

Appendix B

Full comments from the consultation – grouped by priority area and topic

Contents

Housing.....	2
Economy	32
Transport.....	46
Environment & Heritage.....	73
Climate Change	86
Community Facilities.....	95

Housing

Full comments: 307 comments in total received for Housing (Note: some responses were split where more than one topic was covered in the response; none have been removed)

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H1 Meet the affordable housing need by prioritising it on all new developments? (94 comments)	
Priority to be given to local people 30 comments	<p>It's important that local people can live here. Priority should be to accommodate local workers. I do not know how this can be delivered.</p> <p>More housing for local young not for second homes.</p> <p>Help local people obtain a home of their own.</p> <p>Any future development should only be for local people to live in whether social housing, rented or affordable homes.</p> <p>We are not against large development as such, as long as it's sustainable and meets local need, i.e. affordability.</p> <p>More than 50% affordable housing should be set aside for local people.</p> <p>Within the umbrella of affordable housing the council should ensure that there are housing association houses that offer affordable rent and security for local people on low wages.</p> <p>Aim to ensure the needs of local people are met - rather than attract those requiring second/third homes, those with so much money to spend that developers lack the motivation to provide 'affordable' housing (a certain estate agent boasts in its advertising that a certain very large percentage of homes were sold to those from London, the S.E. - this is a disgrace).</p> <p>Any housing should be for local people at a reasonable price or be let to local people.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H1 Meet the affordable housing need by prioritising it on all new developments? (94 comments)	
	<p>As long as local people get most of the proposed housing - not people from outside the area</p> <p>There are small pockets of land within the town and in the surrounding fields that would be suitable to use to create affordable housing for local people.</p> <p>Local need should mean just that</p> <p>It is important that the needs are met of all local families. The wages in West Dorset do not allow for the income of the retirees coming in from outside the area.</p> <p>Housing in this area does not cater for people on low incomes, there should be a lot more social housing.</p> <p>People say that when new houses are built and the people who will be moving in are new comers. I partially disagree local young people like myself who are still living with family, we want to be able to move out and have our own home. We already use the dentists, doctors, etc. so local young people are not putting 'extra strain' on the infrastructure as we already have doctors etc. within the town. We just need an opportunity to move out of the parents house and into our own. It ok for the older generation they mostly already own their property what about the young locals? There should be more shared ownership housing.</p> <p>We need affordable housing for young people.</p> <p>Make affordable housing for local young people <u>first</u>.</p> <p>I think any large development sites should be taken over by the Town Council, to build and run as council housing for real local people born and bred in Bridport, not outsiders. This would make sure they would be affordable to rent</p> <p>When houses are made to make sure 90% are for people who are from Bridport and not 2nd homes or bought by outsiders because they can afford them. And these homes should follow with the wages of Bridport which are quite low!</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H1 Meet the affordable housing need by prioritising it on all new developments? (94 comments)	
	<p>It is very topical as are the other questions in view of Vearse Farm. If that project was made up of social housing for local needs and real affordable houses, there would not be so many people objecting to it,</p> <p>I believe social housing should be a priority. There are a lot of local families and single people on low wages who need secure affordable housing. This could be developed both within and outside the town.</p> <p>Developers are greedy! There should be at least 50% given over to first time buyers from the locality, with possible low cost renting as well.</p> <p>Also needed is lower than market value property to buy, available to those who live or work in Bridport and/or shared ownership.</p> <p>We do need more housing that is genuinely affordable by those who live and work here, especially those in low paid work, unemployed or in other difficult circumstances.</p> <p><u>All</u> new builds should be affordable housing, speculate development only brings more non-locals into the area and exacerbates property price rises.</p> <p>I find the people who are so against affordable housing are not local, but people who have retired here with plenty of money and total disregard of local peoples need.</p> <p>To ensure affordable and social housing is offered to local people first. We also need more affordable housing for our young people. We are becoming an old town.</p> <p>Any designated site should not be able to go ahead until it agrees to prioritise a decent percentage of affordable homes (affordable in terms of the local population requiring housing) , not as a tack on when enough up-market homes have been built and sold.</p> <p>Housing <u>must</u> be affordable for <u>local</u> families.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H1 Meet the affordable housing need by prioritising it on all new developments? (94 comments)	
	<p>There needs to be opportunities for the younger generation to buy a property where they have grown up to, I think shared ownership is a good way forward & hopefully one day I shall be able to have the chance to buy. Lots of my friends have moved away as there are no jobs in this area, which support the cost of living.</p>
<p>Meeting needs of particular groups (young/elderly/key workers)</p> <p>19 comments</p>	<p>As the older population increases it is important to construct properties accessible to wheelchair users, so they can stay in their own home for as long as possible and be close to neighbours they already know.</p> <p>The problems are that there is too much building of expensive housing that only 'incomers' can afford. The youngsters are forced out or have to continue to live at home because they cannot afford to buy on their incomes and there is insufficient social housing available. Central Government should be doing more to encourage social housing (and that is the fault of all parties that it is not done).</p> <p>Housing for local people should also include the moving into the area for work eg. teachers</p> <p>We have many luxury types of houses. These attract more people from outside and the local young are still unable to afford. Suitable housing to stay in the area. This creates an in balance of older retired people.</p> <p>Housing for single people, difficult I know because of land prices, may be ground and first floor, 2 flats sensitively designed i.e. up not along but NOT an eyesore</p> <p>Aim at first time buyers to keep the youth in town, rather than second home buyers and holiday homes.</p> <p>I am also very concerned about the lack of housing accessible by people with physical difficulties - very hard to find anywhere wheelchair accessible.</p> <p>Are the elderly being considered in the new housing proposals or only young families?</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H1 Meet the affordable housing need by prioritising it on all new developments? (94 comments)	
	<p>More new housing should be suitable for elderly and disabled.</p> <p>Do something to help the local youngsters whose wages are lower. The new comers can usually help themselves.</p> <p>Need to cater for the minority as well as the majority.</p> <p>Key workers are the essential focus but if this means younger families then we need public transport facilities to support them.</p> <p>Housing sites should be suitable for local elderly as well as young aspiring families.</p> <p>More effort should be made for first time buyers, especially for youngsters brought up in this area.</p> <p>We need affordable housing for our young people, otherwise we will lose them from our area, as they will have to move away to find homes elsewhere.</p> <p>Some affordable housing is required but there are other worthy needs that should not be ignored, elderly, special needs etc. These should all be priorities and come from within existing site allocations.</p> <p>Affordable housing for young people trying to get onto the property ladder is important as house prices in this area are over-inflated due to the number of second homes etc. There is a need for social housing but working young people must not be forgotten so for me, affordable housing is a greater priority.</p> <p>The need is for affordable housing for local young people and this should be accommodated within the existing development sites NOT by taking up more green land allocated outside existing built up area.</p> <p>Whilst affordable housing is a clear priority new developments should provide for a mix of housing needs across the whole community. Key worker schemes should be considered to address the difficulty of recruitment in many areas such as the NHS; education; police; local authorities.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H1 Meet the affordable housing need by prioritising it on all new developments? (94 comments)	
Definition of what is 'affordable' 11 comments	<p>What is "affordable housing"? "Affordable" to who? Small "starter" homes are a good way of getting residents on the housing ladder - but they should be considered but not classes as a priority.</p> <p>What is affordable?</p> <p>What is affordable housing? A young couple in this area would struggle to get a mortgage large enough to buy a house never mind save the deposit while paying extortionate rents to private landlords.</p> <p>What the government (national and local) consider affordable is not in fact affordable for most.</p> <p>Even so called affordable housing is not affordable for young (indeed older).</p> <p>This is a very difficult set of questions. At the heart is the issue of 'affordability'. What precisely is meant by 'affordable housing'? 'Affordable housing' is also not necessarily the same as 'lower cost rented housing' or 'social housing'.</p> <p>"Affordable" or genuinely affordable? And result attempts by developers to wriggle out of that responsibility.</p> <p>Would prefer to see the term 'genuinely affordable' as opposed to the government's use of the term 'affordable housing' which is still expensive.</p> <p>'Affordable' housing is not affordable.</p> <p>What is affordable for our young folk? Most of the "affordable" houses are occupied by incoming retirees or second homes. We do not want to be a town for "oldies". We need our young folks to stay. This is a low wage area they should have priority housing.</p> <p>I am not sure what constitutes affordable housing, how is it controlled (e.g.. Who can buy/sell). I am strongly in favour of housing associations that seem to manage these developments very well.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H1 Meet the affordable housing need by prioritising it on all new developments? (94 comments)	
<p>35% affordable housing requirement in the Local Plan/planning applications and decisions</p> <p>10 comments</p>	<p>35% on all new developments should be affordable - rent or buy - and this should be <u>NON NEGOTIABLE!</u></p> <p>35% <u>social</u> housing not "affordable"! Should be <u>mandatory</u>.</p> <p>If developer claims housing is not financially viable their justification must be subject to scrutiny but by whom?</p> <p>Social and affordable are paramount but so often builders find a look hole to avoid supplying sufficient or none at all.</p> <p>Council needs to deliver on the existing affordable housing target</p> <p><u>Affordable</u>/social needs should not only be agreed at planning level but rigidly enforced in the delivery stages.</p> <p>How do you intend to stop developers, who promise to provide affordable housing in order to get their planning approved, form back tracking because they say they cannot get enough profit?</p> <p>If H1 plan is met - H4 plan shouldn't be necessary. I do feel that any development should meet the needs of those living in Bridport or its surrounding areas.</p> <p>Any provision in development of 35% affordable housing, should be insisted upon and not be capable of being avoided at all.</p> <p>Bridport should also allocate a percentage of all new housing sites to self-build co-ops - ideally 25% of all new build should be self-build.</p>
<p>Private v social/CLT housing</p> <p>8 comments</p>	<p>This problem would be solved if council land and council money was used appropriately to build more council houses - not to be hood winked by developers. Return to the policy prior to Maggie Thatcher the days reasonable rent will suit those on limited means.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H1 Meet the affordable housing need by prioritising it on all new developments? (94 comments)	
	<p>Look more to private land lords. Look at part buy/part rent. Social housing - perhaps not Magna? As they 'have let' Court Orchard and parts of Skilling look very 'run down'.</p> <p>Ideally we should have Community Land Trusts that own the houses in perpetuity - you have to sell back to the CLT.</p> <p>As you know the issue with so-called affordable housing is that someone needs to pay the subsidy - and central government is the only body that can do this on the scale needed and the refusal of government to do this is what has caused the shortage, along with the continued sale of social housing. It has really got nothing to do with sites - parishes can already develop exception sites if they find them - but the shortage of these sites is down to the shortage of landowners prepared to give away land free. This is not an issue that can be solved locally. Additionally there will always be a big housing list here even if you build many more affordable houses - poorer people want to live here just as much as richer ones!</p> <p>Properly affordable housing has to be social/housing association supplied, and not via private commercial development.</p> <p>Commercial developers will always put profit as their first priority; I believe that the affordable housing will be best met through a combination of self-build, Community Land Trusts and housing association involvement. Reliance on commercial developers to provide affordable housing will land us with developments too expensive for local residents, which put pressure on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Affordable housing is vital to this area. It should be included in new developments, but not privatised.</p> <p>Every parish should have low cost rented housing for local people funded by the District Councils overflowing cash reserves.</p>
Management of housing longer-term 5 comments	<p>The affordable housing must stay affordable in perpetuity - by resting the land in to community land trusts.</p> <p>A stop should be put on selling council and Housing Association properties</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H1 Meet the affordable housing need by prioritising it on all new developments? (94 comments)	
	<p>Homes sold must go back to the housing association so they are safeguarded in perpetuity - not lost to the community. More Community Land Trusts.</p> <p>Building council houses should be a priority or housing association. The government should withdraw its policy of selling public housing</p> <p>Too many scams in this area with stair casing a good example buying cheap and build any at a low price.</p>
Higher level of affordable housing needed than in the Local Plan 2 comments	<p>Stop <u>all</u> housing developments if it is not 100% affordable or single houses for private individuals.</p> <p>Until housing needs for local people are met, all new housing should be affordable housing: not only for families but also suitable affordable homes for single people and couples. This needs to be affordable to run too - with renewable energy generation and zero carbon emissions.</p>
Affordable housing general/other 9 comments	<p>We have a big housing issue in Bridport we need more affordable housing</p> <p>More affordable Housing is needed as soon as possible in Bridport its a big issue we don't have enough</p> <p>Make sure every new development which is given the go ahead must include affordable housing for rent and to buy.</p> <p>Social housing in new small developments will have an effect on the whole project</p> <p>Affordable housing - yes!!</p> <p>Affordable housing for lower cost rental is a priority, but not the present planning policy of allowing developers to build houses for resale.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H1 Meet the affordable housing need by prioritising it on all new developments? (94 comments)	
	<p>See the website affordable housing Bridport.</p> <p>Encourage competitive tenders. We do not need another Poundbury in our AONB.</p> <p>Affordable housing should be Bridport's main priority.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H2 Make sure the type and size of housing built best meets the local need, and that it is well integrated with other developments? (5 comments)	
5 comments	<p>What is the local need? What are the criteria to be an owner? Principle private residence, second home owners, housing trusts, holiday lets, local rental? Is any category excluded?</p> <p>More bungalows required for this area and less 4&5 bedroom houses.</p> <p>More houses like Dibdin View.</p> <p>We do not want a repeat of the overdevelopment as in the block of flats on the sea front at West Bay.</p> <p>Development should be approved for smaller sites and not new developments of luxury housing and more retirement homes.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H3 Require new developments to have high standards of design and sustainability? (23 comments)	
Sustainability 7 comments	<p>I believe that new developments should be as close to zero carbon as possible and should give priority to families already living in the area.</p> <p>I feel strongly that even the lowest price housing should automatically include solar panelling and double glazing.</p> <p>Energy efficient.</p> <p>Bridport should require all new homes to be zero carbon. This is the only way of being sustainable for the future and balancing out less energy efficient old stock housing.</p> <p>Prioritise truly sustainable developments e.g. Community Land Trusts. Severely restrict mainstream developments such as the current Vearse Farm Development proposal. Focus on low-cost housing. Combine housing with food production in sustainable developments.</p> <p>Going forward it would be prudent to look at making sure homes were far more efficient so that they are even more affordable in the long run, even if this costs a little more in the building process.</p> <p>Don't be so concerned about keeping all new house styles the same as old ones as it restricts the sustainability of developments, all new houses should have solar panels which are and a sign of reducing CO2 emissions and becoming more integrated into the tiles etc.</p>
Design 6 comments	<p>Sustainable design is vital - but this could be lower cost solutions from non-traditional materials.</p> <p>Good design and right layout is essential</p> <p>Aesthetics is a contentious issue.</p> <p>All housing - private market/affordable and social housing - should be built to the same high standards. Developers shouldn't get away with building a few rows of cheap looking structures as their requirements to provide social housing on otherwise 'desirable' estates.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H3 Require new developments to have high standards of design and sustainability? (23 comments)	
	<p>Use cutting edge design. History is made up of different styles - we need to reflect this in good modern design. Prioritise renewable energies etc.</p> <p>Your record here is dreadful. See bland new affordable housing next to the Medical Centre. Compare with Poundbury architecture your new builds are making Bridport a second class town.</p>
General design and sustainability 6 comments	<p>Design & sustainability needs also to be safe as recent sad events have shown. How do you intend to get developers to spend their profit margins on building to high standards of design and sustainability without a change in law?</p> <p>The building regulations require this anyway.</p> <p>Should have the highest priority and even if slightly more expensive in the short term,</p> <p>Meaningless twaddle!!</p> <p>Remove the word 'require' replace with encourage.</p> <p>Seems incompatible with H1</p>
Appropriate sites for housing 4 comments	<p>Issues of flood prevention should wield the power of veto over development proposals.</p> <p>Finding suitable sites that are not (for example) on water meadows or other ground likely to flood needs to be a priority and needs careful consideration and real consultation badly.</p> <p>Only where appropriate.</p> <p>We would like to see new settlements like Edwards Close (nr Medical Centre) of 12-15 houses (affordable including rented in perpetuity) on fringes of towns and villages across West Dorset rather than large estates like Vearse Farm (proposals).</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H4 Allocate new sites for development for up to 100% social housing? (46 comments)	
Housing to be integrated, rather than all social 36 comments	<p>All new development sites for housing should be mixed.</p> <p>A mix of housing is desirable.</p> <p>A small amount if social housing integrated with modern sustainable developments.</p> <p>The creation of 'estates' of social housing is now an outdated concept. Much more acceptable is the development of social housing within the current built-up area of Bridport, of which there are already good examples.</p> <p>100% social housing is reminiscent of old council estates and this does not work in today's society. Mixed tenure is the key. There is enough new housing planned for Bridport.</p> <p>Not 100% social. Should be mixed up as new developments in Newquay</p> <p>Social housing 40%, private 40%, Shared equity 20%.</p> <p>There is no indication of site size - small development to provide mixed communities could make a better social balance.</p> <p>Affordable housing should be integrated with private housing.</p> <p>Leads to ghettos and exclusion.</p> <p>Why not mix up all people</p> <p>Ghettos! Mixed developments healthier and encourage social cohesion.</p> <p>No more large or any council housing estates integrate.</p> <p>100% social housing separates people. We should live and work together.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H4 Allocate new sites for development for up to 100% social housing? (46 comments)	
	<p>By creating 100% social housing you risk creating ghettos and they may feel that they are second class if all shoved in the same place.</p> <p>Careful integration is needed.</p> <p>A mix of social and private housing is preferable to 100% of either.</p> <p>Social housing should be integrated.</p> <p>All new development sites for housing should be mixed.</p> <p>As appropriate, although mixed use is also beneficial, particularly when shared ownership is included. <u>But</u> the plan should move totally away from large scale developments which are only promoted in order to provide bonuses for the H.A. and as the 'only' way to ensure social housing e.g. Vearse Farm.</p> <p>Could result in ghettos of poorer people.</p> <p>Should be a mix.</p> <p>Should be mixed</p> <p>Prefer mixed housing.</p> <p>So called sink estates invite problems that solidify barriers to social mobility.</p> <p>Mixed developments are best for the sustainability and attractiveness of an estate</p> <p>H4 and H5 recent experience suggests that 100% social housing may conflict with H2 - well-integrated developments.</p> <p>Social housing should be integrated within community at large, not forming a ghetto. The District</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H4 Allocate new sites for development for up to 100% social housing? (46 comments)	
	<p>Council should be help truly accountable for meeting their own targets for social (truly affordable within context of level of incomes) and provide this.</p> <p>Prefer mixed sites - social housing and private.</p> <p>100% social housing like a ghetto. Social is more important than affordable (which isn't affordable anyway.)</p> <p>I think affordable housing is a priority but mixed housing provides for a more balanced community.</p> <p>Integrate affordable housing</p> <p>Mixed housing development, private and social seem to work best. 100% social housing estates can become stigmatised.</p> <p>I believe that 'social housing' should be integrated throughout all housing developments to get away from exclusively 'poor' and 'posh' areas.</p> <p>Question H4 is open to interpretation. Homes should be "tenure blind" to avoid being treated as ghettos.</p> <p>I think that social housing should be integrated with other housing. Where new mixed housing is to be built it should be insisted that the affordable housing should be build first.</p>
Social housing general 10 comments	<p>Lower cost rented housing is only required due to the lack of affordable homes to buy.</p> <p>No huge estates of social housing. This will lead to social unrest and rioting.</p> <p>The question is ambiguous - the percentage of social housing should be absolute</p> <p>Rented</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H4 Allocate new sites for development for up to 100% social housing? (46 comments)	
	<p>Do not allow 100% social housing when developing new areas.</p> <p>Is very necessary in this age of high rental costs.</p> <p>New social housing for people with a local connection is needed</p> <p>Not sure depends where.</p> <p>Not really understand</p> <p>All above - proposes integration and separation of affordable housing!!</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H5 Consultation has shown that lower cost rented housing is a high priority for our area. We haven't identified enough suitable sites to meet this need. Do you think we should try and allocate land outside of the existing built up area to accommodate all, some or no affordable housing? (69 comments)</p>	
<p>Use brown field sites/existing properties first</p> <p>22 comments</p>	<p>Use brown sites and make better use of existing built up areas rather than losing green space forever</p> <p>We should be upgrading and making use of the buildings and enterprises that we have, not building more. Town has far too many empty buildings, make use of them.</p> <p>Brown field sites should be used for housing. The (wooden) buildings in flood lane need to be redeveloped.</p> <p>Why do we need so much more housing? We already have many second homes unused for most of the year, also I believe a lot of accommodation could be utilised over shops in the town centre.</p> <p>Stop building on green field sites and making the area less attractive for tourism.</p> <p>Why not sub-divide large properties to provide affordable housing? What about using the spaces above shops that stand idle currently.</p> <p>There are pockets of brown field sites which should be used first</p> <p>There are still a number of Brown Site areas in Bridport. Why not develop these for 1st time buyers or single-parent families?</p> <p>A cursory glance reveals a number of currently derelict or brownfield sites which could accommodate such development.</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be prioritised. Innovative schemes to make the best use of existing housing stock should be thoroughly investigated. E.g.. , renovating dilapidated houses, Co housing etc.</p> <p>Mountjoy site? Hanson Yard? Any of the many unused existing farm buildings - this would mean that overall views are not impacted.</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H5 Consultation has shown that lower cost rented housing is a high priority for our area. We haven't identified enough suitable sites to meet this need. Do you think we should try and allocate land outside of the existing built up area to accommodate all, some or no affordable housing? (69 comments)</p>	
	<p>There are plenty of 'brown field' sites all suitable for social/rented housing. This should be the number one priority and not retirement complexes that will end up self-defeating in purpose when our social infrastructure is failing at the moment. Buses, hospitals, social services, care for the elderly/infirm.</p> <p>Utilise empty properties and second homes before even considering building</p> <p>Build on brown sites and derelict land where possible save green fields and spaces</p> <p>What about all the empty accommodation above all the shops in town centre. This would meet the needs of a lot of starter homes for the young. Done properly.</p> <p>Not on green field sites</p> <p>The 'derelict' old Mountjoy School could be used for affordable housing - its an eyesore at present</p> <p>Before any A.O.N.B. are used all brown field and other options should be considered.</p> <p>Place a levy on green field sites to encourage the development of brown field sites (which incur greater costs to clear).</p> <p>Developers should <u>not</u> be allowed to "cherry pick" their sites. Brownfield sites should be fully utilised in any planned development.</p> <p>Council should buy up old sites and convert to new rentals no high rise blocks.</p> <p>Is it possible for the council to purchase housing that needs renovating to perhaps create apartments to rent? (I am assuming they would not have achieved high market sales prices.)</p>
<p>Against greenfield/prioritise the need to protect the</p>	<p>The green belt must be protected at all costs.</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H5 Consultation has shown that lower cost rented housing is a high priority for our area. We haven't identified enough suitable sites to meet this need. Do you think we should try and allocate land outside of the existing built up area to accommodate all, some or no affordable housing? (69 comments)</p>	
<p>countryside/AONB</p> <p>13 comments</p>	<p>Outside built up area - no!!</p> <p>Building should not take place outside of the defined development boundary. Each parish and their residents should be individually and thoroughly consulted if extensions to the boundary or development outside of the defined boundary is to be included in the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>We should build on existing unused sites but not flood plains and keep the town boundaries.</p> <p>We should try to keep the existing town boundaries by building on existing unused sites but not on floodplains.</p> <p>Obviously we need to protect rural undeveloped green areas in general but there could be some less developed parts that have no especial beauty or do not provide a green continuity between areas, and these might be identified for necessary development.</p> <p>Don't provide owners of land in our AONB with the "gift" to maximise their asset values to the detriment of the countryside.</p> <p>H5 Its basically a logical idea to seek additional sites outside the existing area but we are surrounded by areas of outstanding natural beauty, historic sites, agricultural land, flood plains and so on. The bottom line is it is a very big ask and is likely to take a long time from identifying the proposed site, planning, consultation etc. to achieving the final target.</p> <p>Subject to protection including EH1 – 5</p> <p>I'd always understood truly affordable housing was outside the scope of N Plans? But if anywhere can make it work, I believe Bridport can - more power to your elbow to keep truly local folk in their natural habitat and help visitors like us appreciate it more. But <u>not</u> at the expense of 'green living' areas outside town boundaries - that is perverse! Destroy Bridport unique character and the bottom will fall of out the tourist market.</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H5 Consultation has shown that lower cost rented housing is a high priority for our area. We haven't identified enough suitable sites to meet this need. Do you think we should try and allocate land outside of the existing built up area to accommodate all, some or no affordable housing? (69 comments)</p>	
	<p>The unmet need for LCRH will in part be determined by the levels of unused/second-homes housing in the area. Hence my reluctance to sacrifice more greenfield/AONB land to meet a need that might be more appropriately met in other ways.</p> <p>Land allocated outside of the existing built up area should not compromise EH4 - the protection of green gaps between settlements and other valued green space from development - significantly.</p> <p>Not sure about best response, all options for low cost housing should be explored - while protecting against town centre "over build" and maintaining green spaces.</p>
<p>Generally for additional lower cost rented housing</p> <p>11 comments</p>	<p>Lobby the government to enable councils to take out low cost loans to build social rented/private houses where needed - preferably small developments on fringes of town / villages. Neighbourhood plan might be able to influence policies.</p> <p>It depends who buys the (rented) accommodation. If it is for local authority housing, I agree. If it is for those who want to buy to let, NO. Or if it is going to be bought by those who buy to let, they must only let to those who want to live here and the rest should have a cap. Not for holiday or business accommodation.</p> <p>As long as the housing built on these sites is in keeping with the building style and materials of the area.</p> <p>Some greenfield sites should be identified as potential for housing development.</p> <p>May be but on a case by case basis, e.g. not at Vearse Farm due to concerns about building on a flood plain. There are still empty properties in Bridport.</p> <p>Possibly depends where.</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H5 Consultation has shown that lower cost rented housing is a high priority for our area. We haven't identified enough suitable sites to meet this need. Do you think we should try and allocate land outside of the existing built up area to accommodate all, some or no affordable housing? (69 comments)</p>	
	<p>We must ensure we have enough homes for younger families. If this means 100% social housing on some existing sensitively chosen green areas, so be it.</p> <p>Possible places <u>some</u> of Colfox school playing fields, some at Gore Cross, some at other trading estates e.g.. St Andrews.</p> <p>Some and only small pockets</p> <p>Only if 100% affordable on these sites.</p> <p>H5 As H4 we need to accommodate all especially affordable houses. Yes allocate land outside the existing built up area. With affordable housing we need schools and new medical centre and parking for cars going in and around the town</p>
<p>Against additional housing 7 comments</p>	<p>There is lots of council housing here already no more.</p> <p>Enough houses already being built.</p> <p>Bridport is big enough. In the last few years new houses have been built on all sides. Even one new home, with family, puts an unprecedented strain on <u>all</u> already over stretched services. Enough is enough.</p> <p>Enough houses already planned for</p> <p>Question H5 I cannot answer as you don't supply the answer I want. I do not believe we need to allocate land outside of the current provision and potential allocation shown in the existing Local Plan.</p> <p>Enough housing here already.</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H5 Consultation has shown that lower cost rented housing is a high priority for our area. We haven't identified enough suitable sites to meet this need. Do you think we should try and allocate land outside of the existing built up area to accommodate all, some or no affordable housing? (69 comments)</p>	
	<p>We have enough council housing in Bradpole!</p>
<p>Affordable/social rent housing should not be out of town</p> <p>7 comments</p>	<p>Only allow new housing for social housing. Keep development within the existing built up area if at all possible.</p> <p>Putting people into out of town sites just means getting into town is difficult for old people, young families etc. It also smacks of hiding the problem of all that town housing going to incomers whose deposit income continues to push up house prices.</p> <p>If affordable housing is located solely outside the existing built up area, how will people get to work/leisure? Would we just be building ghettos?</p> <p>People who need low cost rented housing need accommodation which will not incur problems with transport - needs to be more central to town services than those who can afford to run cars.</p> <p>There are now streets in Bridport where the majority of cottages are Holiday lets and residents are in a minority. The local plan must include a means to stop this trend. There would be plenty of houses and lets if properties were not intended to become second homes or holiday lets. The solution is not to build on green field sites, this contradicts your EH2. It is also entirely wrong to push local people out of the town into ghetto like housing developments. Partnerships with Housing Associations the drive to bring empty properties back into use, diving larger properties into self-contained rented units is more appropriate.</p> <p>I do agree that affordable housing for purchase and rent is a priority, however, I do not think we should be expanding too much outside of our established town boundaries.</p> <p>Surely affordable housing needs to be near town shops and schools etc.</p>
<p>General</p>	<p>If Vearse Farm goes ahead it should include social housing.</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: H5 Consultation has shown that lower cost rented housing is a high priority for our area. We haven't identified enough suitable sites to meet this need. Do you think we should try and allocate land outside of the existing built up area to accommodate all, some or no affordable housing? (69 comments)</p>	
<p>9 comments</p>	<p>New areas already built haven't enough low cost rental on offer which is not fair on local people</p> <p>Such an approach may allow developers to avoid obligations under S106 agreements</p> <p>Not sure I understand H5</p> <p>Housing areas need to be on the edge of town as more localised housing will result in traffic queueing even more horrendously</p> <p>The definition of a 'suitable' site shouldn't give undue attention to maintaining the view. New development will always get in the way of people's views, but that's not a reason to deny people housing.</p> <p>H4 and H5 are like paying 50% tax to benefit the wealthy then being asked if you'll pay an extra 5% to help the poor. To say yes is to accept that the Local Plan is failing local people. In that case, we should fight the Local Plan, even if it has to be done outside the Neighbourhood Plan. To accede to an unjust Local Plan is to bargain away a truly equitable solution for future generations, as well as the present one.</p> <p>What would this mean for our parish - where would you build this?</p> <p>I am not sure what size developments you are considering. Sadly our original council housing stock was mainly sold off.</p>

