

ID		COMMENT
<i>CR NPQ 1</i>	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	NO SECOND HOMES
<i>CR NPQ 2</i>	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	NO MORE HOUSES, There is only just enough SERVICES to go round the people we have now.
<i>WPC NPQ 1</i>	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	1000 houses. Development needs to be sympathetic to the area. No more "Nimbys" we want people to be part of the community and not here for a view, less of Steve Smith – joking!
<i>WPC NPQ 2</i>	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	WOOL MUST NOT BECOME A TOWN Loss of open fields, "country" environment Anti-social behaviour as a result of new builds
<i>WPC NPQ 3</i>	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	ANY MAJOR BUILDING PROJECTS NO IMPROVEMENT TO INFRASTRUCTURE, NO REDUCTION IN TRAFFIC UNCONTROLLED IMMIGRATION MORE CRIME
<i>WPC NPQ 4</i>	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Too many new homes without the infrastructure mentioned above Where are people going to work? Park? Exercise? etc Think :- "obese youngsters!!!"
<i>WPC NPQ 5</i>	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	WOOL BEING DEVELOPED FROM VILLAGE TO SMALLTOWN WITHOUT ADDITIONAL FACILITIES
<i>WPC NPQ 6</i>	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Overdevelopment of village using green fields impacting on all the infrastructure, increasing pressure on surgery, schools and other village facilities. Even more traffic passing through the village, using village facilities congesting areas already overstretched.
<i>WPC NPQ 7</i>	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	
<i>WPC NPQ 8</i>	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Too much development, without road improvements.
<i>WPC NPQ 9</i>	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Blocks of flats.
<i>WPC NPQ 10</i>	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	ANY DEVELOPMENT THAT IS IN THE CATCHMENT OF THE WOOL STREAM. ANY DEVELOPMENT THAT HAS INADIQUATE PARKING OFF ROAD.

- WPC NPQ 11** *WOULDN'T LIKE* Any more traffic!!  
Unattractive new build houses  
5G or other phone masts!
- WPC NPQ 12** *WOULDN'T LIKE* HOLIDAY/WEEKEND HOUSING OR DORMITORY HOUSING AND ASSOCIATED COMMUTING  
DISABLED/ELDERLY EXCLUDED BY STAIRS + STEPS  
OUT OF TOWN SHOPPING DEVELOPMENT  
MORE OVERCROWDING OF EXISTING SERVICES DR'S/SCHOOL/TRAIN
- WPC NPQ 13** *WOULDN'T LIKE* Masses more new large houses and a ban on large caravans and tradesmans vans parked on public roads and car parks overnight.
- WPC NPQ 14** *WOULDN'T LIKE* MORE HOUSES just say NO  
DEAD ANIMALS  
More traffic –  
More Rubbish – Due to Houses  
No Parking
- WPC NPQ 15** *WOULDN'T LIKE* The house building opposite Purbeck Gate on the Dorchester Rd.
- WPC NPQ 16** *WOULDN'T LIKE* I wouldn't like to see Wool swamped with new homes that the infrastructure here can't cope with.
- WPC NPQ 17** *WOULDN'T LIKE* Properties over one story high.  
More elderly people. They place too much reliance on the NHS and other facilities (I speak as an elderly person myself)
- WPC NPQ 18** *WOULDN'T LIKE* HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS THAT DON'T HAVE INCREASED INFRASTRUCTURE TO COPE WITH MORE PEOPLE & MORE VEHICLES.  
EXPENSIVE HOUSING LOCALS CAN'T AFFORD, OR SECOND HOMES.  
BIG SUPERMAKETS.  
1 MILE LONG QUEUES OF TRAFFIC WAITING AT THE RAILWAY GATES AS A RESULT OF INCREASE OF RESIDENTS NUMBERS.

