

Public comments	Officer response
<p>If the intention of this is to stop owners demolishing front walls and creating hard standings for cars etc then thoroughly agree with the directive. Changing the appearance of front gardens would seriously undermine the appearance of properties in Damers Rd as it has already done in adjacent streets (1).</p> <p>Seems sensible, but more consideration of parking in the Area is needed (2).</p> <p>Am writing to confirm my support for the continuation of the Direction. There have been a number of walls and fences (but particularly walls) that have been demolished in the course of renovation and have either not been replaced or replaced inappropriately. The character of walls and gates, fences etc is a key component of the townscape and once lost are rarely properly replaced. The continuance of the directive is an important tool within the Conservation area (4).</p> <p>Fully support the Direction in order to maintain the character of Dorchester. However, much of the pressure on residents to create off street parking is due to the increasingly large number of people who work and visit Dorchester and park in streets close to the centre. Urgent attention should be given to establishing large and efficient low cost Park and Ride facilities serving Dorchester (21).</p> <p>Thank you for bringing forwards this Direction with a 6-month duration, with the request for consultation to make it permanent. In response to the request for comment I am fully in support of this proposal, both the immediate direction, and the longer term intention.</p> <p>It may be partly in response to my query that this loophole in the Conservation Area rules was identified, and which I asked to be further considered. This was following the most unfortunate removal of the original period wall and the replacement with out-of-character rendered blockwork. However I would ask that assuming this becomes permanent the application of it by Conservation Officers is reasonably flexible (13).</p>	<p>The overall support for the Article 4 Direction is noted.</p> <p>Regarding off-street parking and Park and Ride, Dorset Council's Parking Services has been notified of the concerns.</p>
<p>In my opinion, people are desperate to find parking spaces for their cars and as a consequence it's changing the character of any space in front of older properties (3).</p>	<p>The character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area is enriched by its many boundaries, in particular those visible from public areas. It is recognised that there is pressure to create off-street parking and the additional potential loss or change to boundaries.</p>

<p>I understand the need to control the look of historic properties in the town but I cannot see the benefit in holding up “maintenance” of gates, fences, walls and other enclosures”.</p> <p>For example, my front gate is currently hanging on one hinge because the other pulled out of the wall. Please can you confirm that I need to apply for permission, before carrying out the necessary “maintenance” or, better still, remove the word “maintenance” from your notification (5).</p>	<p>The inclusion of the word “maintenance” covers work that would be considered to “materially affect the external appearance”, for example, to a fence or wall that has an effect on the character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area. It is therefore intended to include the word “maintenance” in the withdrawn permitted development right. Repairing gate hinges would not come under this category and we have already confirmed this.</p>
<p>We should like some clarification since, on the face of it, the Article 4(1) Direction appears excessively wide-ranging in its scope.</p> <p>We feel that, as it stands, the Direction might give rise to unintended consequences.</p> <p>According to the literal terms of the Direction, we would need to apply for planning permission to repaint (in the existing colour) the gates across the entrance to our property, since this undoubtedly falls within the definition of “maintenance”. Surely this is not an intended consequence of the Direction.</p> <p>Similarly, does the term “means of enclosure” refer only to means of enclosure abutting a public highway or public footpath or is it wider in scope. If the term “means of enclosure” covers walls and fences between properties (such as the wall separating our garden at number 5 from the garden at number 7), then, strictly, we would have to apply for planning permission in order to carry out re-pointing of the wall (it needs re-pointing now) since, once again, this undoubtedly falls within the definition of “maintenance”. In this case too, surely this is not an intended consequence of the Direction.</p> <p>Also, if a fence between our property and another property fell down, the implication is that we would have to leave it in its fallen-down state and apply for planning permission to repair it (“maintain” it). As we have dogs, this would cause problems because they would be liable to escape.</p> <p>We understand that old walls deserve to be preserved, but why is it necessary to extend that protection to fences that separate private residential houses and are not adjacent to public highways or footpaths? In most cases fences are modern and, by their very nature, are temporary structures?</p> <p>Obviously, a common sense approach is needed to the interpretation of</p>	<p>The made Article 4 Direction was too wide-ranging and such a concern has been given due consideration. It is the intention to make a new revised Direction (to be consulted on) that applies to boundaries adjacent to an open space or highway, including a right of way.</p> <p>The inclusion of the word “maintenance” covers work that would be considered to “materially affect the external appearance”, for example, to a fence or wall that has an effect on the character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area. It is therefore intended to keep the word “maintenance” in the withdrawn permitted development right.</p> <p>Under minor operations, repointing, repairing or repainting in a manner that preserves the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not normally require the submission of a planning application. The request for clarification has been responded to.</p> <p>Thank you for providing an alternatively worded Article 4 Direction Order which has been given consideration. For the proposed new revised Article 4 Direction, please see the officer’s committee report to which this appendix is attached.</p>

