

Q1. Have we got the vision and objectives broadly right? If not, what should be changed?		Right	Wrong	Blank
Counts	115	100	14	1
Comments made (see separate tab)		7	14	0

Q1	Number	Q1 Comment
Right	15	... but add to the end of the first paragraph of the objective; " which is, to the west designated a an AONB.
Right	27	Although the objectives are broadly right, I object to building north of Manor Farm Close
Right	32	"Suitable" should be stressed more
Right	51	More stress needed on Pimperne remaining distinct from Blandford
Right	95	But the argument for low profile should be reviewed. The case for is questionable.
Right	96	But the argument for low profile should be reviewed. The case for is questionable.
Right	112	Broadly right; I don't agree that there is a need for 40-45 houses by 2031, so therefore disagree with identifying sites for this number.
Wrong	10	Pimperne is a village and should be left as such
Wrong	11	No development should take place
Wrong	12	Development will turn Pimperne into a town so none required.
Wrong	33	Traffic approaching village is too fast
Wrong	43	Too many houses being proposed
Wrong	78	Further objective should be added to try to reduce traffic speeds on A254 and improve access onto this road.
Wrong	79	Traffic speed on A354 must be considered.
Wrong	80	The speed of traffic approaching the village needs to be reduced and access onto the A354 needs improving.
Wrong	81	Traffic speeds on A354 need reducing and access onto the road needs improving!
Wrong	82	The speed of traffic approaching the village needs reducing and access on to the A354 needs improving.
Wrong	83	Forget the idea of squeezing houses in any open space.
Wrong	91	No building east of Franwill estate
Wrong	92	Discourage extension to Franwill Industrial estate and building in adjacent land. Too much extra traffic on existing narrow roads - Down Road and Arlecks Lane.
Wrong	93	Building at Franwill OK but not on land to the east - too much extra traffic on narrow roads - Down Road and Arlecks Lane.

Q2. Do you agree with these general principles? If not, what have we missed or got wrong?		Agree	Disagree	Blank
Counts	115	98	9	8
Comments made (see separate tab)		7	7	0

Qry_details on individual Qs

Q2	Number	Q2 Comment
Agree	15	In the first paragraph of the Landscape Character Policy replace "where" with "if".
Agree	38	But concerned by traffic on Church Road
Agree	87	Agreed, but Church Road views being carefully considered goes against some options.
Agree	88	See attached
Agree	89	See attached
Agree	90	Yes but be mindful of the view from St. Peter's Close
Agree	110	See Appendix labeled 110
Disagree	45	Lots of development North East of Church Road - why not more
Disagree	54	Disagree, development on higher ground should not be dismissed as much of the village is on higher ground already
Disagree	61	This relates to the last bullet point: while agreeing that space should be maintained the village and Letton space should be maintained between Letton and Blandford as Letton is not part of Blandford.
Disagree	83	Just about everything
Disagree	105	All woodlands must be protected. Street lighting and flood lights will not be permitted.
Disagree	107	Broadly agree but note that newer buildings already along Church Road have been well harmonised, proving it is possible and therefore less of a concern.
Disagree	111	Broadly agree but seems over concerned about higher ground and extent of necessary distinction from other settlements.

Q3. Do you agree that all these spaces need to be protected? Tell us if we have missed any or got anything wrong.					
		Yes	No	Blank	
	Counts	115	97	11	7
	Comments made (see separate tab)	15	11	0	

