



## **Lytchett Minster and Upton Town Council's (LMUTC) Response to Dorset Local Plan Options Consultation**

The Town Council considered the Local Plan Options Consultation Document at its meeting on 21 October 2025 and agreed the following response to the consultation.

### **Introduction:**

Our overall concern is that those opportunity sites identified in the parish are significant and disproportionate.

LMUTC is not averse to further development within its settlement area. We feel it could help the economic vibrancy of the town and hopefully at the same time provide much needed affordable housing. Our concern is that when development takes place it is in the right place, well planned, well built, with significant social or affordable housing and that infrastructure, facilities and services are adequate to support the developments.

We'd like to highlight from the beginning that the parish of Lytchett Minster and Upton comprises one community under the umbrella of the Town Council, with the residents and businesses in Lytchett Minster village having long-standing links and close working relations with the town of Upton, as do the smaller communities of Organford and Slepe. More often than not Upton is mistakenly considered to be part of Poole and the BCP conurbation, which is not the case, and is not the view of the community.

LMUTC would like to submit the following comments which incorporates local wide knowledge and feedback from residents. These comments should be read in conjunction with the Site Specific Comments at Appendix 1 and comments on the main consultation document questions at Appendix 2.

### **1. Housing Allocation:**

We believe that the housing target set for Dorset is arbitrary, inequitable and undeliverable. It fails to tackle the real housing crisis of affordability.

The number of houses proposed for the small village of Lytchett Minster is far higher than in other parts of Dorset, placing an unfair share of development on a single community. Lytchett Minster would see a population rise by a factor of more than 12, not including the additional village extension proposed at Bere Farm (East)<sup>1</sup>. This level of allocation is effectively the subsummation of the village and creation of a new super housing estate, without the proper planning, infrastructure, or services that such a settlement requires. Concentrating development here appears inconsistent with the Local Plan's vision of fairness, and the importance of the distinct character of Dorset's settlements.

The allocations together in the parish amounts to 5,446 houses plus a Gypsy and Traveller site – a new town in all but name. Yet the sites have only been considered individually, not their combined impacts on matters such as traffic, flood risk, schools, health services, and ecology. There is an expectation at this

---

<sup>1</sup> neither LA/LMUP/004,011 Bere Farm (East) or LA/LMUP/001,005,009,010 Bere Farm (West) are included in these figures

stage (Stage B<sup>2</sup>) that the sustainability process will evaluate the likely effects of the plan and its alternatives. There are no preferred options and reasonable alternatives specified, nor has any attempt been made to assess the cumulative impacts in order to properly consider ways of mitigating the adverse effects.

Such figures are also undeliverable given national labour shortages and rising material costs. The building industry in Dorset has never sustained this level of growth, and its ability to make such a step-change is without foundation. Unrealistic targets will inevitably mean that the Local Plan defaults on its five-year housing supply, which will then invite speculative applications and the NPPF's presumption in favour of development, undermining the plan-led system. Paragraph 36 of the NPPF requires plans to be "justified, effective and deliverable". We argue that this quantum of development fails such tests.

## **2. Infrastructure**

The Town Council also wishes to stress the importance of all aspects of social infrastructure including education provision, health provision, utilities infrastructure, sports and cultural facilities and other community facilities. This is underpinned by the NPPF as follows:

- Paragraph 77 – "The supply of a large number of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development,.....provided they are well located and designed and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities (including a genuine choice of transport modes)."

Even if individual land parcels seem modest, the cumulative impact of over 4,000 dwellings around Upton and Lytchett Minster would overwhelm roads, health services and schools. Such infrastructure needs to be a key part of the development, in most cases delivered before related elements are built or occupied.

### **i. Healthcare**

GP surgeries and health services, such as dentists, are already overstretched in the town. No new provision is proposed, and there is no evidence to show that the local practices have been directly approached or consulted on whether they could expand, or whether what is proposed would be sufficient to support a new practice. The Council has had informal discussions with the Adam Practice who is confident that it could recruit sufficient staff for a new surgery in the town.

### **ii. Schools**

The Town prides itself on having high performing and popular schools. The secondary school and sixth form, Lytchett Minster School, is in a rural setting and is managed by Dorset Council. Its feeder schools are Upton Infant, Upton Junior and Lytchett Matravers Primary. Its location is very close to the opportunity sites in Lytchett Minster. It's currently at full capacity with little feasible space to expand. Currently all the local schools accept pupils from the BCP area. In the case of Lytchett Minster School, this is a third of pupils. When all the schools are full, they will give priority to those who live in the town (including those living in future new developments). This means that Dorset Council will need to work with BCP Council on admissions.

The plan acknowledges the need for expansion but provides no secured land or funding. Neither Upton Infant nor Upton Junior have additional land to expand on. It is extremely disappointing that at this stage there is no clear statement on proposals for education provision. Road safety for students accessing the secondary school is already an issue and a serious accident involving a student has occurred in the last year.

### **iii. Roads / Travel**

The proposed site allocations would place significant additional pressure on local roads in Upton and Lytchett Minster, particularly on the A35, which forms the principal east-west route through South East Dorset. The A35 is a key economic corridor, carrying not only local traffic but also

---

<sup>2</sup> NPPG Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 11-013-20140306

regional freight and commuter flows. The A35/A351 corridor is already at, and often beyond, capacity. Currently, any incident on the Hamworthy bridges or Baker's Arms roundabout gridlocks Upton.

The flood risk associated with Poole Harbour and its tributaries, including the Sherford River and watercourses bodies flowing from the ridge on which Lytchett Matravers sites, that includes a significant section of the A35 around the Baker's Arms roundabout, are also relevant. Development in this area may increase the flood risk (and associated traffic disruption), and flooding will make connections to the A35 difficult.

Without significant investment in transport and related infrastructure improvements, which have not been identified or costed at this stage, additional housing in Lytchett Minster and Upton would increase congestion, exacerbate safety risks, potentially exacerbate flood risks, and reduce the reliability of this strategic route. Development of the level suggested will inevitably increase vehicle usage, but again there has been no attempt to quantify this. However, it is clear that the vision in the draft Dorset & BCP Local Transport Plan to increase public transport and cycle routes will not negate the number of increased vehicles on the roads. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF requires Dorset Council to evidence that "any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach". This costing should also be on the basis of the improvements being provided in advance and provide assurance that Dorset Council could cope with the additional maintenance responsibilities and the additional costs that come with this.

