

Flooding

Who is responsible for planning decisions on flooding?

THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY are the regulatory body for works in close proximity to **main river** channels and **river (fluvial) flood risk** and are consulted on all development proposals within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 (medium to high risk).

DORSET COUNTY COUNCIL is the regulatory body for ‘**ordinary watercourses**’ (ie channels/streams not main rivers) and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) dealing with matters such as **surface water** and **groundwater** drainage, and are always consulted on major development proposals with sites over 1ha, or 10+ dwellings.

WESSEX WATER are responsible for **water supply** and the **sewerage** network

NORTH DORSET DISTRICT COUNCIL are the **Local Planning Authority** and ultimately responsible for determining all planning proposals.

We have looked at drafting a policy that really highlights the flooding issues local residents have faced – feedback we have had so far (summarised)

Environment Agency: flood risk in the area is also influenced by groundwater flooding, which could result in increased floodplain beyond the mapped fluvial and surface water extents, and would benefit from local knowledge and expertise.

Dorset County Council: All development proposals should be supported by a site specific Flood Risk Assessment (where appropriate), and supporting Drainage Strategy that sets out a conceptual scheme for surface water management.

Wessex Water: Milborne St Andrew is known for its groundwater flooding, and sewer flooding has been due to ground and surface water entering into the foul sewers, causing surcharging. Planning applications should be supported by a Surface and Foul Water Drainage Strategy outlining the proposed approach to draining. Infiltration techniques should account for local and groundwater conditions. Surface water connections to the foul drainage network will not be accepted

Forward Actions: -

- Continue to investigate how we can map or more clearly define those areas at risk of groundwater flooding.
- Include policy and give clearer guidance on potential solutions for reducing risk, following further discussions with the statutory bodies.

Character – Key Findings

1. Green spaces and trees are important. We should ensure the retention of existing green spaces, public spaces e.g. recreation grounds, footpaths and stream. Any new development should reflect the need for 'green spaces' and of trees
2. We should be clearer about what building styles and materials would be suitable, to retain a character of a 'typical Dorset village'. In particular
 - a. Buildings should be no greater than 2 stories
 - b. Mixed style development – no 'urban' estates
 - c. Include information on local building styles and materials
3. Any new development needs to be enable / incorporate safe integrated road access for pedestrians. Suggestions of through roads with fewer cul de sacs.
4. Consideration should be made for low lighting to reduce light pollution and at a lower level i.e. near footpaths.
5. Footpaths around the village and allowing walks into the countryside are important, providing easy access to green spaces and recreation. These should be incorporated in any new build.
6. There should be better ways to slow down vehicles as they come into the village on the A354, to make this road more pleasant to walk along and cross – are there any workable solutions that the Neighbourhood Plan could help bring forward?

Onward Actions

1. Footpaths – can we identify which are most important / used, and where there are problems or footpaths aren't useful e.g. not connecting with other footpaths, overgrown, etc.
2. Green spaces i.e. Wetherby Castle, Parish Pit, Milborne Woods and the Coffin Path. Have we identified all the important areas that should be protected?
3. Investigate schemes, alongside council officials, to find solutions to traffic problems on the main road

Parking.

The household questionnaire highlighted that parking was seen to be an issue in certain areas within the village, therefore we have produced a draft policy to try and address the issues in future developments.

The below text shows the main points of the draft policy but also includes a table of existing guidance for reference purposes.

The aim of this policy is to dictate the minimum required level of car parking required for new developments (of all sizes) within the Parish of Milborne St Andrew.

The typical car parking space shall measure no less than 2.8m wide by 5.0m long. This allows for a width of 0.4m for door opening within the space. The width can be reduced to 2.4m if a 0.4m clearance is available immediately adjacent to one side of the space. A 6.0m aisle width is required in front of the space to allow vehicles to easily turn into and out of it. This aisle width may be reduced if the space width is widened accordingly.

Garages, car ports or car barns must be allocated to specific properties, and must stay allocated and available to that property for the life of the property, (not rented out separately as they currently are in social housing situations)

Garages, car ports or car barns must be designed with access so that they can be used for the parking of cars (rather than for storage), reducing the demand for on-street parking. The typical single garage, car port or car barn must have minimum internal dimensions of 3.0m wide by 6.0m long per bay. A minimum opening of 2.4m must be provided per bay. A forecourt length of 5.5m allows for the door (if fitted) to be opened whilst a car is parked in the space in front of it. If no parking space is to be provided in front of the garage, the garage should be set back a minimum of 0.5m from the property boundary to allow for the door opening.

Side by side parking is preferred to inline parking, as it’s often seen than inline provision for two cars ends up only being used by one vehicle due to the awkwardness of having to move one vehicle to get another out. There shall be no more than 2 inline spaces per dwelling, including garages, car ports and barns.

<i>Existing parking provision guidance for developments of 5 dwellings or less.</i>	
<i>Number of bedrooms</i>	<i>Parking spaces.</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>1 or 2</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>2 or 3</i>
<i>Visitor parking; One visitor space will normally be required for these proposals per development</i>	

Proposed parking provision for Milborne St Andrew per dwelling.		
Number of Bedrooms	Allocated Parking Spaces	Unallocated Parking Spaces
1	1	1
2	2	½
3	3	½
4	3 or 4	½
5	4	½

Unallocated space numbers shall be rounded up per development.