- WPC NPQ 19** *WOULDN'T LIKE* UN-NESESARY MULITI DEVELOPMENT  
ENDLESS TRAFFIC JAMS – GRID LOCKED ROADS – DIFFICULT COMMUTES TO WORK. MORE  
HOLIDAY HOMES & HOUSES STANDING EMPTY & UNSOLD.  
LOST OF VILLAGE INDIVIDUALITY.
- WPC NPQ 20** *WOULDN'T LIKE* Large housing development which would adversely affect the rural nature of the parish. I  
have concerns that Purbeck uses Wool as the place where they want to put the bulk of the  
development.  
I would not like to see any development that would put extra pressure on the doctors  
surgery or schools.  
I would not want to see an out of town supermarket in the parish which would impact on  
traffic levels and existing shops.  
Nothing that increases the current traffic levels.
- WPC NPQ 21** *WOULDN'T LIKE* Another charity shop  
Large unplanned expansion of housing. Large numbers of second home owners.  
Developments of 3 / 4 bedroom houses only.  
Would not want Wool to become a dormitory town.
- WPC NPQ 22** *WOULDN'T LIKE* New housing developments
- WPC NPQ 23** *WOULDN'T LIKE* ANY MORE HOUSES.
- WPC NPQ 24** *WOULDN'T LIKE* No new housing estates without all the amenities to cope with the amount of people /  
parking / traffic.
- WPC NPQ 25** *WOULDN'T LIKE* Green spaces lost to building  
Cheap builds like Purbeck Gate – houses built with bricks!! Are much better.
- WPC NPQ 26** *WOULDN'T LIKE* MORE TAKEAWAY EATING – LITTER!
- WPC NPQ 27** *WOULDN'T LIKE* Hundreds of ugly new houses built on Agricultural land.  
More second homes and a 65 bed care home.  
More traffic and longer queues at the Railway crossing.  
Longer queues at the Doctors which all these new homes will Create.
- WPC NPQ 28** *WOULDN'T LIKE* An attempt to make a separate 'hub' for the village.

- WPC NPQ 29** *WOULDN'T LIKE* Unnecessary house building which would clog up our roads even further especially in the summer.  
The urbanisation of the area.
- WPC NPQ 30** *WOULDN'T LIKE* No more 3 Storey Buildings!!  
Lots more new builds that come without much needed infrastructure to support.  
More traffic passing through the village.
- WPC NPQ 31** *WOULDN'T LIKE* HOUSES FOR YET MORE HOLIDAY OR SECOND HOMES. BUILDINGS SHOULD BE WHAT IS REQUIRED BY LOCALS  
A VERY LARGE CARE HOME IS NOT NEEDED HERE AND PEOPLE SHOULDN'T BE MOVED TO WOOL OUT OF THE AREA WHERE THEIR FRIENDS ARE.
- WPC NPQ 32** *WOULDN'T LIKE* New houses built which will simply be a dormitory for Poole and Bournemouth contributing nothing to local community and increasing traffic congestion.  
I am very concerned about the disruption the proposed new building will impact at road congestion.
- WPC NPQ 33** *WOULDN'T LIKE* Excess housing.  
Extra traffic.  
Sewage problems from building on flooded land.  
Wool can't cope with what we have now without adding these extras, housing people, traffic.
- WPC NPQ 34** *WOULDN'T LIKE* THE DESTRUCTION BIODIVERSITY, ORGANIC GREEN FIELDS, INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND POLLUTION – ALL OF WHICH WILL INEVITABLY BE THE RESULT OF UNCONSTRAINED DEVELOPMENT.  
I DO NOT WANT WOOL'S VILLAGE FEEL TO BE DIMINISHED BY BECOMING A DORMATORY FOR BOURNEMOUTH & POOLE.  
WE HAVE BEEN TOLD REPEATEDLY THAT 470 IS A MAXIMUM – I WOULD NOT WISH TO SEE THE COMMUNITY BEING FURTHER LET DOWN AND DECEIVED BY THIS NUMBER BEING EXCEEDED.

- WPC NPQ 35** *WOULDN'T LIKE* 1) Don't want the ambiance of the Village changed by increasing the population with the proposed development of 4 sites in Wool & E Burton. The lanes are too narrow to take increased traffic, and we don't want supermarkets built to supply increased demand.  
2) We don't want increased population, traffic, noise, air pollution.  
3) The crescent in E Burton, Sandhills Cres is too small to be used as a through road, existing residents would be severely affected, adversely, and also residents in the other areas next to proposed sites.  
Build a new residential area separate from existing villages ie like Poundbury.
- WPC NPQ 36** *WOULDN'T LIKE* A SUPERMARKET.  
NO MORE SUPER HOUSING ESTATES, STOP NOW BEFORE WOOL BECOMES A TOWN.
- WPC NPQ 37** *WOULDN'T LIKE* More of these awful houses like the ones at Purbeck Gate, they look really Tatty and they haven't been there that long.  
If we have to have more please build proper red brick houses which look far nicer.
- WPC NPQ 38** *WOULDN'T LIKE* 1. More development on the hillside opposite Purbeck Gate, currently it is fitting for a rural area, seeing houses tower above the road would be an eyesore.  
2. Who is going to live here? More retirees ▮ more stress on the surgery. There are no jobs available to support a new large community. If they commute our already congested Dorchester Road/crossing will be horrendous.
- WPC NPQ 39** *WOULDN'T LIKE* Large scale developments.  
No second home built.  
This would completely unbalance the village.  
The people would have travel far away for work, completely against the governments eco friendly targets.
- WPC NPQ 40** *WOULDN'T LIKE* . Another Purbeck Gate style development – too much altogether – makes it like a separate place – doesn't integrate with rest of village well.  
. So much new housing that the village identity is lost and becomes a housing sprawl with insufficient structure + facilities.
- WPC NPQ 41** *WOULDN'T LIKE* More houses unless adequate facilities/amenities included as a condition of planning approval.