Q3	Number	Q3 Comment
Yes	2	A certain number of houses need to be built in Pimperne. The highlighted areas should share this expansion rather than concentrate on just one area.
Yes	4	Why are the (private) grounds of the named properties highlighted - walls yes.
Yes	29	Ensure old school field remains
Yes	52	Protected spaces; why include private gardens invisible to the public. In contrast, the open field north of Manor Farm is not protected.
Yes	53	The field north of Manor farm should be added to protected spaces
Yes	57	The former school playing field could be landscaped; windy paths; trees. At present it is not really used.
Yes	61	Green spaces around Letton (and Letton Close) should also be included.
Yes	62	"Please don't forget Letton Close".
Yes	83	"I have not made a survey of the village so can't comment".
Yes	87	Agreed, but seems like we are protecting the expensive houses and developing near normal people.
Yes	94	The multiplay area and the playarea by the village hall.
Yes	95	But 1.5 stories would be out of character.
Yes	96	But 1.5 stories would be out of character.
Yes	104	Old school field could be developed without harming the village too much
Yes	110	See Appendix labeled 110
No	1	Should private gardens be protected and therefore excluded as in-fill options.
No	15	Land between Fairfield and the Old Rectory should not be designated a green space. While keeping the listed wall and trees, it could be used for in fill.
No	45	Old school field could be developed and playing field moved to the Manor Park site
No	46	Old school field could be developed and playing field moved to the Manor Park site
No	54	Priory Sports field and pavilion should move to the old school field or next to the new school to encourage more people to use them.
No	88	See attached
No	89	See attached
No	106	Not sure why the Rectory and White Lodge areas are protected as 'local green space' as these are private with no local function.
No	107	Surely the grounds of the Old Rectory etc.. are already protected through private ownership
No	108	See Appendix labeled 108 and 109
No	109	See Appendix labeled 108 and 109

Q4. Have we highlighted the most important buildings and features? Tell what we may have missed or got wrong.					
		Yes	No	Blank	
	Counts	115	95	12	8
	Comments made (see separate tab)		11	12	1

Q4	Number	Q4 Comment
Yes	22	Page 12 mentions new primary school but not the Village Hall
Yes	23	Should include the row of cottages on Anvil Road
Yes	30	Has Stud House been missed
Yes	35	St Peters Close- first significant post war development
Yes	50	The site of the Old Forge, off Salisbury Road
Yes	64	Yes but, the Farquharson Arms and the Methodist Church do not merit saving. Both would give additional land for residential development.
Yes	66	Do not agree the Farquharson Arms and the Methodist Chapel are of particular significance.
Yes	102	Occasional thatched style, too.
Yes	104	I have in my possession documents showing the Portman Estate at the time of the auction and can willingly lend these.
Yes	114	The listed boundary wall (White Lodge) Down Road
Yes	115	The listed boundary wall (White Lodge) Down Road
No	15	Numbers 23 & 24 Church Road do not justify and special consideration. The site could be used for affordable homes.
No	38	Missed the Brown House on Church Road, 200 years old
No	43	Object to the wording "Gentry Houses".
No	44	Some of the housing on Church Road does not justify any special consideration
No	88	See Appendix labeled 88 and 89
No	89	See Appendix labeled 88 and 89
No	94	1. Outbuildings of the Farquharson Arms. 2. Victorian stable block behind Berkeley House. 3.The wall behind Berkeley House which is the same as that around White Lodge. 4. The barn at Fairfield House.
No	106	Arlecks Lane and Down Road have special features e.g. the wall and small village appeal.
No	107	Broadly agree, but don't consider the Portman Estate buildings to have particular aesthetic merit.
No	108	See Appendix labeled 108 and 109
No	109	See Appendix labeled 108 and 109
No	111	The list is good but architectyural and historic merit are weak on some buildings relative to practical merit e.g. the shop and its impact on the "community" feel it propragetes.
Blank	83	"I have not made a survey of the village so can't comment."

