

Place Appraisal comments

- Some comments, listed in Table 1, related to the Neighbourhood Plan process as a whole, to Sutton Poyntz as a whole, or to the status of the respondents.
- Several comments, listed below in Table 2, related to the distribution of the Place Appraisal.
- A number of comments, listed in Table 3, provided corrections or suggested improvements for the Place Appraisal.
- Another group of comments, listed in Table 4, related to the Place Appraisal without requesting any specific changes.
- Many comments were effectively answers to Survey questions. These are listed in Table 5 and will be dealt with along with comments made against the appropriate questions.
- Finally, many comments were recommendations relevant to specific subgroups; these are listed in Tables 6a to 6f and will be passed to the appropriate subgroup.

Section 1	[400] The way in which this process has been conducted has been detrimental to the community of Sutton Poyntz. It splits the community which has to be a bad thing it's a waste of money. Money that would have been better spent in public services.
Section 6	[556] Cease intering the area and the lives of those living here
Section 1	[405] What is important about Sutton Poyntz ?
Section 1	[556] Been here since 1950s - has gone steadily downhill.
Section 1	[590] General comment - SP is what it is and at times struggles with its identity. I think its key selling point is in retaining its rural charm as a country village with its own identity and unique setting and landscape. It still has unspoilt areas. We should work to retain its rural heritage and not attempt to sanitise it with pavements and street lights but also let it develop as it has to in response to changing social needs. Change is essentially healthy and should be embraced but it is difficult to manage with so many individual and personal agendas. Parts of this survey suggest to me a desire to over control / manage our environment, interfere too much in individual's rights to do things as they wish. This may not be intentional and may reflect my view of the world. It is just an observation.
Section 1	[601] I will ask at some point how many of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee are not members of Sutton Poyntz Society, None I would imagine. How were you elected to the committee?
Section 6	[602] Get a more representative group of people on the neighbourhood plan committee. They are almost all incomers and have no knowledge or feeling for village. This survey is a farce. Totally leading questions.
Section 1	[602] Thanks for telling people who have been here for years about their village - patronising
Section 2	[81] It is good to know that over time lots has been preserved
Section 1	[467] We are still very new to the area and are still familiarising ourselves [557] Basically we live outside or fractionally on the edge of the area you have highlighted on your survey. We only rent the property so feel that our views would be of secondary importance to the main areas of this survey.
Section 3	[28] Living in one of the houses outside the 'Neighbourhood Area' – I am grateful for being included in this survey – Thank you.
Section 3	[182] I feel it is important to keep Sutton Poyntz as a village – separate from Preston.
Section 5	[280] All villages evolve and are not 'managed' but some 'restrictions' are needed.
Section 6	[429] Yes simple measures involving land owners, developers, residents are welcomed to help reduce risk of flooding, retain trees, introduce threatened species e.g. birdlife in

Table 1 – Comments on Neighbourhood Plan process	
	particular, but through additional planning policies ?
Section 6	[25], [26] This survey is an important opportunity to preserve the character and surrounding views for generations to come.
Section 6	[47] GENERAL – There are a number of people on the steering committee who have interests in the areas being discussed. Please publish a full list and ensure they are not influencing the neighbourhood plan.
Section 6	[48] GENERAL – More information and discussion with the whole of the village.
Section 6	<p>[57] Other comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The appraisal 'assumes' more housing should be provided rather than appraising whether this is appropriate. Sutton Poyntz has no amenities such as shops - and a village shop won't help - it has a sporadic bus service, narrow lanes, flooding issues, no amenities for young people. It is evident from these facts alone that the appraisal should address sustainability for housing - can't read 2 words. 2. It would see would have been helpful to have had an addendum setting out views from relevant professional consultees, for examples the AONB officer, the borough landscape architect and archaeologist, Wessex water authority [flooding issues] conservation groups [biodiversity] to inform the appraisal overall. Any complete appraisal should surely consult widely 3. Everything is about balance in my view Sutton Poyntz maintains balance if it continues to protect what it has in terms of its unique character, wonderful views and the enjoyment it gives for that to the many people who live here and visitors alike. That's worth fighting for and not over whether some areas of the village are most suitable for development or not which is my overall impression of the document [sadly]. it assumes that development is necessary in a 'conservation area' <p>So my final point is 'what is the point of a conservation area?'</p> <p>I applaud those who have endeavoured to maintain the balance in working on this appraisal. I believe this appraisal needs to be a vision of good conservation not development to what end?</p>
Section 6	<p>[325] In September 2017 a dedicated traffic survey was commissioned. Where are the results?</p> <p>[326] Page 52 - where is the data / results of the traffic survey - this would be useful to help inform decisions / views.</p> <p>[550] P52 - what was the result from the traffic survey. This would help inform my views.</p>
Section 6	<p>[325] Surely you need to think what housing you need to bring people into the village. eg starter homes. Not by asking residents.</p> <p>[326] The housing need of residents should not be the only consideration. Needs of the local areas should be addressed as they will be very different.</p> <p>[550] P54 - The housing needs of existing residents should not be the only consideration. New comers should be attracted to the village. Countrywide housing needs should be considered / addressed.</p>
Section 6	<p>[389] I am confused ! Whilst the heading is opportunities and recommendations, the body does not have any of the latter, only the former as currently presented. I could not support the document if presented to the electorate for approval.</p> <p>[418] As it stands I could not vote in favour.</p>

Table 1 – Comments on Neighbourhood Plan process	
Section 6	[400] If you wish to build, you just put up adequate habitat for wildlife. It's not insurmountable. I imagine people won't want to return their survey rather than say how they really feel. Consequently the plan will be railroaded through and people won't realise the full implications until it's too late.
Section 6	[576] 1) I do not think the "housing survey" is valid. All households should have completed a survey for future housing needs.