Garages which are attached to the dwelling to which they belong shall not be eligible to be counted as allocated parking, detached garages can be allocated spaces. This is due to the chances of attached garages being converted to residential space and lost as parking spaces. Where a dwelling has a garage, which is big enough to be deemed to be one of the allocated spaces, there is a requirement to provide an extra ½ an unallocated space per garage for that dwelling (rounded up per development) this is due to the chances of the garage not being used for its designed purpose. This requirement does not apply to car ports or car barns due to them not being suitable to be used for alternative purposes.

Business And Employment

KEY FINDINGS

- Encourage commercial building areas/opportunities
- No need for further employment – but would be nice
- Residents ask for more small units, how can this be achieved/encouraged
- Rather than new space for commercial units – encourage existing to expand.

Support 'sympathetic' creation of additional small units, and resist change of use of existing stock.

ONWARD ACTIONS

- Identify employment sites – and encourage home working?
- Good support for more businesses but promotion needed and more units or 'home units/work spaces'

Conclusion:

Whilst research returned self reported full business units by owners, there is little enthusiasm for residents with businesses to relocate to the village. However the population, as a whole, overwhelming felt that the village would benefit from more businesses, primarily small units. This also is reflected by the research findings.

Neighbourhood Plan – the way forward

The NP will endeavour to support the creation of additional small units. It will resist change of use of existing stock from commercial to domestic. The NP will attempt to identify suitable employment sites for small units (reflecting results from the questionnaire). And the NP will establish a definition of criteria for 'sympathetic'.

Specifically

Qualitative research showed wish for café (5), this has to be community/ commercial led, outside Neighbourhood Plan remit.

Update

Camelco have indicated that they may develop their brownfield site for commercial OR domestic dwellings

Where unallocated spaces are designed in car park type situation, Disabled spaces should be added to the existing number of spaces at a ratio of 1:10 or part thereof.

Facilities

All facilities within the village were mentioned many times on the returned questionnaires as being very important. The highest proportion commented on were as follows:

- G.P. Practice
- Milborne First School
- Village Shop
- Post Office
- Village Hall
- The Royal Oak

The following were also mentioned on a high percentage of returned questionnaires:

- Milborne pre-school
- The Village Hall Playing Fields
- The Sports Pavilion and Fields
- The Allotments

A new purpose built main G.P. practice was mentioned as desirable, as was a new building for the Pre-School.

Three sites were offered with some space set aside for the above, these were, the land behind Homefield, Camelco (land opposite the old factory site) and the land adjacent to Brooklands. None of these sites are being considered to date by either the GP's or the Pre-school, as many aspects will have to be considered by both these facilities, mainly of course financial.

More parking facilities for the church were felt to be important, but it should be noted that Mark Frampton has provided a lot of extra parking for church users on his own land and has gone as far as to fence off the available parking strip.

Renewables

Consensus for smaller renewables

Support actions for “retro-fitting” sustainable solutions, subject to an Impact Assessment

Ensure Tree planting included and assess the impact upon wildlife, and visual intrusion

Forward Actions:

- Renewables are still contentious, and suggested NOT to include in the plan. Not showing consensus either way.

North Dorset District Council’s policy on renewables in brief:

When considering proposals for heat or electricity generation from renewable or low carbon sources, the social, economic and environmental benefits of the scheme should be assessed against the likely impacts.

A proposal for generating heat or electricity from renewable or low carbon sources (excluding wind energy development) will be permitted provided it can be demonstrated that:

- both individually and cumulatively, all adverse impacts arising from the proposal have been satisfactorily assessed; and
- the proposal has maximised the potential to mitigate any adverse impacts that have been identified; and
- the actual benefits that the scheme will deliver outweigh the adverse impacts that remain.

Housing – Key Findings

In January of this year there were 39 applicants on the housing register interested in finding accommodation in Milborne St Andrew. 14 of these had a local connection, including 7 living in the village but in unsuitable accommodation. Most were looking for rented accommodation, primarily for 1 bedroom properties.

This potentially does not show the 'whole picture' of housing need. In response to the household questionnaire in 2016, some 36 people said they were in need of more affordable housing. About a quarter of all responses said their housing needs were likely to change in the foreseeable future, usually because of health reasons (e.g. limited mobility), the need to a starter home for young adult/couple, or larger home to accommodate children.

When we asked 'how much housing' we should have, we had a wide spread of opinions – some people wanting very little growth, and some happy to see a much higher level of housebuilding particularly if this could help deliver significant benefits to the village.

The Local Plan does not give a specific housing need figure for Milborne St Andrew, but our 'fair share' of the larger villages target would be about 44 – 50 dwellings over 20 years – or 2½ homes on average each year. This is fairly similar to the typical level of housebuilding we have had in the village in the last 20 years, if you ignore the 'spike' of housing completions in 2002/3.

Emerging ideas:

1. Our target should be to average 2 – 3 homes every year, unless there is a really compelling community benefit from building more homes.
2. We need some affordable housing as part of this mix – this should remain affordable, with priority given to housing people with a local connection, and shouldn't stand apart from open market housing.
3. Any open market housing should be geared towards starter homes for young people, couples and families (though this shouldn't compromise on parking requirements and village character), and perhaps some homes designed more for older people who may be less mobile.