any enactment or instrument but, if rules are to be respected and properly applied, they must be expressed in clear, comprehensive and unequivocal terms. For the reasons stated above, the Article 4(4) Direction is not expressed in clear, comprehensive and unequivocal terms.

We look forward to receiving the requested clarification (so that we can re-paint gates, mend fences, re-point walls and carry out other minor but necessary repairs without going to the expense and suffering the delay of applying for planning permission) (6 & 7).

It is of course too late now but, in a spirit of collegiality I take the liberty of enclosing (see notice below) what I think would have been a more helpful and readily comprehensible version of the Direction. I have highlighted the changes in yellow (6&7).

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND) ORDER 2015 AS AMENDED

DIRECTION MADE UNDER ARTICLE FOR(1) TO WHICH PARAGRAPH 2 OF SCHEDULE 3 APPLIES

WEST DORSET DISTRICT COUNCIL (DORCHESTER CONSERVATION AREA) ARTICLE 4(1) DIRECTION 2019

WHEREAS West Dorset District Council being the appropriate local planning authority for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended (also hereinafter referred to as “the said Order”), are satisfied that it is expedient that development of the description(s) set out in the Schedule below should not be carried out at the land shown coloured purple on the attached plan unless planning permission is granted on an application made under Part III of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

NOW THEREFORE the said Council in pursuance of the power conferred on them by article 4(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended, hereby direct that the permission granted by article 3 of the said Order for development of the description set out in the Schedule below shall not apply to the said land.

<p style="text-align: center;">SCHEDULE</p> <p>Development consisting of the erection, construction, maintenance, improvement or alteration (which terms do not include (re)painting or repair) of a gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure located adjacent to a publicly accessible highway, footway, waterway or open space, being development comprised in Class A of Part 2 - Minor operations, of the said order,</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any building operation consisting of the demolition of the whole or any part of any gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure located adjacent to a publicly accessible highway, footway, waterway or open space, being development comprised in Class C of part 11 – Heritage and Demolition, of the said Order, and not being development comprised within any other Class(es).</p> <p>THIS DIRECTION is made under article 4(1) of the said Order and, in accordance with paragraph 2(6) of Schedule 3 shall come into force on 6 March 2019 and shall remain in force until 21 August 2019 (being six months from the date of the direction) and shall then expire unless it has been confirmed by the appropriate local planning authority in accordance with paragraph 2(6) of Schedule 3 of the said Order.</p>	
<p>It's disappointing that WDCC haven't adopted the approach of the Plain English Campaign. The letter took me several attempts to even understand what was being notified. In conversation with other people who have received this letter, the same comment is being made. Something as restrictive as what you are suggesting needs to be made clearer as it has potential ramifications.</p> <p>Putting long hyperlinks in a printed letter doesn't exactly make it easy to follow. Even on the website, there's no indication as to why you're doing this.</p> <p>If I am understanding correctly, you are suspending my ability at the above address to change any wall, fence, gate etc without permission for at least six months.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the legal wording of the letter was difficult to understand. Further correspondence will be more explanatory and navigation to documents on the website made easier.</p> <p>Boundary changes that have reduced or are likely to reduce the character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area have raised the need for an Article 4 Direction, which allows the Planning Authority to control change through the need to apply for planning permission. This was explained in the officer's report to committee, which was available on the council's website.</p> <p>The made Article 4 Direction was too wide-ranging and such a concern has been given due consideration. It is the intention to make a new revised Direction (to be consulted on) that applies to boundaries adjacent to an open space or highway, including a right of way.</p>