Table 2 – Distribution of Place Appraisal	
Section 1	[131] Would have been useful to have given a link to the webpage. No
Section 1	[68] No copy given. [218] Not had a chance to review. [329] I have not seen this document. [330] Not aware of this document. [423] Have not seen the Place Appraisal - new to village. [499] No copy given and didn't have time to access the internet to print off own large document.
Section 1	[418] P2 The most recent public meeting did not allow enough time or opportunity for those who work to attend.
Section 6	[590] I did not find the draft place Appraisal easy to access.

Table 3 – Corrections and suggested improvements to Place Appraisal	
Section 1	[57] Yes to imbalances, inaccuracies and other comments. The appraisal fails to emphasise Plaisters Lane is within the conservation area and beyond Limoncello not within the development boundary.
Section 1	[57] It is astonishing that an 'Appraisal' seeking views should suggest that development along Plaisters Lane below Limoncello should be continued as it does on P34 and I quote 'Future development sympathetic to these important pre war designs ,while retaining the trees, key views, and consistent the country lane feel would strengthen the character of this area and enhance the village as a whole.
Section 1	[103] Concern on opportunities and recommendations.
Section 1	[103] Disagree with statement [page 10] that "there would have been no efforts to preserve the quiet charm of the village" without the Springhead.
Section 1	[103] Disagree with statement [page 11] about "waterworks chimney that obscured the skyline".
Section 2	[325] In the Place Appraisal you list the waterworks chimney as "obscuring the skyline for many years". Surely it should have been considered as heritage asset not a blot on the landscape.
Section 1	[200] First paragraph. Only part of the village as defined by the neighbourhood area is protected by a conservation area designation
Section 1	[200] Map 3 Key views. The views shown here do not agree with those shown in this stage two survey.
Section 5	[200] Map 21 - as with map three - has key/panoramic views that don't tally with those in this survey e.g. V9 not identified in place appraisal
Section 1	[213] There does not seem to be a proper section on biodiversity and environmental issues - is this because it is not considered important? We have far more wildlife in our village than just deer, foxes and badgers. [214] Remove the pathetic offering on biodiversity. Either put something in that is meaningful or not bother at all.

Table 3 – Corrections and suggested improvements to Place Appraisal	
Section 2	[407] Top of page 5 needs a suitable sub heading before "following". This section could mention diverse flora and fauna and the amenity value.
Section 3	[116] There should be much more about the natural environment and wildlife.
Section 5	[116] Page 14 why is this section called ecology? [407] Requires sub headings to break up the text eg history, the ecology section is very weak on flora and fauna and the natural environment. [339] The section on biodiversity needs revising and expanding. Where is the list of species / habitat - protected under section 41 of the NERC Act and those protected by the 1981 wildlife and countryside act (all above at a reasonable cost from Dorset Environmental Records Centre).
Section 1	[325] Theme - Land use and conservation & biodiversity. To work with landowners is part of your agenda. When will you start? [418] P4 The introduction states 'better communicate and co-operate with landowners'. This has not happened.
Section 1	[325] Do you really mean the community had direct involvement other than filling out the survey. Nobody asked me about what I wanted in the Place Appraisal. [326] Identifying this document as a shared vision of the village is not accurate due to the lack of response rate. Silence doesn't mean agreement. [550] Survey 1 response rate of 20 - 30% is very low and therefore the claim that the PA presents 'a collective view of the village' is a stretch. 'The community has been directly involved in creating the PA'!! Again I feel this is a stretch as this is the first time we have seen this.
Section 1	[550] Map 4 is unclear as to what it is showing.
Section 1	[326] The trees mentioned on page 5 never used to be there, this proves that allowing a natural evolution of the village works and is of benefit.
Section 1	[425] HA10 incorrect. See map for correct position
Section 1	[429] Under shared vision, provide housing ?? that suits local needs has been ignored with so much emphasis on retaining the local environment as it is and placing so much focus on biodiversity.
Section 1	[589] Adding 'welcoming' community, maybe?
Section 2	[57] The appraisal inaccurately fails to mention the excellent views to and from the Ridgeway from the significant green gaps in Plaisters Lane which were the subject of much emphasis in the planning inspectors recent ruling
Section 2	[87] P4 – Note SSSI – should have 3 xS not 4. - It depends on the spell checker.
Section 2	[116] Pages 10 and 11 there should be more about the changes between 1895 and now.
Section 2	[217] Could add friendly village atmosphere, rolling and easy to access countryside, village pond with resident ducks, historic mill and listed buildings
Section 2	[326] A very idealistic view of the village focussing too heavily on the past. [550] Sense of place focuses too much on the historic past of the village 1800s and 1900s, with rose tinted glasses. Sense of place can be derived from the present - 2018, the modern village. Let's face it it is the only version of the village we know. [589] Should talk more about now and view of sense of place going forward. Great about the past (18th C).
Section 2	[407] Page 7 a better photo fit would be a modern picture of the pond area rather than Weymouth Beach in the 1920s. Remove "(contd)" on page 8-12. Consider substituting with a sub heading eg "the artists view" (page 8) "The writers view" (page 9) "The visitors view" (Page 10) "The Residents view" (Page 11)
Section 2	[554] It is time that people accepted that Sutton Poyntz is not a village in the sense of the word but is simply a pleasant suburb of Weymouth.

