

Three Villages Drop-In

2nd November – 18:00-20:00

3rd November – 10:00-12:00

Village Hall
Swyre Church
The Manor

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group (CEWG)

Community Feedback Summary (incorporating Group Feedback) November 2023

Puncknowle Village Representatives: Jackie Hunt, Paul Bullen & Kate Strawbridge

Swyre Village Representatives: Sally Bowsher, Claire Hart & David Swan

West Bexington: Michèle Vassar & Fran Marsh



Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Introduction | 3 |
| 2. Document purpose | 3 |
| 3. Objectives | 3 |
| 3.1 Community Engagement Working Group (CEWG) Objectives..... | 4 |
| 3.2 The primary objectives of the Village Drop-in sessions. | 4 |
| 4. Groups | 4 |
| 5. Pre-Event Planning | 5 |
| 6. Leaflet Drop | 5 |
| 6.1 Puncknowle..... | 5 |
| 6.2 Swyre..... | 6 |
| 6.3 West Bexington..... | 6 |
| 7. Session 1: 18:00 – 20:00 | 6 |
| 7.1 Puncknowle..... | 6 |
| 7.2 Swyre..... | 6 |
| 7.3 West Bexington..... | 7 |
| 8. Session 2: 10:00 – 12:00 | 7 |
| 8.1 Puncknowle Village Hall..... | 7 |
| 8.2 Swyre..... | 7 |
| 8.3 West Bexington..... | 7 |
| 9. Leaflet & Attendance Statistics | 8 |
| 10. High Level Themes | 8 |
| 11. Summary of Feedback by Village | 11 |
| 11.1 Puncknowle..... | 11 |
| 11.2 Swyre..... | 12 |
| 11.3 West Bexington..... | 12 |
| 12. Lessons | 12 |
| Appendix 1: Puncknowle Details | 14 |
| Appendix 2: Swyre Details | 16 |
| Appendix 3: West Bexington Details | 19 |
| Appendix 4: Groups | 21 |
| Appendix 5: Other Elements | 27 |
| Appendix 6: Questions | 29 |

1. Introduction

This document represents the collective work of the Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group, supported by the Steering Group, to capture the thoughts of residents in the Three Villages. The main target group was residents of the villages, but businesses based in the Parish were not excluded - in many cases the businesses are run by residents and from the same addresses.

This report is the first phase of the ongoing engagement work through the Neighbourhood Planning process and will establish a direction for the next phase of planning.

It is important to recognise that this is the first stage of gathering information from the community and work continues to compile and verify the make-up of the villages: the numbers of residences, holiday homes and business premises are still being computed. Therefore the figures given in this report are approximate and are useful as early indications of numbers of people reached. More important is the registering of the community's views and the lessons learnt for the next stage of community engagement.

2. Document purpose

This document aims to set out the end-to-end process for the drop-in sessions across the three villages within the Parish of Puncknowle & Swyre 2/3 November 2023.

Whilst this document focuses on the community drop-in sessions, it also covers a similar piece of work undertaken with some Community Groups prior to the drop-in sessions.

Community Engagement extends from the inception of the project through till its conclusion. These drop-in sessions aimed to establish community priorities for any future development and land use. They represent a moment in time and will be expanded through sustained engagement with the community throughout the establishment of a Neighbourhood Plan.

It does not suggest a 'vision' for the community Neighbourhood Plan as this report gathers the evidence collected and sets out community themes. The Steering Group will decide on the application of these themes to a 'vision.'

3. Objectives

Neighbourhood Planning is a new way for communities to have a say in the future of the places where they live and work. It gives us the power to produce a plan with real legal weight that directs development in our local area. It helps to

- choose where we want new buildings to be built;
- have our say on what those new buildings should look like;

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

- decide whether, how and where we want other development of land in the parish;
- protect character, features and facilities valued by the community; and,
- support planning permission for new buildings or other development that we want to see go ahead.

This can only be achieved through effective engagement with the local community through each stage of the Neighbourhood Planning process.

3.1 Community Engagement Working Group (CEWG) Objectives:

- Establish a sustained framework¹ of activity that engages the community,² in a two-way dialogue through each phase of Neighbourhood Planning;
- Ensure community views on development and land use are captured and represented in the Neighbourhood Plan;
- Enable effective and clear messages to the community through a variety of printed and digital communication tools to state what's happening and, or, what's needed;
- Create subject-based forums to communicate and discuss topics requiring community input for the Neighbourhood Plan;
- Ensure that each village has a its own platform for Neighbourhood Planning, whilst recognising there will be a single Plan incorporating the needs of all three villages;
- Ensure views that are expressed outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan are passed to the responsible organisation for comment or action (Parish Council).

3.2 The primary objectives of the Village Drop-in sessions:

- Meet residents through the face-to-face distribution of project update leaflets that also invited residents to drop-in sessions, where people could 'learn more' and informally share their thoughts against a set number of open questions; and
- Capture thoughts and answers to questions, establish a focused number of common themes with the aim of creating a community vision and objectives for a Neighbourhood Plan.

4. Groups

The Drop-In sessions were preceded by a similar process to pose the same questions to some of the Village Groups. The groups approached were Village Hall, History Group, Table Tennis Club, W.I. and Luncheon Club. It was felt that these Groups would provide a good test for the Drop-in sessions.

¹ To see full framework see the Community Engagement Plan (to be finalised and agreed)

² Community includes residents, businesses, and organisations

Groups were either issued the questions by paper copies or distributed by email. The principle being that a member of the Steering Group would expand on the process and explain the background along the lines of the supporting notes.

A total of 13 responses were received in the period of the exercise, which became subsumed in the planning for the Drop-in sessions. Most people who responded were from Puncknowle, two from Swyre and one from West Bexington.

It is anticipated these and other Groups will be used as a sounding board for other information initiatives, but the lessons learnt from this exercise will be applied.

5. Pre-Event Planning

- The Drop-In sessions were planned through two CEWG meetings, where it was decided to design and produce a 'key message' and invite leaflet for the Drop-In sessions. They were designed, reviewed, edited, and approved by the Steering Group prior to the meeting on 25th October.
- It was agreed that each village would have their own venue and leaflet, but the poster would be common to all three.
- Distribution of the leaflets would be face to face where possible, to ensure maximum contact with the community. Leaflets were delivered between 27th – 29th October.
- Posters were placed in pubs, notice boards (Parish, Village Hall, Modbury Farm Shop and 'book swap' telephone box). It was also placed on Facebook the day before the sessions.
- It was agreed all three village sessions would follow a similar template, in so much as they would use the 8 questions (used for the Groups³); the printed maps (showing Natural England and Environmental Agency Designations; DERC and National Trust Designations; Historic England and Dorset Council designations; The Parish boundary) to inform conversations; and capture names and contact details of those happy to do so.