<p>What you haven't indicated, is why you are doing this.</p> <p>I note that perhaps you'd like to make this permanent based on comments. How can I make a comment if I don't know why you're doing this?</p> <p>At present, it would seem ridiculous for me to have to apply for permission to move a fence that's only been in existence for about 2 years (8).</p>	<p>The request for further information has been responded to.</p>
<p>This seems to me to be a monumental waste of money and officer time. The definition of maintenance seems obscure. Does this mean for example: painting a gate; replacing a damaged gate or fence; re-pointing a wall? Would these actions justify a £260 charge in order to undertake what would be a means of maintaining the desired look and heritage of an area. Would the order result in properties drifting into dis-repair? This matter needs a considerable amount of further thought before more public money is wasted (9).</p>	<p>The made Article 4 Direction was too wide-ranging and such a concern has been given due consideration. It is the intention to make a new revised Direction (to be consulted on) that applies to boundaries adjacent to an open space or highway, including a right of way.</p> <p>The inclusion of the word “maintenance” covers work that would be considered to “materially affect the external appearance”, for example, to a fence or wall that has an effect on the character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area. It is therefore intended to keep the word “maintenance” in the withdrawn permitted development right.</p> <p>Under minor operations, repointing, repairing or repainting in a manner that preserves the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not normally require the submission of a planning application. The request for clarification has been responded to.</p> <p>Under the Article 4 Direction, there is the possibility that the fee for a planning application will discourage work to be undertaken, but in terms of boundaries, disrepair is more often associated with a lack of maintenance such as repointing a wall or repainting railings, and if such minor works are carried out in a sympathetic manner, it is unlikely a planning application would be necessary.</p>
<p>To need planning permission to replace like for like an existing gate or fence seems totally unnecessary and bureaucratic - a complete waste of council time and residents' time and money. To construct a new fence, wall or gate which does not replace existing or is to be in a very different style, fine to get permission but I am not sure that full planning permission should be necessary? What has triggered these new rules as they seem quite draconian (10)?</p>	<p>The made Article 4 Direction was too wide-ranging and such a concern has been given due consideration. It is the intention to make a new revised Direction (to be consulted on) that applies to boundaries adjacent to an open space or highway, including a right of way.</p> <p>Boundary changes that have reduced or are likely to reduce the character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area have raised the need for an Article 4 Direction, which allows the Planning Authority to control change through the need to apply for planning permission.</p>
<p>Please could I be informed why this decision has been made. The direction</p>	<p>It is agreed that the legal wording of the letter was difficult to understand.</p>

<p>is not worded clearly, if we are painting a fence, or if a fence is blown down and we replace it, does that mean we have to ask permission from the council? We would appreciate the reason for this directive. From an unhappy owner (11)!</p>	<p>Further correspondence will be more explanatory.</p> <p>Boundary changes that have reduced or are likely to reduce the character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area have raised the need for an Article 4 Direction, which allows the Planning Authority to control change through the need to apply for planning permission.</p> <p>Maintenance that does not have an effect on the character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area is not likely to require planning permission.</p> <p>As requested, further information was provided.</p>
<p>Having read through the meeting report, I appreciate the need for this Direction, but it is too draconian, as well as self-defeating in its wording; further clarity is required. I may have misread it, but it appears that if I paint my black metal gate (maintenance) the exact same colour, I would need planning permission. Or if I want to repair my brick wall, I would also need planning permission. If I let the gate go rusty and fall off, or do not repair my wall and let it collapse on its own accord that falls outside the Direction. If the problem is people knocking down walls to create car parking spaces, why do I need permission to maintain my iron gate? Would I have to pay for a planning application to maintain my gate or wall? Have I misunderstood this? Will further guidance be provided? Apologies for all the questions (12).</p>	<p>The made Article 4 Direction was too wide-ranging and such a concern has been given due consideration. It is the intention to make a new revised Direction (to be consulted on) that applies to boundaries adjacent to an open space or highway, including a right of way.</p> <p>The inclusion of the word “maintenance” covers work that would be considered to “materially affect the external appearance”, for example, to a fence or wall that has an effect on the character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area. It is therefore intended to keep the word “maintenance” in the withdrawn permitted development right.</p> <p>Under minor operations, repointing, repairing or repainting in a manner that preserves the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is not likely to require the submission of a planning application.</p> <p>As requested, further information was provided.</p>
<p>I feel that this is causing residents in these areas a lot of stress and anxiety. To implement this as from immediate effect does not make any sense. How is this defined,? is it the walls etc at the front of the property the sides and the rear? If a fence blows down or is damaged in any way it cannot be repaired or replaced without consent is nonsense. Where I live the rear alleyway is always a concern at night as you do not know who is about. This is worrying for elderly residents living alone. I feel that this should be thrown out with immediate effect.</p>	<p>The opposition to the Article 4 Direction is noted.</p> <p>For security reasons any damage to fences or gates in the back alleyway would unlikely affect the character or appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area and therefore require planning permission before repair work proceeds. As requested, further information was provided.</p> <p>The made Article 4 Direction was too wide-ranging and such a concern has been given due consideration. It is the intention to make a new revised Direction (to be consulted on) that applies to boundaries adjacent to an open space or highway, including a right of way.</p> <p>The Article 4 Direction was implemented immediately because of concern that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is being, and</p>

