

## Appendix '2'

### Recommendation from the Neighbourhood Plan Committee

To agree the response to be submitted regarding the Dorset Council Local Plan Consultation January 2021.

Below are responses in blue to the questions raised in Volume 1 and specifically to development in Alderholt in Volume 2 Chapter 18 of the DC Local Plan.

The Chapter 18 response is based on that agreed by the Neighbourhood Plan Committee on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2021, and has taken into account responses submitted by the public prior to this meeting.

Questions from <https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/planning-buildings-land/planning-policy/dorset-council-local-plan/the-plan/pdfs/dclp-jan-2021-dorsetcouncillocalplan-vol1.pdf>

Page	Question
	<b>DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</b>
18	<b>Vision and Strategic Priorities</b>
	Do you have any comments on the Vision and Strategic Priorities
	The vision is overarching and is well supported by the Strategic Objectives, but although flood risk is highlighted, there is no mention of the ever-increasing problem of phosphates with regard to eutrophication and its ecological impact. In particular this affects Alderholt.
20	<b>The housing requirement and the need for employment land in Dorset</b>
	1. Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
28	<b>Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy</b>
	1: Do the boundaries of the four functional areas reflect how the area's housing markets and economy function? Yes 2: Is the distribution of housing between and within the functional areas appropriate? Yes 3: Do you agree with the proposed hierarchy of settlements? Yes, as it promotes development where there is current infrastructure that can be expanded to meet the demand. The tier 3 and 4 levels have very limited infrastructure that isn't able to support development beyond infilling to meet local needs over the plan period. 4: Do you agree that there is a need to amend the green belt to enable development? Yes
29	<b>Green belt review</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes, as development must be sustainable and accessible and by relinquishing some small areas of Greenbelt this can be achieved at the larger tier 1 and 2 settlements.

	<p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
32	<p><b>Q: Growth in the south eastern Dorset functional area</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes, DEV2 policy encompasses all the preferred options outlined in the accompanying text that are achievable within the life of the Local Plan.</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
33	<p><b>Q: Growth in the central Dorset functional area</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
34	<p><b>Q: Growth in the northern Dorset functional area</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
35	<p><b>Q: Growth in the western Dorset functional area</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
37	<p><b>Q: Development at villages with development boundaries in rural Dorset</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns? Dev6 policy wording should also refer to the Figure 2.4 for total clarity.</p>
39	<p><b>Q: Development outside local plan and neighbourhood plan development boundaries in rural Dorset</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p>

	3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns? Policy Dev7 could also specifically list fish farming at the first bullet point.
43	<b>Q: Reuse of buildings outside settlement boundaries</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
51	<b>Q: Meeting the housing need</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
55	<b>Q: Meeting the employment need</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
58	<b>Q: Neighbourhood Planning</b>
	1: Do you have any comments on the approach to establishing housing targets for Neighbourhood Plans? No
	<b>ENVIRONMENT &amp; CLIMATE CHANGE</b>
60	<b>Q: Climate change</b>
	1: What else could the local plan do to mitigate climate change and help people adapt to its effects? Any ideas?
64	<b>Q: Green infrastructure: Strategic approach</b>
	1. Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes except for strengthening point V of policy Env1 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns? Require the wording "long-term" in point V of policy Env1 be strengthened.
76	<b>Q: Habitats and species</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?

80	<b>Q: Biodiversity and net gain</b>
	<p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes except for point IV of policy Env3</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns? Point IV of policy Env3 should include the 30 years provision for monitoring and management rather than just "long-term".</p>
84	<b>Q: Landscape</b>
	<p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
95	<b>Q: Heritage assets</b>
	<p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
97	<b>Q: Geodiversity</b>
	<p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
101	<b>Q: Achieving high quality design</b>
	<p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes, but policy Env7 should reference the details in Figure 3.5</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns? Include in policy Env7 the wording or at least reference the text in Figure 3.5</p>
104	<b>Landscape and townscape context</b>
	<p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes – but see below.</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns? Policy Env8 refers to density in point 111 but doesn't expand upon the importance of amenity space referenced in para 3.9.7. which should be included.</p>