Wider responses to the Housing theme (71 comments)	
<p>Second/holiday homes</p> <p>17 comments</p>	<p>A certain amount of 2nd home/retirement home is to be encouraged because it brings in new blood.</p> <p>Some control on holiday homes is necessary.</p> <p>People should be discouraged from having second/holiday homes, so that there are more available for the local population.</p> <p>When proposing new developments, a huge step forward would be a rigorous restriction on properties being sold as second/holiday homes as per the St Ives model.</p> <p>The problem is stopping these houses being sold on by their initial buyers to become second homes or holiday lets.</p> <p>Keep an eye on St Ives.</p> <p>Can there be a restriction as in St Ives for new houses being sold as second homes?</p> <p>Problem of second homes.</p> <p>Unless there is control over second homes and holiday homes local people will never benefit from additional development.</p> <p>Second homes.</p> <p>It's important to control second homes.</p> <p>Council tax and planning policies discouraging second homes</p> <p>Not holiday lets/second homes.</p> <p>A limit on 2nd homes in the area also holiday homes that stand empty for a large part of the year, should also be limited.</p>

Wider responses to the Housing theme (71 comments)	
	<p>No more second holiday homes.</p> <p>Perhaps second home ownership should be looked at.</p> <p>Less opportunities for second home buyers taking up valuable housing needs in our area.</p>
<p>Infrastructure/services 8 comments</p>	<p>It is vital the infrastructure is in place to provide for new developments and minimise the pressure on existing services - education, health service, transport, roads, parking etc.</p> <p>Local social housing must be easily reached for schools etc.</p> <p>Make sure we have enough infrastructure dentists / doctors / health care!</p> <p>Unless we have <u>all</u> our infrastructure improved I cannot see how we can accommodate yet further extensions of building developments outside the current plan.</p> <p>There is too much building in this area. The infrastructure cannot cope with what it now has.</p> <p>If housing is going to be built in the area the local infrastructure will need to be upgraded, decent employment (not just tourism industry) needs to be thought about and medical and social care too, and not forgetting education.</p> <p>New housing proposals are good if we have the services i.e.. Doctors, hospitals, district nurses to serve the community and not stretch existing facilities.</p> <p>More housing needed yet this must take into consideration the traffic as well</p>
<p>Vearse Farm 7 comments</p>	<p>If Vearse Farm goes ahead with all of the other projects that are in hand the town will grind to a halt. There is congestion most days in East Street even before the add in visitors. It will eventually affect the local businesses. Many people also live in town and need to move around.</p> <p>EH1 take into consideration the needs of local wildlife. Not to proceed with Vearse Farm development - it will put undue strain on local services, especially the medical centre.</p>