<p>Can you please explain what the definition of maintenance is meant wrt the recent article 4 (1) direction?</p> <p>What is the cost of a planning application if any and what is the time line?</p> <p>More over why according to the enclosed map is the area affected not inclusion of the majority of properties. I do find it very surprising that for example Maud Rd properties are included, yet those on Herrington road are not.</p> <p>Thank you for your note, whilst I could understand the requirement for certain construction/ demolition work, it would seem somewhat pointless and expensive to submit applications for maintenance. IE £260 to creosote your fence.</p> <p>WRT areas I still fail to understand why for example Herrington road is not in a conversation area given that No. 1 Herrington Rd built in isolation before the rest of the properties in the road would be exempt (15).</p>	<p>would be, devalued by changes to certain boundaries. .</p> <p>The word “maintenance” covers work that would be considered to “materially affect the external appearance”, that is, work that has an effect on the character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area.</p> <p>Creosoting a fence would not normally require planning permission.</p> <p>As requested, further information was provided.</p> <p>In Herrington Rd, those properties that are in the Dorchester Conservation Area were included in the Article 4 Direction.</p>
<p>It is unclear in the proposed change why West Dorset Council have decided that these changes are required? What is the justification?</p> <p>I particularly object to the direction including 'maintenance' of boundary walls. This means that any time basic maintenance is needed we will have to go through the costly and lengthy process of applying for planning. This will delay any essential work, which, if it is to maintain the same wall etc.. shouldn't be a problem for planners to agree.. Presumably WDDC would want to support homeowners ensuring that their property is safe and in keeping with the general look of the town?</p> <p>To do any maintenance to my house is already complicated and incurs extra charges as my property backs onto a car park. In order for builders to do work from the rear aspect of my property I have to pay for at least 3 car parking spaces and negotiate with the council for times when the work can be done. If I have work done at the front of the house, eg. Have a skip on the road, I have to pay a permit for it.</p> <p>Additionally in Wollaston road there is very little scope to have any developmental work anyway so I think this street should be exempt from the proposes changes.</p> <p>The net result of your proposal, is that homeowners won't have work done. I believe that these proposals are extremely unfair on people living in the centre of Dorchester and are just another way of the council making money (16).</p>	<p>Boundary changes that have reduced or are likely to reduce the character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area have raised the need for an Article 4 Direction, which allows the Planning Authority to control change through the need to apply for planning permission.</p> <p>The inclusion of the word “maintenance” covers work that would be considered to “materially affect the external appearance”, for example, to a fence or wall that has an effect on the character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area. It is therefore intended to keep the word “maintenance” in the withdrawn permitted development right. Maintenance to boundaries, where carried out in a sympathetic manner, is unlikely to require planning permission.</p> <p>As requested, further information has been provided.</p> <p>Wollaston Rd is central and has very small front gardens with attractive boundaries (railings, gate piers). The street’s boundaries contribute to the Dorchester Conservation Area, so for example, replacement boundaries or alterations, as has happened elsewhere in the Conservation Area, would have an adverse effect.</p> <p>The made Article 4 Direction was too wide-ranging and such a concern has been given due consideration. It is the intention to make a new revised Direction (to be consulted on) that applies to boundaries adjacent to an open space or highway, including a right of way.</p>