6. Leaflet Drop

6.1 Puncknowle

It was intended to speak to each resident/occupant but the available time and weather only allowed for two attempts. In the case of the East of Puncknowle (Springfield, Napier Close, Looke Lane etc.) approximately 40% of the people were spoken to on the doorstep. Whilst there were a few people who engaged with the discussion this didn't translate to people attending the meeting, although many did say they had other things to do on those evenings.

³ Community Groups were given eight questions primarily sourced through Locality Roadmap.

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

West Puncknowle (Church Street, Rectory Lane, Hoopers Lane and outlier houses) out of 104 properties, approx. 30 were second homes/holiday lets or otherwise not lived in (includes Looke Farmhouse and Dairy, second homes with no-one there, a couple of properties between owners - just sold). Out of the remaining 74 (currently lived in) 35 were spoken to (48% approx.), a third of the properties overall. The number of second homes/holiday lets is about 18. These numbers are skewed, compared with the whole of Puncknowle, because this is the part with most of the old cottages/converted buildings.

6.2 Swyre

Leaflets were hand delivered the Saturday before this event, and residents were invited to come to the Church of the Holy Trinity which is often used as a community meeting point in Swyre. A table was put up at the rear of the church with chairs around it. Four A2 sized maps of the parish were laid out.

6.3 West Bexington

Leaflets were delivered over the previous Saturday and Sunday as weather permitted.

There are 89 properties in West Bexington including The Chalets and two businesses, The Club House and The Manor. Approximately 40 are known to be residential. 35 leaflets were delivered, and individual discussions took place with a personal invitation to the events.

The venue for West Bexington was The Manor Hotel and restaurant, open to non-residents, as this is identified in the village as an occasional community meeting venue.

A room was allocated and was set up with four maps arranged over two tables with chairs arranged in a large circle in the middle of the room.

7. Session 1: 18:00 – 20:00

7.1 Puncknowle

The evening session was attended by seven people. Some had not been aware of the earlier session (May) or newsletters but had responded to the leaflet. The questions were expanded to start looking at people's reaction to development. "Where would you think is best for housing development in the village?"

It was difficult to keep to the schedule of questions as people had their own ideas/motives for attending. A low turnout for the two hours, but good conversations were had with each resident.

7.2 Swyre

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

This session was led by village representatives Sally Bowsher and Dave Swan and was attended by four residents including one under 18 years of age.

Time was spent explaining Neighbourhood Planning to the individuals and then some general discussion about different aspects of the village. One couple chose to give their comments the next day. Three residents who had been unable to attend the sessions provided their feedback separately.

7.3 West Bexington

The evening session was attended by four residents who were initially invited to view the maps and discussion took place around interpretation and relevance to the process of neighbourhood planning. The Neighbourhood Plan was discussed in relation to the village with everyone before the more structured open questions were asked and responses recorded by agreement.

8. Session 2: 10:00 – 12:00

8.1 Puncknowle Village Hall

The morning session was attended by nineteen people. Most people arrived around 10:30, but there were three people initially. After people had looked over the maps and supporting information small groups formed which eventually merged into one (a circle) with people raising questions discussed by other residents and the village representatives.

The group was a mix of those regularly supportive of community initiatives and residents familiar with the project but new to the discussion. Some had not been aware of the project until the current advertising – in particular speaking to the village representatives on the doorstep.

Again, it was difficult to keep to the schedule of questions given the blend of people, some of whom were familiar with the approach, but it was fair to say there was general enthusiasm for the project, and gratitude expressed for those working on pulling it together. It was apparent that the larger group had limited appeal for some, who were more vocal in the smaller group.

8.2 Swyre

This session was managed by village representatives Sally Bowsher and Claire Hart and attended by two residents. Please see session 1 for approach.

8.3 West Bexington

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

The morning session was attended by ten residents and conducted in a similar way to the previous evening session.

Both sessions were led by Michèle Vassar and Fran Marsh, Ellen Simon was in attendance and offered local knowledge and insight which added to some of the discussion.

9. Leaflet & Attendance Statistics

| Village | Homes | Leaflets | | Attendance | |
|----------------|-------|----------|------|------------|-------|
| | | Hand | Post | Day 1 | Day 2 |
| Puncknowle | 195 | 78 | 117 | 7 | 19 |
| Swyre | 54 | 21 | 24 | 3 | 7 |
| West Bexington | 89 | 35 | 5 | 4 | 11 |

A total of 51 people attended the six sessions across three villages, with a higher number attending on day two. This is the highest single turnout for the project to date. From the details supplied neither Swyre nor West Bexington delivered to all houses (Swyre 45 out of 54; West Bexington 40 out of 89). West Bexington intentionally excluded holiday homes and lets. From the 338 homes (needs validating) 280 received leaflets, 195 of those were delivered in Puncknowle. It doesn't appear that this had a material impact on attendance.

10. High Level Themes⁴

The following table extracts key themes from the comments gathered from residents, and observations common to all three villages are noted, with the understanding that West Bexington differs due to being on the coast.

Theme headings are predetermined by the questions e.g., 'what do you think about heritage?' The first two questions are open, whereas the next six are subject led, and have therefore themes by default. Not everyone answered all the questions, preferring to answer the ones referring to topics that interested them or were within their sphere of experience.

Whilst all comments are captured in the appendix for each village, the themes included in this section are representative of resident comments. All resident comments will be considered when establishing the community survey and subsequent Neighbourhood Planning process.

It is worth noting the main themes remain consistent with those recorded at the last community engagement session in May 2023, and future sessions should focus on specific topics within the themes.

⁴ Appendix 1-4 list of all comments.