Q5. Do you agree with the design criteria? If not, what have we missed or got wrong?		Agree	Disagree	Blank
Counts	115	93	10	12
Comments made (see separate tab)		5	10	2

Number	Q5	Q5 Comment
53	Agree	A TPO should be made on the Sycamore tree in Manor Farm Close.
90	Agree	Yes, but with starter homes.
95	Agree	1.5 story houses would be out of character
96	Agree	1.5 story houses would be out of character
102	Agree	Occasional thatched style. Tile tops on walls.
56	Disagree	Ash Tree is causing concern at No1 Berkeley Road. TV reception impacted, roots in garden prevent digging and there are over hanging branches.
83	Disagree	You have missed the understanding of a basic small village environment.
88	Disagree	See Appendix labeled 88 and 89
89	Disagree	See Appendix labeled 88 and 89
101	Disagree	Most houses in the village are "Flint and Brick". Houses should be no more than 2 storey including "Gentry Houses"
107	Disagree	Broadly agree, but can't farm buildings be adopted for domestic as well as business needs.
108	Disagree	See Appendix labeled 108 and 109
109	Disagree	See Appendix labeled 108 and 109
110	Disagree	See Appendix labeled 110
111	Disagree	Totally disagree. Far too many specifications being dictated, trying to create pastiche architecture.
52	Blank	Blank because answer depends on reappraisal of the conservation area. TPOs are important
76	Blank	A variety of styles is good but this should include non-traditional as well as traditional i.e. as in Manor Farm

Q6. Do you agree with the housing policy? If not, what specific housing needs have we missed or got wrong?	Agree	Disagree	Blank	
Counts	115	80	23	12
Comments made (see separate tab)	5	19	2	

Q6	Number	Q6 Comment
Agree	35	Under occupation of housing
Agree	45	.. but could not the 45 proposed homes be spread across the 3 sites.
Agree	46	spread the 45 houses over the three sites
Agree	87	Starter homes should be the solution.
Agree	102	Development at and between Letton should be specifically avoided to maintain an independent village.
Disagree	2	What is the requirement. Are the houses to be built on the old school site included in the quota.
Disagree	9	individual houses; nor 2 bedroom houses
Disagree	10	Only brownfield sites to be used
Disagree	12	Brownfield development only
Disagree	15	Local plan policies 2.53, 3.38 & 3.39 suggests development in villages should be to meet local and essential needs only.
Disagree	21	Build on all three sites rather than one.
Disagree	39	Some sites are not suitable for affordable family homes
Disagree	43	"We did not buy our house to have 40 houses built in green field / agricultural land
Disagree	54	Building development houses in one site in the village is not correct
Disagree	83	There is no local need for a housing policy in Pimperne
Disagree	88	Where did you get your statics? See attached
Disagree	89	Where did you get your statics? See attached
Disagree	91	Building on land east of Franwill Industrial estate will cause too much traffic on existing narrow roads - Down Road and Arlecks Lane.
Disagree	92	Too much extra traffic on narrow roads.
Disagree	93	Building at Franwill OK but not on land to the east - too much extra traffic on narrow roads - Down Road and Arlecks Lane.
Disagree	107	Measures to cross the A354 are needed.
Disagree	110	See Appendix labeled 110
Disagree	111	It is not difficult to create a safe crossing of the A354 - development east is equally viable and has traffic advantages.
Disagree	112	Disagree the need need for so many houses; Pimpernes plan should reflect what is needed and not a pro-rating foistered on us by someone else. I strongly disagree with the statement on on page 20; "However, this falls short well short ... No local need.
Blank	44	What housing need is specific to local needs?
Blank	113	Not sure

Q7. Do you agree with the employment policy? If not, what issues have we missed or got wrong?		Agree	Disagree	Blank
Counts	115	83	18	14
Comments made (see separate tab)		4	13	2