Wider responses to the Housing theme (71 comments)	
	<p>Who allowed the Vearse Farm site to be a "strategic allocation", making it impossible to challenge, it is the key factor impacting on transport and housing over the coming years and should be included in any overall planning, otherwise all of this consultation is a waste of time.</p> <p>Vearse Farm proposals do not reflect local needs at all.</p> <p>No to Vearse Farm. Total overbuilding in a small area. No infrastructure for it.</p> <p>Say No to Vearse Farm</p> <p>Vearse Farm development will be the ruination of Bridport. We are a small town and cannot sustain such a huge influx of people, of which most will be for foreigners. Do not concrete over our beautiful countryside.</p>
<p>Housing targets 7 comments</p>	<p>Broad central government targets which do not reflect local environments are short term and are clumsy and potentially damaging.</p> <p>These all seem fairly obvious and are probably already addressed in The Local Plan - sadly all the questions are 'closed' and don't offer opportunities for suggestions. The six Aspirations - 'important ideas' detailed in the booklet are the main ones that matter to Bridport particularly challenging the overall target of 945 new homes - for whom?</p> <p>If 945 new homes are to be built, surely a large proportion of these could be rented housing run by a housing association.</p> <p>May be able to challenge the target for 945 new homes.</p> <p>Can't see that Bridport and surrounding need or can take 945 new homes. The ones they do build need to be fit for the community needs and for local people.</p> <p>I think the figures for housing need are erroneous and far too high.</p>

Wider responses to the Housing theme (71 comments)	
	<p>Aspirations: yes the current target of 945 should certainly be revisited: other Local Planning Authorities are reported as having successfully challenged government numbers in areas which contain AONBs, National Parks etc. Yes to income from sales of housing association homes.</p>
<p>Against mixed use development</p> <p>4 comments</p>	<p>Should not have mixed use sites i.e. mixed residential/industrial.</p> <p>New housing development should not be done at the expense of existing sites that are currently used for employment and industrial use.</p> <p>Mixing industrial and housing facilities is a dangerous concept children and lorries are an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>You can't have land for housing and parking and industrial and retail simultaneously. Need to balance,</p>
<p>General/other</p> <p>28 comments</p>	<p>What happened to the money obtained by people buying their council houses? It was supposed to be used to build replacement council houses with affordable rent - this did not happen.</p> <p>New housing must be a priority.</p> <p>It is absolutely imperative that additional housing be provided both for buyers and renters to 'refresh' and rebalance the age average of this town. Businesses will flounder without 'new blood'. Also the hospital would be under less of a threat of closure with a higher more vibrant population, not to mention more viable housing = more rates paid, more funds for the council to improve the town.</p> <p>Make a really beautiful period-feel hill top development. Like Italy or South of France. With pubs and shops too!</p> <p>Unfortunately too much has been done to look after single mothers who have never done a day's work and who expect to get a subsidised roof over their heads by procreating constantly. To be controversial - if they kept their legs together until they got married perhaps we would not have the problem with social housing shortages! Housing groups never build affordable housing anyway, or certainly not affordable in this part of the world.</p>

Wider responses to the Housing theme (71 comments)	
	<p>The small town of Bridport will lose any quality it has by over crowding of built up areas.</p> <p>I strongly support the proposals described under the heading 'Aspirations'. I feel strongly that much greater emphasis should be given to housing for low income families and to developing a more balanced age profile in the area.</p> <p>Higher value housing is also required to encourage growth</p> <p>NP should be allowed to change, challenge or undermine Local Plan.</p> <p>H1, H2, H4, H5 - do not understand what this means.</p> <p>If there's significant extra housing available it won't be bought by workers, but more retired people</p> <p>"Make a balance!!!"</p> <p>People who work in supporting retired people cannot afford to buy.</p> <p>My grandchildren are in rented accommodation (private) and find getting on social housing is near impossible.</p> <p>Developers shouldn't be able to "buy out" their plans for some social housing</p> <p>All income from sale of housing association property should be used to fund more housing development.</p> <p>H1 - H5 - not realistic - who will pay for all of this - work with private developers to get a deal.</p> <p>As maintained in this section</p> <p>Good aspirations and hopefully they will be taken over.</p>

Wider responses to the Housing theme (71 comments)	
	<p>Facilitate the use of back gardens for housing. A practical Bridport tradition which should be reinstated! Perhaps there could be incentives offered? Maybe a survey of possible sites. The 'Bridport Garden' is twice as long as elsewhere. A useful legacy to the rope and net industry.</p> <p>Encourage saving so people can buy, make people independent not reliant on others resources.</p> <p>It's important to promote a balanced age community - we don't want to live in a Bridport that's posh and old (look what happened to Beaminster - not good)!</p> <p>Large scale developments on green field sites (e.g.. Vearse Farm) are not appropriate practically or socially in Bridport.</p> <p>No council estates or alternate groups/camps.</p> <p>Please don't destroy Bridport, it's a small town with a big heart. It would seem the town is filling up with retired people - they are destroying the very things they moved here for. Plus the strain on Drs, hospital beds and services.</p> <p>We are in danger of falling victim to nimbyism based mainly on a perception that development would reduce the value of existing after own priced property.</p> <p>Support all aspirations.</p> <p>Do not permit enlargement of small homes. Prices youngsters out of the market.</p>

Economy

Full comments: 151 comments in total received for Economy (Note: some responses were split where more than one topic was covered in the response; none have been removed)

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: E1 Retain and increase employment, alongside redevelopment, at St Michael's Trading Estate? (28 comments)	
Recent planning decision and Local Plan designation 8 comments	<p>Isn't E1 directly in conflict with the District Council's recent decision to allow the estate to be redeveloped?</p> <p>St Michaels recently gained outline planning permission. Redevelopment will go ahead now and local people should be consulted once a plan is submitted.</p> <p>As planning agreed?!</p> <p>Although permission for housing development at St Michael's Estate was passed it is unclear whether the development is viable and affordable. A close eye should be kept on this development with a view to returning it to employment use.</p> <p>Press to influence the outline planning applications for St Michaels.</p> <p>St Michaels planning agreed, not sure why this is here but looking fwd. to it regenerating at last after too long delays.</p> <p>Question whether this is necessary given that St Michael's Trading Estate is designated as a Mixed Use Development. Perhaps some wording to discourage erosion of the employment component.</p> <p>Closely monitor St Michaels now that outline planning permission has been granted to maximise traders' rights.</p>
Regeneration/tidy of St Michaels needed	It would be good to see a properly planned development of the St Michael's site to replace the ad hoc sales rooms which currently litter the area and to maximise the use of this largely derelict space.

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: E1 Retain and increase employment, alongside redevelopment, at St Michael's Trading Estate? (28 comments)	
5 comments	<p>It has to be acknowledged that some parts of the site are characterful, as is the presence of a distinct artistic offering. The redevelopment of St Michael's has been spoken about for many years but very little has been done and the site is a wasted asset which could easily be developed (capital permitting) as an industrial and commercial area with integrated housing. We hope that the artistic quarter and the sales rooms can be incorporated in any redevelopment - the loss of these aspects and their replacement by something more utilitarian would be detrimental to Bridport as a whole.</p> <p>St Michael's Estate is a major part of Bridport and should be 'smartened up' not made into a block of ugly flats.</p> <p>The existing trading areas of St Michael's should be kept and upgraded, there is still space for some affordable housing to be built there.</p> <p>The redevelopment of St Michaels trading estate is long overdue. Currently it is a mess. A mixture of housing and new start-up businesses would work well. It should be a priority when developing sites.</p> <p>I know St Michaels raises lots of passions, but I think the place is ghastly. It is ramshackle, poorly maintained, badly sign posted. Keep the building but tidy it up drastically.</p>
Retaining employment 5 comments	<p>Retaining and increasing employment, along with protecting the existing businesses is vital, along with a sympathetic development which aims to protect and possibly enhance the general character and history of the area.</p> <p>I am concerned that the plans for St Michael's are trying to cram too much into the site and will drive out some of the businesses.</p> <p>Private housing plans appear to throw local traders off St Michaels Trading Estate.</p> <p>I definitely would not like to see the businesses at St Michael's Trading Estate put at risk by the plans to build affordable housing there.</p> <p>I oppose housing redevelopment plans at St Michael's Trading Estate</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: E1 Retain and increase employment, alongside redevelopment, at St Michael's Trading Estate? (28 comments)	
Protect character of St Michaels 4 comments	Retain the uniqueness of St Michael's Trading Estate with any new proposals Renovate St Michaels - Yes!! Lose its essential character - No!! A priority is AFFORDABLE space - workshops, retail and food and drink premises. These do not need to be flashy or new - the character of St Michaels now is a huge part of its attraction. Low cost is key. So long as it remains a unique antique centre and is affordable for existing stall holders - not to bring in different businesses.
Concerns about mixed use 2 comments	I don't believe housing and industry works well side by side. New residents are prone to complain about noise and traffic - usually incomers Any residential building on St Michael's Trading Estate would be detrimental to employment and inappropriate in an industrial area.
Other 4 comments	What kind of development / employment? Yes as long as residents are protected. Don't increase. Spend time on things you can change - not waste public money on Vearse Farm or St Michaels

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: E2 Protect and encourage the expansion of employment sites (industrial/business areas)? (31 comments)	
<p>Not a need for additional business units/protect not expand</p> <p>9 comments</p>	<p>I do not believe we need to allocate new employment sites as the existing ones are not fully occupied and in some cases very neglected by landlords. Units are empty, in casual use or being used for purposes that generate very little new employment. The Neighbourhood Plan should concentrate on the re-generation of these under used sites.</p> <p>There are already sufficient trading estates around Bridport</p> <p>Protect but not expand.</p> <p>Only consider expansion in exceptional cases.</p> <p>Current sites not full.</p> <p>Make sure existing space is well used before adding more. Many empty units on various estates Gore Cross, Pymore etc.</p> <p>We don't need to build new industrial estates. It would be good to see the development of a sustainable economy which is less reliant on the tourist industry and where people can earn a decent wage.</p> <p>Most of what counts as industrial sites in the area are just cheap retail sites, taking up a lot of room and creating very few jobs. There are currently plenty of sites available to let - why would anyone choose to re-locate their business here?</p>
<p>Support for employment sites</p> <p>6 comments</p>	<p>In principal. Is this expansion beyond existing footfall? Satellite industrial estates? Changing use of outlying farm yards and permitting development? Consider vital commercial transport links. Definitely protect and encourage. We lost Henry Hoover to Somerset and Denhay bacon to Devon, to name but a few. That was local employment/community that vanished and surely we don't want more to go, do we?</p> <p>Protect and maintain industrial sites for local employment.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: E2 Protect and encourage the expansion of employment sites (industrial/business areas)? (31 comments)	
	<p>Site for a new hotel in the area to help increase visitor numbers and increase employment.</p> <p>Employment and increased business potential could be located more on the outer areas.</p> <p>Absolutely vital to protect and increase employment.</p> <p>I think this is essential to the town of Bridport.</p>
Balance with need to protect countryside/green spaces 5 comments	<p>Only if they are sustainably developed and have limited environmental impact.</p> <p>Yes but should not be an excuse to incur into the countryside E.g.. at Gore Cross industrial estate.</p> <p>I feel more comfortable with the proposal - "Protect and enhance other employment sites..." E2 above seems very open - there needs to be a watchful eye on "expansion" with regards to environment lost.</p> <p>Only if expansion does not impact on green areas.</p> <p>Expand current industrial sites. Do not sacrifice green field locales to develop industrial sites!</p>
Existing industrial/business areas to be used before expanding or creating new 2 comments	<p>2 separate questions - I agree with protecting existing business areas, but not with creating new or expanding existing ones as a matter of course. This could mean Bridport gets surrounded by industrial estates like Yeovil.</p> <p>Just smarten up existing areas before starting new.</p>
More information on demand needed 1 comment	<p>Should have an audit of brown field sites in and around Bridport and an estimate for demand for industrial units. An economic/business development plan needs to sit alongside the neighbourhood plan.</p>
Other	E2 see Local Plan policies ECON2 and ECON3.

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: E2 Protect and encourage the expansion of employment sites (industrial/business areas)? (31 comments)	
8 comments	<p>Jobs are important, industry in residential areas must be suitable i.e. no noise or other pollution</p> <p>Emphasise the importance locally of small businesses meeting local needs and prioritise sites for such use.</p> <p>Yes as long as the expansion doesn't include going from light to heavy industry. Ensure infrastructure (roads) are adequate to carry heavier traffic.</p> <p>What is the likely demand from firms wishing to move into the town?</p> <p>Do not allow replacement of industrial buildings with unaffordable housing <u>at all</u>.</p> <p>This depends.</p> <p>Would depend on who these were.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: E3 Allow for new, flexible (including start-up) employment space within existing sites? (12 comments)	
General support 12 comments	<p>E3 this is paramount!</p> <p>Clive Stafford Smith's ambitions for a social enterprise hub in Bridport would generate employment, prosper community integration and stability, and raise the progressive social profile of Bridport.</p> <p>As long as E3 are reasonably priced and for local demand.</p> <p>I think this is essential to the town of Bridport.</p> <p>There are a great many self employed people in the town. Most of whom need an affordable space from which to operate their business.</p> <p>Where practicable</p> <p>In a low wage based economy, this must be a first priority. Well paid people buy houses, rent properties on the open market with less new for social housing.</p> <p>Small rental start-up spaces, such as for a while existed in the covered market in the old Co-op South Street building, would be helpful as a step onward from the outdoor market.</p> <p>The Bridport Literary and Scientific Institute should help with E3 once its up and running.</p> <p>Start ups should be just that and established businesses should be encouraged to move on to commercially-priced premises to allow for follow-on start ups.</p> <p>Encourage start up sites for small companies to flourish particular in technology and art.</p> <p>Established businesses could support start ups by providing subsidised office space together with technology.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: E4 Aim to protect the independent retail character of the town centre? (44 comments)	
Support for independent shops/character of the town 13 comments	<p>Protecting an independent/high street in a town like Bridport is vital - have you considered expanding the LETS scheme and doing what other towns like Totnes and Lewes do and making a local currency?</p> <p>Vitally important - no more high street chains.</p> <p>Very important. Tourist area – important source of income and employment. Character of town very important.</p> <p>Bridport's attraction is the independent retailers - they should be encouraged through "start up" incentives.</p> <p>I think that it is essential to protect the independent retail character of the town centre in order to encourage visitors and maintain the quality of life here.</p> <p>Let's keep our independent retailers and avoid chains taking over.</p> <p>Especially important: this is a vital part of the character of Bridport.</p> <p>Yes please do protect independent retail so Bridport remains unique</p> <p>Certainly the town centre needs to be protected from large chains. In my 20 years of living in Bridport we have lost so many small independent shops. Bridport's character, attraction and success is dependent upon vibrant, local, independent businesses.</p> <p>Too many independent shops are closing down. Need to protect / encourage and support them.</p> <p>The individuality of shops meeting everyday needs is what attracts people to the town.</p> <p>With the inevitable expansion of the town in the next few years, it will be important to ensure that the character of the town is not lost. The easiest way to do this is by maintaining the independent shops within the town centre. Larger chains should be discouraged where there are local alternatives.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: E4 Aim to protect the independent retail character of the town centre? (44 comments)	
	Please, please protect the retail character. It's what makes Bridport unique and popular.
Balance of types of shop 9 comments	<p>The balance of businesses in the town sees to have gone array. So many food outlets how some must surely fail.</p> <p>The town centre needs to change with the times, there is not a good variety of shops.</p> <p>Please, no more charity shops!</p> <p>Too many charity shops</p> <p>No more charity shops! No more coffee/eating places!</p> <p>The number of coffee/café type premises needs to be reduced. We need a more diverse selection of shops.</p> <p>We do not need more shops that sell knick-knacks etc.</p> <p>Whilst a few national chains can assist footfall and are a key part of east Street and West Street, they should be actively discouraged elsewhere and the current proportion of independent and national chain should be maintained.</p> <p>Super important to look closely, and to look again at what is happening NOW to the retail character- question the plethora of tables and chairs abounding on the pavements of Bridport</p>
Additional retail needs 8 comments	<p>If we can encourage a big name store to this area or on the border of Bridport - say a brown site this should help employment and money to the Bridport economy.</p> <p>We need some bigger businesses here to encourage more people and therefore more sales for small businesses.</p> <p>I question the statement in E4, we need to have more retail business in town from popular companies.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: E4 Aim to protect the independent retail character of the town centre? (44 comments)	
	<p>At present we have way too many drinking/eating places, to many charity shops and bric-a-brac outlets but cannot buy a things like reasonably priced pair of shoes</p> <p>Can we have another shoe shop (reasonable prices!)</p> <p>I think we need more shops built and further Retail development as a priority for Bridport</p> <p>More Retail. Space is needed in Bridport more shops built as soon as possible definitely</p> <p>Yes in the town centre but the town would benefit from out of town retail shopping parks for larger stores.</p> <p>We would like to see a good mix of independent and national retail companies in the town. The council should look favourable at other companies coming into our town for future growth.</p>
Business rates for independents 3 comments	<p>Ensure business rates are low for local / independent retail.</p> <p>Study some business plans in Europe e.g. Italy where large corporations are forced to pay extra if they wish to 'expand' into small towns (edging out local businesses) and the surplus goes towards subsidising/supporting smaller shops</p> <p>Retail rents and business rates must be affordable to attract independent businesses</p>
Market 2 comments	<p>The market should also be given special protection as a great asset to the town</p> <p>Yes most definitely, especially for the market; our town centre is part of the iconic parts of our town.</p>
Other 9 comments	<p>Instead of 'aim to protect' need to encourage.</p> <p>Definitely no more chains - especially McDonalds.</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: E4 Aim to protect the independent retail character of the town centre? (44 comments)</p>	
	<p>The NP can have almost no influence on the retail character of the town - the forces creating change are way beyond local control.</p> <p>The vitality of the Town Centre is critical to the future of Bridport. It provides jobs, attracts visitors and is an inherent part of the character of the town. Thriving independent retail outlets, cafes, pubs and restaurants combine to make Bridport what it is. It is sad to see what appears to be an increasing number of businesses closing and not necessarily re-opening in another guise.</p> <p>See also Local Plan policy ECON4 (iv).</p> <p>E4 - We have already lost it.</p> <p>People need employment. I think we have already lost the independent retail character, Costa, No 1, new outlet at Frosts property, Smiths, Peacocks, M&Co, Fat Face, New Look, Charity Shops and Mountain Warehouse. Coffee shops and estate agents, Spar, Waitrose.</p> <p>Not at any cost.</p> <p>Absolutely! Pedestrianisation will also help with this.</p>