<p>Hardly a widespread problem and I can't see why this is being done 1000 dwellings in conservation area and only 26 have had a parking space put in their front gardens and I found those figures from your own publications. The most probable reason why someone would build a parking space is because of the difficulties trying to park anywhere near their home because most workers coming to Dorchester park on residential roads because of the cost of parking in the car parks and many roads now have parking meters making the cost for parking for the working week to costly, also if a resident now apply for planning consent to make a parking space and gets turned down when someone living in the same street has a space built under permitted development, they have the possibility to claim compensation from the council and also claim for the gain in value a parking space would of made to their house if it was done. Would this be correct (17)?</p>	<p>Changes to boundaries not only result from off-street parking but also replacements and alterations, often associated with gardens where lack of space precludes off-street parking. An Article 4 Direction allows the Planning Authority to control change through the need to apply for planning permission. The concerns about car parking have been forwarded to Dorset Council's Parking Services. The inquiry regarding compensation has been responded to. A compensation claim would have to be considered on its merits, as the facts of each claim would differ.</p>
<p>Am I misunderstanding your Notice. Are you saying that if the wooden panelled fence gets blown down, we have to apply for permission to repair it, even if it is just a replacement? Since approval of your planning applications, as I understand it, take a minimum of 6 months this notice is simply RIDICULOUS. And more money for the application to be found no doubt (18).</p>	<p>The inclusion of the word "maintenance" covers work that would be considered to "materially affect the external appearance", for example, to a fence or wall that has an effect on the character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area. The reinstatement of a blown down fence is unlikely to require planning permission, which means there would not be any planning application timescale involved. The request for clarification about the fence has been responded to. If required under an Article 4 Direction, there is now a national planning fee for a planning application. For a householder, it is likely to be £206, as calculated on the Planning Portal available at https://1app.planningportal.co.uk/FeeCalculator/Standalone?region=1</p>
<p>We are surprised that this is necessary as, over 15 years ago, we had to obtain planning permission to make the car park space and were also required to use a certain brick, re-use the stone as far as possible and have only a gravel surface to allow for drainage. We were restricted in the length of wall we were allowed to remove but this worked fine with our plan. Since then another property having removed more wall was required to obtain retrospective planning permission which was refused - however no replacement has been enforced. Other properties have replaced the gravel with paving, there was no planning permission? So this raises the issue that whilst we obviously will support making this permanent anyone choosing to ignore it or in years to come not realise planning is necessary will not be forced to replace what has been lost - so whilst those of us who are law abiding pay the fees those who don't will not</p>	<p>Planning permission was required because it involved a new vehicular access off a classified highway. Also, the effect on the character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area would have been a planning consideration. The matters of the retrospective planning permission and changes to external surfaces were forwarded to Planning Enforcement for consideration. Similarly, the suggestion of a fine of £1000. Planning Enforcement has explained that they had been contacted regarding the wall and informed that it is to be rebuilt. Also current Permitted Development rights permit the hard surfacing of up to 5 sq. metres at the front of a house without requiring planning permission even when in a conservation area. The Planning Enforcement plan does not give the power to impose on the spot fines". Information on Planning Enforcement is</p>