#### **iv. Employment – economic sustainability.**

There is no evidence of new allocated sites for economic opportunities. The ones highlighted are existing ones. Apart from the Bere Farm proposals, none of the other sites in the parish are above the suggested 300 homes threshold for mixed use. This will inevitably lead to more commuting/reliance on vehicles.

#### **v. Other facilities**

There are very limited local services in the village of Lytchett Minster, although there is a secondary school and pre-school, and a range of local meeting venues / recreation areas. There is no primary school, no local library, post office, local convenience store, GP surgery or pharmacy. There is a small business estate off Huntick Road (the Courtyard Craft Centre, albeit that this does not accommodate general industry, and could one day be repurposed for residential under permitted development rights by the landowner). The walking distance from the centre of the village (measured from the parish church) to the edge of Upton is well over the accepted 10 minute or 800m walking distance, and over 2km when measured to Upton's centre.

There is no clear vision as to how or where or what facilities, services and employment opportunities are proposed. National planning policy references the need to "plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments" (para 98) and includes that this is specific to supporting the rural economy (para 88d).

### **3. Environmental**

#### **i. Biodiversity & Ecology**

Lytchett Minster and Upton is in close proximity or home to a number of areas of local, national and international importance for nature conservation which are ecologically sensitive:

- Lytchett Bay View – this is a 9 acre site, owned and managed by the Town Council. It is classified as a 'Site of Nature Conservation Interest' and is a Local Nature Reserve.

- Upton Heath – a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and an internationally important heathland (Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and RAMSAR site).
- Holton and Sandford Heaths – another SSSI, also a National Nature Reserve, and an internationally important heathland with SAC, SPA and RAMSAR status.
- Poole Harbour – another SSSI, Europe’s largest natural harbour and internationally important as a SAC, SPA and RAMSAR site.
- Upton Wood – situated on the eastern edge of Upton near Upton Country Park. The woodland contains a mixture of broadleaf and coniferous trees, with open glades, streams and a small part of heathland which was once part of Upton Heath.

All identified opportunity sites lie within the Poole Harbour Catchment and Dorset Heathlands 5km Zone. The Dorset Heathlands require mitigation in relation to both the adverse impacts of any net increase in urban pressures on the heaths as a result of additional residential development, and to address the adverse effect of airborne nitrogen as a result of increased traffic. Poole Harbour requires mitigation in relation to the increase in wastewater and related impact on nutrient neutrality, as well as mitigating the impact of additional visitors to the Harbour that can cause disturbance to protected birds. Development cannot go ahead unless it can be shown that the Local Plan will not have an "adverse effect on the integrity" of the European site.

In the Poole Harbour Recreation Planning Framework 2019-2024, Dorset Council recognises that ‘additional residential development is likely to have a significant effect’ on the harbour, and specifically states:

*‘Natural England advises that the cumulative effect of further residential and tourism development in a defined ‘Poole Harbour Recreation Zone’ would have a significant effect upon the Poole Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Site. In particular, population growth will increase recreational activities in and around the harbour causing direct or indirect disturbance to protected birds. Disturbance can be defined as any human activity that influences a bird’s behaviour or survival. Studies show that public access in and around the harbour, and various forms of recreational activities can cause disturbance, e.g. boats, walkers, dogs, bait digging, etc.’*

All of the important areas listed above are already subject to nitrogen deposition, recreation pressure and habitat loss. Additional development will exacerbate this impact and it is questionable whether the NPPF requirement (para 192) to provide measurable net biodiversity gain and protection of irreplaceable habitats can be met.

Many sites contain or are adjacent to ancient woodland, hedgerows, ponds, and habitats for protected species (otters, bats, great crested newts). The NPPF (para 180i) affords ancient woodland the highest protection, equivalent to SSSIs. Development should be refused unless wholly exceptional circumstances exist, but the draft Local Plan has not demonstrated such circumstances, nor shown application of the mitigation hierarchy.

The Town Council would request that a much more robust and transparent strategy is set out in relation to green infrastructure across the area, setting out how and where the necessary mitigations will be achieved, and how these will result in a more robust network of wildlife sites and corridors and public access to nature. There appears to be little ‘joining up’ with the draft version of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and map published earlier this year, and Natural England’s standards for accessible greenspace (and requirements in relation to the release of Green Belt), and well as the mitigation elements outlined above.

With a sympathetic approach, a green and pleasant environmentally biodiverse ecology and countryside can be sustained – biodiversity with incredible benefits for residents building attractive, harmonious developments with trees, parks and natural open spaces which creates a place where people want to live and relax. Including spaces for nature in general and appropriate

access for recreation are not barriers to development, growth and social sustainability but should encourage community pride if they are seen to be integral to development.

## ii. **Green Belt:**

All major allocations lie within the South East Dorset Green Belt and almost all the opportunity sites identified for the town are on Green Belt land. The extent of Green Belt loss through potential opportunity sites in our area is not quantified, but altogether the sites cover in excess of 480 hectares (1186 acres) equivalent to 674 football pitches. Section 156 of the NPPF states that for Green Belt to be released for major development, it must meet all of the 'Golden Rules', one of which being 'necessary improvements to local and national infrastructure'. LMUTC has serious concerns around the plausibility in this rule being met adequately for those opportunity sites identified within the Town Council area.

The NPPF (paras 145–147) states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" – and this can include instances where an authority cannot meet its housing needs through other means. However, this is then caveated by the requirement to demonstrate that it "has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development" including the use of brownfield sites, higher density development in locations well-served by public transport, and the potential for neighbouring authorities to meet the identified need. It then goes on to state that in "reviewing Green Belt boundaries, the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should determine whether a site's location is appropriate" with reference to the section on promoting sustainable transport. Dorset Council has not clearly demonstrated what other reasonable options have been considered, and how the Green Belt sites would be in locations that are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.

Better alternatives exist, such as building up and not building out. The NPPF promotes the reuse of previously developed land and urban intensification before greenfield release (paras 119-121). It is LMUTC's view that brownfield capacity and gentle densification of existing towns and cities provide a more sustainable route to meet housing need while protecting rural Dorset.