WPC NPQ 42	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	No more housing estates creating an impact on the environment – traffic/population/people/Noise.
WPC NPQ 43	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	URBANISATION and a creeping dormitory town.
WPC NPQ 44	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	The proposed number of new unnecessary and unaffordable properties on a scale of the poor quality of BUILD provided by Planners/Developers/Builders at Purbeck Gate. Development built without guaranteed infrastructure. Developers/Builders being allowed to inspect their own site.
WPC NPQ 45	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Excessive building development on attractive local areas. The so called 'Planned development' that is planned with extremely expensive so called affordable housing?
WPC NPQ 46	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Big developments
WPC NPQ 47	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	SIZE TO INCREASE BEYOND CAPACITY OF LOCAL SERVICES CHEAP DEVELOPMENT ILL DESIGNED HOUSES NO AFFORDABLE HOUSING NO CONSIDERATION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOOTPATHS ANY DEVELOPMENT INCREASING RISK OF FLOODING
WPC NPQ 48	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	The local area turned into an affluent area for Poole & Bournemouth. Adding more houses is going to make more traffic & even more congestion in the area. If there are to be more houses built they must be more made available locally.
WPC NPQ 49	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More housing would be better suited to an existing town and leave Wool as a viable village.
WPC NPQ 50	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Any significant increase in the number of new houses which would further destroy the character of the village. A major sell off of agricultural land. Any increase of additional housing in excess of local need. (Need not greed)
BOV NPQ 1	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	The corner near the Spar and the Methodist Church as a speed restriction and put up a sign of 20 m.p.h.
BOV NPQ 2	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More housing developments particularly if they gobble up green sites and if local infrastructure cannot support this type of development.
EB NPQ 1	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	TO MANY NEW HOMES

EB NPQ 2	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	The new development becoming clogged up with cars and ugly unsuitable houses, without enough thought for the eventual appearance of the housing, and without provision of enough affordable housing to meet local needs.
EB NPQ 3	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	A massive estate!! Too many houses squashed together with small back gardens \ lack of privacy.
EB NPQ 4	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	ANYMORE BUILDINGS ANY MORE PEOPLE WHICH THIS AREA CANNOT SUBSTANE. OUR DOCTORS AND SHOPS CAN'T COPE NOW. MORE CARS IT IS NO LONGER SAFE TO WALK IN THIS AREA.
EB NPQ 5	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	TOO MANY HOUSES
EB NPQ 6	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	MORE HOUSES. MORE SHOPS.
EB NPQ 7	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	I wouldn't like to see it become one sprawling development with loss of individual identity.
EB NPQ 8	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Housing estates like Purbeck Gate le weird colours!
EB NPQ 9	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	TOO MANY PRE FAB HOUSES BUILDING ON GREEN LAND
EB NPQ 10	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	New houses not made of brick
EB NPQ 11	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	TOO MANY HOUSES BUILT, THEREFORE MORE CARS, MORE PEOPLE WANTING TO USE THE DOCTORS SURGERY, SCHOOLS, ETC HOUSES FOR SALE ALREADY AT PURBECK GATE! THE ROADS GETTING IN AND OUT ARE BAD ENOUGH NOW, ESPECIALLY IN THE SUMMER. TO CROSS MAIN DORCHESTER RD AND WAREHAM ROAD ON FOOT IS A NIGHTMARE!
EB NPQ 12	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Any more housing without proper thought to infrastructure. There is the potential for flooding therefore proper drainage needs to be addressed.
WS 1	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	The loss of organic farmland rich in wildlife which probably won't be appreciated till its gone.

