

Objs	Policies	Comments	AONB Response
Agree	Agree	In this regard we would refer to the major decision affecting the AONB in the Bridport area during the current Plan period 2014-2019 - the decision to approve a major development at Vearse Farm (now proposed 930 dwellings in the current Local Plan Review), which will result in significant impacts on local infrastructure as well as natural beauty. It is still widely felt that the "exceptional circumstances" required by the National Planning Policy Framework to justify major developments in the AONB have not been met in this case, and we would hope and expect that in future cases the "exceptional circumstances" test will be applied more rigorously.	Amendments made
		We are concerned that the wording of Policy PLQ1 on Conservation and Enhancement of the AONB and its Setting by Good Planning and Development states that "Development that does not conserve and enhance the AONB will only be supported if it is necessary." If as stated in para. 3.2, the Management Plan is intended to guide e.g. planning authorities in fulfilling their statutory duties, this wording seems unclear and we suggest the words "exceptional circumstances" should be applied here too.	Amendments made
Agree	Agree	The catchment partnership in Dorset has supported the mapping of the natural capital Dorset offers. We welcome reference to sustainable drainage systems for developments. PLQ1d – developer contributions should be sought to improve connectivity of protected sites and ensure sustainable drainage delivers multiple outcomes for flood risk reduction, water quality and habitat connectivity. PLQ3d -with reference to minerals sites, there should be some recognition of the role of created wetland in providing multiple outcomes for landscape, river water quality and carbon capture. PLQ3h – support woodland planting that contributes to flood risk reduction, carbon sequestration and interrupts flow pathways in the landscape	Action planning
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Good plan making and quality planning decisions are required to ensure that the special qualities of the AONB area are not slowly eroded by the cumulative impact of poor small scale developments . Good planning requires sound and accessible data, shared appreciation of impacts and strong collaboration between stakeholders engaged in the planning process.	Policy framework should facilitate this
		As a Parish Council we are often frustrated by the seeming lack of regard given to our views on development proposals in our parish. This is especially true when it comes to 'conserving and enhancing' the AONB. As we move to the new arrangements for unitary Authorities in Dorset it will be important to ensure that local voices aren't completely lost in planning decision making. The Local Planning Authority, AONB team and local communities need to improve data and evidence gathering and sharing so that the full impact of development proposals can be understood and the best possible planning solution can be arrived at in all cases	Action planning
		We are not convinced that the in the current climate of regulation withdrawal, organisational change and austerity programmes that good planning outcomes, for our parish or the AONB can be achieved consistently	Evidence for Glover Review
		Paragraph 9.3.2 should mention the 4 key verbs (for action related to landscape) stated at paragraph 5.3.	Amendments made
		Paragraph 9.3.3 is a place for a clear statement of how you intend to apply those 4 key verbs, particularly to those landscape character areas which are in poor or deteriorating condition. I accept that planning gain (which is mentioned in the current text) is a key tool to achieve landscape enhancement : but other tools are available, notably woodland planting, agri-environment action and the work of volunteers. I fully understand that, as stated in the Strategic Environmental Assessment, "many of the potential benefits will be dependent on the ability and commitment of partner organisation to deliver AONB policies" : but I suggest that a Plan which looks ahead for at least five years should state your aspirations to achieve landscape enhancement in the character areas that need it.	Woodland planting covered in TWL, work of volunteers in EUE. Broad aspirations covered in new Chapter 10
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	A strategy for trees Planning arrangement via Special Planning Documents to address the height and size of buildings in particular to avoid "Sandbanksification" .	Action planning

Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Development that respects the pattern and character of places in which it is located” seems rightly to stress the importance of aiming to maintain as a priority the settlement pattern in West Dorset of small country towns and scattered villages, for all the benefits which that approach can continue to bring to the area. Inevitably that means avoiding the imposition of large concentrations of housing such as that currently proposed for north Dorchester. Whether or not Dorchester can be incorporated into the AONB, such “homogenisation of the landscape” to its north would damage the existing AONB area in many ways. For the sake of the town and the wider area, I would like to see any plans for an increase in housing (and related building) here made proportionate and handled in environmentally sensitive ways. I strongly believe in the point made at PLQ4d that local identity is underpinned by “the pattern of landscape features, including settlements” and as Dorchester’s strong local identity is a key asset to the town, new building projects here need to continue to work to enhance not undermine it	Not relevant to this plan