Wider responses to the Economy theme (36 comments)	
<p>Supporting local jobs/employment</p> <p>10 comments</p>	<p>Increased employment opportunities for people, there is not much variety of work in Bridport, the choice is very limited.</p> <p>Bridport needs jobs and opportunities for work that will encourage young people especially to stay here.</p> <p>More employment</p> <p>New businesses bring more jobs and they must employ locals more</p> <p>More jobs help local people anything done in this area will help.</p> <p>Employment not more holiday homes.</p> <p>So, where are the possibilities for employment?</p> <p>Employment is needed but it must be meaningful and reasonably paid, not slave labour rates.</p> <p>Employment is the single most important factor anytime, anywhere. If people are unable to work they are unable to contribute towards taxation, public funds and their own family and welfare. This is one of the worse areas for employment opportunity unless it is agriculture, care work or holiday work. We don't want to see huge factory complexes blotting the beautiful landscape, with the lack of apprenticeships, there doesn't seem to be much in the way of sustainable industry.</p> <p>Get the balance between housing/employment. A small site where there is an existing business may be v suitable for housing and the business might benefit from relocation.</p>
<p>Town 'quarters'</p> <p>4 comments</p>	<p>The aspiration sounds terrible - Bridport is not a show town. Please don't re-design the town centre with 'quarters' - No!</p> <p>Aspiration: it is not clear what a re-design is - we have to work with existing infrastructure and recognise e.g. that closure of South Street will have significant detrimental impacts on other vehicle and pedestrian routes, residential and employment areas. What is needed is a Bridport Area Transport</p>

Wider responses to the Economy theme (36 comments)	
	<p>Plan that works with the existing infrastructure to facilitate circulation, encourage non-car use, and reduce or mitigate traffic impacts – see below under Transport, and see also Local Plan Policy ENV11.</p> <p>Very important to develop the reputation of the antique quarter of Bridport - appeals to wider area of tourism.</p> <p>Our vintage/artists quarter is vital to the character of this town.</p>
Town WiFi 2 comments	<p>Town Wi-Fi.</p> <p>Improve Wi-Fi - essential for all businesses. Currently inadequate.</p>
Other 20 comments	<p>All very important to me we need work/jobs and I don't want us to be taken over by companies.</p> <p>Large outdoor area, similar to brewery square, bars, cafes, restaurants and shops, much needed in the area, less focus on accommodating of the elderly and more focus on 18-30 age bracket.</p> <p>Would like to see a community or crypto currency for the town.</p> <p>Would like to see 'Buy Local' promoted more.</p> <p>We need more scrutiny on the way employers treat their employees, as many of the factories around this area exploit the fact there isn't much in the way of manufacturing.</p> <p>To retain younger age group, we need to provide proper opportunities for skills acquisition and knowledge training in support of industry. Make sure broadband available to support knowledge economy and green economy.</p> <p>This is a tourist area and protection of the environment should be paramount.</p> <p>To keep the economic health of Bridport adapting and prospering all of the above are important.</p> <p>There should be more emphasis on the needs of and support for the coastal economy.</p>

Wider responses to the Economy theme (36 comments)	
	<p>The town has to expand to provide more income for the town centre to flourish.</p> <p>The Local Plan probably addresses these anyway</p> <p>Keep small businesses within the town. Do not over industrialise.</p> <p>Support aspirations.</p> <p>Isn't it common sense that true 'communities' live <u>and</u> work in the same area. It doesn't make economic or environmental sense to have employment opportunities miles from the places workers can live does it?</p> <p>Bridport is a very special place.</p> <p>Bridport was built as a working town and that it's character, not a retirement town or a tourist town. Which makes it over priced for local people like myself who can trace my family in Bridport over three hundred years, from Hemp farmer to rope makers.</p> <p>A 'town trail' linking Town Hall, Arts Centre, Museum, Borough Gardens etc.</p> <p>Work with others for a deal. Be realistic.</p> <p>I don't have enough knowledge/information to comment on above proposals.</p> <p>I don't see how I can come to a meaningful conclusion for E1-E3 without seeing a properly reasoned analysis. How can it be decided by vote?!</p>

Transport

Full comments: 314 comments in total received for Transport (Note: some responses were split where more than one topic was covered in the response; none have been removed)

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T1 Make it easier for people to get into and around the town and villages using footpaths, cycle paths and public transport? (109 comments)	
Bus services to be protected/improved 34 comments	Support bus travel. Make sure we have local bus services so we can 'protect' the bus station. We need more local buses regularly from villages for everyone. Protect the rural bus services. The NP hands are ties but the national situation but it is essential that we lobby for a proper public transport system. The promotion and support of ring and ride schemes would be good! Seek help (central or rural government) in maintaining or restoring bus services. (A small charge for pensioners' journeys?) Do not encourage <u>more</u> cars in the road. Leave the buses to Yeovil as they are. Bus services need to be improved. I would like to see a more reliable bus service from town back to Bradpole in the afternoon. Plus a bus from Bradpole to the doctors surgery so we do not have to use our cars Increase local buses

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T1 Make it easier for people to get into and around the town and villages using footpaths, cycle paths and public transport? (109 comments)	
	<p>People won't stop using their cars while buses are so infrequent and end in late / early arriving.</p> <p>Funding for more busses</p> <p>I am new to area and elderly, and would like to see a reliable bus service out of town shopping centres, also Bridport Hospital and medical centre. I do not drive a car or ride a cycle, and in the bad weather find it difficult to get about. I am 84 years old.</p> <p>Subsidised public transport is a very 'green' option.</p> <p>Rural bus services recently discontinued must be reinstated at least in part, if not in full</p> <p>Buses could be improved service.</p> <p>Smaller buses cheaper to run, or pool of cars for sharing</p> <p>Public transport needs more improvement and communication.</p> <p>More investment supporting buses and Bus routes.</p> <p>Public transport will therefore need to be increased and the closure of bus routes renewed.</p> <p>Keep local buses not everyone can or does drive Especially older people will isolate people who really need to get out and about</p> <p>I believe public transport is a vital service and should be increased not decreased.</p> <p>I'd say that the priority for the future of local transport, taking into account the need for carbon reduction, the already heavy traffic in town and the needs of low income families, is to find ways to fund and increase public transport; developing more small scale, local community transport and low carbon options.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T1 Make it easier for people to get into and around the town and villages using footpaths, cycle paths and public transport? (109 comments)	
	<p>Many of residents are OAP's. I am disabled and public transport is scarce and I cannot cycle!! Or walk!</p> <p>More buses!</p> <p>A comprehensive bus service to meet needs of village and town passengers and out of county commuters to work, education. Timetables should be available.</p> <p>Bridport and its villages NEEDS good public transport. It would take a lot of cars off the road too.</p> <p>Important to retain and improve public transport.</p> <p>Bus services need to be enhanced. For example there is now <u>no</u> bus service connecting Jessopp Avenue and Bridport town centre.</p> <p>Reinstate regular once a day bus service from surrounding villages into Bridport.</p> <p>Ensure public transport is maintained or improved for isolated communities.</p> <p>Bus routes essential.</p> <p>More buses</p>
Improvements to cycle paths needed 18 comments	<p>If people are to be encouraged to cycle (especially our children) safe cycle routes <u>must</u> be provided not the piecemeal facilities that currently exist.</p> <p>Encourage cycle paths, routes.</p> <p>Proper cycle lanes that don't suddenly dump you on to a busy road junction. Do like the Dutch do and have traffic lights for bikes as well as cars.</p> <p>Improve cycle routes to be wholly off road and therefore safer</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should:
T1 Make it easier for people to get into and around the town and villages using footpaths, cycle paths and public transport?
 (109 comments)

	<p>Include cycle lanes and transport links for new developments.</p> <p>Cycling feels very dangerous - more cycle paths either separate or marked on the road would help - even if cars need to drive in a marked cycle path along the edge of the road, markings would remind driver of the space you need to leave for cyclists.</p> <p>Keep natural look - no excess tarmac.</p> <p>Cycle path would be a great asset to the area. I believe a link between Bridport and Beaminster could potentially cut down a lot of traffic.</p> <p>Cycle paths are difficult for wheel chair users (surface).</p> <p>Cycle paths must be clearly signed and law enforced to stop the increasing number of people cycling on pavements not allocated to cyclists in town.</p> <p>Cycle paths where possible - not like the stupid one near the Medical Centre though!</p> <p>I would like an easier way to connect the cycle paths - Asker Meadows to the railway track down to West Bay.</p> <p>There is no connection for the bike lane from West Bay to the town. Improving that would be very helpful for cyclists. West Bay roundabout is very dangerous</p> <p>Provide more safe cycle routes in the area</p> <p>We need a segregated cycle way to West Bay</p> <p>Use grass verges and cycle paths in housing estates.</p> <p>We need a more joined up system of cycle ways.</p>
--	--

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T1 Make it easier for people to get into and around the town and villages using footpaths, cycle paths and public transport? (109 comments)	
	<p>Push forward with the cycle path to Maiden Newton, this will link up with Dorchester and Weymouth and bring in extra tourists and jobs to Bridport.</p>
<p>Impact of cuts to bus services 10 comments</p>	<p>BUS CUTS: This is a dreadful thing to do - it isolates many people outside towns etc. How are people going to shop, socialise, visit doctors, friends etc.? Do you really want to encourage car use and pollution? The older population is unfairly deprived. Is this helping the environment? No it is not. We need more parking.</p> <p>Dorset has no motorway (thankfully!) the nearest train station is Dorchester but with public transport in decline how easy is it going to be for people to get to a rail station? The population is aging and less and less is being done to accommodate this. We won't all conveniently curl up our toes and pop our clogs to lessen the problems caused by this natural phenomenon (oh dear, perhaps I have opened the floodgates now for even more progressive thinking and we'll be the next ones to be axed - humanely of course!)</p> <p>I am very concerned about the cuts being made to bus services. Access to the services in Bridport should be provided to residents of surrounding villages. Good public transport should be available to reduce the high volume of cars on the roads.</p> <p>Public transport from surrounding villages being reduced even stopped. <u>Really!!!</u></p> <p>As public transport decreases a lot of people will not even get into town, also more cars will be on the road more pollution.</p> <p>Public transport is very poor and many do not have alternative means of transport. This can cause more than inconvenience to those who need it most increasing hardship and exacerbating social isolation.</p> <p>If the buses were not cut, as planned, there would be less pressure on the inadequate parking available in the town.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T1 Make it easier for people to get into and around the town and villages using footpaths, cycle paths and public transport? (109 comments)	
	<p>Not sure how villages are supposed to be able to get to bus station now buses stopped?</p> <p>The public transport in this area is abysmal. Bus routes are being axed, curtailed and totally destroyed. Some villages have one bus per week, some one per day and others absolutely no bus whatsoever. It is no good trying to promote green travel if you are forcing isolated communities into cars because there is no public transport.</p> <p>Recent cuts in bus services are appalling. Why can't WDDC step in - they are said to be well off and could afford their own lavish offices. What has Oliver Letwin done?</p>
<p>Footpath maintenance needed</p> <p>10 comments</p>	<p>People will use the footpaths if they are kept cut unlike some in Bradpole that are virtually non-existent.</p> <p>Many rural footpaths are poorly signed and maintained and this discourages people from using them for leisure and exercise, as well as to set from place to place.</p> <p>Lots of footpaths around Bridport are overgrown and there seems to be no weed control in the town at all.</p> <p>The pathways to enable people to walk should be regularly cut, at present may are overgrown with vegetation of stinging nettles, making walking in town and many marked paths very difficult.</p> <p>If the existing pavements were improved it would be helpful to pedestrians.</p> <p>High priority to maintain footpaths - some are impassable and overgrown e.g. West Walk West Bay to Bridport.</p> <p>Keep footpaths useable. Very overgrown and given to flooding.</p> <p>Improve the maintenance of paved areas which are dirty and have weed growth.</p> <p>It would be nice for all pedestrian areas and walk ways that are inaccessible due to over grown</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T1 Make it easier for people to get into and around the town and villages using footpaths, cycle paths and public transport? (109 comments)	
	<p>hedges and boundaries, that Bridport Council and parish councils argue over who is responsible. One blames the other and the hedges do not get trimmed back until we complain about it.</p> <p>Most footpaths are in a terrible state of repair particularly in the older estate areas.</p>
Reduce car use 6 comments	<p>Car shouldn't rule the world in town development, especially market days</p> <p>Promotes healthier lifestyle.</p> <p>Would like to see a reduction in the over reliance on the car as a form of transport.</p> <p>I would like less cars and use other forms of transport.</p> <p>More thought needs to be given to "low car use" in town.</p> <p>I think there should be more encouragement for local people not to use their cars for very short journeys unless they are able to walk.</p>
Protecting/increasing footpaths 6 comments	<p>Wheelchair friendly paths please</p> <p>Make village roads safer more footpaths needed.</p> <p>Footpaths should be protected, not to be built on by greedy builders.</p> <p>The keeping of public footpaths between town and surrounding villages should be improved i.e. Green Lane from close to Lee Lane on the Dorchester Road to Loders</p> <p>Use footpaths. Especially to The Buildings Pymore.</p> <p>At present OK to walk from Bothenhampton, Bradpole and Pymore into town; would many people walk further for shopping?</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T1 Make it easier for people to get into and around the town and villages using footpaths, cycle paths and public transport? (109 comments)</p>	
<p>Safer cycling</p> <p>4 comments</p>	<p>Require cyclists to have and use bells on <u>all</u> pathways - give pedestrians more protection, more pedestrian crossings and the A35 round the town bypasses.</p> <p>To paraphrase the Monty Python team, our thanks go to local landowners, without whom anything would be possible. I don't use my bicycle because I value life and limb!</p> <p>Promote the safe use of bicycles.</p> <p>Cycling is particularly hazardous and slows the traffic down, causing hold ups and increased pollution.</p>
<p>Promote bus services to reduce car use</p> <p>4 comments</p>	<p>An additional aspiration should be to protect, promote and encourage public transport and to discourage the use of cars, esp. for local journeys.</p> <p>Car parking is always a problem in the summer and public transport needs to be improved so that car use is decreased.</p> <p>Keeps local bus net works to encourage people to use them to keep cars out of town centre e.g. Hospital bus, village bus.</p> <p>Find ways to reduce the impact/use of the car as the primary means of transport. Regular hop on/off buses would be a start- would happily swap the car ride into town if the buses were more regular.</p>
<p>Cost of bus travel</p> <p>4 comments</p>	<p>The price of the fare is also too high for groups travelling together.</p> <p>No free buses only reduced for OAP and under 18.</p> <p>Consider half price fares instead of bus passes.</p> <p>Yes without subsidising (OAP's etc. without means test).</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T1 Make it easier for people to get into and around the town and villages using footpaths, cycle paths and public transport? (109 comments)	
General/other 13 comments	Very important More cycle racks in town and West bay I think we have good access - footpaths/cycle paths We have so few buses compared to Devon buses every 20 mins. No more buses please, most buses travel with little or no passengers. Buses are not environmentally friendly they pollute. Has the idea of tram to West Bay (like Seaton) or reinstating the rail way (steam train?) been voiced recently? It may have potential. Don't see how you can influence public transport. We use cycles and walk continuous routes, traffic free, would encourage this. Crucial because it would be welcomed and supported by the communities you mention as it would benefit them too - is this called 'joined-up thinking'? It is easy! How practically could this be achieved? New or upgraded roads should incorporate walking/cycle paths. Consider growing use of mobility vehicles.