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

| Category | Theme |
|-------------------|---|
| Development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There was support for new affordable housing, in whatever form that took, with an emphasis on the young and also the elderly (although less so). - There was no appetite for development that perpetuated either the second home or holiday retail market. - Development should not result in the merging of villages; ensure retaining their unique nature. - Community buildings – whilst not a major theme, did crop up in a couple of instances where it was felt additional services or amenities would be helpful. There was also support for the existing facility – Village Hall. - Development should be proportionate to the existing size of villages (infill rather than larger sites). - Maintain and retain green spaces. |
| Development Style | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whilst the three villages differ in style of development, residents of each seemed generally content with the look and range of styles with the notable exception of dissatisfaction with the design of some individual buildings. - Development should complement, blend with existing traditional housing stock. - Little of the feedback centred on additional development, but there was consensus on the need to ensure consistency. - Some residents felt development could be managed through repurposing of older, disused farm buildings. - In all instances it is fair to say that any development would need to be sympathetic to the land, views, environment, and heritage elements. |
| Transport | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Views on transport varied from each village, with those nearer the coastal road taking issue with speed and noise. - Public Transport featured as a key issue for some, but the impact varied. The level of service is considered poor and fails to support local workforce consistently year-round, with services falling off after the holiday makers leave. It was felt that existing transport support for the elderly |

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

| | |
|-------------|---|
| | <p>should be retained and services for the young improved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking, whilst a common theme two villages were directly impacted and, in many respects the issue related to houses in older parts of the village where building didn't consider cars and vans when they were constructed, the roads around the Village Hall and the impact of Airbnbs. |
| Community | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residents who attended unanimously liked where they lived and felt privileged to be able to enjoy the combination of sea and land in a truly rural setting. They respected the unique nature of being in a farming community and respected everything around them. - They enjoy the smaller community interactions with other residents and the general friendliness and good will. - The lack of road markings and pedestrian lighting are aspects they wish to retain, although they want slower vehicles on the roads. - It was noted that community cohesion might be better achieved through a greater understanding of the work done by village organisations such as the Parish Council, Village Hall, and Churches. |
| Heritage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All three villages have heritage buildings in one form or another, but residents were clearly knowledgeable about what they saw as heritage. or in need of protection. - The future of churches, with dwindling congregations should have a plan enabling them to be retained as heritage sites. - It seems confidence in Conservation Areas and AONB status gives little reassurance that policy is being applied. How can the character of villages be maintained, and homeowners encouraged to comply with listed property repair requirements? |
| Environment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The residents engaged in this topic agreed to renewables, solar power (though not solar farms), and in one case wind turbines. - It was thought that any development should consider insulation and solar power as components of any new build. - The environment and the land seemed to be thought of as a land management/stewardship issue. It was generally felt that farmers and the National Trust did a good job of maintaining |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| | <p>hedgerows, biodiversity, and the management of fields.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management of water – from fields onto roads, especially the Coast Road and close to people’s houses. - In many respects the interest in this area might be generational. Most people who attended were older. The few that did actively engage seemed knowledgeable, aware of initiatives. Community solar and wind farms were mentioned, along with other forms of renewable energy to minimise power disruption. - Dark skies, and their protection was a common theme (no streetlights). The growing trend for bright lights outside houses concerned some. |
| Infrastructure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhance mobile phone signal & broadband was a common theme in parts of the community where these services are poor at best. - Burden of new developments on an already pressurised infrastructure, limited parking, roads, processing of sewage, water and power. |

11. Summary of Feedback by Village

11.1 Puncknowle

Puncknowle feedback focused on affordability of houses, heritage, young people, the style of housing throughout and a feeling of community cohesion. Residents enjoyed their surroundings, heritage sites, landscape, pub, and village hall. The maintenance of heritage sites needed a long-term plan. Litter and general ‘upkeep’ of the village was considered poor.

Development should be for affordable housing for young families in the village. Any development should complement the existing housing style. Also, some felt an aging population needed a supply of smaller accommodation for the elderly as most struggled to stay in the village in later life.

Most objected to second homes left empty for long periods and the use of characterful buildings as holiday lets. The increase in Airbnb exacerbated this issue and it was felt greater controls were needed.

It was clear many were unaware of the project, so there is much to be done to increase awareness as some felt it was something being done to them rather than having a say. But it should be noted that people were pleased about the initiative.

11.2 Swyre

The residents of Swyre supplied very detailed thoughts on where they live, what they liked and didn't like. These followed the themes of good community spirit, the need for affordable housing, but limited in keeping with the look of the village. They appreciated heritage sites, farming, environment, and views.

Residents would like to see better tech infrastructure – effective broadband, mobile signal, and power supply. Slower traffic both in the village and on the coast, road was a common theme.

The feedback was thoughtful and extensive, offering a wide variety of views across the eight questions.

11.3 West Bexington

From the fifteen residents who attended the overwhelming sense of living in West Bexington seemed to be views of the sea, walks, countryside, and a strong positive attachment to the approach to farming of Tamarisk Organic Farm.

Common to both Swyre and Puncknowle the primary concerns regarding housing were affordability, with a negative view of second and holiday homes on the basis that they add little to the community and inflate the value of housing stock. This might be different for businesses, such as the Manor, Club House and Gorselands, who weren't represented.

There is little comment on where or what the solution to affordable housing might be although one resident suggested a few solutions, just not in West Bexington.

Less emphasis on transport issues and surprisingly little comment on parking and speed of traffic, presumably because of the nature of the road through West Bexington.

There were a couple of references that need to be investigated further: Drimpton, Community Trust Land and Cornwall's approach to second homes (presumably increased local tax).

12. Lessons

- Undertaking village specific drop-ins was generally well received;
- Hand delivery of leaflets proved to be a good opportunity to engage, although difficult to manage successfully. Multiple attendance at houses is time consuming and after two attempts leaflets were posted;
- It is important to be consistent in the targeting of the leaflets. With this first exercise each village acted slightly differently. As the project progresses and information is gathered it is probable that these discrepancies will be easier to avoid;

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

- The maps and supporting documents proved to be very helpful in defining the space and establishing a point for discussion;
- It was clear that most who attended wanted to be kept updated – the mechanism for this needs to be discussed further;
- It was felt that future sessions should be activity based and only held if there was something to say – it could be topic specific such as environment, youth, affordable housing etc.;
- Work needs to be done to establish the best means of managing the contact list as this will be the main tool for feedback;
- Policy on approach to holiday and second homes required;
- Consideration needs to be given to restructuring questions to get different responses;
- There is a need to determine the data protection issues when gathering comments from residents. In many respects who makes a comment is critical to understanding skills in the community and specific interests for future workshops.⁵

⁵ People offering skills can be noted if agreeable. People offering comments do not need to be individually identified if they are agreeable to be recorded as present.

