

**NEIGHBOURHOOD QUESTIONNAIRE  
RESPONSES RECEIVED  
- by 31 May 2020 -**

Thank you to everyone who has taken the time to respond.

If anyone else still wishes to respond then they are welcome to do so.

This can be done by completing the [survey](#) through the FRA website or by just sending an e-mail to [webadmin@furzehillresidents.co.uk](mailto:webadmin@furzehillresidents.co.uk) and stating the issues that you would like to be considered in formulating any future Neighbourhood Plan.

It is expected that further responses will be recorded in future response documents.

## REPLIES TO SURVEY

## TOTALS from 11 REPLIES

	YES	UNCERTAIN	NO
1. Do you want the green belt around our neighbourhood to be preserved?	11	0	0
2. Do you want any further development permitted in the green belt?	2	1	8
3. Would you accept up to ten affordable dwellings in the green belt?	3	0	8
4. Do you want large developments in the green belt, such as the 45 dwellings suggested for behind the Stocks Inn or the 200 dwellings suggested for Jades Farm north of our telephone box?	0	0	11
5. Do you want the existing village envelope extended?	1	1	9
6. Do you want any further dwelling within the existing village envelope (infilling)?	4	1	6
7. Would you accept up to ten affordable dwellings within the existing village envelope?	4	3	4
8. Assuming the council offices are redeveloped, do you want any further multiple dwelling development within the existing village envelope?	0	1	10

## REPLIES TO SURVEY continued

## TOTALS from 11 REPLIES

											YES	UNCERTAIN	NO	
9. Is there a development that you feel would be appropriate in a particular location?	N	U	Y	Y	U	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	4	2	5
10. Do you wish Furzehill Wood and Woodleaze Copse to be retained as accessible open spaces?	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10	1	0
11. Would you like an area to be designated for village purposes: eg as an open space, part of which could be reserved for a play area for children, or a village hall. (The area behind the Stocks Inn has possibilities but has limitations because pipelines run under it)	N	U	U	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	6	2	3
12. Do you have any other suggestion for open spaces within our neighbourhood, which could be appropriate for village purposes?	N	U	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	2	1	8
13. Do you think speed limits should be reduced?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10	0	1
14. Do you feel that traffic calming measures are necessary?	Y	N	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9	1	1
15. Do you feel that the introduction of Traffic Management Techniques would be appropriate? (such as changing the junction priorities at the Stocks Inn crossroads)?	U	N	U	N	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	5	4	2

## COMMENTS

### Relating to Development

(with Question number added)

3(&8). Why 10? I think it shouldn't be about numbers necessarily but about what impact each property would have. Example - planning permission has so far been denied for a small property along Dogdean which would be no problem at all. (Overlooking the huge estate built on green belt)!!! However if we personally wanted to put a big development on our paddock it should, quite rightly, be refused! I feel the whole debate is pointless as the planning dept seem to do, or not do, whatever they want. Just look at the building that has taken place at Dumpton School over the years despite objections. That plus Bloor Homes development...Plus the loss of the council offices. I'm sorry to say but I cannot think that FRA has any influence over the allowing or not of any development.

4. The Jades Farm development is an outrage - Furzehill is a small hamlet and this would make us into another Colehill mini conurbation!

9. Only infill.

9. a village hall to give the community a focus, somewhere near the cross roads

12. I feel that a village hall would make a big difference to our community. Beside The Stocks, with an access from Grange would be ideal.

I don't feel that a playground would be used enough; and a modest 'open space' would be used to 'exercise' dogs - with predictable consequences.

12. Natural growth only, with footpaths.

## COMMENTS

### Relating to Traffic

13-Limits

14-Calming

15-Management

(with Question number added)

13. On Cranborne Road heading North the speed limit should remain at 30mph until past the turning to Dogdean, and change to 30mph heading south prior to Dogdean turning. The 30mph should be extended heading south from the crossroads by the Post Office on Smugglers Lane until past Dogdean at a minimum. Dogdean should have a 30mph speed limit.

13. Dogdean : 20mph

13. Smugglers Lane to 40mph

13. Main road through Furzehill should be reduced to 20mph limit with other feeder roads max 30mph

13. Along Smugglers Lane down to 40 mph and through Furzehill reduced to 20mph

13. 20 mph on Furzehill itself, with ban on HGVs except for access

30 mph on Dogdean and Long Lane

40 mph on Smugglers Lane

13. 30 mile speed limit on all roads including Smugglers lane

14. Speed bumps/ nothing else will slow them down-speed restrictions don't work

14. Before and after the dogleg bend in Dogdean

14. On the bends along Dogdean.

Extension of village 30mph signs along Smugglers Lane to take in the Dogdean turning.

14 Furzehill (South), Grange and some of Smugglers Lane. No humps, but hatched areas where pedestrians cross in order to walk on the outside of bends. Path on the road edge of Woodleaze copse.

14. some chicanes , similar to those near Canford school

14. Measures at the bottom of Furzehill to make movement to and from Cranborne Road difficult for HGVs  
Soft measures on Smugglers Lane, such as a solid white line down either side of the road; but progressing, if necessary, to a chicane between the Dogdean turn and Dogdean Farm.

15. Changing priorities at the Stocks Inn

15. Speed cameras

15. I think the idea of changing priorities at the Stocks Inn crossroads is worthy of serious consideration.  
Making Furzehill and Grange one way may have merit, probably down Furzehill and up Grange, but only if speeds could be controlled.

15. I do not support changing the junction priorities at Stocks Inn crossroads

## **FURTHER COMMENTS**

+. I think there is a lack of understanding or action for the Dogdean community.

+. FRA does not really have the depth of residents to enable its own Neighbourhood Plan to be developed , hence it would be more practical to keep close to and influence Colehill PC to our specific needs. If later it is seen that Colehill's needs do not reflect or consider our needs, then maybe FRA should reconsider its position and go it alone.

+. I think the questions are leading and should be more open. For example - what are the top issues that affect you. What about litter picking, routes to school, street lighting. As an opening questionnaire it is putting ideas into minds rather than letting people think and thus will be seen as leading.