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T2 Make sure new development includes adequate off road car parking, that the roads are improved to allow for any increased traffic and have limited speed limits to improve road safety? (65 comments)	
Speed limits 20 comments	<p>Agree with reducing speed limits</p> <p>20mph speed limits on road approaches to and in Bridport.</p> <p>20mph speed limit in roads leading to Bridport.</p> <p>20mph limits need to be extended to villages and the town centre.</p> <p>Do speed limits reduce noise? Important for quality of life.</p> <p>A 20mph for Symondsburry, now there is more traffic and busy school runs.</p> <p>I feel very strongly about all these issues and have particular concerns about speed limits. I believe there should be a major review of the limits that fall within the local authorities remit because, in my personal opinion, many of them are too high, particularly some of the villages and narrow lanes. (Not to mention the A35 which resembles a race track at times, attracting noisy motor cycles most weekends).</p> <p>Need to improve traffic flow, but not by reducing speed limits.</p> <p>Speed limits and banning large lorries through the centre would certainly improve quality to life in Bridport.</p> <p>Lower Walditch Lane – You seriously need to consider and contact the Highways Agency with regard to the speed limit on this lane, which from the entrance at Walditch Village to the entrance down to Howard Road, by the cemetery wall, is 60mph i.e. National Speed Limit. This is a single vehicle wide lane with many turns with complete blind spots and overhanging tree branches, which do not get any forestry attention unlike the trees and grass verges down by Jellyfields and opposite the bungalows where the road is considerably wider and comes under the Bridport parish boundary. This lane is already used by: School children walking to and fro to school, parents with young children and pushchairs going to Jellyfields, people walking into town, joggers, dog walkers, horseback riders,</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T2 Make sure new development includes adequate off road car parking, that the roads are improved to allow for any increased traffic and have limited speed limits to improve road safety? (65 comments)</p>	
	<p>cyclists, walking groups, as a cut through by commercial/large Council and Highways lorries/farming vehicles, when the A35 is busy not to mention the Sat-Nav users towing caravans. This is a regular early Friday afternoon event at high speeds. The A35 East Road and Sea Road South have 40 and 30mph restrictions and these are wide main roads with straight/clear views. Where Lower Walditch Lane is an accident spot waiting to happen – what does it take – a fatality before anything is done?</p> <p>Speed limits are a farce, completely ignored in outer edges of town still within residential areas.</p> <p>Any new speed limits should be targeted to areas where there is a real safety issue.</p> <p>Limited speed (e.g. 20mph) only improves safety if enforced.</p> <p>Yes to limited speed limits</p> <p>Don't limit speeds</p> <p>There should be uniform speed limit of 20 miles/hour in town centre. South Street (going to roundabout) is often a racing circuit road!</p> <p>There is no need to alter or reduce speed limits in the area.</p> <p>I think the speed limit should be reduced radically in residential areas to 20 or 15 mph, with speed cameras to rigorously enforce the limit.</p> <p>Introduce a 20mph speed limit in the town centre.</p> <p>Lower speed limits have been shown to increase pollution and are a failed solution to congestion.</p>
New development parking	More car parking spaces per family as children not leaving home as no affordable housing.
14 comments	Every document always puts pedestrians first but I don't see any sign of that with new developments

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should:
T2 Make sure new development includes adequate off road car parking, that the roads are improved to allow for any increased traffic and have limited speed limits to improve road safety?
 (65 comments)

	<p>with the main concerns being how many parking spaces they have.</p> <p>Care needs to be taken so residential roads do not become rat runs.</p> <p>Make this realistic bearing in mind most people don't use their garage to store their car but all their other stuff so at least 2 cars per house will probably end up parked on the street.</p> <p>Please see if there is a way to keep a space for residents' car parking. When I lived in Purbeck many moons ago we had a splendid plan. It is mad when even by 9.15am one cannot park at the local shops and live. I now have a blue car badge thank heavens (but only recently) I realise lots of things have changed but maybe it should be considered, had a fall recently and can't carry too much.</p> <p>'Adequate' off-road parking for new developments might well be none, or at any rate lower than one-vehicle per household. Cutting car-parking is arguably the most effective way of reducing car-usage. But it has to be done in conjunction with massive improvements to pedestrian and cycle access along with the kind of measures regarding out-of-town parking already suggested.</p> <p>This will only work if each development has an 'overspill' car park as many families now have 3 or even 4 cars.</p> <p>Don't forget parking for all new homes to stop this parking on pavements.</p> <p>Parking is already a problem here and elsewhere as more homes have additional cars & vans to accommodate. Anything you can do would be welcome.</p> <p>There will never be enough off road car parking on new developments whilst enclosed garaging is treated as a parking space at the planning stage. Garages are used as store sheds. If parking is to be included it should all be of the open covered bay type so the space cannot be used as a shed.</p> <p>Residents only parking to avoid clogging streets on town periphery i.e. Alexandra Road, Magdalen Lane.</p>
--	--

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T2 Make sure new development includes adequate off road car parking, that the roads are improved to allow for any increased traffic and have limited speed limits to improve road safety? (65 comments)</p>	
	<p>Adequate off road car parking.</p> <p>Housing near the town centre does not necessarily require parking.</p> <p>Stop encouraging more cars on town centre housing developments as in 10-20 years we will hopefully have less cars or autonomous ones which will remove the need for a car for every family/person</p>
<p>Support pedestrianisation generally/of South Street</p> <p>8 comments</p>	<p>Support pedestrianisation of South Street it would be of huge benefit to the wellbeing of the people who use the town.</p> <p>Close the end of South Street permanently!</p> <p>Introduce pedestrianisation in the town centre.</p> <p>Consider traffic free areas in the town.</p> <p>Would it be viable to make Bucky Doo a small pedestrianised road?</p> <p>South Street at weekends should not be just 'looked at' but implemented! Pedestrianise South Street</p> <p>South Street should be pedestrianised from the Town Hall down to Folly Mill/Gundry Lane. All car parks remain accessible. East/West Street traffic would flow smoothly, with no traffic lights, reducing congestion and pollution from queuing traffic. The heart of the town would be an attractive, safe area to enjoy shops, cafes, The Arts Centre, street entertainers etc.</p> <p>We should look again at pedestrianisation of South Street on market days. The noisy and polluting traffic - detract from the attraction of Bucky Doo Square and its events.</p>
<p>Against pedestrianisation</p>	<p>Do not close South Street</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T2 Make sure new development includes adequate off road car parking, that the roads are improved to allow for any increased traffic and have limited speed limits to improve road safety? (65 comments)</p>	
<p>generally/of South Street</p> <p>7 comments</p>	<p>Do not close South Street</p> <p>Do not pedestrianise south street, this will only have a negative effect on trade, and traffic</p> <p>Don't agree with no traffic in south street</p> <p>Do not shut South Street.</p> <p>South Street must not be closed, unless you want a street without shops. No. It is fine how it is, don't change it.</p> <p>Traffic could do with more control on Market days, but not closing south street permanently, as this will only cause build up in other urban areas and confusion, especially for local people who live in town with disable family as non access could cause dangerous delays and stress for local families.</p>
<p>Reducing/calming traffic in town</p> <p>6 comments</p>	<p>Private motor traffic should only be allowed into Bridport town centre under sufferance - it is (or should be) at the bottom of the traffic hierarchy, with pedestrians, then cyclists and next public transport above.</p> <p>Investigate other busy towns with successful traffic policies - more one-ways - more traffic calming -</p> <p>Improve traffic/pedestrian light phasing.</p> <p>I have noticed an increase in traffic over the last 10 years and wonder if there are any proposals for traffic calming along main South Street, West Street, East Street roads.</p> <p>Improve traffic flow.</p> <p>We need a strategy for managing visitors and users of the town, including the reduction of cars in town centre.</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T2 Make sure new development includes adequate off road car parking, that the roads are improved to allow for any increased traffic and have limited speed limits to improve road safety? (65 comments)</p>	
<p>Town Hall junction</p> <p>4 comments</p>	<p>Sort the Town Hall road junction - remove traffic lights!</p> <p>Aspirations: Traffic light controls at Town Hall probably unavoidable because of visibility.</p> <p>It is hoped that the trial closing of South Street will show the benefit of removing the Town Hall traffic lights. This is the key to showing the unnecessary traffic hold ups.</p> <p>No need for a stupid roundabout at the town hall.</p>
<p>General/other</p> <p>6 comments</p>	<p>Clamp down on noisy speeding motorcycles.</p> <p>Aim should be to lower the number of vehicles on our roads.</p> <p>Very important.</p> <p>Want safe roads but that doesn't necessarily mean planning more provision for cars - car free? I'm a cyclist and road user too.</p> <p>Would need to see plans.</p> <p>This has not happened with the new development going to be built next to the hospital. This area isn't on a bus or train route and not enough parking provided which means the hospital car park will get used and local streets which are already full with the cars/vans from residents will become overcrowded. VERY poor planning.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T3 Protect the bus station and promote it as a transport hub? (18 comments)	
Modernise/improve the bus station 10 comments	<p>Any chance of gathering funds (donations?) to make the bus station visually pleasant - small trees, attractive flower beds - fencing? Its not very welcoming</p> <p>Bus station needs modernising/improving.</p> <p>Bus station needs improvement!</p> <p><u>Please</u> improve the toilets by the bus station they are VILE!</p> <p>Improve facilities.</p> <p>Bus station needs improvement.</p> <p>Improvements to the bus station would be an advantage.</p> <p>Improve the appearance of the bus station let it say 'Welcome to Bridport' and have panels of images of local attractions - commission artists to design posters. At present it is a disgrace and utterly depressing.</p> <p>The bus station and area needs urgent attention. It is a disgrace to the town.</p> <p>Build a new bus station (ground level) with social apartments above - better utilisation of the ground space.</p>
Reduce size of bus station 3 comments	<p>You need the bus station, but it can be made smaller. It is oversized for the amount of buses we now have.</p> <p>Bus station area seems quite large at present. Would a 2 story car park help at St Michael's?</p> <p>Bus station only needs 4/5 bays and shelters.</p>
General/other	<p>Move the taxi ranks from main streets into bus station car park.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T3 Protect the bus station and promote it as a transport hub? (18 comments)	
5 comments	<p>Protect bus station if there are buses! All seem to be disappearing.</p> <p>You do not need a bus depot on a prime riverside site. Use individual estates as Damory has at Poundbury/Dorchester.</p> <p>T3 is absolutely necessary.</p> <p>Keep not protect</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T4 Protect town centre car parking? (39 comments)	
More/improved town centre parking needed 13 comments	<p>Improve car parks. Make getting to and around town to park easier</p> <p>Provide on road disabled parking bays and offloading bays for businesses to reduce double parking and un-necessary congestion.</p> <p>Remote indicators on outskirts of town to show spaces available in car parks.</p> <p>Enforce parking restrictions, especially on South Street, to improve traffic flow.</p> <p>We need many new car parks in town</p> <p>Increase parking for Disabled. I qualify for Blue Badge and Attendance Allowance, yet I am expected to walk further than either benefit permits! Need more near town centre.</p> <p>Increase them.</p> <p>Great need for more town parking not less.</p> <p>Add more</p> <p>Increase</p> <p>We need more town centre parking our elderly population <u>do not</u> cycle/walk into town to shop - have you seen a 75year old on a bike with a Waitrose carrier on the handlebars!!</p> <p>Need more car parking urgently.</p> <p>Need more parking.</p>
Multi-storey 6 comments	<p>Relocate car parking e.g. multi-storey to allow room for housing</p> <p>Probably multi-storey car-park or, better, underground car parking (with provision for charging all-</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T4 Protect town centre car parking? (39 comments)	
	<p>electric cars).</p> <p>Put a single/double storey car park at rear of Waitrose.</p> <p>Multi story car park behind Waitrose perhaps.</p> <p>Town centre car parking is a priority. The present inadequate parking causes congestion, pollution and loss of visitors/customers, who will not return! A small multi-storey would help.</p> <p>Transport is difficult in Bridport, especially in - there are frequent jams and gridlock, particularly in the summer, parking is a problem with people having to drive round and round to find a space. Why not try low rise parking buildings, allowing a doubling of parking space, or even underground parking?</p>
Protect existing car parks 5 comments	<p>There are a lot of people that cannot walk far and need to be able to use town centre car parks.</p> <p>Don't build on Waitrose car park - get it taken out of Local Plan! Keep not protect</p> <p>Don't let them build on the Waitrose carpark (its in the local plan - get it removed)</p> <p>Great need for car parking, current car parks should not be cleared and built on.</p> <p>As the town grows, town centre parking will become a big problem as it already nears capacity at times. Bridport is a market town and needs the town centre to thrive, we HAVE to ensure people are able to easily get into, or park in the town centre.</p>
Car parks encourage car use 4 comments	<p>Allowing for increased car traffic and parking is in conflict with aspirations to reduce carbon emissions and improve air quality.</p> <p>Encourages car use.</p> <p>Car parks encourage car use.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T4 Protect town centre car parking? (39 comments)	
	Town-centre car-parking encourages people to drive into town when few really need to (the elderly, disabled).
Low cost/free car parking 2 comments	Keep off road parking at reasonable prices to encourage local high street shopping. No charges, no parking meters.
Additional parking not needed 2 comments	Don't need anymore town centre parking. We have plenty of parking in town.
General/other 7 comments	Reduce the use of Waitrose car park and move traffic to the other car parks outside the centre as it encourages more traffic into a zone that cannot cope. Review as part of a Bridport Area Transport Plan Parking facilities are ridiculous in the town at present especially in the season. Difficult for me to answer - I live very near to town centre so walk to town (usually). Encourage residents to walk, get out of their cars. Why not have extra parking a short distance away from all town centre rather than moan about weekend grid lock. Not necessary if good transport links. Off street car parking should be more controlled to stop hold ups within the town and on road junctions in the side streets.

