

Comments	AONB Response
<p>This policy is a total failure to address the greatest threat to the AONB - that of major development for housing, which is being permitted (indeed instigated) by LPAs, in agreement with bodies like yourselves, by ignoring the statutory protections the AONB is supposed to benefit from. Our local MP, Oliver Letwin, has even described Vearse Farm as a 'perfectly suitable place for additional housing in Bridport'. In that single phrase he has dispensed with the legal protections and even contradicted the commitments made in the 2015 and 2017 Conservative party manifestos such as:</p> <p>'set ourselves the goal of being the first generation to leave the natural environment of England in a better state than that in which we found it' and 'For Conservatives, Britain's "green and pleasant land" is not some relic from a bygone era, to be mourned and missed: it's the living, breathing backdrop to our national life' and 'We will protect your countryside' [abbreviated; response relates to development pressure, accepted development, 'exceptional circumstance' and Vearse Farm in particular]</p> <p>It is therefore pointless to submit detailed comments or suggestions on the individual policies - the AONB management plan is almost worthless - it's ignored when there's money to be made.</p>	<p>This plan's policy framework should facilitate good planning</p>
<p>We agree with and support the policy framework set out in the AONB management plan – Our concern is that the scale of the challenge and the resources deployed to deliver the policies are wholly inadequate - (See comments under Action Planning).</p>	<p>Support / some coverage in new Chapter 10 / Chairman's Intro</p>
<p>I note, and strongly endorse, the comment in the Strategic Environmental Assessment that "the policy framework lacks spatial focus in most part and the true environmental benefit may not be fully recognised until the spatial actions are delivered, as set out in a rolling annual action plan with the updated Landscape Character Assessment (my underlining).</p>	<p>Action planning</p>
<p>In my view, this lack of spatial focus is a serious weakness in the Policy Framework. You have shown in Chapter 7 that the condition of some landscape character areas is poor and/or deteriorating. You have recorded degradation in some significant habitats, and this degradation is given spatial record in maps published by the DLNP. I fully recognise that specific proposals for spatial action must await the annual action plan, and that (as is stated in the SEA) "many of the potential benefits will be dependent on the ability and commitment of partner organisation to deliver AONB policies". But that is no reason to omit from the Policy Framework a clear statement of the geographic areas which cause concern in terms of landscape quality or ecological degradation. I urge that you record these areas, with a clear indication of the action which may be needed in order to redeem them.</p>	<p>Partially addressed by new chapter 10; more detail in LCA</p>
<p>The same principle applies to the three main areas of conflict recorded in the Strategic Environmental Assessment - renewable energy developments; access and enjoyment; and sustainable construction. The SEA states that you have drafted or redrafted policies to take account of these areas of conflict. But I suggest that :</p> <p>a. You should consider including a statement of principle about those parts of the AONB in which solar-panel arrays and wind turbines will be opposed.</p> <p>b. You should make plain the main locations where access and enjoyment are producing significant conflict, and what action or precaution is needed to address that conflict</p> <p>c. Your policy reaction to the point about sustainable construction should be given the positive twist that I have suggested in reference to paragraph 6.3.3 above.</p>	<p>Points a & b: the policy framework here enables issues and opportunities to be addressed as they arise, as evidence increases and on a case-by-case basis. The AONB Partnership have been reluctant to undertake sensitivity studies in that they can cause inadvertent additional pressures in 'less vulnerable places'. Point c: no change recommended</p>
<p>It would be helpful to state how the policy framework relates to the DLNP Strategy. I suggest that Paragraph 9.3, focused on landscape, should come before all the other aspects of heritage dealt with in paragraph 9.1.4 – see my reasoning earlier related to Chapters 6 and 7.</p>	<p>Amendments made to the introduction of Chapter 9 to outline areas of focus in each policy section</p>
<p>The presumption in favour of development should not normally apply within the AONB. Those responsible for planning decisions and planning applications should be made fully aware of the acute harm created by discarding or marginalising this matter. The designation of the AONB could be enhanced if there were additional resources devoted to commenting on planning applications and planning matters. Residents support for the AONB would be enhanced if this matter was fully addressed.</p>	<p>Presumption in favour does exist, however the policies within this plan should facilitate good development management</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The "policy context" acknowledges, neatly and simply, the key challenges but fails to link the pressure of these challenges to specific local actions to deal with them and take advantage of the opportunities. • This is essential for striking a balance between visitor numbers and impacts on the AONB and local communities and requires an on-going annual report of visitor numbers for each community, an assessment of impacts, and a plan for mitigation and management. 	<p>Action planning</p>

BTC agrees and supports the policy framework set out in the AONB management plan – Our concern is that the scale of the challenge and the resources deployed to deliver the policies are wholly inadequate (See comments under Action Planning)	Action planning
I would still like to see 'Educating' named within the policy framework – perhaps alongside Exploring, Understanding etc..	Learning' encompasses formal education as well as many other opportunities: this broader choice of wording is recommended by the Review Group