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

Appendix 1: Puncknowle Details

Session 1: 18:00-20:00

| Name | Contact | Comments |
|--|---------|---|
| Resident 1 & 2 | | Letter attached (point 10). Affordable homes should be available and more control over 2 nd homes. Young couple living and working in the Parish. Unable to rent/buy because of high house prices. |
| Resident 3 2 nd Home Owner | | Partner is a designer (space & graphics) and leaflet distribution. NP is a useful enterprise. Like sense of community/swimming/pub. Likes mix of housing & families & arch styles + traditional. Traffic OK. Resident 3 is supportive and would like to help. Though second-homers they spend a lot of time in the village and consider themselves part of this community. |
| Resident 4 | | He completed a form as part of a Group – supportive. New building – where? – Camp Site The playground is a good asset and well maintained. |
| Resident 5 | | He completed a form as part of the History Group. |
| Resident 6 | | Too many HH/2 nd Homes – affordable housing for young people/families. Likes history of the area, pub, church (historic buildings). Also, ancient history. Pro development if its proportionate and has the supporting infrastructure. |
| Resident 7 | | Consultation – would each village have a say? It seemed there was some competition between villages – although what wasn't clear. The structure of the village (housing stock) is fine, and should be maintained, especially historic sites. Holy Trinity – Church, Pub and Manor. These historical assets should have some longer term thought towards retaining them as community assets. In the next 10 years – churches may close. There needs to be an improvement In how the villages are maintained – litter, weeds, sweeping roads – although this has an impact on the precept. What do we get for our precept? The matter of where housing/development should be situated. Little scope to build in the West, but any building should be sympathetic and affordable. Poor Transport. |

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

Session 2: 10:00-12:00

| Name | Contact details | Comments |
|-------------|-----------------|---|
| Resident 8 | | <p>Had not been aware of the project before this event.</p> <p>Traditional look of the village, the larger house in Swyre isn't appropriate (height is clever though). Speed limits – driving in the village is invariably too fast. Air B&B needs to be controlled (licensed). If building – insulation, solar panels should be included in the approach.</p> |
| Resident 9 | | <p>Had not been aware of the project before this event. Member of Green Pound Club – Weymouth (men group). Also, where is your TOR what is process, have you assessed what is manageable and measurable, expectations – what does success look like?</p> <p>Need for young people to be attracted to living in the village: 'seed corn' for the future; need for any new development to have design sympathetic to existing and retain separate character of each village; new development needs to have parameters of scale (e.g. say a % increase over a set time to keep in proportion to existing built environment); bungalows should not be enlarged to larger storied houses – need to be kept for older people; where would new development go? Unsure – suspect people would not want it by their own house.</p> |
| Resident 10 | | <p>Had not been aware of the project before this event.</p> <p>Value of being able to tailor Dorset Local Plan policies to our community by creating NP is strongly endorsed; both Resident 10 and partner felt strongly about affordable housing for young people and also liked the idea of older people being able to stay in the village (sheltered housing etc.). Transport an issue; keep greenspace between villages – defines difference and boundaries; keep playing field as a community resource; danger of enlarging properties (by large extensions) which takes them out of the market for smaller properties – we need a range of property sizes in our village.</p> |
| Resident 11 | | <p>Affordable housing needed: an important issue. Her family wants to stay in the village and can't afford to, so has first-hand knowledge; lack of public transport also an issue and by association, parking. Airbnb's are causing parking issues – should be licensed and only allowed where off-street parking available; good to have an event like this which brings people together to discuss these issues - would like more of them in venues such as the village hall – which relies on community use to stay in use; keen to help in any way going forward but works full time.</p> |
| Resident 12 | | <p>Part of the general discussion.</p> |
| Resident 13 | | <p>Felt many of the challenges in the village (high house prices etc) were the result of migration from the east to the west.</p> |
| Resident 14 | | <p>Felt the countryside was an attraction, but flooding and power cuts are an issue. Affordable housing for younger people. Definitely no streetlights or speed limit signs.</p> |

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

| | | |
|-------------|--|---|
| Resident 15 | | Cleaning of the village is needed – looks poorly kept. Bus stop doesn't really fulfil a function (also untidy). Lack of community cohesion may just be a result of modern living. |
| Resident 16 | | Community Integration: Shared other's thoughts. |
| Resident 17 | | Community Integration: There are a few governing bodies in the village that need to meet – not monthly, but quarterly or every six months to share ideals and initiatives – include the Church, Parish Council and Village Hall. There needs to be better cross working to support initiatives such as the NP. This would assist the development and eventual success of the Village Fete. |
| Resident 18 | | Part of the general discussion. |
| Resident 19 | | Had not been aware of the project before this event. Part of general discussion. Supportive of the project. Suggested we could have a workshop making a book (with visuals) about the villages to bring people together and gather views. Resident 19 is an artist/painter. |
| Resident 20 | | Part of the general discussion |
| Resident 21 | | Oil: What are the choices? HVO Biofuel? Some discussion over importance of young families to support local primary school funding as well as for good of village – need for affordable housing etc to attract younger people. |
| Resident 22 | | Part of the general discussion. |
| Resident 23 | | Completed a form (History Group). |
| Resident 24 | | Reflected on how schools are financially supported per head of pupils which has implications for village age profile and need for infrastructure to support (health, transport, services.) Has experience of School Governor position (chair?) Has made a photographic record of the Bride Valley 2020 as a book which he brought to share. Raised issue of footpaths – registering for Definitive Map. |
| Resident 25 | | Transportation for older people, transport in general (210 Bus) |
| Resident 26 | | Generally supportive and part of general discussion |

Appendix 2: Swyre Details

Session 1: 18:00 – 20:00

| Name | Contact Details | Comments |
|------------|-----------------|---|
| Resident 1 | | Like: The pub in Puncknowle, opportunities for informal social interaction e.g., talking in the street – it's nice the roads aren't too busy. The natural beauty and the farm at its heart. Dislike: Speed on the coast road. Lack of buses in the evening. I like the fact that the road through Swyre is not too busy and selfishly, I don't want more houses here. |

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

| | | |
|------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>It's important to preserve what we've got left but (have) new builds that fit in and blend well.</p> <p>Dark skies are important to me.</p> <p>Maintaining ditches around fields to prevent (water) run off as it is bad in Bull Lane.</p> <p>I support (local business) as much as I can.</p> |
| Resident 2 and 3 | | <p>Like: The views, the countryside. Good Neighbours. Historic Buildings.</p> <p>Dislike inconsistent (interrupted) electricity supply.</p> <p>Allow (housing) infill. Allow repurposing of old buildings. Need financial support to encourage supply of affordable housing. Land use has to evolve/change over time.</p> <p>Local businesses are critical – they support local jobs, a positive approach to their planning requirements is needed.</p> |