- WS 2**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Even more traffic at peak times !  
 Lack of thought given to access from main road to the new developments. (The single access to Purbeck Gate with vehicles parking near the entrance is currently dangerous and there will be an accident at some point ! )  
 New Houses that are expensive and only for rich people ! Lack of recreational space on the new developments.
- WS 3**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Not keen on a supermarket although if there are to be another 470 houses there may need to be one !
- I don't like massive housing estates as they tend to make local "ghettos" and the whole area loses the community feeling which is important to rural life.
- Smaller developments close to existing houses may be the answer.
- WS 4**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      More housing being built on green areas.
- WS 5**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Large scale development that has been proposed, would make the area a sprawl of housing that local people could not afford and would encourage more 2nd homes for people who live in the larger cities of the south and treat Dorset and the Purbecks as a 'Theme park'.
- WS 6**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Housing built on flooding areas  
 a supermarket
- WS 7**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Large supermarket - our 2 little shops serve us well and have been loyal for years. They would go out of business if we had a large supermarket. I suspect we might even get a third small shop open on the outskirts.
- A 2nd 'hub': eg. if Wool extended too far towards Dorchester ; those on the West fringe might well be some distance from D'Urberville but we need more use of D'Urberville not less. Both would end up going under.
  - The submerging of East Burton into Wool - EB would lose its identity - leave a 'green belt'.
  - Multicoloured rendering - we are not an italian riviera but dirty looking town.



WS 8

*WOULDN'T LIKE*

An Asda or other similar large corporate supermarket.

More street lights.

More road signs.

More signage of any sort, there is too much of it.

Large carparks.

CCTV everywhere.

More road furniture like speed cameras, crossings, traffic lights, light boards, billboards etc.

WS 9

*WOULDN'T LIKE*

I would not like to see an estate like Purbeck Gate. I have walked through it on quite a number of occasions and it is soulless. Houses should have a decent amount of garden and not look like a "rabbit hutch". If social housing is mixed with private I think this is a good thing. Social isolation of people who are on benefits (and maybe with drug or alcohol problems) is not desirable and could cause more problems. They should be able to feel included. We have an example of this in Breach Field Rd, where social housing is alongside private and I have not heard of any problems.

Also, I do not like to see "infilling" just for the sake of it.

Finally, light industry could be catered for, maybe on the Winfrith site where, I believe, space is becoming available. This would enable work situations for people and reduce traffic if they were able to cycle or walk to work.

WS 10

*WOULDN'T LIKE*

The idiots who suggested that 470+ new homes to be developed in excellent ag quality fields must be a few apples short of a fruitcake .

We do not need any more mass building on that sort of scale , absolutely not .

We cannot cope with any more extra traffic , people , nor more strain on the community. We are being strangled by government demands and we have a County Council that believes it must cover swathes of rural Dorset in homes

We must not become a town nor must we become a dormitory commuter belt .

The pollution from heavy road traffic is pretty noticeable during hot weather , we are nestled in a valley , and the smell just lingers .

Since we moved here to Wool 20 years ago the village has expanded nearly threefold . East Burton is almost unrecognisable now , the back road has pretty newish houses , but limited parking spaces .. Allowances should have been made for extra parking spaces . Sadly that back road is a bit of a rat run .. sign of the times.

No to 470+ houses .. no no no.

WS 11

*WOULDN'T LIKE*

NO MORE PUBS.

WS 12

*WOULDN'T LIKE*

More traffic - it's really bad in summer during the holidays

More litter and bad behaviour particularly around the recreation ground

More dog fouling

People who don't care about their community

WS 13

*WOULDN'T LIKE*

I welcome improvements to all villages and the area i cant think of anything specific that i wouldnt like to see but i would be worried about anything that ruined the peacefulness of the villages.

- WS 14      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      The new housing estate to be built opposite Purbeck Gate. I don't object to new builds, but it's far too many. It's putting profit over the quality of people's lives here. If Purbeck Gate affordable housing is anything to go by, it won't be local people buying them. I know very few locals who could afford to buy a house there and the social housing seemed to be filled by residents from other areas.
- WS 15      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      More houses.
- WS 16      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Blocks of flats  
Fields taken away  
Old people deciding what's best for wool
- WS 17      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Further unnecessary or justified development of the area for housing that is not needed by local families and cannot be supported by the roads and infrastructure in Wool or even the Purbeck's.
- WS 18      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      NIMBYS, far too many of them not interested in the opinion of people born and raised here. They have the audacity to say they don't want people to move into the area and take our houses when they did exactly that. No large development needed.
- WS 19      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      More homes without more consideration for the impact on local services. Longer train queues. More cars on the roads. Unnecessary developments the houses are not selling around the village no need for more homes.
- WS 20      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Any more cycle paths.
- WS 21      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      I wouldn't like to see it growing anymore, after all it was a village as such and I would say it should remain as such but I dare say comments like that will fall on deaf ears
- WS 22      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      more houses
- WS 23      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      470 homes built. What an idiot idea to ruin a lovely village of wool.  
The county councillors who propose Wool none of them live near to these site or in the area.  
The impact on the train crossing its horrendous on a good day, please please don't allow these 470 houses to be built.

