	when combined with the			
	large additional population,			
	would bring a far higher level			

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	of traffic through the area and there will be an associated increase in air and noise pollution Removing the green boundary between housing and Ringwood forest is likely to have negative impact on the ecology of that area Removing the woodland to the north of the B3078 would be detrimental to the character of the village, take away an area popular for exercise, and reduce availability of local natural environment for wildlife.			
62	There is already approval for 192 homes therefore NO further plans for expansion should be implemented unless the Council commit to significant investments in local infrastructure including improved roads, community facilities and provide assurances that wildlife habitats and	For any expansion (not just significant) Alderholt would require a significant investment in improving the local roads in and out of the village, improved public transport options, another school, additional preschool facilities, improved internet connectivity, healthcare facilities, and increase in other community	I do not agree to the proposed development given, even for option 1, there is a failure to meet the council's own objectives that to achieve sustainable development the proposal would require growth in employment, retail, community facilities, highway improvements and schooling would need to be provided alongside housing. There is no 'growth' apart from the provision of these houses!	

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	environment would be protected.	facilities including shops and other business space to create employment opportunities.	Option1 includes little or no improvement to infrastructure or to access roads to and from the village even though they are proposing to increase the population by a third! It also would adversely impact the local wildlife and environment. The development is not necessary and the council has failed to demonstrate the benefits to the community for such a proposal to go ahead.	
63	In my opinion Alderholt is only suitable for small scale growth. The plans for this growth already probably exceed what is needed for the community. Although a large village in terms of population it is lacking many of the things usually associated with this. The access roads are narrow and windy, there is almost no public transport, only a part time surgery and only one shop. The plans already out seem to have 190 houses over 1.5km from the shop. People will not be walking or cycling to shop	It is very difficult to see this working. I could list at least a dozen things but few of them seem to be attainable. Top of the list is roads since employment opportunities and facilities in the village likely to remain very limited. It would make better sense to have major developments close to existing main roads. Bigger school, full-time surgery, better recreational facilities, public transport all needed.	Alderholt has very few facilities, one small shop, part time surgery, secondary children bused to school. Road links are difficult. No major roads very close and narrow rural roads to all destinations. Plan mentions improved transport to Fordingbridge - good idea but how will it be achieved? Fordingbridge is not very large and is already worried about effect of possible growth of Alderholt. Almost no public transport; I am always amazed visiting friends in rural Norfolk or Devon how much better they are served. There is almost no employment in Alderholt and places with large scale employment a fair distance away.	I am an individual. I am commenting by email rather than using the form because I may want to comment on areas not covered by the form but I will try to use a similar format to make consideration easier. My first point is disappointment at the poor publicity about the plan. I know about it because I buy the Alderholt Parish Magazine and I have walked past a poster objecting to the proposals. Since an original meeting over a year ago there has been absolutely nothing from Dorset Council. Others have suggested this is a deliberate attempt to push something through. I am sure this is not the case. Covid has made some things difficult but not basic communication.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
	(too far, dangerous roads, heavy loads). The present policy of infilling has not reached its limit and adds accommodation without needed extra infrastructure. Pleased that plan is for reducing climate change but I cannot see how building houses in an area that already sees most residents commuting helps with this.		Local services would need to be completely revamped. A properly researched plan needs to include details of proposed improved infrastructure. It is not enough to say, 'with luck these things will follow after the houses are built', as I was told at the public meeting. With much improved road links to Fordingbridge and Ringwood a small town is not impossible but such improvements seem far away. I am sure it is cheaper to add to existing small towns or possibly large villages that already have good road links and more facilities than to start from scratch.	7.3.4. At Alderholt, which lies on the outer edge of the Green Belt, options are being considered for major transformatory growth. The level of growth that may be appropriate at Alderholt is not fully understood but it would need to deliver significant employment and facilities to improve the self-containment of the settlement. It is likely that this level of growth would require development within New Forest District. Chambers dictionary does not include transformatory. What a pity this document is not in plain English! I am assuming you mean radically changed. I have read the whole document. It seems that there may be three reasons for Alderholt being considered for major transformatory growth: • it is a larger village • developers have bought plots of land • it is close to New Forest District. These may be reasons for considering radical change but there are other more compelling ones for no major growth (see below). 'What may be appropriate at Alderholt is not fully understood'

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				This is an interesting statement. Not understood by whom? Planners, residents, the people writing this document? 'it would need to deliver significant employment and facilities to improve the self-containment of the settlement' This is pie in the sky. There are no employment opportunities and few facilities and apart from a larger recreation ground and the idea of a cycle trail to Fordingbridge no plans for more. 'It is likely that this level of growth would require development within New Forest District.' Not sure what this means. Dorset Council and New Forest District working together to provide employment is a nice aim but unlikely to happen. Part E: Specific discussion points Vision and Strategic Priorities We will reduce our carbon footprint and seek to enhance our natural environment. Excellent employment opportunities will exist at the towns with sustainable travel opportunities provided to them from the surrounding villages.

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				This is a sound vision. Unfortunately that's all it is, some of the rest of the plan runs counter to these laudable aims. We must be looking to reduce distance and number of journeys. Apart from setting aside areas for possible employment there seems to be little detail or even vision on what these might be. I would like to see improved public transport, especially more regular bus services included in the vision. The large areas of significance for biodiversity will be protected. It is important not to forget the smaller areas. Small local nature reserves play an important part in many other parts of the country. There are some excellent examples in Dorset but not enough. Again it might be included in the vision. Strategic priorities I would have liked to see something on water supply here. it is an important priority. There are already concerns about chemicals in water here in Alderholt which are mentioned elsewhere in the document. Suitable housing

settlement?	
Perhaps something here on limiting more) homes? Spatial Strategy / Settlement Hierar Do the boundaries of the four funct reflect how the area's housing marl economy function? This is an example of the worst form consultation - a complicated questic box. I imagine the functional areas were after a lot of work by a group of spe impossible for anyone to look at as map and make a useful response. However, I do wonder if the areas at short cut - in a similar way that cour boundaries are just for convenience. Affordable housing (proposals to be through detailed viability testing) Do you agree that affordable housing delivered by developments at differ across Dorset? Yes, it seems obvious that the need the same everywhere Do you agree with the suggested te It has taken me a while to find the peaplains what this means. Having do	rchy tional areas kets and n of on and a tick produced cialists. It is mall scale re real or a nty e refined ng should be rent rates may not be enure split? assage which

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				realise that this is another question it is impossible to answer without detailed knowledge. I would prefer people buying their house, or possibly public renting rather than more landlords getting richer.
				Second homes Just wishful thinking but I would like to see the council look to use the method most likely to slow them down.
				Other questions Electric vehicle charging and broadband seem to be necessities though things can change rapidly. Anything is possible in another twenty years. Renewable energy sources should be developed. This is not restricted to the wind farms mentioned. Solar energy both as fields and individual roofs is possible. On a similar subject insulation/energy efficiency of new buildings could be included in the plan. To the final section prefer not to say to all. Appalled that most of them (including race, sexuality) are still considered suitable to ask, and difficult to see any relevance to the plan.
				A neighbour has just told me that surveying is taking place today for new dwellings very close

Res No	Q1 - What level of small scale growth and major expansion should take place at Alderholt?	Q2 - If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?	Q3 - Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?	Other Comments
				to me. If correct it is another instance of finding things out by accident. Dorset Council needs to be much more open if it wants communities to support its policies. Interesting that I started my email with a similar observation!