106	<b>Q: Achieving high levels of environmental performance</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns? Policy Env9 appears rather weak whilst trying to encompass the text within paras 3.10.1 to 3.10.8.
107	<b>Q: Shop fronts and advertisements</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
111	<b>Q: Amenity</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
113	<b>Q: Pollution control</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns? No mention is made to high phosphate levels and the potential eutrophication of rivers eg Avon in Hampshire.
119	<b>Q: Flood Risk</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
124	<b>Q: Sustainable drainage systems (SUDs)</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
127	<b>Q: Land instability</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes

	3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
130	<b>Q: New built development in Coastal Change Management Areas</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
132	<b>Q: Coastal Erosion</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
	<b>HOUSING</b>
135	<b>Q: Housing mix</b>
	1. Do you agree that major residential development sites should provide at least 20% of the homes as accessible and adaptable homes to meet the needs of the elderly and less mobile? Yes
141	<b>Q: Affordable housing</b>
	1: Do you agree that affordable housing should be delivered by developments at different rates across Dorset? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested tenure split? Yes
144	<b>Q: Affordable housing exception sites</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns? Policy Hous3 point 3 should read the site is small scale with the design and character of the scheme appropriate to the location and size of the existing settlement; and
146	<b>Q: Community care hubs</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
148	<b>Q: Specialist purpose built accommodation</b>
	1: Do you agree that specialist purpose built accommodation as extra care should provide affordable housing? Yes 2: Are there any practical limitations to this approach? 3: Are there other approaches that could be taken to deliver

	for those who cannot afford to pay market rates?
149	<b>Q: Housing for complex dementia and nursing care</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
151	<b>Q: Self build and custom build housing</b>
	1: Do you think the council should identify sites for self / custom build housing? No 2: Can you suggest any additional sites which could be allocated for this purpose? No
154	<b>Q: Second homes</b>
	1: What approach do you think the Council should explore to address the pockets of high second home ownership? As this is a very localised issue, any policy to address this situation needs to be undertaken at the lowest level and thus an approach of "principal residence" through neighbourhood plans is the best solution.
156	<b>Q: Isolated homes in the countryside</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
160	<b>Q: Occupational dwellings</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
164	<b>Q: Other residential development outside development boundaries</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes – but see below 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns? Surely the guidance of a maximum of 50% larger which has been omitted from policy HOUS9 point 1 should be included.
167	<b>Q: The requirement for traveller sites</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes

	3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
170	<b>Q: Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople site allocations</b>
	1: Do you have any comments on the proposed site allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling showpeople? No
172	<b>Q: Sites for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
	<b>ECONOMY</b>
182	<b>Q: Protection of key employment sites</b>
	1: Should any sites be added or removed from the list of Key Employment Sites in Appendix 6? No
186	<b>Q: Protection of other employment sites</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
192	<b>Q: Town Centre hierarchy</b>
	1: Do you agree with the classification of the centres in the proposed hierarchy? Yes 2: Are there any additional centres that should be included? No
194	<b>Q: Town centre impact assessments</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
197	<b>Q: Management of centres, primary shopping areas and markets</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
203	<b>Q: Supporting vibrant and attractive tourism</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes



	3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
204	<b>Q: Loss of tourism accommodation</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
207	<b>Q: Caravan and camping sites</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes but no mention has been made of "shepherds huts" 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns? Reference to Shepherds Huts has been omitted from all of the text.
209	<b>Q: New agricultural buildings</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
211	<b>Q: Diversification of land based rural businesses</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?
216	<b>Q: Equestrian development</b>
	1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes 2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes 3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns? Text 5.12.11 should mention lighting, and in 5.12.14 which Policy HOUS ?  Policy Econ11 1v second bullet should read ....built of materials that complement the landscape and that are capable of ..... In this way the materials used in a rural environment can be controlled.
	<b>COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE</b>
223	<b>Q: Making sure new development makes suitable provision for community infrastructure</b>