Per planning/spatial policy, Upton forms part of the wider Poole–Bournemouth conurbation. The land between Upton and Lytchett Minster/Lytchett Matravers serves the Green Belt purpose of restricting urban sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Allocations to the east of Lytchett Minster would clearly lead to urban sprawl, eroding the Green Belt break between the conurbation and the villages of Lytchett Minster and Lytchett Matravers. It would effectively create a continuous conurbation from Lytchett Matravers and Minster to New Milton via Poole, Bournemouth and Christchurch. This would also be true in a northerly direction towards Wimborne, Colehill, Ferndown and Ringwood. Swathes of Green Belt and countryside would be lost for which 'SANGS' cannot compensate, to say nothing of the impact upon wildlife. A minimum requirement would be a substantial green gap between Lytchett Minster and Matravers not only for wildlife but to retain their distinct character and also for the aesthetic impact upon residents and, for some, their mental health.

To quote from 'The Vision for Dorset' section of the Local Plan: "The character of rural areas will be maintained and enhanced where opportunities arise. The area's rich heritage, hedgerows, trees and the character of the landscape will be respected where development takes place. The large areas of significance for biodiversity will be protected and real enhancements to the natural environment will be realised, guided by the Local Nature Recovery Strategy." LMUTC feels that this vision appears to be at odds with the opportunity sites put forward and it is questionable whether the allocations comply with national Green Belt policy.

In general, the proposals to build on Green Belt do not meet the following paragraphs of the NPPF:

- Para 9 “guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area”
- Para 143a “to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas”.
- Para 143c “safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”.
- Para 187a “protecting and enhancing valued landscapes”.
- Para 187b “recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside”.

### iii. Flood Risk

Several allocations lie on or near watercourses and flood paths. One site was previously identified for wetland restoration to manage flooding and biodiversity — this opportunity would be lost if built upon.

Lytchett Minster is historically prone to flooding, with events occurring almost annually. Unlike other areas of Dorset, climate change modelling has not been applied to allocations around Lytchett Minster. Examples of the flooding are illustrated in this video: [Lytchett Minster Flooding](#)

The flooding stems from both surface water and fluvial sources, affecting:

- The B3067 corridor from the Bakers Arms roundabout past Orchard Close.
- Watery Lane near St Peter's Finger and the Rugby Club.
- Post Green Road, particularly where it joins Dorchester Road.

These areas are particularly vulnerable due to their low-lying nature and slow drainage, especially when tides prevent efficient water outflow through the culverts under the A35 into Lytchett Bay. This situation is made worse by consistently high ground water levels. Any development on the land directly north of Dorchester Road or behind Ashbrook Walk would likely increase surface water runoff, exacerbating flood risks to existing properties.

The Jacobs Report (Lytchett Minster Flood Risk Study IMSW002130), commissioned by the Environment Agency in 2016, remains one of the most comprehensive assessments of flood risk in the area. The Environment Agency had advised that this report has since been updated and its predictions remain fully aligned with the Agency's latest data.

Key findings include:

- *“It is unfortunate that the village lies at a location that is at risk from more than one source of flooding and which is particularly sensitive to a range of combined events.”*
- *“Whilst there is an existing risk from ordinary watercourses and tidal flooding, the impact of climate change is expected to change the balance, such that tidal flooding becomes the principal source of flood risk.”*
- *“The risk from tidal sources starts to increase significantly post-2030, and within the next hundred years, there will be significant numbers of properties at risk from tidal flood events as frequent as the 1-in-1-year flood.”*

Crucially, the report also states:

*“The available hydraulic modelling and mapping does not take into account flooding from all sources at the same time and therefore provides an underestimate of the flood risks in Lytchett Minster.”*

Further concerns regarding the flood risk are as follows:

- Local conditions include groundwater flooding, not addressed in the Sustainability Appraisal.
- Developers (e.g. Bloor Homes) have not undertaken borehole testing.
- Reliance on private management companies for flood mitigation and open space (funded by annual resident charges) is not a sustainable or equitable approach.

- Flooding of the A35 and other arterial routes threatens regional economic resilience, not only local traffic. This raises wider implications for Dorset's infrastructure and economy which the Local Plan has not addressed.
- It is unclear whether the allocations pass the sequential and exception tests required by national flood risk policy.
- Any mitigation measures (e.g. SUDS, balancing ponds, or attenuation systems) would need to be maintained indefinitely by Dorset Council, placing a long-term burden on public resources.
- There is currently no viable mitigation for rising sea levels, other than major infrastructure like tidal barriers – such as the one now being constructed around Holes Bay. These would prevent effective drainage of fluvial and surface water until tides recede, and sluices can be opened.

Therefore, the proposed sites for Lytchett Minster and Upton are unlikely to meet the NPPF stipulation (paras 159–168) that development should avoid areas of flood risk and to plan for future climate impacts.

#### **iv. Loss of productive farmland**

CPRE research shows the plan could remove 10,000 acres of Dorset farmland, undermining national food security when the UK already imports 45% of its food.

The strategic ALC map indicates the land around the village is Grade 3 farmland, with the exception of LMUP/016/017 which is indicated as Grade 4. The predictive BMV map identifies land to the south-east side of the village as having the highest probability of containing the best and most versatile farmland (>60%), with the remaining land having moderate likelihood of containing such sites. The scale of loss may be relatively small for each site, given the site sizes, but would be much more significant when assessing the cumulative impact.

#### **v. Pollution**

The A35 and, to a less degree, the A350, are significant sources of noise pollution, which without mitigation in the form of noise barriers is likely to penetrate up to 200m from the carriageway, where average noise levels may be expected to exceed 55dB<sup>3</sup>, although this will vary depending on local topography and other factors. This would require mitigation, particularly in relation to the sites adjoining the Upton bypass and create poorer quality of living conditions where it is not possible to sit outside or open windows without an undue level of disturbance.

### **4. Heritage harm**

Lytchett Minster and Lytchett Matravers are historic rural villages. Development on this scale would destroy their distinctive character and boundaries, merging them into urban sprawl.

Several parcels sit within or beside the Lytchett Minster Conservation Area. At the western end of the parish, development would encroach on the Scheduled Monument at Bulbury Camp. The setting of many Listed buildings would also be impacted by development including the Parish Church and United Reformed Church, South Lytchett Manor, Post Green House (which is Grade II\*), Cottage Farm House, North Holton Farm House, 57 Dorchester Road, 60 Dorchester Road – amongst others. Development would erode the setting of Lytchett Minster's historic buildings and the distinctive rural landscape that defines their context. This is contrary to the NPPF (paras 199–20) which requires great weight to be given to conserving heritage assets and their settings and requires 'clear and convincing justification' for heritage harm. It is also questionable whether the allocations comply with the statutory duty under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 that requires "special attention" to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of appearance of Conservation Areas, and the setting of listed buildings. There is a similar duty under Section 66 of the Act which requires local authorities to "have regard to the desirability of preserving features of special architectural or historic interest, and in particular, listed buildings".