Strongly agree	Strongly agree		0 n/a
Agree	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific inclusion of “Landscape Gain” in the LPP ENV section. • A reworking of AMP Policies PLQ1 series to align the LPP ENV wordings to fully incorporate the “positive contribution” as at PLQ1d. • All planning applications relevant to AONB and Heritage Coast automatically referred to the AONB team, and a specific Planning Liaison Officer funded and employed within the AONB team, not only to comment on Applications, but also to advise Parishes. • The incorporation of PLQ2d directly into the emerging LPP ENV section. • A clearer, specific definition of “Benefits” in PLQ2f, perhaps with reference to “Planning Gain”. 	Local Plan process; actiona planning; some amendments made
		Paragraph 9.3.4. PLQ1–4: The parish council’s welcomes the active involvement of the AONB in planning and development matters	Support
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Good plan making and high quality planning decisions are required to ensure that the special qualities of the AONB area are not slowly eroded by the cumulative impact of poor small scale developments. Good planning requires stronger collaboration between stakeholders engaged in the planning process. BTC is keen to work more closely with the AONB team to ensure knowledge, information and data relating to the future management of the AONB is effectively shared and acted upon by local communities.	Action planning
Agree	Disagree	Opportunities & Pressures section – we believe that this section should contain links to nutrient neutrality for development and the potential benefits from offsetting/payment systems for public goods.	Amendments made
		Section 9.3.3 identifies the pressures that demographic change will have on the AONB, including the need for wider infrastructure and service provision and upgrades. We consider that support for such infrastructure and the beneficial impacts that it’s provision has (for example, clean drinking water and effective treatment of sewerage in the case of the water industry) should be explicitly recognised in Policy PLQ1a and policy PLQ2f. We would wish to see policy support covering proposals for new or extended sewage treatment works, water treatment works and network infrastructure which will be permitted provided they are located and designed so that any adverse impact on the landscape is minimised (in line with our statutory duty in this regard). Our water supply and waste water infrastructure is often located in rural locations within the AONB, but still requires power supplies for telemetry and MCC (motor control centre) equipment in order to operate. Whilst supplies can come from mains electricity, it is often a more sustainable option to provide small installations using small scale renewables (typically small wind turbines or solar panels, at a microgeneration scale). Section 9.3.3 identifies opportunities to improve sustainability using small scale renewables, but in the content of community energy initiatives only. We consider that it would be beneficial if this could be expanded to recognise the opportunity to use small scale renewables to improve the sustainability of infrastructure. We would therefore also extend our support to Policy PLQ3f, which seeks to support renewable energy production where compatible with the objectives of AONB designation.	Policy framework does not preclude necessary development
		Policy PLQ1d – whilst we have no objection to this policy, it would be preferable for a clear Green Infrastructure network document or plan to be presented to enable developers to identify locally relevant and effective contributions.	Action planning
		Policy PLQ1f – Wessex Water’s infrastructure may exist within the AONB coastal areas and could require development or improvement over the life of the plan. We accept the need to conserve and enhance the undeveloped and tranquil nature of such areas, but the policy should recognise that development by a statutory undertaker may be necessary in such areas in order for us to meet our statutory obligations and protect the environment	Policy framework does not preclude necessary development

		Policy PLQ3c – whilst Wessex Water would not necessarily object to the diversification or repurposing of barns, buildings and other structures, we would wish to see that water quality issues associated with drainage and sewage treatment for such developments is adequately considered. Any increase in diffuse pollution through septic tanks, or provision of private small scale sewage treatment, has the ability to affect water quality in any adjacent watercourses, particularly where located in headwaters.	Amendments made
		Policy PLQ4j – we are concerned about the broad wording of this aspect of the policy. The wording states that the AONB should resist unnecessary proliferation of masts and other vertical structures, requiring the sharing of infrastructure by service providers. Whilst this may be appropriate for certain infrastructure providers, we consider that this may be impossible for our operational sites, which are widely dispersed across rural areas. We would further note that masts (typically related to our telecommunication requirements for control of our infrastructure) are part of the essential equipment necessary for operation of our statutory water supply & waste water treatment sites, for which we enjoy permitted development rights. A distinction should be made between masts and vertical structures provided for the essential operational requirements of a statutory undertaker and other masts and structures	Policy framework does not preclude necessary development