WS 24	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* 470--1000 new homes.</li> <li>* New build second homes.</li> <li>* Holiday rentals</li> <li>* Destruction of local environment and reduction of Biodiversity</li> <li>* Increased C emissions</li> <li>* Increased N run off.</li> <li>* Possible overload of local infrastructure &amp; services eg Drs Surgery , Sewage works, local roads and railway crossing.</li> </ul>
WS 25	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	more cars
WS 26	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	
WS 27	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More places of worship, I think we have enough. Mosque etc.
WS 28	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>Additional traffic impact through the village centre (by the Black Bear, Spar, Bakery etc.), through Collier's Lane (already heavily influenced by parked vehicles, especially at school drop off/pick up) or at the Railway station where significant land would be required to accommodate additional parking.</p> <p>470 more homes are too many causing up to 2000 more residents, 1000 more vehicles and additional strain on traffic and local services.</p>
WS 29	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	1. More pubs.
WS 30	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Major development (with or without suitable infrastructure(namely By-Pass))</li> <li>2. More flooding problems.</li> <li>3. More power outages or sewage problems.</li> <li>4. Destruction of the habitat for people and animals.</li> <li>5. Removal of rights of way, footpaths and railway crossings.</li> </ol>
WS 31	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Commencing further Development of designated green belt without new/adequate facilities amenities and drainage in place.
WS 32	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More houses

- WS 33**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Vast estates of ugly new housing. There is already a huge amount of resentment about the one new estate that has been built there which is unfair to those residents. It would be good to have an area of new building that Wool residents are proud of - everyone accepts the need for new building but it needs to be both affordable to locals and of high quality build.  
Removal of rights of way  
Nuisances as a result of new building such as needless destruction of wildlife habitats.
- WS 34**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      a. Development of the scale proposed
- b. Long lines of traffic on both sides of the level crossing and increased traffic congestion. This will also lead to longer delays for emergency services having to cross the railway.
- c. Essential local facilities such as medical provision being overloaded even more than it is now.
- d. More second homes and empty unsold properties. e.g. Poundbury
- e. Loss of countryside views, sky and sunsets.
- WS 35**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      More housing.
- WS 36**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Houses built without the proper infrastructure being included in plan - not to the detriment of existing residents  
Houses built which destroy the countryside views in Wool  
Houses that are not built in keeping with current housing styles  
Huge amounts of social housing and a repeat of the Purbeck Gate estate  
Cheap houses built or lots of flats  
An increase in traffic, noise and pollution in Wool  
An increase in anti social behaviour caused by influx of young people with nothing to do

WS 37	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Further development that cannot be sustained and is not needed for local people but will simply allow more people from outside the area to relocate here. This constant development is not sustainable and permitting is just a weakness.
WS 38	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Too much to mention, but wasted young lives (teenagers) hanging around smoking drugs. A gym might help.
WS 39	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	A large housing estate. This would bring with it so many problems in relation to public services. For example waste management and health services.
WS 40	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	The overwhelming of this peaceful village by the building of an unwarranted number of new homes as proposed for the West side of the village. The damage to already threatened flora & fauna in our locality that will result during the building of and subsequent habitation of the proposed housing development. Additional overcrowding of our local schools. The likelihood of the existing drainage systems being overloaded as a result of the proposed new housing development. A significant increase in the number of vehicles used for commuting on our already overloaded roads as a direct consequence of lack of local employment for the inhabitants of the proposed new housing development.
WS 41	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	470 extra houses
WS 42	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	
WS 43	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Housing developments that don't have increased infrastructure to cope with more people and more vehicles. Expensive housing locals can't afford or second homes. Bog supermarkets. 1 mile long queues of traffic waiting at the railway gates as a result of increased residents numbers
WS 44	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	High rise flats, don't mind nice houses.