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.extrium.co.uk/noiseviewer.html>

## 5. Housing design

LMUTC also has grave concerns around the type of housing that will be provided and whether they will meet the needs of the local community and its circumstances. Clearly a mix of types and styles is required – housing that looks attractive and meets the needs of a variety of people, including first-time buyers, young professionals, key workers, families, affordable social housing and the elderly. The latter are frequently overlooked when it comes to purchasing a property.

They need to be the right size for families, with the right adaptations for residents who are elderly or disabled, with enough provision for single people and be genuinely affordable to local people – Dorset is an area with high house price-to-income ratios. Affordability (either to own or rent property) is far more complex and linked to many non-exhaustive factors including macro-economic trends, local wages, inflation, and construction costs.

Housing design is equally as important. Small gardens with plenty of green and community play spaces with tree lined paths would improve air quality and the beauty of the area. Buildings that mirror nature with curved roofs embellished by nature's symbols, e.g. acorns and leaves, would allow a development to meld with the countryside, arising from it rather than being deposited on it. Moreover, to encourage a sense of continuity and sustainability, names of prominent local people and features could be used for street names.

By building 'low' rise apartment buildings, e.g. 3 story buildings and not just for social or affordable housing, could reduce the demand on the Green Belt.

Planners, architects and developers could do worse than to take Poundbury and Nansledan for inspiration. The outdoor spaces, such as allotments, community orchards and wildflower meadows encourage people to get together and is known to be good for mental health well-being. Social housing should be integrated with private housing and look identical if not similar so that all residents are part of the community. Any construction should be centred around improving our community not just hitting centralised numbers.

A shortage of bungalows is stopping many so-called 'last time buyers' from downsizing and therefore creating a 'moving block'. This development has the opportunity to help correct that. There is a huge demand for bungalows but hardly any get built – in 2024 bungalows made up 1% of new homes. Given that bungalows are stair-free they encourage independent living and therefore place less strain on social services – particularly acute for Dorset's budget. They are almost always more energy efficient which means a lower carbon footprint. A way should be found to persuade developers of the need for bungalows even if they generate less profit per unit of housing. Could a percentage of Dorset's adult social care budget be allocated for this?

In accordance with the NPPF 'Golden Rules' for Green Belt development (paras 156-157), we welcome the requirement for more affordable housing on such sites, with a 50% contribution applied by default.

The quality of the housing stock to be provided is also of paramount importance. New homes must be energy efficient, conserve water, use renewable and sustainable materials, help reduce waste, and have good indoor air quality and light, and healthy outdoor living environments. The construction of a new housing development often comes with a high environmental impact, from high carbon emissions to resource depletion and waste generation. It is therefore crucial to embed circular economy practices into the planning, design, and construction of new homes to ensure that growth doesn't come to the detriment of the natural environment.

## 6. Sustainability Appraisal Report

Having considered the Sustainability Appraisal Report (Regulation 18) prepared by the Land Use Consultant, LMUTC concludes that it is crudely scored and fails to consider key nuances:

- Treats heritage assets inconsistently (e.g. a Grade II church vs a Grade II cottage) and makes unevidenced assumptions as to their setting.



- Omits local knowledge on flooding and ecological value.
- Fails to properly assess cumulative impacts.

This would be inconsistent with the SEA Regulations 2004, which requires robust, evidence-based and transparent assessment of alternatives.

## 7. Flexible Settlement Policy

The proposed removal of settlement boundaries will encourage urban sprawl. Whilst the Local Plan suggests the Flexible Settlement Policy would not apply to Green Belt settlements, there is significant uncertainty regarding how 'grey belt' sites would be considered, and whether the absence of a settlement boundary may create higher levels of speculative applications in the Green Belt, particularly if there is the likelihood of the Local Plan failing to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, meaning that developments will come through the "back-door", with little planning or consideration of cumulative impacts.

## 8. Alternative Strategy for South East Dorset

A recent ministerial statement about how to ensure that local plans developed by planning authorities include achievable housing targets<sup>4</sup>, emphasised the need for local plans to be deliverable over the plan period, and also the need to take the views of local people into account. It also made clear that land availability and constraints on development can all impact on the number of new homes that can be provided in their area. LMUTC would urge Dorset Council not to allocate land in unsustainable locations, or commit to a housing target that it cannot deliver.

Rather than concentrating high levels of unsustainable growth in Lytchett Minster and surrounding villages, Dorset Council should adopt a strategic, balanced approach to housing in South East Dorset. This alternative strategy would include:

### ***a) Urban Regeneration and Brownfield First***

Prioritise development on underused or brownfield sites within urban areas and larger towns. Redevelop former industrial, institutional, or MoD sites, and intensify town centre sites where appropriate. This reduces pressure on Green Belt and rural landscapes.

### ***b) Balanced Distribution of Growth Across Dorset***

Avoid placing an excessive burden on one parish. Allocate housing and employment land more evenly across the county, based on settlement size, infrastructure, and local capacity, and protect the fundamental functioning of the Green Belt around the Poole–Bournemouth conurbation.

### ***c) Planned New Settlements (New Town or Garden Community)***

Create one or two stand-alone new towns, with schools, healthcare, employment, and open space master planned from the outset. Locations should align with existing transport corridors (rail, major roads) and allow for integrated infrastructure funding. This avoids piecemeal encroachment into villages and reduces cumulative environmental impact.

### ***d) Proportional Village Growth***

Villages should only accommodate small-scale and primarily infill development, respecting character, infrastructure, and landscape. Housing numbers should be modest and spread across multiple rural settlements, rather than concentrated in one parish, and consider how best to support improved local services and facilities and access to jobs.

### ***e) Infrastructure-Led and Climate-Resilient Growth***

In all cases, housing allocations must be tied to secured infrastructure delivery (roads, schools, healthcare, flood management) based on a thorough knowledge of existing capacity and issues. Sites must avoid flood-prone areas and sensitive ecological zones, with climate change and groundwater impacts fully assessed.