Q7	Number	Q7 Comment
Agree	20	Survey indicates there is no need for more employment
Agree	35	The development of family properties has enhanced the village as has the Gym
Agree	64	Move Franwill units to the Taymix site and include Franwill in any residential development
Agree	102	Development at and between Letton should be specifically avoided to maintain an independent village.
Disagree	9	Development of Franwill will increase traffic
Disagree	10	Pimperne is a village so why do we need employment opportunities
Disagree	12	No employment development needed
Disagree	19	Survey indicates no need for more employment
Disagree	21	Do not agree Pimperne is a 'working' village
Disagree	60	Discourage Taymix "expansion". No infill between the village and Letton Park.
Disagree	83	the idea of being able to provide more employment land
Disagree	84	Page 17: "unlikely to cause harm to living conditions". Can you replace "unlikely" with "will not".
Disagree	88	See Appendix labeled 88 and 89
Disagree	89	See Appendix labeled 88 and 89
Disagree	105	Wrong to say unlikely to cause an impact on residents. Franwill industrial estate already produces noise. Speeding is a problem on Church and Down Roads
Disagree	106	Would like to see more concrete wording e.g. "Will not" cause harm to living conditions.
Disagree	110	See Appendix labeled 110
Blank	3	Too much employment may increase the need for more housing
Blank	66	Scope for locating all employment development south of the A354 should be explored.

Q8. Do you agree with the community facilities policy? If not, what do we need to change?		Agree	Disagree	Blank
Counts	115	88	8	19
Comments made (see separate tab)		5	7	1

Q8	Number	Q8 Comment
Agree	59	Can Pimperne have a health care clinic. Blandford's are overcrowded
Agree	107	N.B. Preserving the Shop and Post office in the face of impending sale is vital.
Agree	110	See Appendix labeled 110
Agree	111	The shop and its open yard are vital.
Agree	112	But, the village stream is not mentioned as a facility.
Disagree	54	Priory Sports field and pavilion should move to the old school field or next to the new school to encourage more people to use them and free up that site for housing or allotments.
Disagree	83	For the size of Pimperne community facilities are sufficient.
Disagree	91	Youth facilities are non existent, even in Blandford. Transport links need to be addressed.
Disagree	92	Youth facilities are non existent, even in Blandford. Transport links need to be addressed.
Disagree	93	Youth facilities are non existent. Transport links to adjacent towns need to be addressed.
Disagree	106	Transport links to other towns e.g. bus.
Disagree	113	No need for further allotments as there are already some at Letton. No mention of the expanding gym at Stud Farm / Westleigh Farmhouse.
Blank	97	How will space be found for allotments, Pre-school and housing.

Q10. If land east of Franwill Industrial Estate is allocated for development, do you agree with the issues that need to be addressed (as set out in the overall conclusions)? If not, what issues have we missed or got wrong?				
	Agree	Disagree	Blank	
Counts	115	64	36	15
Comments made (see separate tab)	5	32	3	

Q10	Number	Q10 Comment
Agree	23	Good site for allotments, safe path to the school.
Agree	30	See Petition
Agree	35	Welcome future access route to the school and village hall
Agree	55	See Petition
Agree	59	Good access is an issue.
Disagree	1	Development at Franwill requires full width roads allowing two way traffic an complete footpaths.
Disagree	3	Increased traffic on Down Road
Disagree	4	See attached sheet
Disagree	6	Insufficient consideration to possible traffic problems
Disagree	9	Need access road to the school- not by Down Road or Arlecks Lane
Disagree	26	Don't see why the normal planning process is not used
Disagree	32	Arlecks Lane and Down Road are too narrow
Disagree	36	Traffic Arlecks and Down Road
Disagree	37	Not suitable
Disagree	39	Traffic
Disagree	66	Scope for increasing housing by relocating Franwill industries should be explored.
Disagree	76	The traffic issues on Down Road should be addressed
Disagree	83	Living conditions for existing would deteriorate. Roads are too narrow
Disagree	84	It would be dangerous to put the access onto Down Road or Arlecks Lane. No more cars please.
Disagree	87	Sorry, road is dangerous now. 20 new houses equates to 40 additional cars - so accident waiting to happen.
Disagree	88	See attached. Archaeological Investigation needed here due to proximity to the Longborrow. Why is the Longborrow not
Disagree	89	mentioned in the plan.
Disagree	90	The road will not accommodate 40+ extra cars
Disagree	91	Not suitable for development
Disagree	92	Not suitable for development. Increased traffic on very narrow roads etc.
Disagree	93	Not suitable for development. Will cause too much traffic.
Disagree	99	Concerned about width of Arlecks Lane and Down Road at the junction with Anvil Road where there are no pavements. Consider
Disagree	100	both unsuitable for much increase in traffic.
Disagree	101	Arlecks Lane is not suitable to accommodate HGVs so therefore a one-way system is a ludicrous idea.
Disagree	105	Down Road and Arlecks Lane not suitable.
Disagree	106	1. Down Road and Arlecks Lane are too narrow for more traffic. 2. This would spoil one of the favourite walking spaces in the village. 3. not an appropriate business site for expansion.
Disagree	107	Remote from the village
Disagree	110	See Appendix labeled 110
Disagree	111	This position would create a dormitory estate giving its residents poor intergration with the villagevand forcing their traffic through the smallest central roads. See Appendix labeled 111.
Disagree	113	There is no safe predrestrian pavements; any development would increase the problem.
Disagree	114	See Appendix labeled 114
Disagree	115	See Appendix labeled 114
Blank	95	Could this be linked with a new road east of village to the Salisbury Road. Could the industrial estate be relocated to Taymix for the benefit of new housing.
Blank	96	Promoting safe pedestrian access is too weak. No development unless Arlecks Lane and Down Road are given pavements. This area should be used as allotments.
Blank	112	