	<p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
226	<p><b>Q: New or improved local community buildings and structures</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns? Text 6.3.4 last sentence .....may be permitted where its location is accessible to the community it supports.</p>
229	<p><b>Q: Retention of community buildings and structures</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
235	<p><b>Q: Recreation, sports facilities and open space</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
236	<p><b>Q: Hot food takeaway</b></p> <p>1: Should the council look to restrict hot food takeaways around areas where children and young people congregate? Yes</p>
238	<p><b>Q: The provision of education and training facilities</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
240	<p><b>Q: Creating a safe, efficient and low carbon transport network</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
242	<p><b>Q: Parking standards in new development</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p>

	<p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
244	<p><b>Q: Provision of infrastructure for electric and other low emission vehicles.</b></p> <p>Do you agree with this proposal Yes</p>
246	<p><b>Q: Low carbon and renewable energy development</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
247	<p><b>Q: Wind energy</b></p> <p>1: The locations identified as opportunities for larger scale wind developments are shown on Figure 6.5 and Figure 6.6. Do you support the principle of allocating any of the areas for wind turbines? Yes</p> <p>2: Are there any planning issues that would need to be resolved to enable community backing to be secured?</p>
251	<p><b>Q: Small scale wind energy development</b></p> <p>1: Do you agree with the suggested approach and what it is trying to achieve? Yes</p> <p>2: Do you agree with the suggested wording? Yes</p> <p>3: How could the paragraph / policy / section / chapter be amended to reflect your concerns?</p>
253	<p><b>The provision of utilities services infrastructure</b></p> <p>1: The plan requires the provision of full fibre broadband connections to each home on major development sites. Do you agree with this proposal? Yes</p>

Page	Question
7	<b>Q: Green Belt</b>
	1. Do you agree that there is a need to amend the green belt to enable development? Yes
15	<b>Q: Land south of Blandford Road (<i>Corfe Mullen</i>)</b>
112	<b>Q: Options for growth at Alderholt (<i>Alderholt</i>)</b>
	<p>1. What level of growth should take place at Alderholt?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alderholt is defined in 2.3.14 an fig 2.4 as being a Tier 3 village which therefore has a development boundary, and is considered appropriate for small scale infilling to meet local needs. Para 2.6.6 says that an option of significant growth at Alderholt has been considered but this would lead to a significant improvement in the self-containment of the village to enable it to be considered sustainable development. "Significant Growth" would make Alderholt roughly the size of Fordingbridge 3 miles away or Shaftesbury. These towns have the necessary infrastructure to support the scale of development, Alderholt has none, and such development at Alderholt would not meet the interpretation of policy Dev6.</li> <li>• Currently there is planning permission passed for 192 new houses in the village and it is our view that this number would satisfy local demand during the period of this plan with only a small number of additional homes added over the period of the plan. This is borne out by the 2017 village survey which shows that 90% of the respondents wanted less than 200 new dwellings. So, Local demand can be achieved by building the 192 houses already approved with further infill contained within the existing village envelope, and represents an 18% increase on the current level of housing in the parish</li> <li>• 18.2.4 Alderholt Option 1 suggests another 300 houses for Alderholt. With the 192 planning permissions already granted and some infill this would create over 500 new houses. This would create over 650 new commuters (40% increase) with nearly 400 of them travelling over 20Km to work.</li> <li>• The suggestion that Alderholt could be increased in size by 40% (Option 1) with very little in the way of additional infrastructure seems to go against the very heart of the principles underlying the document such as from Fig 3.1 "We will take actions to minimise the impact of climate change including minimising flood risk and to reduce the impact on the climate by locating and designing developments to reduce distances travelled and minimise energy use".</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We note that Lytchett Matravers which is of a similar though slightly larger size than</li> <li>• Alderholt is suggested to receive only 200 houses, and indeed the major town in Dorset, Weymouth has a suggested increase in housing of only 550.</li> <li>• One asks if the 300 additional dwellings in Option 1 at 2.28 people per dwelling as per the 2011 Census giving an increase of 684 people which equates to a 23% increase in population is of itself sustainable?</li> <li>• Any further growth in Alderholt is in complete contravention to the Strategic Priorities as laid out in Vol 1 Strategy and Topics, Pages 27 and 28 and the statements that say "How the Local Plan will meet this Priority". Building in Alderholt will not help towards any of these priorities. Alderholt has no public transport and no larger towns where employment and services are located are within a 15 minutes' drive.</li> <li>• Advice currently stated by Hampshire County Council and New Forest District Council is most clear in the 2020-2026 NFDC Future Plan that facilities are at capacity.</li> <li>• If Alderholt was to be identified for significant expansion, what improvements would be needed to improve the self-containment of the settlement?</li> <li>• 18.3.4 a new link road to replace Ringwood Road is suggested, but Major Roads improvement would be required to link to the A338 at Harbridge, the A31 at Ringwood and on the B3078 towards Cranborne and down to Verwood. The first two of these would require work in unlikely collaboration with Hampshire Roads Authority. The nearby town of Fordingbridge has development plans for 1700 new homes in Hampshire and they are against large development in Alderholt as it would severely overcrowd the town adversely. Please refer to the responses from Fordingbridge Town Council and The New Forest District Council both of whom are against any major development in Alderholt.</li> <li>• Further detail regarding Highways:- Highways: Route 1. B3078. Route 2. Verwood. Route 3. Harbridge/Ringwood. Route 4. Sandleheath. Correspondence from Dorset Council Highways Section: Noted that funding will be limited, hence that no provision for major Road links is currently under consideration with any provisional finance for the future. Information issued (Ref: Dorset Highways Transport Policy Manager). Hampshire Council likewise have no plans for any future improvement scheme to the B3078. Route 1. B3078: This road is of a rural nature, narrow with many places reduced to single width only. Two difficult 90 degree bends exist within Alderholt, along with dangerous narrows towards Fordingbridge. Throughout</li> </ul>
---