WS 45	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rampant, high volume housing developments that are inappropriate for the rural environment.</li> <li>2. Housing that increases the "2nd home syndrome"</li> <li>2. Increase in local population without the necessary scaling of infrastructure:- NHS, Dental, Schooling.</li> <li>4. Any additional, new main roads.</li> <li>5. Trains that do not stop at Wool but, nonetheless, cause traffic to halt as they pass by, unaware that their mission should be to deliver a service.</li> <li>6. Increase in local population, out of proportion to local employment needs.</li> </ol>
WS 46	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>Growth beyond supporting infrastructure  Any development going ahead without a supporting infrastructure in place.  Any development which does not fully integrate ecological concerns with planning (for example drainage, insulation of houses, surrounding environment etc etc).  Houses built by the cheapest bidder.  New houses to be built without a plan for integrating new family's into Wool, for example youth club, other clubs support services etc....  Traffic queues at the crossing, cars with engines left on.</p>
WS 47	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>New houses to be built without a plan for integrating new family's into Wool, for example youth club, other clubs support services etc.... Houses built by the cheapest bidder. Traffic queues at the crossing, cars with engines left on.</p>
WS 48	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>Large unaffordable homes which would end up being bought as second or holiday homes. The loss of our friendly village community.</p>
WS 50	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>Not enough infrastructure to cater for all the new families coming to the area.</p>
WS 51	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>Large properties built. New houses used as holiday or second homes. Loss of green spaces and hedges. More than 470 houses built and if the first group of houses don't sell stop any future planned build.</p>
WS 52	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>The countryside being ruined, more pressure on schools, shops and GP's. Increased traffic</p>

WS 53	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>Mass development that would mean destruction of village and community life that is quite strong in the Parish.</p> <p>Large number of houses built due to easy option as large areas of farmland released to build on.</p> <p>No guarantees of genuinely affordable housing, this could mean houses built would be out of reach of local people due to high market prices and low average wages and a high proportion could end up as second homes.</p> <p>No guarantees of improvement to infrastructure loss of organic farmland increased traffic problems</p>
WS 54	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	An increase in houses not mitigated by an increase in resources to support the community.
WS 55	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Less tank drives past my home late at night. Sometimes they sound like their going to pop in for tea. Very loud.
WS 56	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More housing without the additional infrastructure.
WS 57	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Over population
WS 58	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More social housing
WS 59	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>Places that cost the earth.</p> <p>I don't want to see housing being built if they are going to be for other people who do not live in the area or don't have family</p>
WS 60	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Any further housing development unless it is Affordable housing or council housing.
WS 61	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	The proposed housing developments will ruin the rural character of Wool, and add pressure to existing road bottle necks.
WS 62	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More development as currently shown by Purbeck Gate.
WS 63	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Nothing
WS 64	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More houses
WS 65	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More traffic. Less scenery. Limited housing development.
WS 66	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More homes as the road network cant take it nor can the doctors deal with more people.
WS 67	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More houses Holiday homes
WS 68	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	



- WS 69**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      High rise development on the fields opposite Purbeck Gate. The DIP buildings take maximum height into account, so developers should do likewise.
- Garish colours and poor materials visibly degrading on relatively new developments.
- Concreting over everything - the wildlife is disappearing.
- No new rank of shops when the existing shops need all the business they can get and need tidying up.
- WS 70**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Developments not taken on by the Local Authority because they paths and lights and roads don't meet the standards.
- Squashed in housing with concrete everywhere.
- Shops that undermine the ones already trying to make a living.
- WS 71**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      A new skatepark  
A new housing development
- WS 72**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      100 plus new homes built with a doctor's surgery that can't cope with present volume of patients
- WS 73**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      More houses of the wrong type  
More things built like the cycle path being justified by the DIP which is a white elephant
- WS 74**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      More than around 250 new homes for the village (470 sounds a bit much).
- Identikit, unimaginative new housing that doesn't feature the best environmental standards such as high thermal insulation, solar PV & HW, rainwater harvesting and e-vehicle charging points.
- WS 75**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Any more development we haven't the infrastructure to cope

WS 76	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Large scale building of private housing.</li> <li>2. More second homes.</li> <li>3. Increased traffic travelling through the village.</li> <li>4. High density housing.</li> <li>5. Back gardens used as building plots.</li> </ol>
WS 77	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Further development.
WS 78	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>Every available scrap of land used for development because the area is easier to develop in that most of Dorset. Road and driveways so constricted that roads become rat runs with cars parked everywhere. Loss of character properties demolished and replaced with small boxes in the relentless tide of development and drive for financial gain by builders and opportunists. Obliteration of the character of the existing village.</p>
WS 79	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>I would not like more housing built unless it is accompanied by additional facilities, such as sports facilities, for young people, more cycle paths and more facilities for social events, both indoor and outdoor. I would not want more car parks to be built in Wool unless there are improvements to the social and sports facilities.</p>
WS 80	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	URBAN style development ! Bypass across water meadows. Large supermarket.
WS 81	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>Would not want any more than the minimum possible new houses. Houses should be built on edges of existing towns, not in villages else it will put more cars on roads as people have to drive to towns for supplies etc.</p>
WS 82	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>Anymore building till the effect of the existing plans have on the environment, People making decisions with no knowledge of local conditions &amp; natural water drainage, and the effect of the level crossing backing up traffic causing a bad effect on air quality.</p>
WS 83	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<p>Developer led development  Housing beyond the 500 limit.  Off the shelf poor standard high density bulk housing.  Any closures of existing shops and SME's.  Closure of local schools, youth facility or library.  NO MORE BRIGHT LIGHTS. Perimeter street lighting on A352 needs to be timed.  Increase of through traffic.  Loss of any more railway staff or closure of booking office at Wool Station.</p>