Session 2: 10:00 – 12:00

| Name | Contact Details | Comments |
|-----------------|-----------------|---|
| Resident 4 | | <p>I like that it's very safe. Lovely dark skies. Rural environment. Views of fields and sheep.</p> <p>I dislike the lack of amenities - could do with a pop-up shop for basic provisions- and power cuts.</p> <p>We need affordable housing for young people. I support agriculture as the major industry in the area.</p> <p>Only 3% of people in the UK can see the Milky Way (due to light pollution) (info from CPRE) – we have an excellent view and possibly the best dark sky in Dorset. Renewable energy would be useful to protect from power cuts. The Knoll is an important landmark. It's great to see it and great to look at the views from it. Each village has its own character which should be maintained whilst acknowledging their connection.</p> |
| Resident 5 | | <p>I like the kindness of neighbours. The church, the churchyard, and dry-stone walls, all of which should be preserved. I dislike speeding traffic; you never see a policeman. Public Transport is not good.</p> <p>Any new houses should have solar panels.</p> <p>Any new houses should have off road parking spaces. Keep the villages separate – no infill. Maintain listed buildings in good order. (Should have) the right to roam but only on footpaths. No building of estates on flood plains. Support family run shops and pubs. Mobile (phone) signals need to be adequate.</p> <p>I would like to hear of developments on the noticeboard and in the BVN.</p> |
| Residents 6 & 7 | | <p>We like the friendly community and natural beauty of the area. We dislike the speeding traffic. Any new building must be in keeping with the area and carbon neutral new builds. Do conservation area and AONB restrictions do enough to protect biodiversity, or should the neighbourhood plan focus on any specific biodiversity issues in our area?</p> <p>Would like to hear of developments on noticeboards, BVN, newsletters public meetings and emails.</p> |
| Resident 8 | | <p>I like being among a group of helpful, friendly people. The space, being able to see the landscape, sky, weather, wildlife and hear the sea from my house. I dislike disputes about boundaries,</p> |

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

| | | |
|-------------|--|---|
| | | <p>apparent inconsistencies in local planning decisions, speed and noise of traffic on the coast road. New housing should be affordable for those working locally, and the size (should be) on the same scale as the existing housing. There are landmark buildings in Swyre which make up the character of the village and should be protected. They are: the church, the farm buildings, the old rectory, the original farm house and the two terraces of houses. Also, several grass verges, at the junction with the coast road, by the telephone kiosk and in front of the church are important. The effects of climate change have become apparent in the more extreme weather patterns. Swyre needs to be protected especially from cloudburst rainstorms which overwhelm the ditches and streams. Recent advice from the department of environment about changing ploughing practise and building reservoirs to hold storm overflow etc should be implemented.</p> <p>One would hope that Swyre continues to be able to support Manor Farm.</p> <p>I would like to hear about NP developments on all of the outlets above plus Puncknowle Post FB page.</p> <p>The N Plan is a good initiative which brings us all together to exchange views and recognise our priorities.</p> |
| Resident 9 | | <p>I like the surrounding countryside and farm fields, the village housing and history, the community spirit and the quiet and peacefulness.</p> <p>I dislike the expansion of car ownership entailing parking issues and the loss of public transport. There are very few opportunities (for development). No (other) dislikes.</p> <p>Positive investment in modern communication required.</p> <p>Upholding heritage is important. Development?... In Swyre!? Multipurpose use of churches.</p> <p>We need to support farm shops and maintain village halls.</p> <p>The website and public/community meetings are important to hear about development in the N Plan.</p> <p>Environment, biodiversity and land use, rural character, protecting the environment, dark skies, renewable energy, climate change – all are important</p> <p>The safety of local roads (is an issue).</p> |
| Resident 10 | | <p>I like the unspoilt views across the fields and to the Jurassic coast.</p> <p>I dislike that there is no mobile signal for a large area in and around our home, there is too much water run-off from land drainage coming onto the coast road, the speed of the traffic on the coast road.</p> <p>Any development should be small scale, infill only and restricted to affordable housing.</p> <p>No second homes.</p> <p>I like the working farm at the centre of Swyre and the views over the surrounding farmland and down to the sea. I think a renewable community energy scheme would be good if ever possible (not sure it is)</p> <p>Keep the villages from merging into each other</p> <p>Protect the ancient wells along the road in Swyre, the walls in Swyre and the remains of the houses that were “Little” Swyre. We have glow worms in and around our property, rare orchids in the village, working farms and fabulous dark skies. All of these should be protected.</p> <p>The views from the coast road are special.</p> |

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Totally support local farms and small businesses and value the pubs and restaurants in Puncknowle and West Bexington.</p> <p>Value the church in Swyre – both as an active church, for its history and as a central meeting place for the village</p> |
|--|--|--|

Appendix 3: West Bexington Details

West Bexington Session 1 18:00 – 20:00

| Name | Contact details | Comments |
|------------|-----------------|--|
| Resident 1 | | <p>Good: The position, maintaining agricultural development in a positive way through Organic Farming.</p> <p>Bad: Speeding, camping on the beach, motor bikes, lack of public transport and cycle routes to west bay.</p> <p>Housing: need affordable</p> <p>Heritage: Farms building. Conservation area for land but not buildings unless they are listed.</p> <p>Environment: Renewable energy, providing it's safe.</p> <p>Developments: broadband improvements, difficulty in accommodating staff who work in small businesses.</p> <p>Contact: yes – part of timely information exchange.</p> <p>Parking – for non-anglers.</p> |
| Resident 2 | | <p>Good: Being by the sea, preserve the environment using good farming practice.</p> <p>Bad: land being used to deposit/store farm items e.g., tyres, seek balance between individual use of land which is not offensive which is not offensive to others.</p> <p>Housing: Accommodation for young families (people)</p> <p>Heritage: Have a lot of assets but lack integrated overview to inform community e.g., map.</p> <p>Environment: Landowners feel responsible for making this happen, creates biodiversity in working life.</p> <p>Including public rights of way and public access.</p> <p>Developments: in favour of supporting local relevant business.</p> <p>Contact: will keep abreast.</p> |
| Resident 3 | | <p>Good: Being by the sea, Waitrose.</p> <p>Bad: lack of control on second homes, younger families can't afford homes.</p> <p>Housing: Social Housing behind Swyre church and the field next to the large house on Swyre Road, plus a community shed. It is important affordable housing is located near public transport, this site is next to the bus stop.</p> <p>Developments: Encourage living and working in village (home working) need good mobile phone signal.</p> |

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

| | | |
|------------|--|---|
| | | Heritage: Ancient drainage pipes on the beach – gun emplacement. Support Business: Worth encouraging small groups to set up local businesses. |
| Resident 4 | | Good: Wild environment and the sea, character of people. Bad: Feels isolated, would like a community hub. Housing: Would like to see houses sub divided (enabling the care of the elderly). Heritage: Destruction of views by the erection of polytunnels Environment: Landowners feel responsible for making this happen, creates biodiversity in working life. Including public rights of way and public access. Support business: different types of local business, poor internet signal. |