Q11. If land north of Manor Farm Close is allocated for development, do you agree with the issues that need to be addressed (as set out in the overall conclusions)? If not, what issues have we missed or got wrong?				
		Agree	Disagree	Blank
	Counts	115	71	31
	Comments made (see separate tab)	5	27	3

Q11	Number	Q11 Comment
Agree	29	Road widening is a must
Agree	59	Agree but have concerns on the impact it will have on nearby householders.
Agree	85	But this should only be done in Extremis. The other sites are far superior from a view and location standpoint.
Agree	110	See Appendix labeled 110
Agree	111	See Appendix labeled 111.
Disagree	2	The requirement to avoid houses overlooking each other appears to encourage ribbon development
Disagree	3	Increased traffic problems and access
Disagree	5	Building on this site/field will increase the risk of flooding along Church Road and increase the amount of traffic on this narrow road.
Disagree	26	Don't see why the normal planning process is not used
Disagree	27	Overlooking existing properties will be an issue
Disagree	28	There has been recent development so residents of the Close do not want the upheaval of another nearby development.
Disagree	31	How to make a one-way or widen Down Road
Disagree	32	Traffic issues
Disagree	36	Traffic issues
Disagree	44	Development which doesn't overlook other properties seems to be excluded therefore ribbon development seems to be the only option
Disagree	51	Any development north of Manor Farm would have an adverse impact on road and pedestrian traffic. The flood risk would increase.
Disagree	52	Against building north of Manor Farm. If there is can there be a strip of land separating the existing development from any new one.
Disagree	64	With the new school now built any development would increase the flooding risk.
Disagree	83	Present residents would suffer from being overlooked.
Disagree	84	You have missed, safety, location, easy access, centre of village, near school, this site has clearly the best potential
Disagree	87	Sorry, road is dangerous now. Adding 25-35 houses equated to 50-70 extra cars on a road with a terrible bend. Please be sensible.
Disagree	88	The hedgerow can stay - see attached
Disagree	89	The hedgerow can stay - see attached
Disagree	90	The road will not accommodate 70+ extra cars.
Disagree	94	Pedestrian access to the school would in itself damage the rural character of this part of the village.
Disagree	95	This option would create the biggest in village traffic problem.
Disagree	96	This option would create the biggest in village traffic problem.
Disagree	101	Building in this area would alter the pleasant approach to the village from the North and change the entire character.
Disagree	105	Flooding on Church Road is a problem
Disagree	107	The benefit of building on predominately flat lower-lying land has not need adequately emphasised.
Disagree	108	Appendix 1
Disagree	109	Appendix 1
Blank	23	Flooding possibilities impacting Church Road
Blank	66	Safe pedestrian access to the school should involve road / pavement widening .
Blank	112	This is green belt and provides a soft transition to countryside on the northern border.