		In 9.3.2 (2nd bullet) it would be helpful to refer to seeking net gain for biodiversity / environment, as set out in the 25 Year Environment Plan and National Planning Policy Framework.	Amendments made
Strongly agree	Agree	In 9.3.3 the current terminology used on Dorset for You is Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal process (rather than mitigation protocol) . It would be helpful to link to this explanation https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/countryside-coast-parks/countryside-management/biodiversity/biodiversity-appraisal-in-dorset.aspx .	Amendments made
		PLQ1d – this policy should also refer to the ecological network – “required to make a positive contribution to the overall green infrastructure network and ecological network.”	Amendments made
		PLQ1h – referring back to our comments under Chapter 7, it would be helpful if this policy featured non-visual impacts as strongly as it does visual, and at the least listed a greater range of non-visual impacts such as wildlife impacts and pollution as well as noise.	Amendments made
		PLQ4 – some of these policies use strong terms such as Remove, Require, Protect, Ensure, others are weaker and state Resist, Discourage which are easier to bypass. In some cases this means that the policy itself could be weak, for example PLQ4e “Avoid and reduce the impacts of development on biodiversity” would be much stronger as “Require development to follow the hierarchy of avoid, mitigate and compensate and to achieve a net gain for biodiversity.” There are several other policies which could reasonably be strengthened, such as PLQ4h and PLQ4m.	Amendments made
		It would be helpful to work on initiatives such as supplementary planning guidance and protocols, once the new rural Dorset local authority is established	Action planning
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	9.3.2: Reference could be made to environmental and biodiversity net gain included in the 25 Year Environment Plan and revised NPPF	Amendments made
		9.3.3: Reference to opportunities enhancing green infrastructure and ecological networks through planning gain should be included	Amendments made
		Continued activities as those within previous management plans	Action planning
Disagree	Disagree	Sections 6 and 9.3 briefly mentions our wonderful dark night skies. This is particularly true in the more remote parts of the area. We've received many visitors from urban areas that marvel at our skies. In Section 9, there's an opportunity to promote related initiatives, especially linked to tourism, but unfortunately it's not included. Please reconsider.	Promoted in EUE; policy framework enables positive action to be developed
		The Plan makes no mention of the undergrounding of power lines to enhance views across the AONB. An important initiative is already being implemented and it warrants inclusion. It would be good to attract additional funds to the area for this project.	Amendments made
		There is indeed a recent trend towards "glamping". Such agro-tourism activity is an important diversification opportunity for farmers in the AONB. It's usually of low intensity and implemented in conjunction with Countryside Stewardship and nature conservation activities; the shepherd's hut at the Kingcombe Centre provides a good example. Such initiatives should be promoted, as long as they blend into the surroundings	Amendments made
		PLQ3a states "Support appropriate farm diversification schemes, particularly where these contribute to the conservation and enhancement of the AONB", but it is suggested to amend as follows in light of the need to encourage innovation and rural enterprise: "Support appropriate farm diversification schemes, particularly where these contribute to the conservation, enhancement and sustainable development of the AONB."	Amendments made
Strongly agree	Strongly agree		0 n/a
Agree	Agree		0 n/a

		The AONB is, in character, little, or no different to land immediately beyond its boundary. However the existence of the AONB means that the existing planning system “dumps” housing and other developments in these peripheral areas when it may, in reality, prove more sensible to have these developments within the AONB. The proposed development North of Dorchester is a typical example // This is very important at this time with the formation of Dorset Council which will replace all the significant current partners. As I said before, the Dorset Council is an large island AONB surrounded largely by non-AONB of equal landscape importance. It is not an island in a sea of unpleasantness and planning controls in the AONB should not adversely impact on other areas.	Not relevant to this plan
		The AONB’s record has been to oppose almost every development. It should have a policy of encouraging development where, on balance, it is in the “greater good”. In addition to housing and business development in towns and villages the AONB needs to positively encourage “green” technology like hydro and wind power. Opposition to wind turbines is in particularly difficult to justify on aesthetic grounds	Not true. AONB team has supported many developments and not resisted many more. Guidance exists which encourages good wind energy development within the AONB and guidance to improve the quality of solar energy applications. MDLQ3f supports renewables within the caveat of AONB purpose.