<p>face any penalty if they simply ignore it. We would suggest that in making this a requirement there is an on the spot fine of e.g. £1000 for anyone who ignores it even if planning permission may have been granted. Otherwise it seems unnecessary to bring in something which no-one is going to enforce! We would also argue that if it is made permanent then it should apply to both sides of Icen Way from South Walks corner to Kings Rd as it seems ludicrous with the stone walls and the Victorian wall lower down that the occupants can remove these opposite those if us who are restricted. This should apply to both sides of any highway frontage in the conservation area which would then include Icen Way both sides? Also as the letter sent out was totally misleading, please send out before the end date for comments the very clear additional leaflet which explains that maintenance does not include weeding etc. We received this by email but all owners should be made aware. Hoping these comments are useful in helping a sensible decision to be made in August (19).</p>	<p>available at https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/planning-buildings-land/planning/planning-enforcement.aspx</p> <p>Unlisted walls on both sides of Icen Way were included in the Article 4 Direction, except for curtilage listed walls, for which material changes require Listed Building Consent.</p> <p>The made Article 4 Direction was too wide-ranging and such a concern has been given due consideration. It is the intention to make a new revised Direction (to be consulted on) that applies to boundaries adjacent to an open space or highway, including a right of way.</p> <p>It is agreed that the legal wording of the letter was difficult to understand. Further correspondence will be more explanatory and include a leaflet.</p>
<p>This directive is dated and arrived at our house the week after we had replaced our broken gate and several weeks after we had replaced the adjacent 2 fence panels which had been badly damaged in the storms over Christmas and thereafter, to a degree where our garden was not safe to contain our pet dogs. My son then saw someone yesterday taking pictures of our fence/gate and possibly that of our neighbours. This has caused us concern and worry. We used the existing fence posts which have been in situ for at least 15 years and our boundary has not moved. Yet we feel now, with this instruction arriving so soon after we had carried out this maintenance, as if we are being hounded. Furthermore, having lived in this property for almost 30 years, I can assure you that there is no heritage behind any of the properties adjoining the alley between Damers and Dagmar Roads, just a rag-bag of higgledy piggedly fences and lean-tos. Would like to make our objections known to this ridiculous order. We would also like to point out that following the link to this consultation we find a webpage with links to further details and maps, both of which are broken and inaccessible. How can you hold a consultancy when the residents affected are unable to view the proposed impact? It is inept and ridiculous (22).</p>	<p>The objection to the Article 4 Direction is noted.</p> <p>It is not know who took the photographs. The work described can remain, as already explained.</p> <p>The problems with the website links were resolved promptly and the respondent notified.</p> <p>The made Article 4 Direction was too wide-ranging and such a concern has been given due consideration. It is the intention to make a new revised Direction (to be consulted on) that applies to boundaries adjacent to an open space or highway, including a right of way.</p>
<p>I feel that we should be able to make alterations to fences, gates and walls without needing to put in a planning application (23).</p>	<p>The character and appearance of the Dorchester Conservation Area is enriched by its many boundaries. The Article 4 Direction allows greater control of changes to certain boundaries. However, the Direction was too</p>

	<p>wide-ranging and such a concern has been given due consideration. It is the intention to make a new revised Direction (to be consulted on) that applies to boundaries adjacent to an open space or highway, including a right of way.</p>
<p>My guess from reading the letter was that it would turn out that you're worrying about the number of front gardens being converted to parking spaces... And lo, having read the planning officers report, that's exactly what you consider the problem to be.</p> <p>Which is fair enough, except of course it's been district and county level planning decisions over the last 30 or 40 years that have led us to our current situation w.r.t parking in Dorchester. /You/ chose to introduce residents parking in select areas, /you/ forced people to park elsewhere, and then, when residents in Fordington asked for *their* streets to be made resident only, /you/ made it as difficult as possible to get it done. So it really shouldn't be any surprise that the response was to obliterate front gardens where possible. It's no coincidence that the places you highlight for the additional restrictions are those where pressure for on street parking is at its highest.</p> <p>Grasp the nettle and deal with the parking situation in Dorchester. It might mean there was less pressure on front gardens.</p> <p>I'm assuming that, given the nature of the problem, and your planning system response, you'll be generally refusing applications to convert front gardens into parking spaces unless there are exceptional circumstances. Would this be the case? If so, which circumstances would you consider? EVs?</p> <p>People are being encouraged to buy electric cars and the government is increasingly looking at disincentives for FF vehicle owners. I would probably expect my next car to be an EV when I replace it in a few years time, and I'm probably not alone in thinking that. But I have no off street parking (in common with many in your conservation area) and given the virtual absence of public charging points within Dorchester and a complete absence of street side charging, the /only /way this would be viable would be to sacrifice my front garden to provide a facility for overnight charging...</p> <p>I would rather resent being penalised for owning a FF car when council legislation is actively preventing me from owning an EV. It might be a good idea to start making plans for the widespread availability of public charging</p>	<p>Whilst boundary changes due to off-street car parking is a consideration, other changes are too, such as replacement or altered boundaries, even where gardens are too small for off-street parking.</p> <p>The concerns about car parking have been forwarded to Dorset Council's Parking Services.</p> <p>Dorset Council has recently signed up to an agreement which will allow affordable access to prefeasibility work to identify viable locations throughout the county for additional electric vehicle charge point provision. Currently, Dorchester has four publicly available electric vehicle charging points – 2 rapid chargers at Trinity Street and 2 fast chargers at County Hall pay and display car park. There is also a fast charger provided at M G Cannon and Poundbury Gardens.</p> <p>Each planning application would be considered on its merits, taking into account all material planning considerations at the time.</p>