WS 84	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	A ban on dogs on the sports field Too many big houses built we need smaller stater homes
WS 85	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Large scale development that is inappropriate for the area and its limited employment opportunities - this will lead to it becoming either a dormitory community for commuters or a retirement community.
WS 86	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Large expensive housing that locals can't afford or more housing without the appropriate infrastructure in place first.
WS 87	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	The following comments apply to the new housing that is to be built.  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NO housing above the 470 specified in the Local Plan.</li> <li>2. NO additional shopping outlets that will fragment the village.</li> <li>3. NO road or footpaths against existing boundaries of houses on Chalk Pit Lane/Oakdene Road etc</li> <li>4. ALL new build to be no higher than two stories.</li> </ol>
WS 88	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The opposite to the points above.</li> <li>2. Overdevelopment such that the village identity is lost and communities become fragmented.</li> <li>3. Wool (and the parish) should not pick up a share of the as yet unallocated 900+ houses in addition to the 470 specified in the local plan. Wool seems to be a soft target for this; leave this issue for the new Dorset County Local Plan due in 2024.</li> <li>4. Increased noise, especially from road traffic.</li> <li>5. Creep in numbers of houses from the 470 in the plan and arbitrary changes to the plan by landowners that were not subject to consultation with residents, eg the addition of a care home, care units, village hub, etc.</li> </ol>
WS 89	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Unsustainable and greed-based development of more and more houses without any supporting infrastructure.
WS 90	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More houses bringing more people, more social deprivations, more people with mental health issues and social problems without the facilities for them...all this puts more and more pressure on an already struggling system

- WS 91      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      More development  
Traveller facilities provision
- WS 92      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Social housing  
Over crowding  
Traffic congestion  
Increased noise  
The spoiling of a beautiful and peaceful dwelling place.
- WS 93      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Becoming to populated that the current infrastruture won't cope. Big amounts of money going on silly things like the bridge going over the railway line in Wool, where I don't think I've seen a single person use it.
- WS 94      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Any more bland bungalow development. Anything like the D'Urberville.
- WS 95      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Retirement flats, 2nd home owners.
- WS 96      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Our green space being developed. Having said that, I will not object to homes being built for people in need of homes, provided that the building is of homes which give rise to zero greenhouse gas emissions.
- WS 97      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      No supermarket as this could lead to the loss of existing local shops.  
Internet Shopping is available.  
There is an existing village hub so there is no need for a replacement which would be outside the centre of the village.  
I am not in favour of a Care Home as this seems to me a way to justify more housing. At the Planning Inspectors Meetings, which I attended, it was suggested it could be individual units!

- WS 98**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      I do not want overdevelopment to pander to rich landowners who use government and national trends to justify their greed and to overdevelop in rural communities. So they overload existing facilities and services and infrastructure (i.e. Roads, Gas, Water, Electricity, Communications, Broadband, Transport, Flood prevention, Health care, Education), decimating the community.  
Certainly any properties built should NOT have any encumbrances on them to financial benefit to land owners or builders. Things like ground rent or paying to extend the like of what was reported about Persimmon Homes some years ago. See current build complaints from buyers.  
If there has to be massive development it should be a separate entity providing all the infrastructure and amenities. Maybe like Poundbury or Milton Keynes, and government funded or sponsored.
- WS 99**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      1. No more houses to be built as this will ruin a Dorset village, there is a high volume of traffic already and the surgery and pharmacy are very busy now  
2. Not to see any animals kept in barns and not allowed out into open fields  
3. No reduction in playing fields for any development  
4. Not to close the rail station  
5. Not to loose the regular bus service  
6. Not to allow these small villages to be over developed  
7. Not to allow the environment to be affected by any future changes  
8. To avoid the destruction of trees in this area  
9. To maintain the current farmland and to be able to view animals in these fields
- WS 100**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      blocks of flats and nursing homes. Though they have their place. Housing needs to be mixed use private and H/A with affordability for residents within Purbeck being a key priority. The recent development of a rest home and commercial premises in Upton could be seem as a model for the future.
- WS 101**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Any more housing that is,for most local, younger people unaffordable. The Barratt Estate has been a great success yet proposals for further building will lead to big profits for the developers but will be of little use in housing first time buyers
- WS 102**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      High rise buildings. Cars parked haphazardly. East Burton Rd used like a “rat run”