the route to Fordingbridge narrow conditions exist, with numerous extreme restrictions throughout the historic Town's listed buildings. The B3078 route to Cranborne likewise has many narrow road widths, acute bends, single vehicle passage type streets with much negotiating around numerous parked vehicles at any time of the day or night.

Route 2. Alderholt/Verwood route which commences direction at Cripplestyle is a rural type road with two 90 degree bends, plus many narrow single width areas. (Traffic Data not available from Dorset Council for this route).

Route 3. Village route via Harbridge towards Ringwood is extremely rural enduring many traffic side lane junctions with poor visibility and narrow single track sections. (No Traffic data available from HCC).

Route 4. This route north towards Sandleheath has restrictive bridges (Old railway Bridge and Mill Bridge). Railway Bridge height restriction and the Mill Bridge width and weight, the route throughout has many narrows, blind bends of rural nature making it unsuitable for increase traffic.

B3078 Traffic Flow Data: (Fordingbridge Road, Alderholt) Issued by Dorset Council for 2020/21. Note: Current Dorset Council advice that these flow levels are down by 28% due to Covid-19 effect.

Daily 2020 Vehicle flow volumes.

Average 4047 (28% Adjusted 5180)

Annual 2020 Vehicle flows volumes.

Average 1,477,155 (28% adjusted 1,890,700)