<sup>4</sup> <https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2025-09-08/75868>

### **e) Climate Change**

A number of measures can be taken to mitigate the impact of the development of climate change, as follows:

- i. The encouragement of active travel along with the provision of built-in EVC charging points and a good public bus service would reduce polluting CO2 and other noxious gasses being pumped into the atmosphere.
- ii. Efficient insulation, solar panels and heat pumps would contribute to a net zero contribution.
- iii. Porous hard surfaces would reduce flood risk and not add to the current threat arising from surface water and fluvial sources with the latter predicted to become substantially worse.
- iv. Conserve water by the installation of free communal water butts.
- v. Prohibit loss of garden space (concreting over gardens).
- vi. Prevention of the destruction of ancient woodlands and encourage the planting of trees throughout new developments to enhance carbon capture.

### ***This strategy would:***

- Share housing responsibility more fairly across Dorset.
- Be deliverable and less likely to breach statutory duties.
- Not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the Green Belt.
- Better address environmental constraints, flood risk, and climate resilience.

## **9. General Comments:**

LMUTC and its residents are extremely disappointed that Dorset Council did not arrange a public consultation drop-in session in the town despite it having one of the largest number of opportunity sites identified. Whilst the village of Lytchett Matravers did have such an event, this was not readily accessible to residents in the town, which is the second largest town in the Purbecks, with a population close to 10,000.

The official response form is most certainly not user friendly, both in complexity and length. It should also have been made clear that responses in any format would be acceptable.

## **10. Final Comments**

The proposals, as they stand, would have a significant adverse impact on Lytchett Minster & Upton. The biggest impact will be on the village of Lytchett Minster which is a Conservation Area and lies between protected heathlands at Holton Heath and Upton Heath, and on the edge of Poole Harbour (with significant and complex flood-related issues around the A350). As such there is potential for development in this location to have indirect impacts on its historic character, flooding and on these globally important sites that will require mitigation.

The lack of any detailed assessment on the current and projected capacity of the transport infrastructure and local services, including healthcare and education, is deeply concerning. This goes to the heart of whether sustainable development can be delivered, and whether the required infrastructure and environmental mitigation can be fully funded and secured in advance. This needs to be established before allocation, not afterwards as part of a 'negotiable' S106 planning obligation in which the infrastructure phasing is pushed back, and the delivery of affordable housing is reduced or even omitted completely so that the scheme can go ahead.

## APPENDIX 1 – SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Site Name, Reference & Details	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bere Farm, Bulbury Woods Golf Club, Land at Lytchett Minster &amp; Bere Farm (Parcel 1 and 2)</li> <li>▪ LA/LMUP/001, LA/LMUP/005, LA/LMUP/009, and LA/LMUP/010</li> <li>▪ 2718 homes</li> </ul>	<p>This is a significant development site on Green Belt and has the potential for immense adverse impacts.</p> <p>The south-eastern part of the site is within easy reach of Holton and Sandford Heaths that lie to the south side of the A350, and drains into the catchment of Poole Harbour. As such, there is potential for development in this location to have indirect impacts on these internationally important sites that will require mitigation.</p> <p>There are significant areas of ancient woodland and priority woodland habitat, including Bulbury Coppice, Short Lake Wood, and French's Coppice. Development should not encroach on these woodlands, and further planting should be encouraged to link up these important habitats.</p> <p>Development could encroach upon the relative isolation and rural setting of the scheduled hillfort at Bulbury Camp and the Grade II Slepe Cottage and Newton Farm. Any development should avoid harm to their setting.</p> <p>The village of Lytchett Matravers lies immediately to the north. However, the village centre is too far to the north to serve this area. It is difficult to see how any extensive development in this area would ensure that it did not simply 'merge' with this village, without requiring a substantial gap to be maintained and managed to this end.</p> <p>The site is poorly served by public transport and given likely commuting traffic would result in higher road traffic levels at the Bakers Arms roundabout (which floods and is an accident collision hotspot).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Frenchs Farm</li> <li>▪ LA/LMUP/002</li> <li>▪ Care Home</li> </ul>	<p>The site is within 400m of protected heathland and is presumably proposed as a care home for residents that would not have pets and are unlikely to be able to walk outside for recreation. Otherwise, it would not meet the current mitigation requirements currently established.</p> <p>It would be difficult to find a more inappropriate site for a care home for reasonably active / rehabilitating residents than the one proposed for French's Farm, as its residents would be largely isolated from the community given the distance to local facilities where they can socialise. The site would be well in excess of 400m from the nearest bus stop / route, meaning that most visitors will come by car.</p> <p>The nature of the roads (Watery Lane, Policeman's Lane) would present considerable construction difficulties.</p> <p>The opportunity for inter-generational living would be missed here. Care homes and housing for the elderly should be integrated into the community.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hill Farm and Land at Lytchett Minster &amp; Bere Farm (Parcel 3)</li> <li>▪ LA/LMUP/004,011</li> <li>▪ 1720 homes and employment</li> </ul>	<p>The area is within easy reach of part of the Dorset heathlands (Holton and Sandford Heaths) that lie to the south side of the A350, as well as within the catchment of Poole Harbour (which also borders the A350 to the south-east). Parts of the site are within the 400m zone. As such, there is potential for development in this location to have very significant indirect impacts on these globally important sites and which may be difficult to mitigate.</p>