Q12. If land at the top of Berkeley Rise is allocated for development, do you agree with the issues that need to be addressed (as set out in the overall conclusions)? If not, what issues have we missed or got wrong?		Agree	Disagree	Blank
Counts	115	84	17	14
Comments made (see separate tab)		3	14	2

Q12	Number	Q12 Comment
Agree	95	Seems to be the least disruptive i.e. on the edge of the village.
Agree	96	Seems to be the least disruptive i.e. on the edge of the village.
Agree	102	Against development on this site as it would set a precedent for development of all the properties and land along the footpath behind the church.
Disagree	32	Traffic issues and disruption during building
Disagree	36	Flooding issues on Church Road
Disagree	43	Excess traffic
Disagree	60	Too near to the Blandford Plus Group's proposed development - "Bridge Too Far".
Disagree	87	Same as Q11, these areas cannot cope with the extra volume of traffic.
Disagree	88	Housing here would be no more visible than houses if built at Franwill.
Disagree	89	Housing here would be no more visible than houses if built at Franwill.
Disagree	90	The extra volume of traffic will be problematic.
Disagree	97	Too much in the wrong place.
Disagree	101	This area is not seen from most places in the village. Access is not required via Chapel Lane. Why does the footpath need to be moved?
Disagree	105	For transparency explain why not available in the short term
Disagree	107	The benefit of building on predominately flat lower-lying land has not need adequately emphasised. Building here would impact the fewest existing residents out of all proposals
Disagree	110	See Appendix labeled 110
Disagree	111	See Appendix labeled 111.
Blank	23	Flooding; Difficult access
Blank	112	Current roads are deficient and its green belt.

Q13. Do you consider that the Neighbourhood Plan group were wrong to discard any of the housing option sites? If so, which ones should be reconsidered and why?		Right to discard	Wrong to discard other options	Blank	
	Counts	115	70	33	12
	Comments made (see separate tab)		0	28	1

Qry_details on individual Qs
Q13

Number	Q13 Comment
Wrong to discard other options	1 The village already spans the A354 so Farquharson Arms, land east of Hyde Farm. These are at lower elevations than current developments
Wrong to discard other options	2 East of Hyde Farm
Wrong to discard other options	9 All three sites suitable with access to the main road rather than having increased traffic through the village
Wrong to discard other options	15 No sites should be completely discarded
Wrong to discard other options	31 Consider Taymix site
Wrong to discard other options	43 Hyde Farm East
Wrong to discard other options	45 30 to 40 houses behind the Farquharson Arms would be good for business
Wrong to discard other options	54 All 3 sites should not be discarded; other developments exist close to the road or on sloping sites
Wrong to discard other options	59 Land south east of Hyde Farm ; smaller houses edging the road would look attractive and supply the 1 / 2 bedroom units required.
Wrong to discard other options	85 The potential availability of the Farquharson site should not be discarded once the current incumbents have departed.
Wrong to discard other options	86 Land to the rear of the Farquharson Arms and south of the A354. Good space for development with minimum effect on existing properties.
Wrong to discard other options	87 Lots of space east of the road that can have a modern car friendly design.
Wrong to discard other options	88 Why has housing at Berkeley Rise been discarded?
Wrong to discard other options	89 Why has housing at Berkeley Rise been discarded?
Wrong to discard other options	91 Some infill at Hyde Farm
Wrong to discard other options	92 Land at Hyde Farm; infill between pre-school and existing dwelling.
Wrong to discard other options	93 Some infill between the pre-school and the Farquharson Arms.
Wrong to discard other options	95 Objections are overstated and arguable.
Wrong to discard other options	96 Objections are overstated and arguable.
Wrong to discard other options	99 Hyde Farm is a possibility. Similar sites have been developed e.g. at Spetisbury.
Wrong to discard other options	100 Hyde Farm is a possibility. Similar sites have been developed e.g. at Spetisbury.
Wrong to discard other options	104 Farquharson Arms development would give easy road access.
Wrong to discard other options	107 Crossing the A354 could be included. Housing may be an improvement over the existing unsightly buildings.
Wrong to discard other options	108 Appendix 1
Wrong to discard other options	109 Appendix 1
Wrong to discard other options	111 See Appendix labeled 111.
Wrong to discard other options	114 East and South Hyde Farm
Wrong to discard other options	115 East and South of Hyde Farm
Blank	90 There is lots of space east of the road with ample parking.