- New schools at all tiers would be required in Alderholt. At present pupils from Alderholt are bused to Burgate, Wimborne and Cranborne. The Burgate schools in Hampshire are likely to be oversubscribed as the development in Fordingbridge takes place precluding Alderholt pupils from attending or necessitating further expansion.
- Local Health provision would be required. At present most villagers are registered with either Fordingbridge or Cranborne Surgery. Both have difficulty in getting Doctors and Fordingbridge, in particular, is concerned whether they can meet the planned growth in Fordingbridge without adding extra pressure with development in Alderholt.
- At present we have a locally funded occasional bus service (3 days per week) which runs outside normal travel to work hours. To be sustainable we would require an 18 hour per day regular bus service to Fordingbridge and Ringwood seven days per week.
- Service Provision. This would require upgrading our water supply and drainage. Added to this would be a requirement for better gas & electricity supply.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alderholt currently enjoys poor broadband connection AND poor mobile phone receivership. More housing just makes more usage and even poorer reception until major work is carried out.</li> <li>• Most residents of working age need to travel long distances to their employment which is often not only outside the village but, usually, outside the county. We should not be developing housing to suit employers in neighbouring Counties.</li> <li>• We currently have only two retail outlets in the village – a Co-op and a 2nd hand children’s wear shop. There is also Wolvercroft Nurseries which not only serves the village but attracts customers from fairly long distances. Development in Alderholt would require significant new retail premises selling a wide range of merchandise.</li> </ul> <p>3. Are there any factors that may inhibit the deliverability of significant expansion of Alderholt?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obtaining any help from Hampshire County Council or New Forest District Council would be highly unlikely due to their commitment to their own plans to enlarge Fordingbridge. This is included in their County Plan and would be unable to cooperate with Dorset until that plan has run its course!</li> <li>• There are more sustainable areas totally within Dorset that would be less expensive, kinder to the environment and closer to established infrastructure (road and rail) and employment – e.g. Dorchester and Crossways.</li> <li>• We would only get a doctor’s surgery when the population exceeds 20,000. Large scale expansion would add intolerable pressure on both the Fordingbridge and Cranborne surgeries to such an extent that it could well cost lives!</li> <li>• The land north of Station Road houses several protected species and should not be made available for development.</li> <li>• Both options 1 &amp; 2 contravene Dorset’s own climate control and toxic emissions regulations. Section 1.3 states the need to lower greenhouse gases (GHGs) which cause global warming, and that the transport sector produces 28% of net GHGs emissions. The local plan will help reduce the need to travel through its role in managing the location of development and encourage the use of public transport. Section 2 Development Strategy, the Strategic Priority Climate and Ecological Priorities says that you will minimise the impact of climate change by designing and locating developments to reduce distances travelled and focus travel on active travel and public transport options.</li> </ul>
---

1.3.14 says that the former East Dorset had the highest number of commuters in the country (79.5%). The 2011 Census shows Alderholt with 1.3 workers per household of which 80.4% commute, 60% of them travelling over 20Km to work.

- The level of funding required to supply the infrastructure for option 2 renders this development unaffordable and unsustainable. The impact it would have on Fordingbridge is not just “likely” but indisputable.
- As Alderholt lies within the catchment of the River Avon Special Area of Conservation (Salisbury to Christchurch) any development would have an adverse impact due to the potential eutrophication of the river by increased phosphate levels as a result of development. The Sustainability Appraisal for Alderholt (pages 145 and 146 cite this issue recommending that any new development must be phosphate and nitrogen neutral. We understand Wessex Water are very concerned about the Fordingbridge developments currently underway which will create maximum capacity on the sewage plant system, without even considering any increased harmful impact further development in Alderholt would have.
- Requirement for extensive areas of SANG to mitigate against adverse impacts on the Dorset and New Forest protected heathlands.
- If mineral extraction at Purple Haze is approved, there will be increased HGV pressure on this inadequate local road system.
- The area identified as ALD1 includes the Bonfire Hill SNCI and is adjacent to land that in a recent survey for PA 3/21/0046 has shown foraging and commuting corridors for 8 species of bat and supports an exceptional reptile population.

#### CONCLUSIONS

We believe that the vision of self-containment for Alderholt is unrealistic. Neither of the 2 options in the consultation document is sustainable, deliverable or required and we should request that an option “3” be considered where future development during the period of the plan is limited to those houses already planned with any further approved infill within the existing village envelope.

We support the policies for small (1 to 10 dwellings) rural exception sites for “affordable housing”

We attach the report produced by Jo Witherden (Alderholt and the East Dorset Local Plan Review – February 2020) which contains background information supporting this rejection of both options 1 and 2.