Table 3 – Corrections and suggested improvements to Place Appraisal	
Section 3	[555] Sutton Poyntz is not a traditional village in the sense some people would like to think of it. [116] Should there be more about connectivity to Preston/Weymouth which stops SP being an isolated rural community which many other Dorset villages are?
Section 2	[556] No sense of continuity or local history
Section 3	[57] 3. The appraisal reads as imbalanced in favour of the 'historic core' rather than the 'whole conservation area' of the village
Section 3	[116] I think S2 & 3 need reworking. Bits in S3 should be in S2?
Section 3	[217] Could add dates of when first house was built & history e.g. farming
Section 3	[325] I think it is very wrong to label Sutton Poyntz as a retirement village. You also mention the village having grown very substantially and a wide range of building types and styles, in your words, successfully transformed. Have we a need for a Neighbourhood Plan. [326] Page 17 states that 'the village has successfully transformed itself' This was done without a neighbourhood plan so raises the question of why is one required now - especially a strict and detailed one. I very much strongly disagree with the village being identified as a retirement community. I do not believe this to be accurate and is not something to be proud of. [550] I strongly object to the description of the village as a 'residential / retirement' community. Sutton Poyntz should be an inclusive village for all - not limited to retirement. This statement stands for all instances of 'retirement community' in the Place Appraisal.
Section 3	[400] This neighbourhood plan is not presenting the village in its true light as it should be. This survey lacks the personal approach. Tick boxes will not give you the true picture of how people really feel. A small minority think they know how to run this village and what is best for the villagers. This survey gives a limited choice of responses
Section 3	[407] After paragraph 2 it concentrates on history. Requires more on how the transport infrastructure developed eg ancient track ways to coast, hill fort, etc. Development of the road system and influences, impact of the railways eg dairy produce could be sold further afield, see Transport. Something on employment and trades and how this is currently reflected.
Section 3	[429] The geological map (map?) has been shown with no key.
Section 3	[575] The Housing Survey as a separate survey indicates only to complete if you know your needs within the next 5 years yet in this survey (Q14) states up to 2036! It is fairer if all people in Sutton Poyntz completed the separate homing survey.
Section 4	[25], [26] The village demography precludes development or economic purposes. [27] Let this evolve naturally.
Section 4	[57] The appraisal is inaccurate in its description of the more recent development of Plaisters Lane. On page 16 the appraisal should reflect that the south side only has suffered from ribbon development in the past, but the north side only sporadic development which is why eventually it was given some protection by being designated in part (the significant green gaps) as being outside the development boundary
Section 4	[103] Statement 'village hall is a popular venue although its capacity is limited to 60'. But site includes the garden and much larger capacities have been catered for.
Section 4	[110] There seems to be implied criticism that so many residents are retired or are old. It is partly because people are older (and/or retired) that there is such a sense of community. These are the people who have the time for all the available activities and events. Until I retired I had little time for anything much. My sons who were born and raised in the village, and who are now in their 30's, have made their own successful way in the world but have little time (or desire) for anything in a village life. Of course there

Table 3 – Corrections and suggested improvements to Place Appraisal	
	is a higher car ownership. There is hardly any other form of transport. I would hate to see anything introduced to the village which made the roads and area around the pond any more of 'no go zones' than they already are. Particularly the pond area on a Sunday which is deeply unpleasant.
Section 4	[116] There should be more about how the demographics and economy has changed. Why is community facilities in this section? Ditto transport and parking? Street furniture? These should be in different sections
Section 4	[217] Use graphs to show figures; households (1,2,3,4 bed etc) population from last census, age of residents (band it e.g. 1-11, 12-18, etc) house prices, economy of village, pub, cart shed, waterworks, mission hall activities, self employed people, business owners (Browns windows) Cove gallery owners etc. Victorian street fayre. [590] Could be presented better - tabular form.
Section 6	[217] Add more graphs for easier reading.
Section 4	[325] You cannot use a census from 2001 for your data. [550] P23 data is being used from 2001 census. Only data from 2011 census should be used.
Section 6	[325] Data from 2001 is surely outdated information to use.
Section 4	[326] Page 20 - "Benches have been provided to enable residents and visitors to enjoy the scenery and important views" - who has classed these as important? This is a very strong statement with no back up evidence.
Section 4	[407] Amend bus transport on page 21
Section 4	[407] Strengthen the list of social groups on page 22 to show true diversity eg add SPAM Art Groups, Craft Groups, Theatre Group.
Section 4	[407] More on other areas affected by overhead service cables and impact of pylons on the AONB.
Section 4	[427] I am concerned that the plan is dominated by the visual appeal of the village. However it is the inhabitants who are fundamental to the village heart-beat. My concern is that the heart-beats have been overlooked in favour of the bureaucratic purpose.
Section 4	[505] Always likely to be a "retirement" village as houses very expensive and no major commercial enterprise nearby.
Section 5	[116] Page 25 para 2. Changed from what? there should be more reference to what it has changed from e.g. lots of families and children...
Section 5	[116] 5.3 summary - there are not several wide side roads with pavements. Agree bit about retaining hedges and views, if any small developments.
Section 5	[217] Could add; stone cottages, thatched buildings, country lanes, pub, duck pond.
Section 5	[325] Corrections: The trees were repollarded, some because the branches were encroaching power lines and others to try to extend their life they are still in poor health. [326] Page 36 "significant trees" by the river were actually repollarded to improve their health and extend their life as well as because the mere ????? of overhead cables. Although the life of the trees has been extended they are still in very poor health. [550] P36 - The "significant trees" by the river were actually re pollarded to improve their health and extend their life. They were all re pollarded to prevent damage to overhead cables. Although we have extended their life by re pollarding they remain in poor health.
Section 5	[325] Corrections: 5.5 Gateway summary statement regarding future development lacks supporting evidence. 5.7 Green corridor - another bold statement.