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T5 Look into options for temporary car parking areas on the edge of town for peak times and events? (42 comments)	
Against use of Asker Meadows 12 comments	<p>Plans to allow temporary parking in Asker Meadows was not popular.</p> <p>Not on Asker Meadows.</p> <p>Temporary parking in Asker Meadows is unacceptable</p> <p>Keep car parking off Asker Meadows at all times.</p> <p>Asker Meadows should <u>not</u> be used for temporary car parking, because of entrance being dangerous for pedestrians and bus stop and entrance to Pasture Way.</p> <p>But not Asker Meadows.</p> <p>Asker Meadow is <u>not</u> to be used as a car park! Access lethal.</p> <p>But not on green areas such as Asker Meadows.</p> <p>Where will car parks go - Asker Meadows? It would damage any green field sites for long after its use.</p> <p>There should not be any car parking allowed on the meadows, which are there for wildlife protection and the enjoyment of all.</p> <p>No temporary parking on Asker Meadows...it will eventually become permanent</p> <p>Absolutely <u>no</u> temporary parking should be allowed on protected areas like Asker Meadows - fumes would be injurious to wildlife.</p>
Park and ride 12 comments	<p>A town serving a rural hinterland will always need to be accessed by some by car (especially given DCC's antediluvian attitudes to buses) but Bridport needs to move to an out-of-town park & ride (e.g. by the new waste depot).</p> <p>A park and ride should be set-up to restrict the need for car access to town centre and fewer car</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T5 Look into options for temporary car parking areas on the edge of town for peak times and events? (42 comments)	
	<p>parks in centre.</p> <p>More park & ride.</p> <p>Park and ride</p> <p>Park and ride scheme</p> <p>With regard to the parking issues in town a park and ride system could be the answer during peak times.</p> <p>The town is already jammed most of the day. We need out of town parking and park and ride.</p> <p>A park and ride scheme.</p> <p>Park and ride and shuttle buses</p> <p>Park and Ride schemes.</p> <p>Promote a park and ride scheme.</p> <p>Promote Park and Ride.</p>
<p>Sensitivity of using out of town green spaces</p> <p>6 comments</p>	<p>Not at the sacrifice of damaging views, landscape or sites of significance that should be protected.</p> <p>Not on environmentally sensitive sites!</p> <p>Again this is a difficult one if we are to protect sites as in EH1 and EH4.</p> <p>Make car parking spaces double up as green spaces with appropriate surfacing.</p> <p>The thin end of the wedge! Where, apart from green spaces are possible car parking areas?</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: T5 Look into options for temporary car parking areas on the edge of town for peak times and events? (42 comments)</p>	
	<p>Yes but no into fields.</p>
<p>Promotion of Football Club car park 3 comments</p>	<p>Promote parking at the football pitch site.</p> <p>More signage should be used to promote parking at Football Club and path to town.</p> <p>Build two storey car park adjacent to Bridport FC.</p>
<p>Support for edge of town car parking 2 comments</p>	<p>Should have more parking at town edge e.g., old Mountjoy School.</p> <p>A certain amount of town centre parking is essential for the less able bodied but more edge of town parking would also be a valuable asset with access to the town centre on foot.</p>
<p>General/other 7 comments</p>	<p>A job for event organisers surely.</p> <p>Must be convenient.</p> <p>Where would temporary parking be?</p> <p>Why put pressure on surrounding village roads?</p> <p>Review as part of a Bridport Area Transport Plan</p> <p>Yes for 'events', but not clear what is meant by 'peak times'.</p> <p>But so long as these never become permanent replacement for town centre parking. Also consider distance to walk to shops for older people and small children.</p>

Wider responses to the Transport theme (41 comments)	
<p>Concerns about volume of traffic</p> <p>7 comments</p>	<p>Bradpole village roads are too busy no more traffic.</p> <p>Look into the amount of heavy traffic using North Allington.</p> <p>We should explore a scheme for cutting the traffic around the harbour at West Bay. Get a survey done and you will see as I have whilst sitting on a bench by St Johns Church, around 75% of all traffic entering the harbour area drive to the Esplanade or Park Dean roundabout turn round and drives back out again. Never stopping or using the facilities of the area, particularly late afternoon and evenings.</p> <p>Before housing, we need work to prevent Bridport becoming a commuter town. Bus links and rail links do not currently support this and now the roads are becoming too congested, too.</p> <p>Promote car sharing. As an aside - this summer has been a total nightmare with regard traffic volume and the resultant pollution - and that includes noise pollution.</p> <p>The area is busy enough! Without adding housing in this area, it will come to a stand still at weekends</p> <p>Care must be taken not to generate too much traffic in the town. An example being the approach to Mountfield Gardens and Coneygar Hill. The Churchill development has generated a large amount of traffic - deliveries, resident's cars visitors, taxis etc. Maybe the speed limit should be 5mph as children and animals share this space.</p>
<p>Improvements to A35</p> <p>6 comments</p>	<p>There is no mention of the A35. This is the main trunk road through Dorset. There are 30, 40, 50 mph speed limits on its length between Ringwood and Honiton. This goes to show for today's traffic it is not fit for purpose. Bridport, Dorchester and Charmouth bypass where all short sighted cheap options. Before thousands of new homes are built along its length it needs upgrading to take the traffic in fifteen, twenty years time. Devon and Cornwall get hundreds of millions spent on their roads. Bridport can't get a roundabout at Miles Cross. Why?</p> <p>There is nothing wrong with the junction at Miles Cross, people just need to use common sense there.</p> <p>A 40mph limit would be safer for the Miles Cross/ A35 junction.</p>

Wider responses to the Transport theme (41 comments)	
	<p>Roundabout at Miles Cross.</p> <p>Speed limit reduced on A35 coming out of Bridport towards Dorchester to enable safer entry and exit Walditch.</p> <p>Not enough to reduce use of cars, especially A35 during peak periods: railway to West Bay and Dorchester, Weymouth?</p>
<p>West Bay car parking needs 5 comments</p>	<p>There is a great need for more parking at West Bay, especially now funding is being put into several projects, which could encourage more tourism.</p> <p>Desperate need for additional temporary parking in West Bay</p> <p>West Bay desperately needs more car parks. Huge visitor numbers park on Meadowlands and Marsh Barn Lane which means revenue is being lost and buses and emergency vehicles cannot get through. £2 per day is less than a cup of coffee and should be upped to at least £4.</p> <p>I regret that the temporary summer parking at West Bay was not allowed to continue as this would have provided extra revenue and reduced those parking on the road from West Bay to Marsh Barn which caused much congestion.</p> <p>Additional car parking is urgently needed for West Bay during the summer months. The large car park needs to be maintained and parking bays indicated as now poor parking means there are even fewer places available.</p>
<p>Provision for electric cars 5 comments</p>	<p>Should support an effective network for charging points for electric vehicles</p> <p>Get ready for the electric car revolution which will soon be with us with more power points.</p> <p>I cannot imagine that there would be a charging point for electric cars in every village!</p> <p>Rather than providing off road car parking, developments should include electric car charging points</p>

Wider responses to the Transport theme (41 comments)	
	<p>and car share parking - to encourage people to adapt to new methods of transport and move away from car ownership which will be unsustainable as Bridport expands.</p> <p>We need fewer cars in Bridport and the town should start planning for electric cars (charging points) and driverless cars (which will reduce the need for personal car ownership) and in the meantime promote car share schemes.</p>
<p>Concerns with overall proposals</p> <p>3 comments</p>	<p>The needs of the less mobile and disabled are largely ignored.</p> <p>What transport proposals!! You only take away what we have.</p> <p>The plan should make a 100% commitment to T1 & T3 and to reducing private car use, + air pollution. T2 & T4 indicate a lack of commitment to the above.</p>
<p>Support for overall proposals</p> <p>2 comments</p>	<p>Glad to see items like parking provision and cycle/footpaths included in the plan.</p> <p>Looking good.</p>
<p>Commercial vehicles and parking</p> <p>2 comments</p>	<p>Have more loading bays for shops.</p> <p>Do not allow commercial vehicles to be parked in residential areas, vans/lorries to be encouraged to park at industrial sites.</p>
<p>General/other</p> <p>11 comments</p>	<p>The land off Sea Road now used for public functions, i.e. Music festivals etc. is that to be protected. Sea Road South is getting busier with traffic and it is getting harder to cross the road for pedestrians, especially the elderly and traffic from Pasture Way entrance trying to get to town etc. We need a controlled crossing.</p> <p>Current parking/pedestrianisation is a mockery, isn't working and divides the community.</p> <p>Our Transport system is important</p>

Wider responses to the Transport theme (41 comments)	
	<p>Govt plan - no petrol/diesel cars 2040 - make provision - understand where car industry developing electric hydrogen?</p> <p>Make West Bay Road single lane with passing places to slow down speeds and provide a cycle track.</p> <p>I have never known another town to have a by-pass that requires cars to enter the town to get to! Surely ours should divert fro Travellers Rest way?</p> <p>All these points need to be considered as part of a Bridport Area Transport Plan, which Bridport Town Council could take the lead in commissioning, if planners and others are serious about reducing dependence on private car and improving circulation by non-car methods. As part of this, the Town Council could also consider increasing its commendable and growing sense of ownership, responsibility and initiative (TIC, WCs) by providing its own buses (?electric?). And note Local Plan Policy ENV11, "Bus routes and bus stops, strategic cycle and pedestrian routes, should be planned for." A Transport Plan should incorporate all of these. It should be based on existing infrastructure and should avoid being distracted by the sort of unrealistic projects which have rendered previous plans unviable (such as the railway scheme, which would involve insurmountable issues of landowner consent, and require yet more infrastructure and clutter).</p> <p>Roads will be quieter maybe we could build houses nearer to them?</p> <p>We have far too many Taxis and restricted areas for Taxis. The Taxis blatantly disregard parking i.e. Bus stops and U Turning into busy traffic with in the town centre.</p> <p>What about focusing on future needs - how to encourage less car use - set up a car share scheme in Bridport (the Bridport co-housing scheme are currently looking into this) making electric car charging points available?</p> <p>Where? And what? is proposed to safeguard and increase pedestrian crossings in line with an inevitable increase of traffic</p>

Environment & Heritage

Full comments: 121 comments in total received for Environment & Heritage (Note: some responses were split where more than one topic was covered in the response; none have been removed)

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: EH1 Protect the green river corridors and the undeveloped hills in and around the area? (5 comments)	
General support for proposal 4 comments	Yes, but should not weaken the provisions of Local Plan policy ENV1. I think all the surrounding hills should remain protected. But it might be really interesting to develop one of them into streets like Lewes or Boston! Add some romance and views. It is essential that the views surrounding and the historic townscape are nurtured. It is very important to protect the rivers and surrounding countryside for the safe passage and breeding opportunities for a vast array of wildlife which frequent our open spaces.
River corridor upkeep 1 comment	The problem with green river corridors is that without grazing, these areas soon become unkempt and to developer's eyes, attractive for housing. But they are expensive to keep up. Maybe 'sponsorship'.
Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: EH2 Protect the views in and out of the area from over-large development? (4 comments)	
General support 3 comments	Remove the words 'over large'. Very important Yes, but should not weaken the provisions of Local Plan policy ENV1.
General/other 1 comment	E.g. Vearse Farm

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: EH3 Promote the use of building styles and materials appropriate to the historic character of the area and protect heritage features? (37 comments)	
Promoting a balance between heritage and modern development 27 comments	<p>Progressive environmental solutions, e.g. solar panels etc. should never be prevented for the sake of 'historic character' and 'heritage'.</p> <p>Although Bridport is a historic town it is important that it does not remain in the 20th century and that some of the development is modern architecture. As well as protecting our environment we must allow for modernisation as well and satisfy the demands of 21st century living.</p> <p>As for protecting the heritage of the area, I think this is important but it can no longer be done at the expense of the oldest housing being so inefficient at retaining heat. There also needs to be a sensible discussion on the listing of some buildings, as there are some ridiculous examples of these throughout the town.</p> <p>Building styles should not stagnate in Bridport. More effort should be made to promote more modern design.</p> <p>But not to make a chocolate box town.</p> <p>Avoid pastiche. Add imaginative new & Env. Sustainable architecture which compliments existing.</p> <p>I do agree it is important to preserve historic buildings and for new buildings to be sympathetic to the traditions of the area. But Bridport should also embrace good modern design and be open to new styles and new materials - provided they are of high quality and no higher than existing building heights.</p> <p>Use contemporary design materials and protect heritage.</p> <p>We should try to incorporate modern, <u>green</u> ideas that sit well with heritage and old buildings. All new builds should include energy saving and generating features. Let's not be afraid of different styles and solutions.</p> <p>Respect for local distinctiveness and heritage should not lead to pastiche, pseudo historicist design</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: EH3 Promote the use of building styles and materials appropriate to the historic character of the area and protect heritage features? (37 comments)</p>	
	<p>(e.g. Poundbury style), and should not exclude innovative and good contemporary design.</p> <p>But also stop any of the shelf building design and use real, talented architects to create new buildings that enhance rather than just turn us into a red brick 'Tesco' looking town. Modern architectures can be beautiful and environmental.</p> <p>But this should not preclude a modern and innovative use of building styles where appropriate and visually appealing.</p> <p>I broadly agree with this <u>but</u> there should also be a place for innovative design and interesting use of materials which is sympathetic to the local environment. Sustainable and environmentally friendly developments should be <u>actively</u> encouraged, and favoured. Quite happy to see some modern design in the area.</p> <p>In principle I see the answer to the question as 'yes'. However I do believe there is opportunity in some circumstance to welcome 'contemporary' design.</p> <p>Yes providing someone doesn't want a Poundbury style pastiche here!</p> <p>To ensure any developments are kept within proportion to the surrounding area.</p> <p>I put no opinion regarding building styles because I think some new materials and design can be excellent too. I particularly want to record my opinion that green spaces between settlements should be protected from further development - the field at Happy Island Way/Jessopp Ave is a prime example of somewhere that needs keeping out of the development area to stop future urban spread and sprawl.</p> <p>EH3 - is two questions a) I think modern is OK, especially if innovative and energy efficient. B) But to protect heritage features of existing structures.</p> <p>It needs to be mindful, of not creating pastiches but promoting contemporary design alongside</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: EH3 Promote the use of building styles and materials appropriate to the historic character of the area and protect heritage features? (37 comments)</p>	
	<p>protection of heritage features.</p> <p>Whilst it is important where appropriate, to take heritage and character into account, it should not exclude modern, sustainable, eco-friendly buildings that might be deemed out of keeping now, but will in time become part of the heritage and character of the future. How boring if everything stayed the same.</p> <p>Careful here! A lot of old buildings are of poor design i.e. small windows, flat boring frontages right on the street.</p> <p>Yes but consider, not dismiss, contemporary design and smart materials, sustainable sedum roofing etc. The recent contemporary dwellings on the west side of West Bay harbour unfortunately do not seemingly reflect or consider heritage; however, it would have been possible, for example, to be influenced by the "Dutch" fishermen's dwellings on the east side to build contemporary homes that complimented the essential historic nature of the old port, incorporating heritage features. Would it be possible for Neighbourhood to see visual representations of proposed edifices at planning stage, I wonder?</p> <p>Focus on the use of locally sourced, innovative and sustainable materials which will naturally reflect the local environment over adherence to tradition.</p> <p>Modern building styles and materials are not necessarily inappropriate for the area and, providing the design is sympathetic, should not be precluded.</p> <p>We must be careful not to get stuck in a particular view of the local "vernacular." Some traditional materials, such as stone, may be better replaced by timber.</p> <p>I actually think we could be bolder with our approach to development and expect features such as underground parking in residential developments, communal buildings and developments, a more sustainable approach to our housing needs. I also like a lot of modern architecture - not all new houses need to look like a 'chocolate box' development. the planning committees should be more open to new styles and types of buildings instead of everything looking like a dull suburb.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: EH3 Promote the use of building styles and materials appropriate to the historic character of the area and protect heritage features? (37 comments)	
	<p>While I broadly support the use of 'appropriate' building styles and materials there is little worse than ersatz renderings of what mass builders take to be vernacular architecture. Let us have some unashamedly C21st designs - well done, this can look excellent; e.g. Amsterdam.</p>
Promoting the protection of heritage as a priority 8 comments	<p>I have seen too many places fall victim to 'modern' thinking. Just because we have to move forward as far as progress is concerned, this should not be at the expense of our heritage, conservation and amenity. Mostly I believe progress is more like vandalism.</p> <p>A contemporary approach to a non contemporary town could be a disaster for our local heritage</p> <p>Don't let this town become just a drab ultra modern blob keep the originality</p> <p>Building materials and thought for design is vital if the area is to keep its unique historic and visual character.</p> <p>While I don't wish the overall design of the town should look as if it's preserved in aspic, it is important to retain a coherent style that reflects the history of Bridport.</p> <p>Building styles and materials are vital to get right in an area such as this "new build". Can so often look soulless and uninviting. Detailing on windows, chimneys, front doors is so important to get right.</p> <p>Enforce planning rules by not allowing inappropriate designs that are not sensitive to the surrounding area.</p> <p>Make sure we never end up with buildings like the ones at West Bay. Keep a close eye on development at St Michael's Lane.</p>
General/other 2 comments	<p>In reality many of the 1950-2010 estates which surround Bridport are undistinguished.</p> <p><u>Who</u> is to say what is appropriate? Which part of history does this refer to? It usually means 'mock' Victorian, hideous black tacky lamp-posts etc.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: EH4 Protect the green gaps between settlements and other valued green space from development? (20 comments)	
Areas identified for protection as valued green spaces 12 comments	<p>While I would not object to a small (provided it is for local people or have moved into the area for work reasons) amount of new homes in Walditch, it is essential 'old' Walditch remains a distinct village and the space between the village retained and protected.</p> <p>Avoid building on site between main road and Walditch on left as coming into Bridport</p> <p>The green spaces around Bridport are a key part of living here, especially the field next to Happy Island. Protecting them is very important.</p> <p>Would like to see Asker Meadows enhanced as a visitor friendly nature reserve in keeping with its LNR status.</p> <p>Publicly used green field sites like Happy Island should have permanent protection against development.</p> <p>The iconic green spaces that separate the parishes surrounding Bridport should be preserved, for example the field monarch way traverses leading to pack horse bridge by Happy Island.</p> <p>Strongly agree about keeping gap between e.g. Bridport/Symondsburry.</p> <p>I believe it is imperative that the green field sites are protected particularly the field by Happy Island/Happy Island Way/ The fields around the area are part of what makes this area so beautiful and so to consider developing this would be to spoil the landscape, not just for those who live there now, but for future generations as well.</p> <p>Bridport is at risk of overdevelopment. Save the green spaces especially Happy Island fields.</p> <p>The field next to Happy Island is an important part of Bridport green spaces and I do not think it's appropriate to build houses on it.</p> <p>Bridport has a number of highly valued green areas. The fields beside Jessopp Avenue and Happy</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: EH4 Protect the green gaps between settlements and other valued green space from development? (20 comments)	
	<p>Island Way are particularly well-used by the local community and should be preserved. Green fields like these around Bridport are an essential part of the iconic views.</p> <p>Protection of Jellyfields and Allington Hill is a must, both are loved by many locals.</p>
<p>Support for the protection of green spaces generally</p> <p>7 comments</p>	<p>You say 'protect <u>valued</u> green space for development' you should protect <u>all</u> green spaces.</p> <p>Accessible green space is essential for the well-being of everyone who uses the town/lives here.</p> <p>Whilst I am less worried about green gaps between settlements, I do believe we should protect valued green space such as parks.</p> <p>Remove the word 'valued'.</p> <p>Our area is beautiful and protecting it and our green spaces is very important. Once gone, they're lost forever.</p> <p>Yes, but within settlements, the protection offered by Local Plan policy COM5 (Retention of Open Space and Recreation Facilities) and the list of types of open space and facilities (e.g. allotments, community orchards, natural green spaces) detailed at para. 6.3.8 on pages 118-119, must not in any way be undermined or weakened by the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Green gaps should be used for leisure not for car parking.</p>
<p>Balance with development needs</p> <p>1 comment</p>	<p>Maybe. Yes - there needs to be a balance between protecting views and development for the future. Hard to achieve, but you can't restrict all developments to protect all views and green spaces.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: EH5 Ensure alterations to shop frontages are sensitive to the historic character of the conservation areas in terms of design, materials and signage? (11 comments)	
Support for greater control over shop frontages/includes contemporary 7 comments	Definitely preserve original shop fronts - especially encouraging independent stores. Develop mandatory design rules for business facades that limits the brash colours and brand names that sit uncomfortably on the period buildings particularly along East and West Street Reduce signage to a minimum to avoid clutter. Yes, but also in quantity of signage. Reduce the use of neon and lighting at night. Again contemporary design should be considered. Yes and perhaps certain premises could even have plaques on walls with information about the past residents or location of The Shambles, for example. Any new stonework might have obligatory rope-work carving, symbolic of the heritage, a feature that would provide continuity throughout the town.
General/other 4 comments	Boots in Bridport a serious mistake What happened about Dominoes then? Bit late in the day. Re-alterations to shop frontages the scaffolding around the West Street / South Street junction goes on...and on...