West Bexington Session 2: 10:00 – 12:00

| Name | Contact details | Comments |
|-------------|-----------------|---|
| Resident 5 | | Good: Views, quietness, remoteness, fresh sea air, organic farm. Bad: Lack of parking or concessions for locals. Housing: Delicate issue – peoples’ wants and needs difficult to balance. Heritage: Protect buildings and consider community use Support business: need for local support – buy local products. |
| Resident 6 | | Good: Using permissive paths, maintenance required. Community initiative - willing to be involved in future development. |
| Resident 7 | | Bad: Lack of children, population skewed towards older/middle class Heritage: Important to maintain listed status, encourage imaginative ways of using them. Support Business: Local shop for basic provisions e.g., bread, milk, sugar etc. |
| Resident 8 | | Good: Dark Skies preserved, no streetlights. Bad: too many second homes owners, not balanced community. Support business: they can’t run on local support alone. |
| Resident 9 | | Good: Quietness, walking in fields, views not to be taken for granted. Bad: Too many second homes. Support business: People who live and work in the village have an incentive to maintain it and not primary focused on tourism. |
| Resident 10 | | Good: Dark skies, feeling of safety, no cars parked on road, regular paths maintained. Bad: Too many second homes, would like to know breakdown, how to effect proportion of second home ownership to residents (Cornwall example) |
| Resident 11 | | Good: Views, access to footpaths and walks. Bad: Power and mobile phone signal stability. |

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

| | | |
|-------------|--|---|
| Resident 12 | | Good: Rural landscapes, thriving community, having The Manor, walks, quiet area. Bad: Fields covered in plastic and rusting machinery. |
| Resident 13 | | Good: Quietness, sound of the sea, like variety of housing styles. |
| Resident 14 | | Good: Rural character of village. No streetlights, would like public transport and use of electric bikes. |
| Resident 15 | | Good: Dark skies, unspoilt nature of village (no yellow lines) footpaths, parish boundary sculptures, the people, the natural environment, the sensitive stewardship of Tamarisk farm. Bad: No community meeting place in the village, other than The Manor, overly bright security lights and outdoor lights, fishermen blocking the beach. Housing: Affordable, suggest looking at what Drimpton achieved, maybe community trust land. Sympathetic and subtle alterations are fine (Cranford is a good example) that are in keeping with what is here. Support Business: Love the organic farm, wondered if wind farm would be a possibility here for renewable energy. We are tremendously lucky having an organic farm whose stewardship of the land is so careful - Norfolk farms as a comparison. Would like this to continue. |

Appendix 4: Groups

| Name | Contact details | Comments |
|------------|-----------------|--|
| Resident 1 | Puncknowle | Good: The people, location and various community organisations. Bad: lack of transport, lack of affordable housing. Development: Scope for limited housing. Should be ring fenced for local people and not second or holiday homes. Heritage: Important to maintain local history. Environment: Important to balance productive farming with wildlife. Local renewable energy would benefit the village, however, can envisage problems with this. No streetlights in Puncknowle please. |
| Resident 2 | Puncknowle | Good: A community that takes care of each other. A safe place for children to grow up. Space. Bad: No affordable housing for our children – they have to move away. Too many second homes. Development: Housing for local people. Heritage: More funding for heritage buildings. |
| Resident 3 | Puncknowle | Good: Views, Friendly (small supportive), Pub (Events) Bad: Better access roads to the village, cutting of hedges on smaller roads. Development: in keeping with what is here (best of) and accessible for buying, renting for those less well off (young and old). |

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

| | | |
|------------|------------|---|
| | | <p>Environment: Yes, to all of the above bracketed, but not fields of solar panels (windmills planned in keeping with natural environment).</p> <p>Supporting local business: Yes., but how to achieve.</p> |
| Resident 4 | Puncknowle | <p>Good: Compact, silent but lived in, pub/church.</p> <p>Bad: too many holiday lets and second homes – some areas are really untidy.</p> <p>Development: Some infill housing – Not B&B or holiday lets.</p> <p>Heritage: Difficult to maintain heritage with empty houses in winter.</p> <p>Environment: No car charging points – should be allowed. There are some unsightly areas that need attendance (plot by the garages) bottom of Clay Lane.</p> <p>Support local business. What is a local business? Does this include holiday lets? How many businesses are registered?</p> |
| Resident 5 | Puncknowle | <p>Good: Countryside and accessibility to it. Character of the village. Friendliness of the villagers.</p> <p>Bad: sometimes overpowering rural smells. Lack of public transport, especially in winter- no buses in the evening. The number of empty properties.</p> <p>Development: ideally fewer empty houses and lower prices for the indigenous/working people can also live here – not just the wealthy.</p> <p>Heritage: Very much needs to be preserved. Great to learn more of the history and significance of the old and inform others so they appreciate it to.</p> <p>Environment: incredibly important – all for conservation, preservation and helping to protect the earth and minimise global warming.</p> <p>Support local business: yes, if they don't impact negatively on the nature of the village and countryside.</p> |
| Resident 6 | Puncknowle | <p>Good: Community aspects -church/pub etc. I like the fact that the village isn't highly organised (no bossy people) and therefore feels natural to live in. There are small Groups – craft/history and we have a Parish Council which seems ineffectual from the outside.</p> <p>Bad: Nothing in particular.</p> <p>Development: Maybe a few more affordable rented properties to encourage new families to join.</p> <p>Heritage: the Crown Inn is an important hub in the village, and I am trying to get more revenue for the Church.</p> <p>Environment: The land around Puncknowle is owned by Puncknowle Manor. It is not intensively farmed and has many good aspects for wildlife – conservation strips around fields/woodland, fields planted for wild birds.</p> <p>Supporting Local Business: yes, if the business gives good service.</p> |
| Resident 7 | Puncknowle | <p>Good: Friendly, Church, Luncheon Club, Little Green Bus</p> <p>Development: More amenities – shop/bus.</p> |