Table 3 – Corrections and suggested improvements to Place Appraisal	
	<p>5.6 Puddledock south as you say the views have already been spoilt. Sympathetic housing would have little or no impact.</p> <p>[389] This section has many recommendations which are hidden in the summary. The summary does not summarise!</p> <p>[407] Summary is crushed into a small space that on page 28 preempts the survey and may need revision. Similarly for the other summaries.</p> <p>[409] Summaries 5.2 to 5.9 are inappropriate at this stage. Who says ?! Maybe there should have been survey questions Agree / Disagree with these subjective statements?.</p>
Section 5	[400] This was because it wasn't economical to continue with those businesses and people didn't want them in a residential area anyway. There are badgers, deer, foxes etc trotting all over the village along roads and into gardens. They don't seem to need a green corridor in which to live. They are attractive to houses and gardens.
Section 5	<p>[460] Must be preserved.</p> <p>[556] Non existent.</p>
Section 6	<p>[116] Should be fully updated after the survey results.</p> <p>Overall interesting document but we really need an updated conservation area appraisal.</p>
Section 6	<p>[200] Map 22 does not really draw out the importance of flood risk areas. Government website show for example that the area behind the 'Cartshed and 'The Willows' is a high risk area which should be taken into account in any future development.</p> <p>A separate flood risk map would be useful in helping to decide where development might take place under 'housing and planning', the section on 'risks' the impact of new housing on surface water running and flooding should be mentioned.</p>
Section 6	[217] Include activities already set up e.g. bird watching, bird count, mill pond cleaning. Opportunities- Mission hall clubs and activities. Tourism- add Victorian street fayre, Mission hall activities. Need to consider access for emergency vehicles.
Section 6	[407] Lack a clearly stated vision and supporting objectives. The draft vision needs to be stated between page 52 and 53 and the objectives incorporated into replacing the information in each of the left hand text boxes on pages 53-58. Reorder topics alphabetically.

Table 4 – Comments on Place Appraisal	
Section 1	<p>[81] An excellent document”.</p> <p>[87] What a wonderful piece of work.</p> <p>[110] The Place appraisal is a mighty piece of work and I thank and admire those who have given up their time and efforts to complete it.</p> <p>[160] Excellent.</p> <p>[200] General comment. The place appraisal is excellent and should be published as a booklet for sale to villages/visitors/developers.</p> <p>[219] It is a most impressive document.</p> <p>[335] Many thanks to all those volunteers for your time and constructive contribution in the production of the excellent Place Appraisal 2017 followed by the survey stages.</p> <p>[391] A lot of hard work has resulted in an excellent document.</p> <p>[484] No further comments on the Place Appraisal except thanks to all the steering group for the obvious amount of work they have carried out.</p> <p>[512] A very good document indeed.</p>
Section 2	<p>[35] A great deal of thought, study, investigation and data collection has created a very comprehensive document. WELL DONE.</p> <p>[160] Excellent.</p>

Table 4 – Comments on Place Appraisal	
Section 3	[160] Excellent and informative. [173] Very informative. [390] Well researched. [589] Very good.
Section 4	[173] As before very interesting
Section 5	[81] An excellent summary. [173] Excellent summary with focus on the 'historic core'.
Section 6	[115] Good analysis of the risks and advantages. [160] Challenges / risks & opportunities of all the options are well documented and give scope for debate and decision making. [261] I think all 6 sections are potentially a good foundation, with sufficient safeguards built in to allow the village to continue to be a special place to live.
Section 1	[81] Agree page 5 'the challenge for the village and for Weymouth is how to maintain this separate identity while accommodating change for the better. Each decision small or large should be judged against whether it will enhance the change for the better. [173] 'The challenge' is a cogent and accurate summary of the current situation. The need to conserve the character and distinctive identity of the village is paramount, especially as this would ensure the protection of the green corridor and vulnerable sites important for biodiversity, flora and fauna. [95] I have read all the appraisal and agree to the comments in the appraisal. [96] I have read with interest the appraisal which seems to carefully define our village and its needs / requirements". [103] In general agree with the appraisal – a lot of work has been expended. [115] No change needed. [137] I consider this a very comprehensive document providing an excellent framework for any discussion and future negotiations, especially with regard to any planning applications. [217] It describes it fully. [390] Well set out. [395] As newcomers to the village the Place Appraisal document appears to be a well researched and formulated document which encapsulates what we see as the fundamental attributes of this wonderful area. [409] Thorough, logical. [569] I agree with the content of the Place Appraisal for all sections.
Section 2	[46] No comments all very interesting and thorough. [115] No change needed. [390] Pleasant.
Section 3	[115] No change needed.
Section 1	[228] No! [279] No
Section 2	[279] No
Section 3	[279] No
Section 4	[279] No
Section 5	[279] No
Section 6	[279] No
Section 2	[173] Good focus on the historical / literary perspective
Section 2	[409] I want to live in a place like that!
Section 5	[390] Nice place to live
Section 3	[200] Beautiful photograph of village from Chalbury Hill
Section 5	[25], [26] Very important and could easily be lost.