Wider responses to the Environment & Heritage theme (44 comments)	
<p>Green areas – general</p> <p>9 comments</p>	<p>This is not just about how things look, important though this is. It's also about caring for and protecting the environment we live in, both natural and made by humans. Quality of life affects us all, including our mental and physical wellbeing. We need to bear this in mind when making decisions about "development".</p> <p>See also Local Plan Policy ENV10 – Landscape and Townscape Setting, including references at (iii) to hard and soft landscaping. In many recent developments (over the past 40 years) there is too much hard landscaping, tarmac, gravel etc., and not enough soft landscaping, grass, trees etc. This is undermining a key element of Bridport's local distinctiveness, its "green" character.</p> <p>All our green fields have to be protected or we lose Bridport for the beautiful town it is. People come to Bridport because of what we have here, not to see housing estates. No reincarnation of Bridport.</p> <p>Apart from the amenity value for residents, these features attract tourists to the area from more developed parts of the country, and the income they generate is important for local businesses. Wildlife doesn't have a vote and can't fill in questionnaires, but needs consideration and protection for its own sake, for the delight it gives and contribution to mental health, for tourism reasons or because if we don't protect the natural environment, humanity is doomed to extinction.</p> <p>If any developers are allowed to erode into our beautiful green spaces and rivers, that will be the end of our wonderful town and surrounding area</p> <p>Keep green spaces when possible as they are much needed for nature and wildlife.</p> <p>I would also like to see designated areas for dog walking, although most owners are conscientious some are not and dog excrement in areas is appalling.</p> <p>Once they're gone, they're gone for good!</p> <p>People want to live here precisely because of the beautiful views of hills, meadows, livestock etc. Developments on these areas would defeat the object of coming here in the first place / remaining here is born in the locality. For incomers, why swap one suburban sprawl for the equivalent or another!?</p>

Wider responses to the Environment & Heritage theme (44 comments)	
<p>Heritage – general</p> <p>6 comments</p>	<p>We must ensure the 'uniqueness' of Bridport is protected.</p> <p>How are our village conservation area protected.</p> <p>Have been visiting Bridport since 1970's part of its attraction is its proximity to unspoilt countryside and the 'petit' nature of its layout. While we understand that the town and its environment must be made fit for purpose in the 2020's and beyond. The heritage and character deserves protecting. Now we live in the area and shop here 3-4 times a week this character is valued even more. Would be very sad if this unique townscape become too homogenous. Love it as it is</p> <p>Pevsner says: "Bridport is one of the best towns in Dorset for a continuously sustained (urban) feeling, perhaps the best of all" "(streets) are unusually broad, this broadness the result historically of Bridport's medieval prosperity".</p> <p>Bridport is a vibrant market town, full of heritage and uniqueness which attracts masses of tourists. If people keep wanting to change the town and St Michael's Trading Estate i.e. the alleyways, Bridport music centre etc. we will lose the tourists and lots of cash!</p> <p>Bridport needs to aspire to remaining a vibrant market town and to retain its distinctive character within the glorious West Dorset countryside. Therefore, it is important to limit sprawl of the town and enhance the Town Centre, in particular.</p>
<p>Balance green space protection with the need to provide housing</p> <p>4 comments</p>	<p>Whilst it is important to reflect the rural nature of the area by restricting development on greenfield sites, it is also important to recognise that we have to offer more housing.</p> <p>Desirable though views and "corridors" are, I feel that housing needs (accurately assessed) must be the priority. (A map of where the "green corridors" are would be helpful).</p> <p>I agree with all the above as ticked but not at the cost of affordable housing.</p> <p>I find the continuing argument that any development despoils this area of outstanding natural beauty. This is an excuse for opposing any housing development e.g.. Its so called 'Advearse Group'. Almost all of West Dorset can be described as AONB- but hasn't prevented the approval of sprawling</p>

Wider responses to the Environment & Heritage theme (44 comments)	
	ugly holiday chalet sites of caravan parks!!
Not building beyond development boundary 3 comments	The present development boundaries should be completely respected. Do not encroach into the AONB. No building outside the Bridport development area. Do not build on A.O.N.B. we cannot do this. The town should grow but not to the detriment of the beneficial countryside.
Brown field sites to be prioritised for development over green 3 comments	Fully utilise brownfield sites before encroaching on more greenfield. In terms of building infill sites/brown field sites should be considered before any development of green field sites. <u>All developments should be on brown field sites.</u>
General/other 19 comments	The unique character of Bridport and surrounding areas must be preserved for future generations. Tourist Area. Approach to Bridport important Stop would be developers from filling in at night Badger setts on Watton Hill claiming the Badgers have left when they haven't. Not to build on flood plain. These all seem fairly obvious and are probably already addressed in The Local Plan - sadly all the questions are 'closed' and don't offer opportunities for suggestions. e.g. How are green river corridors, undeveloped hills identified. How are 'views to the surrounding countryside' to be identified? What are the heritage features and building styles of Bridport? What steps will be taken to define the historic character of design, materials and signage?

Wider responses to the Environment & Heritage theme (44 comments)	
	<p>Stop trying to let the town grow.</p> <p>This town and surrounding parishes are in AONB with many conservation areas, and this amenity is valued very much by the community.</p> <p>In terms of protecting views and hills in and around our area then who in their right mind decided it was a sensible idea to plant forty to fifty new Fir Trees on top of Colmers Hill - in a few years time this iconic view/aspect of West Dorset will be ruined. Chop the new trees before it is too late.</p> <p>At present the river banks are severely cut back to the waters edge during the summer by the Environment Agency making it impossible for Water voles and other mammals, insects and birds to colonise the river bank habitat. This is done in the name of 'flood protection'. There has to be an end to this if the river banks are to be wildlife corridors and a consultation about the conflict between flood protection and wildlife conservation. Nature plants, such as Yellow Flag Iris and Purple Loosetife are now loss sights, whereas they were common in the past. Over hanging trees are cut back thus making it difficult for Kingfishers to fish etc.</p> <p>The rivers in and around Bridport are neglected and full of rubbish. Are there any working parties set up that could assist with cleaning them up?</p> <p>We need to inspire people to do so indeed!!! EH1 → EH5. In Dutch, Mauwen op stropen, or; role up your "Sleeves".</p> <p>All council members especially planning need to understand that they serve the views and needs of individual ratepayers. WDDC appears to be in the pocket of local developers and disregards the heritage and philosophy of an area of outstanding natural beauty allowing developers to do what they want regardless of individual's rights and always to the developers' financial gain. In 40+ years have seen a decline in standards allowing those from outside the area to disregard beauty for monetary gain.</p> <p>Instead of the word 'protect' change for 'conserve and improve'.</p> <p>It is essential to protect our green spaces, the natural context of the town and its historic character in</p>

Wider responses to the Environment & Heritage theme (44 comments)	
	<p>order to maintain its local distinctiveness and charm</p> <p>Please make absolutely sure that developers keep to agreed conditions e.g.. A mature beautiful Oak tree on the site of New Zealand Farm Estate was removed and only replaced with a weedy little sapling, which is struggling.</p> <p>Bridport towns people and surrounding parishes are passionate about environment and heritage and make their voices heard at local meetings and District Council level but WDDC do not listen or take on board opinions and concerns of local people. Just as Kensington chose to ignore people's concerns and advice. Gridlock, accidents, lack of facilities NHS, Leisure, transport care of the elderly.</p> <p>Please progress these policies to protect our environment without delay.</p> <p>Prioritise development areas, so those with least environmental impact are developed first. (And those with greatest impact left till last).</p> <p>All these proposals are very well covered in the West Dorset District Local Plan</p>

Climate Change

Full comments: 92 comments in total received for Climate Change (Note: some responses were split where more than one topic was covered in the response; none have been removed)

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should:

CC1 Call for increased energy efficiency for new housing and commercial developments, including generating renewable energy where appropriate?

(29 comments)

<p>Solar panels</p> <p>12 comments (10 for, 2 against)</p>	<p>For</p> <p>Solar panels on all new homes to be mandatory. Allow solar panels on all roofs, including listed buildings - they are less of an eyesore than tangle of T.V.s and telegraph wires that <u>are</u> allowed.</p> <p>Solar panels on new housing but not large wind turbines on small 'sites.'</p> <p>Solar panels, double glazing should be insisted upon in all new properties.</p> <p>Encourage the installation of solar panels on the roof of new developments.</p> <p>Private usage PU and storage solutions are now becoming cheap so should be encouraged and individual PU / Solar thermal air/ ground source.</p> <p>Where possible solar panels should be fitted to new/refurbished buildings. All types of renewable energy should be considered in planning decision.</p> <p>What about a solar panel scheme for Bridport for homes and community buildings?</p> <p>Require all new builds to have solar panels and low carbon footprints.</p> <p>I am surprised that few, if any Magna properties have solar panels.</p> <p>All large roof areas to be encouraged to use solar panels.</p>
--	--

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: CC1 Call for increased energy efficiency for new housing and commercial developments, including generating renewable energy where appropriate? (29 comments)	
	<p>Against</p> <p>No solar panels please unless they are designed to be unobstructive.</p> <p>I hate looking at solar panels, but are there other options?</p>
<p>General support for CC1</p> <p>8 comments</p>	<p>All new houses should be built with energy efficiency in mind.</p> <p>I support CC1 in principle but expectations need to be realistic - what does this mean in practice?</p> <p>All new housing to be capable of being energy neutral (i.e. generates own power) by say 2025.</p> <p>Allow flexible approach to house design to allow them to be more sustainable</p> <p>Anything that can be done to reduce the local need for energy would be a huge benefit. Going forward I feel a priority should be given to developers who are looking at energy efficient homes, and there should be a move towards solar power generation becoming mandatory.</p> <p>Increased energy efficiency for new housing.</p> <p>Remove the word 'increased'.</p> <p>Is it possible to insist that houses here are built facing south, like the local stone farm long houses, to maximise light, heat and wellbeing. It is often the "imposing" garage that benefits from that, which does not seem massively efficient. It is possible to plan houses on a housing estate facing south.</p>
<p>Need to balance with the cost of installation/running</p> <p>4 comments</p>	<p>Will these changes increase the cost to house holds who may not be able to meet the costs.</p> <p>This may be at odds with 'low cost' housing. Other funding to sustain this would be beneficial.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: CC1 Call for increased energy efficiency for new housing and commercial developments, including generating renewable energy where appropriate? (29 comments)	
	<p>Agree as long as this doesn't put up house prices.</p> <p>Extra generation on new housing and commercial developments puts all the rest of our bills up.</p>
<p>Other</p> <p>5 comments</p>	<p>Good suitable housing yes, but great case to prevent large enterprises overwhelming the town.</p> <p>My answer will depend on each project - i.e.. Wind turbines no but solar panels on new builds yes.</p> <p>Energy efficiency and renewable energy must be encouraged in the existing housing stock, especially housing associations which own large estates on the outer edges of the town. Housing association communal areas can be included in the 'Green corridors'.</p> <p>This is covered by statute.</p> <p>What does 'calling for' mean? How are you going to make this happen without government support?</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: CC2 Support community-led renewable energy projects? (24 comments)	
Types of renewable energy 9 comments	<p>Make Bridport a green town - support home solar panels, find a location for wind farm, other renewables</p> <p>Wind farms are <u>not</u> unsightly - noise is negligible.</p> <p>Using the movement of the tides seems to be considered.</p> <p>Would love to see water powered generation, historically our rivers and mills were the reason Bridport thrived.</p> <p>Local windfarms on a small scale for neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Mini hydro's have been achieve in other areas with variable rainfall e.g. North York's, yet it is never mentioned here where there are lots of storms. I know there are challenges but are we mice or men?</p> <p>Would love to see community power project to use turbines and water source heat pumps to harness electricity from our rivers.</p> <p>Use wave and river power. As in France. Eco buses.</p> <p>No more wind turbines, proven inefficiency.</p>
Concern for appearance in sensitive landscape 5 comments	<p>Although in favour of increased energy efficiency, I think more consideration should be given to aesthetic impacts. Mobile phone masts were carefully disguised - the same should apply to renewable energy generators, fields of solar panels look awful and white wind turbines stick out like a sore thumb.</p> <p>The emphasis on the energy efficiency and renewable energy projects is, in many ways, an obvious aspiration and demands careful consideration. However, the answer does not lie in solar farms or wind turbines which would desecrate the West Dorset countryside. Instead, there should be a requirement for new developments, residential, commercial and industrial, to incorporate up-to-date energy efficiency technology and have roof-mounted solar panels.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: CC2 Support community-led renewable energy projects? (24 comments)	
	<p>Subject to aesthetic considerations, some present renewable energy installations are most unattractive.</p> <p>This is a sensitive subject - wind turbines do not mix with our A.O.N.B. status.</p> <p><u>No</u> wind turbines - they are a form of aesthetic pollution.</p>
<p>General support for renewables</p> <p>4 comments</p>	<p>There are huge opportunities for community led renewable energy schemes and we should be pursuing them.</p> <p>Support community led projects - but it would depend on the individual case - carte blanche would be inappropriate</p> <p>We should generate enough power for Bridport and around Bridport. It can be done.</p> <p>A community energy generation project.</p>
<p>Other</p> <p>6 comments</p>	<p>Remove the word 'support' replace with encourage.</p> <p>What type of renewable energy?</p> <p>Apprenticeships for plumbers, engineers and electricians can be part of this.</p> <p>Should be <u>nationally</u> led. Funded by obscene profits from energy suppliers.</p> <p>Support with money or expertise?</p> <p>Personally I think this is a waste of money. I am all for energy efficiency but renewable no thank you until it's cheaper.</p>