## APPENDIX 1 – SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Site Name, Reference & Details	Comments
	<p>Other key issues relate to the potential harm to the character of the Conservation Area and related Listed Buildings and non-designated heritage assets, harm to the functioning of the Green Belt in preventing urban sprawl, and flood risk. Cumulatively, these adverse impacts would be significant.</p> <p>Hill Wood, Stafford Row and Cuzenage Coppice are classed as ancient woodland and priority woodland habitats. Development should not encroach on these woodlands, and further planting should be encouraged to link them and enhance their resilience.</p> <p>The village of Lytchett Matravers lies to the north-west, and Lytchett Minster is to the south-east. A substantial gap should be retained and managed to ensure that these two distinct settlements do not merge as a result of intervening development. It is difficult to see how any development between the two villages would not result in undermining their separation.</p> <p>The earlier (2021) proposals by Bloor Homes suggests that the village of Lytchett Minster is enlarged substantially, mainly to the west (either side of the watercourse that flows southward in the valley through Hill Farm down to the Baker's Arms roundabout), but also to the east, with a new central green. This would substantially impact on the character of this small, rural Dorset village. It is not clear how or where further facilities such as a primary school and healthcare outreach would be provided in a location that would be in easy walking distance of most homes. A lot of the possible western expansion close to the Baker's Arms roundabout is both within the 400m zone of the Dorset heathlands and subject to flood risk (which may be more extensive than indicated given its inter-relationship with Poole Harbour and rising sea levels that have not been subject to detailed modelling).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Post Green Farm</li> <li>▪ LA/LMUP/008</li> <li>▪ 96 homes</li> </ul>	<p>The main issue for this site relates to the impact on the area's historic character. The frontage of LMUP/008 lies within the Conservation Area and four of the estate buildings within the site, whilst not Listed, are of local interest and make a positive contribution. This site lies opposite the Grade II* Listed Post Green House. Development of this parcel of land, including the area to the rear, would impact on the setting and relative rural isolation of the estate cottages / farm buildings, and as such is also likely to harm their significance. Limited redevelopment of some of the existing farm buildings that do not contribute positively to its character may be possible.</p> <p>The northern site boundary borders Hill Wood, which is classed as ancient woodland and a priority woodland habitat. There would need to be a substantial buffer to mitigate harm including indirect impacts (recreational access, noise, cat predation etc).</p> <p>The area is also shown to be susceptible to groundwater flood risk. Any surface or groundwater pollution would drain into the local watercourse and from there reach Poole Harbour.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land at Lytchett Minster &amp; Bere Farm (Parcel 4)</li> </ul>	<p>This site abuts the parkland of the Conservation Area and during the winter months is clearly intervisible from the Grade II parish church and</p>

## APPENDIX 1 – SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Site Name, Reference & Details	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ LA/LMUP/012</li> <li>▪ 144 homes</li> </ul>	<p>united reformed church. The Conservation Area Appraisal also notes a key view looking across the site (down Post Green Road) from the junction at the northern end of this site.</p> <p>The southern part of the site (comprising ~ 4.0ha), accessed off the Dorchester Road, would seem to provide one of the more sustainable and least harmful options for development in this area, to some extent 'rounding off' the village, and could also provide some scope to achieve a better mix of uses and increase the sustainability of the village. However, issues relating to heritage, groundwater / drainage and wider highway safety (at the Baker's Arms) would still need further consideration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land at Lytchett Minster &amp; Bere Farm (Parcel 5)</li> <li>▪ LA/LMUP/013</li> <li>▪ 250 homes</li> </ul>	<p>This large site adjoins the Conservation Area on its northern edge. The Conservation Area includes the two sets of Listed gate piers on the Dorchester Road, and parkland in between. Development along the entire frontage would potentially harm the setting of the Conservation Area and related Listed Buildings.</p> <p>The south-eastern edge of the site butts up against the Upton bypass (A35). There are two implications from this – the impact of noise on the living conditions of future occupants and their ability to sit outside and enjoy their gardens, and also the role of the bypass in defining a clear edge to the conurbation. Extending beyond the bypass up to the edge of the village would result in the urban sprawl which the Green Belt was created to prevent.</p> <p>There is also a substantial strip of flood risk zone either side of the watercourse that runs north-south through the site, across the aptly named Watery Lane, and down to the Baker's Arms roundabout, in addition to groundwater flooding susceptibility.</p> <p>If a suitable drainage strategy could be found, the development of ~2.8ha in the westernmost end of the site (outside of the flood risk zone) would seem to potentially provide one of the more sustainable and least harmful options for the expansion of the village, to some extent 'rounding off' the village, and could provide greater scope to achieve a better mix of uses and increase the sustainability of the village. However, the setting of the Conservation Area, and wider highway safety (at the Baker's Arms) would still need further consideration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land at Lytchett Minster &amp; Bere Farm (Parcel 6)</li> <li>▪ LA/LMUP/014</li> <li>▪ 140 homes</li> </ul>	<p>The Council does not support this particular site. It is already recognised in the Sustainability Appraisal (paragraph 4.27) as a site expected to have significant negative effects. The whole of LMUP/LM014 lies within the Conservation Area and its open space contributes significantly to its historic interest. The pond to the south side of LMUP/014 is of ecological value. The site is relatively isolated from the village and would require substantial investment to give reasonable access to sustainable active travel opportunities.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land at Lytchett Minster &amp; Bere Farm (Parcel 7)</li> <li>▪ LA/LMUP/015</li> <li>▪ 79 homes</li> </ul>	<p>The Council does not support this particular site. It is already recognised in the Sustainability Appraisal (paragraph 4.27) as a site expected to have significant negative effects. It does not relate well to the village, and would impact negatively on the rural setting of the relatively isolated Grade II Three Oaks cottage. There is an important local watercourse and woodland running through the centre of the site. It would require substantial investment to give reasonable access to sustainable active</p>

## APPENDIX 1 – SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Site Name, Reference & Details	Comments
	travel opportunities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land at Lytchett Minster &amp; Bere Farm (Parcel 8 and 9)</li> <li>▪ LA/LMUP/016,017</li> <li>▪ Around 192 homes (plus potential new Gypsy and Traveller site)</li> </ul>	<p>The eastern portion of LMUP/016/017 lies within the 400m buffer zone of Upton Heath, with direct access via the PRoW network (footpath SE18/3), which would reduce the ability to have certainty in regard to the success of potential mitigation.</p> <p>The southern edge of the site butts up against the Upton bypass (A35). There are two implications from this – the impact of noise on the living conditions of future occupants and their ability to sit outside and enjoy their gardens, and also the role of the bypass in defining a clear edge to the conurbation. Extending beyond the bypass would result in the urban sprawl which the Green Belt was created to prevent.</p> <p>The western end of the site adjoins the Conservation Area close to the Listed gate piers and Lodge House on the Dorchester Road, and associated parkland. Development here would potentially harm the setting of the Conservation Area and related Listed Buildings.</p> <p>Given these constraints and the poor relationship between this site and the village, it is difficult to see how its development for housing would be appropriate.</p> <p>The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2024) makes clear that “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development unless the exceptions set out in Chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework apply”. This includes the need for the site to comprise ‘grey belt’ and that it is in a sustainable location, with particular reference to promoting sustainable transport. The proposed site lacks safe access. If combined with the other opportunity sites in this area, it would contribute to the urban sprawl. It is also vehemently opposed by a highly successful nearby business, the owner of which is fearful of the visual and noise impact. Contrary to rumour, as far as can be ascertained there has never been such a site in this area.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land at Lytchett Minster &amp; Bere Farm (Parcel 10)</li> <li>▪ LA/LMUP/022</li> <li>▪ 30 homes</li> </ul>	<p>The Council does not support this particular site. It is already recognised in the Sustainability Appraisal (paragraph 4.27) as a site expected to have significant negative effects due to the risk of flooding which we unequivocally agree with. The road access into the site along Watery Lane is also extremely poor. The southern edge of the site abuts the Upton bypass (A35). There are two implications from this – the impact of noise on the living conditions of future occupants and their ability to sit outside and enjoy their gardens, and also the role of the bypass in defining a clear edge to the conurbation. Extending beyond the bypass would result in the urban sprawl which the Green Belt was created to prevent.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land east of New Rd - LM1 greenbelt review</li> <li>▪ LA/LMUP/LM1</li> <li>▪ Around 77 homes</li> </ul>	<p>The whole of LMUP/LM1 lies within the Conservation Area and its open space contributes significantly to its historic interest. The northern end of this site includes the Grade II* South Lytchett Manor, and the southern end forms the rural setting of the Grade II Listed parish church.</p> <p>A key local characteristic of the Lytchett Minster village is its areas of woodland, and parkland character associated with the Grade II* South Lytchett Manor. The Conservation Area Appraisal notes, “The historic parkland remains attractive viewed from various angles both from within</p>