Table 4 – Comments on Place Appraisal	
Section 6	[81] Strongly agree with biodiversity and natural environment opportunities. These should have a strong focus in the plan.
Section 6	[173] Planning policies that protect the village's biodiversity and outreach work to involve more members of the community are particularly welcome. The suggestions regarding sports and recreation facilities are also extremely valuable and worthy of support.
Section 6	[390] Found this complicated and confusing

Table 5 – Answers to Survey questions, which may or may not be endorsed by the Stage 2 Survey	
Section 1	[116] Do we want to change much? We need to preserve SP as the special place it is. [137] It is so important to preserve the beauty of the village that we all enjoy, whilst ensuring that any new building only enhances this, but does not intrude or spoil Sutton Poyntz. [293] Please leave Sutton Poyntz alone. For 50 years it has not changed _ that's how we like it!! Its setting, history, friendly local and new residents and the rural architecture gives great pleasure + comfort - surrounded by beautiful countryside together with peace + quiet. The pub is lively but that is what happens in pubs. Stop analysing everything.
Section 3	[601] I really think all of you should get on with your own lives and leave the rest of us to carry on with ours. This village has existed without interference. [25], [26] This is what most people appreciate and development could destroy it. [81] The sense of peace and tranquillity should be maintained. [333] The village has been a long time in the making and has already been allowed to grow to a higher density than it should be. It is a beautiful village and benefits from being set in a beautiful location and this must be taken into account when considering any future applications so as not to lose the views or the community spirit that exists here. There is very limited space for any additional development so we must ensure that if anything is built that it is done so in keeping with the village and the surroundings.
Section 5	[71] It is important to keep the village as it is. [104] The reason we all moved into Sutton Poyntz was because of the beauty of it, which is becoming rarer and rarer.
Section 1	[352] We have too much traffic coming through Sutton Poyntz now. We do not want any more. Adding anything business wise will increase the traffic and parking and will increase accidents.
Section 6	[249] Traffic speed reduction is an important challenge to be addressed - also the issue of Parked vehicle congestion. I also worry that more tourism will result in an increase in motor traffic & need for more car parking areas (these would need to be chosen very carefully!). [286] General Comment overall plan should as far as possible restrict further concessions to cars as provision of extra parking etc etc simply encourages more private vehicles + less provision of mass transport. Likewise, development should encourage walking, bicycling + motorcycling. [325] Tourism - other than self catering and B&B the knock on effects, traffic is more trouble than it is worth. We need a better bus service.
Section 1	[372] The (village) suburb only has any character around the pond / pub. The remainder is a mismatched collection of properties that have grown up over time. This is how a real village develops. To try to control any future development to create a "biscuit tin" village is vacuous.

Table 5 – Answers to Survey questions, which may or may not be endorsed by the Stage 2 Survey	
Section 5	[602] Village essentially a rather ugly bunch of buildings in a good location. Village centre nice. Rest a mishmash of unremarkable houses.
Section 2	[25], [26] The current sense of place should be maintained as is reflected in our answers
Section 3	[286] It is virtually inevitable that residential development will continue within the village however this should not mean the destruction/degradation of local environment outside development boundary. There is plenty of space within the village with potential for densification + development of small scale housing projects provided local planning authorities can be satisfied.
Section 3	[439] I applaud the work that has gone into this initiative. I recognise the need for a community like Sutton Poyntz to work together to help the village to develop but also maintain its unique character. The questionnaire addresses some important issues in terms of taking such a plan forward. As residents here for the past 22 years, we have seen development both good and bad. The Neighbourhood Plan is certainly a welcome scheme for the community.
Section 3	[488] Need to be open minded about future development boundary We should not compare too much with current properties as many are ugly, dated and out of keeping Modern contemporary and low energy homes should be considered with an open mind.
Section 5	[286] Village has the advantage of some historical building and general greenery, however this should not preclude introduction of modern/architect designed buildings, rather than faux cottage style. New design can be successfully integrated w/old provided done well w/ quality materials.
Section 3	[555] The setting of Sutton Poyntz is agreeable but the houses vary in attractiveness and homogeneity.
Section 4	[286] Re Village shop/businesses. Cannot see ventures (other than pub) which rely on local residents shopping being successful / economic, as most villagers prefer to do major shopping @local supermarkets. There is no reason however why home-based / craft / consultancy business should not be successful.
Section 4	[400] This village needs more affordable housing and if it's the use of green space to facilitate this it would be a small price to pay for keeping the village alive with community spirit, real community. 2 farms have gone, spray shop has gone, the village shop has gone, riding stables have gone, bakery has gone to name a few businesses.
Section 4	[488] Encourage younger people and families Develop outside of building boundary to allow some sub £400k properties Not all social housing as attracts the wrong demographic
Section 4	[576] 1) Would the neighbourhood forum be qualified on matters such as "tree preservation"? 2) There is a danger that "power stricken" individuals on the forum could adversely affect lives of other people causing much unhappiness. 3) I think individual households should make a decision on whether to fell a tree and whether or not to replace a tree.
Section 5	[575] Q6 Don't like the idea of a Neighbourhood Forum having the power to decide if someone's tree requires their permission to fell / replace. It should be a totally independent body.
Section 5	[27] Fewer cars, less parking maybe green energy opportunities solar power ????? electric vehicles [cars and vans]
Section 5	[76] I whole heartedly support the comments in the summary on P46 -'The views into the village are largely protected [Excepting Sutton Knap] but several of those out of the village have been lost. Consideration should be given in future development to protecting these remaining key views that add so much to the community's quality of