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|---|
| | | <p>Heritage: Preserve them Environment: Need to preserve farming community and landscape. Support local business: Yes if there were some.</p> |
| Resident 8 | West Bexington | <p>Good: Pleasant and quiet. Very good neighbours. Bad: No shops. No proper buses apart from community bus. Development: No amenities to encourage families to move in. Heritage: Not too many required. Environment: Very good that farmers (some) are encouraging wildflowers and birds. Support local business: Not too many.</p> |
| Resident 9 | Swyre | <p>Good: Pub, Village Hall, Church Bad: Transport services – Broadband Development: More affordable sustainable housing for young people in keeping with village character. Heritage: redundant houses should be turned into housing not holiday lets. Environment: While everyone cares about the environment, priority needs to places are wildlife friendly. Food promotion.</p> |
| Resident 10 | Puncknowle | <p>Good: The history of the area and residents are friendly. The character should be preserved. Bad: don't dislike anything – it would be nice to see more flowers by Puncknowle signs and church. Development: More affordable properties available for young people and families less holiday rentals. Heritage: I think heritage is so important to keep its identity. Every village has a past. Environment: I think all of these are important and should be prioritised. Support Local Business:100% - we always support local or individuals.</p> |
| Resident 11 | Puncknowle | <p>Good: English Countryside, vernacular architecture, and open field arable/pastoral farming. Bad: Property owners should try and contain their environmental impact within the boundaries of their own properties. That includes light and noise pollution and run off. Signage should be discrete. Development: The ethos that every village should be apportioned the same amount of housing development is not sustainable in terms of protecting nature and diversity. Certain areas of this island need to escape further development. Our links with the EU resulted in a lack of proportionality... France for example has 4.5 times the surface area with a slightly smaller population. The UK is now the most densely populated country in Europe, having overtaken the Netherlands. If current trends continue, there will be nowhere to grow food and the British holiday will simply comprise visiting another suburban area. This is already true of many seaside spa towns. It has tended to be the old fishing villages that have retained some of their character, which is presumably why Cornwall remains so popular. It too is dying in terms of appeal! We should not forget that Puncknowle was a fishing village well into the late 20th Century!! Swyre had a dependence on the sea too Heritage: We now have 15-minute city ideology being implemented. Villages were 15-minute, yet they have been dismantled by centralisation. It is interesting that Puncknowle School was originally designed for 130</p> |

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>children. Swyre also had a school. How many children live here now yet are being bused away?</p> <p>Environment: One cannot introduce further housing development since it is sheer numbers of people that destroy the rural environment. The fertile land should be used for the growing of crops and the grazing of animals. The countryside is not primarily a playground for city folk as television might lead us to believe. Wilding can be used to improve the countryside, but it should not take large tracts of farmland out of food production. If the UNESCO World Heritage Site and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty are to mean anything then a different set of criteria need to be applied.</p> <p>Supporting Local Business: We need to support farming and traditional rural businesses. Working from home has been beneficial in that it is relatively low impact although the demand for 5G comms might change that. It seems to me that community support may lead to the expansion of retirement communities which are detrimental to the needs of young people. Inconvenience protects rural life and can help to maintain a demographic balance! It may well be that poor transport links have protected west Dorset! It is of course over an hour's driving to get to the nearest Motorway.</p> <p>Other Comments: The countryside is under threat because the quality of life and air is perceived by those brought up in our towns and some parts of suburbia to be better. Unfortunately, many of those people do not like isolation, inconvenience, the sound of silence, mud on their feet, darkness, etc. Conditioning from our surroundings and the Mainstream Media inevitably affects all of us.</p> <p>There is a tendency for this majority with suburban roots to recreate (often unwittingly) suburbia in the countryside. There is similarly a tendency not to notice the detriment of double yellow lines, additional road signs, street lighting, pavements, pedestrian crossings, etc. Worse still there are the traffic-calming schemes, which tend to increase pollution and all those mini-roundabouts which have never succeeded in safely prioritising drivers coming in from side roads.</p> <p>These trends of course permeate Councils and attempts to improve anything often result in detriment to the countryside. Beware the terms "improvement" and "enhancement"! Don't get me wrong, it is inevitable that country people, those that are left, enjoy some of the benefits of infrastructure (we are all being conditioned), but the expansion of such infrastructure needs to be carefully controlled and remain low impact. Worse still, the food security that dominated the post-war period has been forgotten, many people do not know where their food originated beyond the supermarket shelf and farmers are often perceived to be enemies of the environment. This is not being helped by television programmes which see the countryside as a recreational area, an escape from the cities, rather than it being productive in terms of crops, animals, field sports, forestry, etc. The truth is that without the big landowners, the farmers, the Ministry of Defence and the benevolent there would probably be little traditional English countryside left. The attitude to farmers and the resulting impact on their profit and welfare, one way or another, has led to much farmland becoming available to developers. A parcel of flatland in the countryside, even if it is an old floodplain, is now seen as ripe for development be it housing, a site for an alternative energy array or for waste disposal. Golf courses are considered to be countryside... they are not!! Rural characteristics and identity which includes villages</p> |
|--|--|--|

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>cannot be maintained if nothing rural remains. The village becomes a variant of Disneyland!! I would say that the “Jurassic Coast” label is indicative of this trend. It is a far cry from the Blue Lias of Lyme Regis that many enlightened schoolboys might have wanted to visit in the 1950’s!</p> <p>Puncknowle until recent times was a fishing village and should have a special littoral status. The Jurassic coast UNESCO world heritage site seems to be 95 miles long in terms of coastline, but how far does it extend inland? It’s breadth does not appear to be defined on the Web. All our coastline is now erosion coastline due to the proliferation of the winning of marine aggregate and sand by dredging with the incessant need for concrete and mortar. This has accelerated the retreat of the coastline, so the definition of any coastal zone needs to take this phenomenon into consideration!</p> <p>If Puncknowle is included (it surely should be) then these UNESCO aspirations apply.....</p> <p>QUOTE: “The Jurassic Coast Trust, the independent charity wholly responsible for the site, sees it as a joint endeavour. The Trust’s Learning Framework states ‘At the heart of our work is a belief that the Jurassic Coast is ultimately best looked after by the people who visit it, use it and love it. Therefore, our focus is always as much upon the people and communities of our World Heritage Site as it is upon the rocks, landscapes, and fossils.’</p> <p>This belief is embedded in the site’s partnership plan which outlines a clear set of responsible, inclusive and sustainable goals and objectives, particularly influenced by Articles 4, 5 and 27 of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention.¹¹³ These articles encourage the site to make it their ‘duty’ to protect, preserve and present its heritage (Article 4), to ‘strengthen the appreciation and respect by the people towards the Jurassic Coast’ (Article 27), to have ‘a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes’ (Article 5).”</p> <p>In the Shell Book of English Villages of 1980, Anthony Brode is scathing describing the villages as follows; “Puncknowle - now dominated by awkwardly-stepped terraces as well as farm silos – and Swyre, where caravans have been allowed to trickle down the combe between village and sea”.</p> <p>Unfortunately, these trends become a slippery slope since precedents are often quoted regarding planning applications. The aesthetics deteriorate further.</p> <p>We already have the approaches to Burton Bradstock, the entrance to the Hive, the approaches to Swyre and much of West Bexington resembling suburbia. I would be interested to know what the Jurassic Trust believe they have achieved in terms of conservation. Certainly, the accreditation has increased the number of visitors. Puncknowle, Swyre and West Bexington need to take a leaf out of the Abbotsbury book, although I accept that the big landowners, such as the Ilchester, have probably been more successful than most in preserving rural Dorset.</p> <p>Whilst only resident for 18 months, I have regularly visited Poundbury over the years and was certainly a strong supporter of the young Prince Charles’ critique of modern architecture. I still admire the first phase of Poundbury development. I have followed the expansion of C. G. Fry’s building quality and positive influence which has permeated some Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall developments. Since living here, I inevitably</p> |
|--|--|---|