## APPENDIX 1 – SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Site Name, Reference & Details	Comments
	<p>and outside its boundaries, with varied compositions of woodland, trees and open spaces the best of which are found within the eighteenth century landscape core. Some key views/vistas are noted on Map 4.” Map 4 also indicates the notable open green spaces, including the whole of LMUP/LM1.</p> <p>Even the earlier (2021) proposals by Bloor Homes recognised the historic sensitivity of this site, suggesting that it may be better repurposed as a new central green – and not housing.</p>

# LYTCHETT MINSTER AND UPTON TOWN COUNCIL DORSET LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

October 2025

### Main consultation document questions

#### Question 1:

*Do you have any comments on the proposed vision for Dorset?*

Whilst supporting the overall vision, the potential extent of change proposed to the village of Lytchett Minster that would completely undermine its distinct character, and lack of information on the scale and delivery of infrastructure needed to support the proposed development, does not appear to reflect this vision.

#### Question 2:

*Do you have any comments on the proposed strategic priorities for the Local Plan?*

The strategic priorities do not reflect the need to respect the unique character of our Dorset settlements, or sufficiently emphasis the need to coordinate and ensure the timely delivery of necessary infrastructure, prior to housing being built.

#### Question 3:

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

Lytchett Minster has a recorded population of about 210 people living in about 80 households<sup>5</sup>. The size of the settlement would normally suggest it should be Tier 4 (which has been applied to all other settlements with a population of less than 400). However, the Settlement Hierarchy Background Paper explains that an exception was made because of the “very close association with the town of Upton” and that the village “supports a ‘higher order’ facility, which is usually only found in towns (i.e. a secondary school).” It noted that “The village also has a public house, a church and a range of services at the nearby Courtyard Craft Centre, including shops and a café.” A further factor was that there would need to be exceptional circumstances to justify including Lytchett Minster in the Green Belt, and as these did not exist, it would remain inset from it and identified as a Tier 3 settlement.

Whether Lytchett Minster should be a Tier 3 settlement is debatable. Whilst the church, pub, village hall, preschool and sports club / field are all close together within or adjoining the small settlement, the Courtyard Craft Centre is some 1.3km on foot from the village centre. It should

---

<sup>5</sup> Based on the 2021 Census profile for the equivalent lower output layer (best fit shape)  
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/visualisations/customprofiles/build/>



## **APPENDIX 2 – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT QUESTIONS**

be noted that Lytchett Minster is part of the town of Lytchett Minster and Upton, not a separately administered entity.

Furthermore, the scale of development proposed around the village would not only tip it into being a 400+ population, but would accelerate this to in the region of 2,850, within the top 3 Tier 3 settlements in the South East Dorset functional area.

It does not seem proportionate that a settlement that potentially should not even be Tier 3 should be catapulted to being one of the largest Tier 3 settlements as a result of the Local Plan proposals. This is not proportionate growth or respecting the distinct character of our village.

### **Question 4:**

*Do you have any comments on the proposed strategy for the south eastern area?*

The strategy lacks detail. This is particularly important given the large area it covers and differences across the area and between the Tier 3 villages.

The reference to fluvial and surface water flooding should be expanded to include reference to tidal flood risk, which is particularly relevant and complicated in our area.

The reference to traffic congestion is welcomed, but it would be useful to detail the locations where this is recognised as a particular constraint. This includes the limitations on the A35. Please refer to comments on infrastructure in the main report.

The strategy does not appear to recognise the important role of the Green Belt in restricting urban sprawl and the importance of ensuring that any land released from the Green Belt is compensated by improved recreation opportunities.

See also response to Question 3.

### **Question 5:**

*Do you have any comments on the proposed strategy for the central area?*

[No comment]

### **Question 6:**

*Do you have any comments on the proposed strategy for the northern area?*

[No comment]

### **Question 7:**

*Do you have any comments on the proposed strategy for the western area?*

[No comment]

## APPENDIX 2 – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT QUESTIONS

### Question 8:

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

This depends in part on the degree of growth planned for each settlement. For Lytchett Minster, the answer could vary considerably depending on which if the potential opportunity sites may be allocated.

Please refer to comments on infrastructure in the main report and the Town Council's detailed response to the draft Local Transport Plan.

### Question 9:

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

Please refer to comments on housing in the main report.

### Question 10:

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

*a. Agree*

*b. Disagree*

*c. I have another suggestion*

a. Agree – it is important that Dorset Council do not commit to a housing target that it cannot deliver along with the necessary infrastructure.

### Question 11:

*Where should a policy allowing sites for only affordable homes apply?*

*a. All of Dorset*

*b. Only around those towns and villages listed in the proposed settlement hierarchy*

*c. Only in the Green Belt*

None of the above.

## APPENDIX 2 – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT QUESTIONS

### Question 12:

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

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

*Please provide any further comments or reasoning...*

e. Disagree – the use of a settlement boundary is a well-established planning tool that is clearly understood by local communities. It enables clarity in terms of where new housing and other specified development is in principle acceptable, and provides reasonable certainty on the level of housing to be expected over the plan period, enabling more effective and timely planned for infrastructure delivery, and balancing this with consideration of employment opportunities as well as preventing continuing urban sprawl.