Table 5 – Answers to Survey questions, which may or may not be endorsed by the Stage 2 Survey	
	life and sense of place'. [502] The remaining key views must be protected - particularly those outside the centre of the village.
Section 5	[116] 5.4 should be strengthened to protect the Rural lane not just a 'country feel'. Remaining views should be preserved otherwise Lane will be very closed in.
Section 6	[214] To recommend that individual properties have some form of protected status is too intrusive. Even the 'street scene' approach could be a problem. [325] Heritage - we do not need a list of Heritage Assets. We are in a conservation area already which works very well. Are you really going to ensure that the planning authority gives appropriate protection. Powerful. Who elected you to govern us?.
Section 6	[294] Car parking urgently needed. No parking next to the pond. Purchase land for car park.
Section 6	[505] We believe there should be a moratorium on further housebuilding. There must come a point at which development stops for the very reasons outlined in your neighbourhood plan / Place Appraisal. To try and bring younger people into the village is a pipe dream in the current economic environment - it is simply too expensive. At the other end of the scale the demise of the bus service makes it unviable for the very elderly; they should move out - Preston is not far! (Or encourage care home providers to set up in the village).
Section 6	[576] 2) I rather get the impression that for some people that have lived in the village for many years, would like to "downsize" with regard to their homes. 3) Maybe with this in view there is an opportunity to build a care home. This could provide business opportunities.

Table 6a – Recommendations or comments related to the Transport subgroup	
Section 1	[87] Theme transport – P4 – 'Consider the formation of passing places in the higher reaches of Plaisters Lane [in view of the ever increasing width of modern cars] Passing has become more difficult in the last 5 years and it is getting worse.
Section 1	[258] Stage 2 Survey (this survey) No mention is made of public transport or questions. I feel it would be a great loss to village amenities if any form of public transport was allowed to disappear from village.
Section 1	[426] General Observations: 1. Appropriate signs to be placed at either end of the roadway on Puddledock Lane designated as a "Public Footpath" (private property) 2. Signs at the top of Plaisters Lane and on Sutton Road indicating to traffic entering the village "Welcome to Sutton Poyntz. Please drive carefully / slowly" - example
Section 1	[575] Puddledock Lane is a high flood risk area. Drainage required for tarmac area from Sutton Road to Dairy farm. Puddles are a constant hazard for walkers / young children - especially in buggies. Also unsafe due to no street lights and poorly maintained / overgrown boundary hedges / trees. Puddledock Lane is a residential lane therefore there is a safety issue. [576] Puddledock Lane is a flood risk area being made worse by inadequate drainage. At least on the residential / tarmac section (Sutton Road to the Puddledocks) proper drainage could be installed. Puddles create hazards for walkers and it looks unkept and a mess.
Section 3	[576] Puddledock Lane is a flood risk area as indicated above. I understand it is privately owned road. It is a very dark road and requires lighting for safety reasons. Human safety is of the uttermost importance. The whole length of Puddledock Lane from Sutton Road to "The Cottage" is a safety hazard.

Table 6a – Recommendations or comments related to the Transport subgroup	
Section 2	[28] Re Qn11 and traffic calming. Not listed is my concern the traffic accelerates after the quarry in Plaisters Lane. There is a concealed drive and walkers often in this part up to the top of the hill and Ridgeway Path. [OK I have an interest]
Section 2	[245] 1. Keep street signage to a minimum. It is a fact that if you introduce 20 mph signage for example then incident frequency increases as people concentrate less as they think the area is safe.
Section 5	[245] I would not support signage & engineered solutions ie Traffic calming measures based on theory. We must maintain the rural feel of the 'village'- otherwise we are in danger of creating an urban feel.
Section 5	[245] Q 11a Hazard points- I would like to know where the data has come from to identify 'hazard points'- is it based on empirical evidence?
Section 2	[575] Roads - the roads, Sutton Road to Cartshed and then on to Plaisters Lane up to Mission Hall Lane are in need of re surfacing and better drainage. [576] 1. Has anyone considered the terrible state of the roads within Sutton Poyntz? They are in need of resurfacing and increased drainage. 2. The poor surfacing of the roads makes the village look very rundown.
Section 2	[589] We haven't got good community or public transport sadly - this would reduce the need for parking spaces for houses and "car parks".
Section 3	[27] Enforced 10-20 mph limit. L??? possibly place. Move [some] bumps, to slow down traffic. Central parcel store to stop village and those delivery vehicle larger lorry [???] DAN
Section 3	[78] I believe that SP is somewhat unique in its setting but I have always maintained since we moved here with a young family 42 years ago, that it was, and still is a village of three parts. 1.Old Sutton Poyntz or the historic core 2.Sutton Road upwards to Preston Road and 3.Plaisters Lane where very large properties continue to be built, demolished and rebuilt, with no regard to the fact that Plaisters Lane is just that a lane, but the lane has never been structured further to maintain this density of building. Consequently there is danger in walking the lane and therefore not meeting neighbours etc. The lane is extremely busy for such a potentially dangerous road. When accidents occur on surrounding roads e.g. Weymouth relief road Plaisters Lane and Coombe Valley Road both become totally congested. In the last few months three dwellings almost opposite each other have had extensive building works carried out And I have often seen heavy laden delivery lorries having to turn in Sutton Close in order to reverse up the lane to their destinations. The tricky bend around Wyndings gives way eventually to a slightly wider straight part of the lane and traffic speeds up considerably way above the speed limit.
Section 3	[152] Although I can't see this happening I would like to see no parking immediately around the pond on the pub side.
Section 4	[81] Being able to walk safely around the village is very important for village life. I do not think we need pavements to do this but I do not think that increased traffic should be encouraged.
Section 4	[103] Statement 'the existing street furniture is low key' -+ should remain so!
Section 4	[160] The fact that SP is mainly a retirement village then the issue of a bus service and parking are high priorities. It is lovely to have a 'wish list' of community facilities, but lack of suitable space can not be changed, so the pub and Mission hall need to be fully supported and utilised.
Section 4	[407] Mention under parking, page 21, access issues and pedestrian safety along the Sutton Road Gateway.