		Dorset AONB sits in the middle of the new unified Dorset County Council with several centres of population on its periphery. The road links between these centres are poor and the result is not just only delays and hindered economic development, but also threats of life with the concentration of health services in Bournemouth and Poole. Improved roads through the AONB are required	Relevant to Local Transport Plans; policies within this plan would ensure any necessary road building was designed and delivered in as sensitive a manner possible with negative impacts being compensated for.
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Langton Matravers Parish Council welcomes the AONB Draft Management Plan, but are concerned that, though the intent is good, historically, delivery in the planning areas has been weak. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMPC would urge the AONB team to be more forceful and active when considering Planning Applications. • We urge the AONB team to insist that they are invited to attend all relevant significant, Planning Applications to ensure that AONB policies are fully respected and followed by Planning boards. 	Action planning
		PLQ 2g) 'Changes in landscape condition will be monitored and assessed' Please can you explain who will monitor and assess, and what criteria will be used?	Assessments to be undertaken by the AONB team using best practice guidance. These may be project-specific, but the whole AONB will be re-assessed within the life of this plan. No amendments to text recommended
		PLQ3g) LMPC fully supports this policy, as it has grave concerns about the impact of traffic in local villages and rural areas in Purbeck.	Support
Agree	Agree	We regret the decision to approve the proposed major development at Vearse Farm, Bridport, and hope that in future cases the "exceptional circumstances" test for major developments in the AONB will be applied more rigorously. The wording of Policy PLQ1 on Conservation and Enhancement of the AONB and its Setting by Good Planning and Development states that "Development that does not conserve and enhance the AONB will only be supported if it is necessary." This does not offer sufficient protection	Amendments made
		PLQ1a Support development that conserves and enhances the AONB, ensuring sensitive siting and design respects local character. Development that does not conserve and enhance the AONB will only be supported if it is necessary. Is this a strong enough policy? Would it have any impact on, for example, the Vearse Farm development extension?	Amendments made
		PLQ4g Protect the AONB from an overprovision of visitor accommodation, including camping, caravanning and glamping sites, particularly where existing development weakens the character and appearance of the countryside. Again, of particular value to us.	Support
		There was no specific Plan for managing the balance between commercial / employment and the visual impact of Open Cast Quarrying No specific aims or objectives to ensure reinstatement especially to previous levels of quarry sites. No Plan or policy for full reinstatement rather than token saucer reinstatement after completion or on reducing visual impact of existing and future spoil heaps	Some too detailed for inclusion in this plan, but for the team's action planning. C3d covers the issue of restoration of sites
		1. Development (too many new homes, new housing using non-local materials / uncharacteristic of the area, expansion of road access, other development, etc.) 2. Overhead infrastructures (poles, pylons, cables, etc.) 3. Too many people (traffic, land damage, litter, etc.)	Policy framework should enable these issues to be managed
		Generally, the plan is supported by those officers who use the current plan as part of their day to day roles, i.e. planning and landscape. The Development Management manager was positive regarding the increased reference to the need for affordable housing in the draft plan.	Support
		Bridget had one comment, in section 9.3.2 the text refers to the NPPF 2012, which was updated this year. She suggested replacing it to refer to the NPPF 2018.	Amendments made

Agree	Agree	Does not refer to the commercial pressures such as wind farms, oil research and fracking, mining especially for ball clay, landfill sites. (copied to PLQ)	Policy framework should enable these issues to be managed
		Should be more involved in planning of housing in AONB, build towards requirement for housing suitable for AONB and local communities so not second homes or luxury housing	Action planning