Wider responses to the Climate Change theme (39 comments)	
<p>Climate change measures a high priority</p> <p>10 comments</p>	<p>These are not ambitious enough. Climate change is happening now - and is happening quickly. ALL new development needs to be fit for the future - zero carbon build and zero carbon emissions should be mandatory and community renewables (and community owned) required as part of EVERY development - enough to provide the energy for the development plus additional energy.</p> <p>Climate change should be considered as a priority to ensure that future generations are able to thrive.</p> <p>Alongside efforts to become a Rights Respecting Town, it's time we learnt to respect and preserve the environment on which this community depends. In many other countries, the consumption of energy and water is rationed. If we won't act responsibly, we forfeit our 'toys'.</p> <p>Climate change reduction measures have to have a high priority - we all have to work together on this in order to have the effect we need.</p> <p>Still need to protect and support climate change</p> <p>Climate change is our biggest challenge - we have both wind and tidal resources here.</p> <p>We need to protect climate change and support it</p> <p>We "Humans" must make the maximum effort to "protect the climate" worldwide. We after all, all breathe the same Air!!</p> <p>Climate change is inevitable so we have to do everything to offset the effect.</p> <p>Very important issue for longer term sustainability.</p>
<p>Suggested projects</p> <p>6 comments</p>	<p>Offer advice on domestic energy saving.</p> <p>There are projects in countries like Austria where local workshops allow residents to build and help</p>

Wider responses to the Climate Change theme (39 comments)	
	<p>install their own solar hot water and PV</p> <p>Should promote more green energy projects/businesses in the area.</p> <p>Get the local school pupils to help and get involved.</p> <p>Is there more we can do to recognise the effects of climate change on local farming and the Jurassic Coast?</p> <p>Stop people paving over gardens and erecting fences which necessitate the removal of hedges- green up and grow more plants. Have a broader approach to combatting climate change. Educate people to let them know the part they are playing in contributing to global warming and what they can do to help slow the process - one gets the impression that it's not relevant to the majority of people in this area.</p>
<p>Flooding/flood plain development</p> <p>5 comments</p>	<p>Provision of flood risk mitigation based on increased rising figures reflecting climate change needs to be seriously taken into account.</p> <p>Flooding remains a concern.</p> <p>Aspiration: support all of these. On flood risk, see Local Plan policy ENV5, para. (i)</p> <p>Do not allow building on flood plains to go ahead by using pumping stations 24/7.</p> <p>Refuse development on flood plains, don't allow it to go ahead with the use of pumping stations 24 hours 7 days a week.</p>
<p>Reducing plastic/recycling</p> <p>4 comments</p>	<p>It would be great to see some community projects around this issue - a whole-town campaign to reduce the use of single-use plastic packaging and bags, for instance</p> <p>Recycling look again at the way collections take place in town. At present collection day looks like a battlefield. Also contact people who don't yet recycle.</p>

Wider responses to the Climate Change theme (39 comments)	
	<p>Plastic carrier bag free zone?! Become a 'green town'. <u>Promote/reward</u> businesses with <u>truly</u> green credentials or who do their bit by recycling, reusing etc.</p> <p>Ask our town and its environs to ban plastic carrier bags.</p>
<p>Climate change measures not a priority</p> <p>3 comments</p>	<p>Climate change is (my opinion) a bit of a farce. Renewable energy projects such as turbines and fracking get a very bad press. Surely these are the best way forward, together with nuclear energy. I used to be vehemently opposed to nuclear power, but as I have got older I can see the value. Electric cars/buses/lorries. Sorry pipe dream. Firstly they will never be able to provide enough resources for recharging. Secondly the price of the vehicle would be prohibitive to most people thereby forcing people to give up travel altogether. Also has anyone given any real thought to the energy and resources required to provide 'green' energy!!!! Green is a myth all anyone can do is to try and cut down.</p> <p>This is very 'fashionable' - but INMHO there are much higher priorities</p> <p>Too much hysteria is being generated about climate change!</p>
<p>General/other</p> <p>11 comments</p>	<p>Support aspirations.</p> <p>Technology is in place, but not the will, to make houses a lot more 'green'.</p> <p>The area needs to advance into a progressive future of energy and not with over crowding of more over priced housing</p> <p>The aspirations listed should all be in your proposals</p> <p>Preserve green spaces and develop them for children to play</p> <p>Excellent aspirations.</p> <p>These should be key priorities!</p>

Wider responses to the Climate Change theme

(39 comments)

This does not give a chance for real choice. We need change to thrive "protection" does not achieve that!

This is the biggest threat facing the area mid- to long-term.

This is vital and would be of enormous benefit to the town, as well as making financial sense and benefiting the environment.

Very important for proposed Vearse Farm. Let it not be another Poundbury.

Community Facilities

Full comments: 88 comments in total received for Community Facilities (Note: some responses were split where more than one topic was covered in the response, none have been removed)

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: CF1 Protect and support the expansion of the range of sport and leisure provision in the area, particularly where this helps to boost and not undermine the use of the Leisure Centre? (46 comments)	
Importance/value of Bridport Leisure Centre 17 comments	<p>Must not let the Leisure Centre go under!</p> <p>Vital to keep the swimming pool open when we are so close to the sea. All should have the chance to learn to swim.</p> <p>Only when this helps to boost the use of the Leisure Centre.</p> <p>Vitally important to protect and enhance sport and leisure facilities especially for the younger generation.</p> <p>We have a good Leisure Centre and access to other recreation and sports in the town such as Highlands End, Freshwater.</p> <p>The Leisure Centre may well need support in the near future due to the removal of some grants. This is an amazing well run facility for our town so any other considerations should bear in mind their range of activities.</p> <p>Very important for wellbeing of older folk to keep the excellent swimming facilities at the Leisure Centre. Taking into account the aging demographic of the area we support adequate (i.e. more) provision for the health and wellbeing of the elderly</p> <p>The leisure centre has to be properly funded</p> <p>The Leisure Centre is a fabulous resource!</p>

<p>Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: CF1 Protect and support the expansion of the range of sport and leisure provision in the area, particularly where this helps to boost and not undermine the use of the Leisure Centre? (46 comments)</p>	
	<p>The Leisure Centre is a great resource for the town and needs much more promotion by all clubs, councils and health facilitators.</p> <p>The Leisure Centre needs to be a priority.</p> <p>The Leisure Centre needs to have a boost, I regularly go swimming on a Saturday mid-morning and the majority of times between 11-12, there are usually less than 10 people!</p> <p>Encourage the use of leisure facilities on prescription</p> <p>I use the Leisure Centre and greatly appreciate it.</p> <p>The Bridport Leisure Centre is a great asset to our town and should be supported by the local councils.</p> <p>The Bridport Sports Centre is excellent</p> <p>As for the Leisure Centre, it is a fantastic facility. As a local sports coach I get to see and use it and other sports centres in the area on a regular basis. Bridport Leisure Centre is by far and away the best all round sports facility for many miles.</p>
<p>Cost of using Leisure Centre 9 comments</p>	<p>BLC has been the only option for many years, allowing them to become overpriced as before there was little or no alternative.</p> <p>Yes to CF1 but this is a lower priority than the creation of jobs in Bridport. The use of sports and leisure facilities will only be possible if they have customers willing to spend their money in using them. It should not be a provision at the ongoing expense of the council-tax payers.</p> <p>Subsidise use for under 25s.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: CF1 Protect and support the expansion of the range of sport and leisure provision in the area, particularly where this helps to boost and not undermine the use of the Leisure Centre? (46 comments)	
	<p>Change the name of the 'Leisure Centre' and make it cheaper and more accessible to local people.</p> <p>The current facilities seem barely affordable - new facilities will cost more to build and run. Solve current funding issues first.</p> <p>Leisure centre prices prohibit many from using facilities there.</p> <p>Leisure Centre too expensive for many people.</p> <p>Make the fee's in the Leisure Centre affordable then more people would go there.</p> <p>No more subsidies for the Leisure Centre.</p>
Other leisure facilities 8 comments	<p>West Bay has the sea - that's a feature that not everywhere has! Encouraging and heightening the profile of marine activities (gig, sea cadets, diving, fishing, sailing) would not infringe on the Leisure Centre. The risk would be the increased parking and thereby the possibly shrinking space between West Bay and Bridport (protected green space).</p> <p>Support development of a new indoor skate park and outdoor.</p> <p>More tennis courts.</p> <p>Sport and recreational activities are essential to the community, wellbeing and enjoyment of the people in the area. The leisure centre can be expensive (and intimidating to those not used to going into places like this) so any kind of low cost, reasonable cost venture would be very much appreciated I am sure.</p> <p>Why protect the leisure centre if there are better options?</p> <p>I would like to see 'elderly' outside 'gyms' - they have them in Dorchester and other places.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: CF1 Protect and support the expansion of the range of sport and leisure provision in the area, particularly where this helps to boost and not undermine the use of the Leisure Centre? (46 comments)	
	<p>Probably adequate, like to see cricket.</p> <p>More communal facilities like the French Salle des fêtes - more scope for minority sports e.g. Croquet.</p>
Use existing facilities before expansion 4 comments	<p>Expansion into new sites should be the exception.</p> <p>Improve the quality of what exists to encourage people to use it.</p> <p>Low cost facilities for children to encourage families to use the facilities already available and there by increasing usage and profit.</p> <p>Use existing facilities efficiently.</p>
Expansion needed 3 comments	<p>Over crowding and no facilities for sport is an unhealthy approach to a community</p> <p>These facilities should be planned to grow as the population increases with the additional 1000 planned homes over the coming years.</p> <p>This expansion is good for all to keep people healthy.</p>
General support for sport/leisure/healthy lifestyle 2 comments	<p>"Sport & Leisure" are the most important to ensure a balanced and healthy lifestyle!" And a "Positive main frame of mind".</p> <p>Sport and leisure facilities enhance the well-being of residents not only by providing activities for health benefits, but also the social interaction that these activities provide. Anything that can be done to help this can only be positive.</p>
<i>Other</i> 3 comments	<p>CF1 - Encourage not protect.</p> <p>Not undermine.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should:

CF1 Protect and support the expansion of the range of sport and leisure provision in the area, particularly where this helps to boost and not undermine the use of the Leisure Centre?

(46 comments)

I basically agree but do not know what "expansion of the range ofprovisions " would entail.

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: CF2 Protect play and sports fields in the area? (22 comments)	
<p>Play areas – improvements or new needed</p> <p>11 comments</p>	<p>While I welcome the idea of re-instating the skate park, it would be good to see increased provision for active, autonomous play for younger children too. The development of challenging playgrounds at strategic points across the Bridport area (in easy walking distance) would go a long way towards supporting lower income families and helping address childhood obesity. Regular bus services to local beaches would also address these issues and, potentially, help relieve traffic density during the holidays.</p> <p>There should definitely be more focus on children's parks and play areas.</p> <p>The play areas at St Mary's and near the tennis courts need updating. The play equipment is old and worn and probably dangerous. There are lots of broken benches too!</p> <p>Improvement of outdoor skatepark and promote parks.</p> <p>An attractive outdoor keep fit area similar to the excellent one in Seaton would be great.</p> <p>Play facilities on N-E of town. Dog free green spaces for children to play, support organisations such as Allington Hillbillies.</p> <p>And increase</p> <p>More free, outdoor facilities for children, please.</p> <p>Bridport's children's play areas are very run down - they needs investment. Support the climbing centre. Promote an active community - people cycling, walking sea activities etc.</p> <p>More conversions of play parks into rope based ones like West Bay site that's brill</p> <p>The state of the outdoor skate park is a disgrace; it is a sad reflection of the importance attached to providing services for adolescents, that is, very little. Between toddler and pub you are virtually on your own and if it wasn't for the efforts of many volunteers the view would be very bleak indeed.</p>

Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should: CF2 Protect play and sports fields in the area? (22 comments)	
Areas to be protected 8 comments	<p>Particularly Gore Cross Green</p> <p>These fields should not be allowed to be sold off for housing or business sites.</p> <p>Play and sports areas should have a high priority and be protected. They are essential for residents (of all ages) for their physical and mental health.</p> <p>In Bradpole keep the green spaces at Wellfields and near Post Office and near Gore Cross. More erecting of trees, provisions for children, plant more trees to give continuity.</p> <p>Keep your green spaces and don't ever build on them</p> <p>Very important for the young.</p> <p>The community use of school playing fields and sports facilities should be promoted</p> <p>Check out "Fields in Trust" to prevent building on green spaces</p>
Importance of outdoor play/sport areas 2 comments	<p>It is important for children and young people to have outside recreational space where users are safe from vehicles.</p> <p>Encouraging exercise and communal spaces for this is all part of what makes people healthier and happier and part of a community.</p>
<i>Other</i> 1 comment	CF2 - Conserve not protect.

Wider responses to the Community Facilities theme (20 comments)	
Additional facilities/services 10 comments	<p>Not enough activities in town for young people or the elderly. The council needs to back the Chancery House Centre, very valuable enterprise if used.</p> <p>I believe Bridport would benefit greatly from having a central park that is both beautiful and functional. The park by the skate park is crying out for a make over to create a beautiful park space akin to Dorchester park.</p> <p>Medical facilities must be increased to cope with any population increase. They are inadequate now, especially in getting a doctor appointment.</p> <p>The main injuries unit at hospital must be retained.</p> <p>Need for infrastructure: transport; medical; education.</p> <p>Youth centres & nurseries</p> <p>All toilets should be open or built e.g. Co-op, Town Hall.</p> <p>I think we definitely need more facilities needed</p> <p>We will need more doctors at the Medical Centre with an ever increasing number of elderly people - I am one of them!</p> <p>We need a night club for young people to give them an outlet for their high energy, as all young (we all did) need a place to gather and dance, courting place.</p>
Allotments 2 comments	<p>Preserve existing allotments and orchards and expand their provision - as an aid to mental and physical health.</p> <p>More allotments would be good.</p>
Aspirations – skate area and	Support both aspirations.

Wider responses to the Community Facilities theme (20 comments)	
community storage 2 comments	Aspirations: See Local Plan policy COM4. A storage facility would be good. Skate park may depend on whether there is sufficient community initiative, e.g. funding applications.
<i>Other</i> 6 comments	<p>Both are really important.</p> <p>Until it is built on by opportunists there is plenty of countryside and beaches for walking/running/swimming etc.</p> <p>I agree, but do not think this is a high priority.</p> <p>CF1 and CF2 yes and refer again to the list on page 119 of the Local Plan and Policy COM5.</p> <p>Consult on what is needed/wanted, and listen to the responses.</p> <p>Protect the community facilities and have more</p>