Table 6a – Recommendations or comments related to the Transport subgroup	
Section 4	[429] Parking (and access) can be a problem. Notably only one business benefits economically from the parking issues around the pond. Perhaps more input is needed from the business owners?
Section 6	[27] Less cars and especially vans – traffic calming on Plaisters Lane.
Section 6	[325] We need to concentrate on our bus service (20 years ago there were 3 buses an hour now its 3 a day). [550] P55 - get the bus service back will reduce traffic.
Section 6	[589] Answered in the plan - we must have better use of technology, public transport, renewable energy, accessible housing for older and disabled residents. So we maintain a healthy diverse community spirit, especially that of young families moving to and living in our hopefully developing village for years to come.

Table 6b – Recommendations or comments related to Housing & Planning subgroup	
Section 1	[537] Can you please take into account the paper that has been submitted on behalf of The Springhead
Section 1	[187] General comment. To make Sutton Poyntz a windchime free zone. We live in a peaceful community enjoying natural sounds of wind in the trees, bird song etc. Why do some wish to spoil the natural noise environment with the clang or tinkle of metal / wood chimes polluting this rural peace.
Section 1	[418] P37 The potential for conflict has been underestimated. We have already lost view v5.
Section 4	[87] From Qn 5 – Protected views. It is noted that view 5 has been vandalised by the removal of the old field gate and its replacement by an obtrusive steel gate – picture P33. Also a caravan and a corrugated steel building
Section 5	[115] Photograph view eastwards from Plaisters Lane shows how views can easily be destroyed by inappropriate actions. [249] So sad and rather horrified that the view eastwards from Plaisters Lane across fields towards East Hill has been obscured by a vast metal gate. The gate would be more suitable for the entrance to an industrial unit!.
Section 1	[575] Puddledock Lane is a high flood risk area. Drainage required for tarmac area from Sutton Road to Dairy farm. Puddles are a constant hazard for walkers / young children - especially in buggies. Also unsafe due to no street lights and poorly maintained / overgrown boundary hedges / trees. Puddledock Lane is a residential lane therefore there is a safety issue. [576] Puddledock Lane is a flood risk area being made worse by inadequate drainage. At least on the residential / tarmac section (Sutton Road to the Puddledocks) proper drainage could be installed. Puddles create hazards for walkers and it looks unkept and a mess.
Section 3	[576] Puddledock Lane is a flood risk area as indicated above. I understand it is privately owned road. It is a very dark road and requires lighting for safety reasons. Human safety is of the uttermost importance. The whole length of Puddledock Lane from Sutton Road to “The Cottage” is a safety hazard.
Section 1	[589] Provide housing that better suits local needs - for the young and older residents - not sure if this neighbour plan does that? The older residents may have had to move out of the village as there are no flats, warden assisted accommodation. Young families (unless high income) can't currently move into Sutton Poyntz.
Section 2	[400] This village used to support 2 farms, many farm workers cottages accommodating many young families with children. Farm buildings and yards have been sold off and developed with expensive housing out of reach of younger families. No help to buy