Q14 (a). Do you consider that the small extension south of Taymi should be included as an employment allocation (and therefore not part of the important open gap)?	Yes	No	Blank
Counts	115	69	32

Q14 (b). If allocated for development, do you agree with the issues that need to be addressed (as set out in the overall conclusions)?	Agree	Disagree	Blank
Counts	115	87	14
Comments made (see separate tab)	4	8	3

Q14	Number	Q14 Comment
Agree	19	No reduction in the gap, especially at Blandford end
Agree	20	No reduction in the gap, especially at Blandford end
Agree	51	More stress on Pimperne remaining distinct from Blandford
Agree	70	"I want the gap to remain."
Disagree	6	Open gap is too important to trifle with.
Disagree	59	Any increased development should ensure there is no increased disturbance to local residents from machinery noise and traffic.
Disagree	60	Wrong to link Pimperne & Letton with the by-pass edge in any way.
Disagree	62	Landscaping, planting and low level lighting do not work; The current lighting is very intrusive. Do any landscaping ahead of any development to allow it to mature first.
Disagree	84	The critical open gap between Pimperne and Blandford. Please no extension at all. If anything we need to soften the effect of the current 2 story industrial sheds at the exit of our village.
Disagree	88	What does open gap mean? See attached.
Disagree	89	What does open gap mean? See attached.
Disagree	102	Decreasing the speed limit between Pimperne and Blandford would reduce the feeling that Pimperne is a separate place to Blandford and increase the chances of infill.
Blank	16	Taymix site development would reduce commuter traffic away from the village centre.
Blank	58	Land to the east of the existing development should be used; not land to the south.
Blank	83	Cannot answer until the number of proposed units is known

Q15. Do you consider that the Neighbourhood Plan group were wrong to discard the larger extension to Taymix? If so, why?	Right to discard	Wrong to discard other options	Blank	
Counts	115	70	33	12
Comments made (see separate tab)		1	28	0

Q15	Number	Q15 Comment
Right to discard	59	Absolutely!
Wrong to discard	16	Taymix site development would reduce commuter traffic away from the village centre.
Wrong to discard	31	Employment location and Housing
Wrong to discard	33	This may have slowed the traffic
Wrong to discard	35	More information needed.
Wrong to discard	54	To support the influx of people the larger site should be considered. The local area requires more employment opportunities.
Wrong to discard	78	Not all Pros & cons have been considered. The proposal would maintain distinctiveness of Blandford / Letton Park & Pimperne. It would provide safer access onto A354 and reduce speed of traffic approaching Pimperne. Room for industrial expansion.
Wrong to discard	79	This would reduce the speed of traffic entering the village and improve access onto A354.
Wrong to discard	80	This would decrease the speed of traffic approaching the village and improve access onto A354.
Wrong to discard	81	This proposal would help to reduce the speed of traffic approaching from Blandford and provide safer access on to the A354 for large vehicles.
Wrong to discard	82	The speed of traffic approaching the village needs reducing and access on to the A354 needs improving.
Wrong to discard	99	Hard to decide, it would depend on the development planed.
Wrong to discard	100	Hard to decide, it would depend on the development planed.
Wrong to discard	111	We need to have an eye beyond this 15 year plan and "what if" more housing is imposed than currently slated. The size of the gap to Blandford can decrease without impacting Pimperne's individual character. This site has merit.