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

| | | |
|-------------|------------|---|
| | | discovered that C. G. Fry is based in Litton Cheney. What I find interesting is that whilst the influence of C.G. Fry seems to have spread further west, it does not appear to have crossed the Bride Valley to Puncknowle! My general impression is that west Dorset has more unspoilt countryside than much of the UK and it is important that we preserve it. |
| Resident 12 | Puncknowle | <p>Good: No street lighting, no yellow lines, no 30-mph speed limit.</p> <p>Bad: Lack of parking especially for the hall.</p> <p>Development: No new build without considering whole infrastructure, lack of buses & affordable housing.</p> <p>Heritage: each village should retain its identity and any new build should reflect this in design and material.</p> <p>Environment: Protecting the environment and biodiversity and use of land are vitally important – dark skies – peace and quiet etc.</p> <p>Support Local business: Yes, as long as they conform to the rural aspect of the village and do not impact on it.</p> |
| Resident 13 | Swyre | <p>Likes: working farm in centre of village, beautiful, quiet location and friendly;</p> <p>Dislikes: speed and noise of traffic on Coast Road, creeping development along Hazel Lane; lack of housing for young people;</p> <p>Development: Would like to see: affordable housing for young, more use of heritage buildings such as the church,</p> <p>Environment: protection of the environment and support of farming are important, also dark skies, keeping the identity of the separate villages – not to blur their boundaries;</p> <p>Supports local business.</p> |

Appendix 5: Other Elements

12.1 Comments not attributed at the Drop In:

“How do we bring in new blood/life into the village or it will become a retirement village.”

“Registration of footpaths.” Dave Bird explained the process, that they were mapped and fall under Dorset Council, who will carry out repairs.

“WIFI tec infrastructure to improve broadband.”

“Double decker buses and large farm vehicles impact on trees.”

5.2 Letter from XXXXXXXXX

Thank you for letting us have a say on the future of the villages. My name is XXXXXXXXX, I am 24 years old and currently live with my parents and work locally.

I would love to be able to afford to buy a home in one of my local villages. Unfortunately, due to the vast amount of second homes and very few affordable homes, it makes it extremely difficult to purchase within the local area.

With the amount of second homes within the three villages, a lot of these are unoccupied for many months of the year. This is very frustrating for the local younger generation where these properties are unoccupied for many months of the year. This is very frustrating for the local younger generation where these properties are left empty with no contribution to the community. If local people were to have the opportunity to purchase within the area, they would also be more active within the community to help the local villages to thrive.

I feel that we are being forced to move away from the area due to the lack of affordable (2/3 bed) properties becoming available.

I would be grateful if consideration could be given to restricting the amount of second homes within the villages and it would also be beneficial to the younger generation if development of smaller and more affordable homes could be built within the area to allow us to remain within the community, we all love.

Thank you for taking the time to read my letter.

5.1 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX email:

Hi XXXX,

You popped round last week, and gave me a flyer for your Neighbourhood meeting.

As I said, I wouldn't be able to go, but I thought I'd send you some quick thoughts on the points that you mentioned:

What I like?

- Beautiful location
- An eclectic mix of friendly people
- 'Working village' (Puncknowle) - As in it's not a twee representation of a rural village. Real people going about their daily lives. With few holiday homes.

What don't I like?

- No bus service from the village
- Minority of drivers driving too fast
- Dog poo on road/paths

Environmental issues?

- Community solar would be lovely
- Prioritise any building of new homes, to be affordable, eco-friendly (solar, ground source heat pumps, etc), and for people who live locally
- Deter holiday lets through greatly increased council tax. Or legislate against further holiday homes, as has happened in other parts of the UK, like The Lake District, Cornwall, Wales, etc.

Support local businesses?

- I think that having a village bus service would benefit local business, as it discourages people from just buying online.
- Bridport doesn't do a great job of communicating the great range of diverse businesses on offer.

I hope this helps.

Thanks

5.4 Comments from residents who couldn't attend:

Three residents who were unable to attend because of age and, or mobility (Puncknowle):

The first mentioned how important local friends were and wished we could have a small residential home for the elderly in the village so that people did not have to leave, and that would release smaller/bungalow homes for younger people and families. Transport is a big issue, and she was fearful of losing the community bus (once a week service only when called for) – realises that this bus isn't frequent/useful enough for people to use instead of their cars. The 110 bus was a really important service when it ran a few years ago. Very mindful of the need to encourage young generation to live in the village by having affordable houses.

Neighbourhood Plan Community Engagement Working Group

A second lady who has lived in the village for many years remembers when people used to be out and about in the village more and women would sit on the doorsteps making nets – adding a community feel and everyone knew each other. Now she doesn't know many people in the village. Transport, and support is an issue. I understood that she felt a level of isolation.

Another who is isolated by mobility issues wanted to say that she would like to come and take part but can't access the Village Hall easily – why don't we have a ramp? She uses wheelchair. She felt strongly about many of the housing, transport and environmental issues that have already been raised.

A resident of Swyre who spoke to a representative on the doorstep:said that footpaths are disappearing and/or not being maintained.

Appendix 6: Questions

1. What do you like about living in our villages and what should we aim to preserve (top three things)?
2. What do you dislike about living in our villages and what would you like to see changed (top three things)?
3. What do you think about housing (development priorities, building guidelines, infrastructure etc.)?
4. What do you think about heritage issues (identities of villages, development guidelines, use of heritage buildings etc.)?
5. What do you think about environment, biodiversity, and land use (rural character, protecting environment, dark skies, renewable energy, climate change etc.)?
6. What do you think about supporting local businesses (priorities, community support etc.)?
7. How would you wish to hear of developments in the Neighbourhood Plan (email, website, notice boards, Puncknowle Post, BVN, newsletters, public meetings etc.)?
8. Any other comments?