<p>points... (24).</p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated the 6th March regarding the Article 4(1) Direction. I have to say that along with a number of people it took me a while to work out just what it was all about or what had caused it. It was difficult, but having looked back online at past Council Meeting Minutes & other online documents I believe I am a bit clearer.</p> <p>As invited by your letter, I would like to take the opportunity to make a comment about the Direction.</p> <p>I moved to my house in Icen Way, Fordington 5 years ago. I was certainly attracted to Dorchester by the proposed shopping development in the town, particularly that in Charles Street along with other development plans to improve the town. These of course have now been shelved & if the major reason was caused to protect archaeology, that is unlikely to ever be seen, I feel that this is a great shame.</p> <p>Prior to moving here, I became very aware of the parking issues in the town, especially that caused by hospital staff, council staff, town workers and shoppers who would park all day in residential areas such as where I live in Fordington. For that reason I did ensure that I looked for a house either with a garage or off road parking. I was told on moving in that there were plans to tackle the parking issues around the town. Over the five years living here I am aware that the situation with parking has worsened. I have also been aware of individuals and groups trying to get something done, but do not know of any successful changes. I now believe that if there had been any proposals that were being considered, the recent change in Councils will be given as a reason to cause yet further delays on implementation.</p> <p>Because of the increasing parking problems & the fact that no changes have been made, I can quite understand why residents have become frustrated and where possible are making structural changes to accommodate vehicles onto their own property.</p> <p>By looking online, I have attempted to find out what work has been done by councils to review the parking issues but been unable to find anything, although I am sure something is being done. It is a great shame that this information is not easily accessible.</p> <p>From previously living in Sussex, I know that in Worthing, in an area close</p>	<p>It is agreed that the legal wording of the letter was difficult to understand. Further correspondence will be more explanatory.</p> <p>It is possible to sign up for news about the Dorchester town centre redevelopment at https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/business-consumers-licences/economic-development/dorchester-town-centre-redevelopment.aspx</p> <p>The concerns about car parking have been forwarded to Dorset Council's Parking Services.</p> <p>Information (locate controlled parking zones information, resident and business parking bays or parking restrictions) is available at https://www.dorsettraffweb.co.uk/</p> <p>There is the Dorchester Transport & Environment Plan available at https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/roads-highways-maintenance/highway-improvements/dorchester-transport-and-environmental-plan/dorchester-transport-and-environment-plan.aspx One of its objectives is to "provide accessible car parking for shoppers, residents and other essential users".</p>
--	--

to the town & hospital & problems not unlike our own, they improved things dramatically by introducing parking permits for residents but also allowing specific periods for other vehicles. This catered for visitors & shoppers for reasonable short term parking but stopped the all day and longer parking by hospital staff. There must be other schemes nationally that would be suitable for Dorchester.

In conclusion for the purpose of your letter, I would say that if there was an efficient scheme that catered for the parking needs of residents whilst visitors and workers in the town were also considered & catered for in some way, I would fully support rigid enforcement of any planning requirements. However, with the situation we have at present and with no likelihood of any significant changes in the near future, I would support the relaxing of any planning requirements to allow residents to partly overcome a major problem in the town.

I am more than willing to be contacted about my views (25).