Table 6b – Recommendations or comments related to Housing & Planning subgroup	
	<p>schemes, no shared ownerships. The average house price in this village is 500k plus. There is no diverse population in this village now. It is made up mainly of retired or older people.</p> <p>[429] 'Backland development' and infill has ensured no large developments take place and as such, has gone a long way in retaining the quiet residential village this is. A retirement community needs replacement as time goes on but if property values continue to rise in the area, this will become more difficult as younger people are needed in employment.</p>
Section 2	[245] 2. Dog poo signs make no difference. People who are responsible dog owners bag & bin the waste. People who don't ignore the signs!
Section 4	[283] Intrusive commercial signs eg at the fork by the cart shed do little to enhance the approach to village and is in fact detrimental.
Section 5	[284] Street furniture is detrimental to the notion of the Conservation Area. Especially those put up without planning permission. Just look at the photograph in Section 4 p22 of the "Dorset Finger Post"
Section 3	[283] The average cost of houses (£485,000/Right Move) together with the almost complete decline of professional occupations has resulted in the last few years Sutton Poyntz becoming a retirement area for retirees from London and the home counties. How will this affect the village in 20/25 years time? Do we really need more 4 bedroom houses on green fields?
Section 6	[604] The village must look to the future. Most of the current residents will not be here in 25 years time. We must think of our children's future.
Section 3	[352] Building extra houses will increase traffic and take away the beauty of the village.
Section 4	[103] Statement ' the proliferation of power and telephone cables.... ' a big eyesore are the numerous waste bins many left out all week.
Section 4	[589] Given demographic of the village we need to look after our older residents so they can stay in the village when their health deteriorates - not move out. More needs to be thought of in this plan as the older age demographic will increase - how are we as residents going to help here - better housing design, models and the need for flexible care models.
Section 5	[116] 5.5 this whole area is developed enough no more please [116]5.6 ditto
Section 5	[160] Historic core is the soul of village and needs maximum protection on all aspects.
Section 5	[318] To remain unchanged but open spaces adjacent roads could be used for housing
Section 6	[81] Housing is a challenging issue. Do not agree that we need new homes for younger families or older residents. Will be interested in the Housing survey results.
Section 6	<p>[103] Do we want a population growth like Preston had? Risk is that all reasons to come to SP will be swamped. The village has developed along the shape it has because it has evolved. There has been no housing estate imposed - only small developments to allow its gradual growth. Major risk is to change that evolution.</p> <p>Statement page 52 'provide housing better suited to local needs' - we need to ensure that any new developments do not distract from 'why residents chose to live in SP'.</p> <p>Statement page 54 'lack of new homes means the population is mainly older with few young families'. - populations evolve - old farming families get replaced by 'incomer'.</p> <p>New local industries in the area (like the atomic plant and Naval research facilities bought new residents to SP. Residents age (like the industries) and die off or move out, allowing the village to evolve naturally. It is not a new town social engineering concept</p>

Table 6b – Recommendations or comments related to Housing & Planning subgroup	
	that is wanted, but natural evolution. The result of unintended consequences must be avoided. One assumes that the majority of people live and continue to come to SP as it was a delightful rural village and not a suburban conurbation.
Section 6	[589] Answered in the plan - we must have better use of technology, public transport, renewable energy, accessible housing for older and disabled residents. So we maintain a healthy diverse community spirit, especially that of young families moving to and living in our hopefully developing village for years to come.

Table 6c – Recommendations or comments related to Business & Tourism subgroup	
Section 1	[537] Can you please take into account the paper that has been submitted on behalf of The Springhead
Section 3	[103] From statement 'development of both caravan camps and extensive residential development across the surrounding farm land that has overwhelmed the former hamlet of Preston...', must ensure that this does not happen to Sutton Poyntz.
Section 5	[488] Needs to be upheld Do not allow any campsites even if temporary or those that masquerade as temporary like Eweleaze and Northdown
Section 5	[589] Should we add the use of technology - internet etc - or Q9.
Section 6	[289] Improvement of the Freeview signal from secondary to primary transmitter. In moving from Broadmayne I lost 50% of the Freeview channels.
Section 6	[325] 1/2 mile to walk to the shops is not far. If you find somewhere in the village how many people will still pop to the shop in their car - more congestion.
Section 6	[325] Any business in the village that employs staff would have to be paying them a very substantial wage for them to live in the village.
Section 6	[589] Answered in the plan - we must have better use of technology, public transport, renewable energy, accessible housing for older and disabled residents. So we maintain a healthy diverse community spirit, especially that of young families moving to and living in our hopefully developing village for years to come.

Table 6d – Recommendations or comments related to Biodiversity subgroup	
Section 2	[18] Suggestions of reintroducing hedgehogs is suicidal for the hedgehogs as they are killed by badgers which are plentiful in the village and we observed them killing the hedgehogs which were here 20 years ago.
Section 6	[325] Maybe the hedgehog isn't here because there are too many walled gardens, foxes and badgers (not ideal environment). [326] Page 53 - there are reasons why some species are no longer here - that doesn't mean something needs to be changed - that is natural evolution. [550] P53 - There are reasons why species are no longer present in the village - re introduction of hedge hogs would not be suitable.
Section 2	[339] Current thinking in the Lawton Report 2010 is going beyond the local place but one position of the place on a landscape scale - so we should be looking at SP in relation to the whole S Dorset Ridgeway from Little Bredy - Hardy's monument - Bincombe - Osmington - Poxwell.
Section 5	[429] The AONB, SSSIs designations protect the village and surrounding land, designed as they are to protect specific and these days in particular, biodiversity, introducing more regulations seems unnecessary.
Section 6	[589] Answered in the plan - we must have better use of technology, public transport, renewable energy, accessible housing for older and disabled residents. So we maintain

Table 6d – Recommendations or comments related to Biodiversity subgroup	
	a healthy diverse community spirit, especially that of young families moving to and living in our hopefully developing village for years to come.

Table 6e – Recommendations or comments related to Recreation subgroup	
Section 4	[160] The fact that SP is mainly a retirement village then the issue of a bus service and parking are high priorities. It is lovely to have a 'wish list' of community facilities, but lack of suitable space can not be changed, so the pub and Mission hall need to be fully supported and utilised.
Section 4	[325] Some of the things you want to bring to the village, are there enough children for a play area, sports field etc. Doesn't seem viable.
Section 6	[325] Do we need to focus on sports facilities, have you engaged with the younger population? Are there enough youngsters to make a play ground viable. A table tennis club was started about 6 years ago. 3 people turned up.

Table 6f – Recommendations or comments related to Heritage subgroup	
Section 5	[160] Historic core is the soul of village and needs maximum protection on all aspects.
Section 6	[81] Can views be locally important heritage assets? These should be added to the list if possible to be preserved.