### Question 13:

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

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

*Please explain your reasoning*

(d) none of the above. See answer to Q12

### Question 14:

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

- a. Yes
- b. No

*Please provide any further comments*

No. One such site should be completed prior to another being considered in order to review its impact.

### Question 15:

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

The Town Council does not consider that it would be an appropriate policy for Lytchett Minster and Upton.

## APPENDIX 2 – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT QUESTIONS

### Question 16:

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

Any definition will come down to planning judgement and therefore may be interpreted differently in differently locations. Villages like Lytchett Minster included outlying areas which would complicate the interpretation of this policy further. See answer to Q12

### Question 17:

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

The Town Council does not consider that it would be an appropriate policy for Lytchett Minster and Upton for the reasons given. However, the removal of the settlement boundary without a clear policy for Green Belt Tier 1 – 3 settlements also leaves uncertainty over what approach might apply to areas of the Green Belt adjoining those settlements that may be classed as ‘Grey Belt’. The ‘Golden Rules’ that aim to deliver affordable housing and necessary infrastructure, as well as better green spaces, do not apply to non-major development.

### Question 18:

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

[No comment]

### Question 19:

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

Only if they contradict each other.

### Question 20:

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

There needs to be a much clearer link / balance between housing and employment locations, including housing and employment areas within the BCP area, and consideration as to how this currently influences commuting patterns and how any changes will impact on traffic and congestion.

## APPENDIX 2 – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT QUESTIONS

### Question 21:

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

It is not clear at this stage whether this is intended to apply to Green Belt sites, and greater clarity / consultation is needed in light of the definition of grey belt land. However, additional employment opportunities will certainly be required.

### Question 22:

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

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

*Please provide any further comments or reasoning...*

d. Partially disagree - this does not appear to take into account the cumulative impact of multiple smaller housing sites. Apart from the Bere Farm proposals, none of the other sites in the parish are above the suggested 300 homes threshold for mixed use, but altogether would produce over 1000 new homes. The lack of mixed use will inevitably lead to more commuting/reliance on vehicles with subsequent congestion, pollution and a high carbon footprint.

### Question 23:

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

- a) *Do you have any views on the strategy we have suggested for protecting employment sites?*
- b) *What criteria should we consider when defining 'key' and 'non-key' employment sites?*
  - a. Site size
  - b. Location
  - c. Employment use type
  - d. Accessibility
  - e. Contribution to meeting economic objectives/needs
  - f. Market attractiveness
  - g. Opportunities for growth/expansion
  - h. The site's status in previous local plans
  - i. Other

The Courtyard Centre, South Lytchett Manor Caravan and Camping Park and Harbour View Burial Ground are very important and successful business in Lytchett Minster and must be protected.

## **APPENDIX 2 – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT QUESTIONS**

### **Question 24:**

*How do you think we should plan to support town centres in the future?*

More often than not Upton is mistakenly considered to be part of Poole and the BCP conurbation, rather than being a town in its own right. The strategy should include support for increasing the vitality of all town centres, including Upton which it currently does not have because of historic development which have been piecemeal.

### **Question 25:**

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

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

See response to Question 24.

### **Question 26:**

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

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

*Please provide any further comments or reasoning*

See response to Question 24.

### **Question 27:**

*Should the threshold also apply to leisure uses that are net 280 square metres? Yes/No*

See response to Question 24.

## APPENDIX 2 – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT QUESTIONS

### Question 28:

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

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

*Please provide any further comments or reasoning*

See response to Question 24.

### Question 29:

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

Perhaps by offering incentives such as enhanced planning process and favourable business rates.

### Question 30:

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

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

*Please provide any further comments or reasoning...*

Whilst it may be necessary and appropriate to review the Green Belt boundary as part of the Local Plan, the potential scale of land that could be released around Lytchett Minster village is strongly opposed.

Please refer to the '7. Alternative Strategy for South East Dorset in the main report.

## **APPENDIX 2 – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT QUESTIONS**

### **Question 31:**

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

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

*Please provide further comments or reasoning.*

No impact.

### **Question 32:**

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

Highlight the opportunities in a marketing campaign.

### **Question 33:**

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

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

*Please provide any further comments or reasoning...*

Agree

### **Question 34:**

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

- a. Yes
- b. No

*Please provide any further comments or reasoning.*

[No comment]



## APPENDIX 2 – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT QUESTIONS

### Question 35:

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

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

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

The definition of 'sustainable locations' needs to be clearer in relation to promoting sustainable transport / active travel opportunities for access to education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure. The objectives should also reflect that such sites would be inappropriate in the Green Belt.

### Question 36:

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

The Government guidance highlights the need for policies to promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community. There are concerns about how this can be achieved, and much clearer guidelines / working practice examples are needed. Such sites are likely to deter potential buyers.

### Question 37:

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

- Yes*
- No-it should be higher*
- No-it should be lower*

*Please provide any further comments or reasoning.*

No – it should be lower. This would mean that the town would have at least 50 such pitches which is unacceptable.

### Question 38:

*To encourage Travellers to deliver their own sites, we are suggesting that the Local Plan should include a criteria policy which takes account of the site's location, access, neighbouring development, environmental impact and management of the site. Do you think we need to add or change any of the suggested criteria?*

The criteria should also reflect that such sites would be inappropriate in the Green Belt. The location criteria also needs to consider how the site's occupants will be able to access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure through sustainable transport / active travel opportunities.

## APPENDIX 2 – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT QUESTIONS

### Question 39:

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

- a. Yes
- b. No

*Please provide further comments or reasoning.*

Yes. The town, especially the Lytchett Minster segment, is surrounded by Upton Heath (SSSI, SPA, RAMSAR) and Holton and Sandford Heaths (SSSI, SAC, SPA, RAMSAR) plus Poole Harbour, Lytchett Bay View (Local Nature Reserve, SNCI) and Upton Wood. Their status alone demands mitigating impacts.

### Question 40:

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

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

*Please provide any further comments or reasoning*

[No comment]

### Question 41:

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

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

*Please provide any further comments or reasoning*

[No comment]

## APPENDIX 2 – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT QUESTIONS

### Question 42:

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

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

*Please provide any further comments or reasoning...*

[No comment]

### Question 43.

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

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

*Please provide any further comments or reasoning...*

[No comment]

### Question 44:

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

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

*Please provide any further comments or reasoning...*

[No comment]

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

[No comment]