WS 103	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More large estates, especially as there appears to be no funding for improving the infrastructure
WS 104	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	I wouldn't like to see a large supermarket or a fast food chain in our community - it wouldn't be fair on smaller businesses. I also wouldn't like to see another pub, we have 4 close by drinking establishments, more than enough for a village of this size.
WS 105	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Haphazardly designed buildings, lack of awareness and sensitivity of the nearby area of outstanding natural beauty, more lack of GP's.
WS 106	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	1. The proposed 470+ houses and a 65 resident care home (the latter imposed without consultation) because: a) there are no jobs, facilities, infrastructure here sufficient to provide for the needs of 1050+ extra adults and 1000+ extra children/teenagers AND none are included in the proposals. (The suggestion that the technology centre will provide the jobs is naive as highly qualified staff there commute from as far as Winchester.) b) The proposed location of the new dwellings is at the opposite (west) end of Wool and furthest from: the 3 primary schools, the library, the Doctors surgery, 3 churches, the youth club, the railway station etc. This makes nonsense if the country is to achieve a carbon neutral future and will exacerbate the existing traffic congestion and "rat-runs" in Wool parish.
WS 107	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	Over development especially on farmland
WS 108	<i>WOULDN'T LIKE</i>	More housing for old people.

WS 109      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      I wouldn't want to see the area bow so easily to outside pressures to build this and that here in the Purbecks; we are not the overspill for the Nation's problems. We are lucky to live and thrive in an area of outstanding natural beauty, and this should be preserved for today and tomorrow's generations to enjoy, whatever the cost. So, No to mass housing at the cost of the environment and wildlife. No to second homes here just for the rich, and not local people whom have to move out of the area. No to unaffordable housing, just greedy firms out to make a quick profit. Build more local housing, yes, but not at the cost of the area. Otherwise a lot of the local villages here will be lost and become towns instead at the cost of what generations past fought hard and sacrificed to build in the first place.

WS 110      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      More houses. Second homes. More traffic.

WS 111      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      More houses! Need to keep village feel and look after/update facilities we have (park, schools, skatepark)

WS 112      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      More houses

WS 113      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Any more housing other than those which are currently agreed.  
Any development the other side of the Giddy Green road.

WS 114      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Any new large private houses which could be, or even end up being, used as second homes for people from outside the area.

Additional housing should be for local people - families, workers, young and old.

Any high-rise buildings (ie no more than two-storey). It should be remembered that the ground level of the fields to the west of Wool are higher land than the neighbouring houses on current western edge of the village, and could dominate this end of Wool and even cut the light level in the existing houses.

Just new houses; we also need places of employment - more places for young people to work so they don't move out of the area. Don't make Wool just a dormitory for large urban areas.

WS 115      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Better doctors surgery

- WS 116      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      An increase in population without a concomitant increase in educational and medical services, and without updating the village's infrastructure.  
I wouldn't wish to see the drainage system remaining in its present parlous state if any development were to take place.
- WS 117      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      sorry to say it but more housing.  
i know we need to build some but we are going to be massive and will lose that lovely feeling of being in a village.  
-nursing home
- WS 118      *WOULDN'T LIKE*
- WS 119      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      To many new houses
- WS 120      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Large estates skylining the aforementioned natural beauty, stretched infrastructure, traffic jams
- WS 121      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Don't believe 20MPH is needed in the village(or at least not as far as proposed up Lulworth Road) - better option would be 30MPH electronic speed indicators at all 3 entrances to the village.

Wouldn't want more houses unless doctor and nurse recruitment to match. Also we need a better supermarket if more houses. Local infrastructure like drainage, internet access etc. would need to be dealt.

If new houses are built opposite Purbeck Gate then drainage to ensure heavy rain water doesn't flood down Bailey's Drove is essential as that did happen when the plough lines were vertical up the hill in the past.



- WS 122**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Additional housing development within the village where the need the need for that housing has not been clearly established in the numbers that have been proposed. Even more traffic on an already busy road without further provision for getting across Dorchester Road with longer queues of cars with idling engines waiting for the level crossing to open. The numbers of people in the village will increase by in excess of 1500 and there does not appear to be a proposal to improve the infrastructure in any meaningful way. The already overstretched surgery who are already struggling to recruit new GP's will become less likely to cope. The schools do not have the capacity to expand without encroaching on the already limited playground or playing field provisions. The feel that Wool is a village will disappear forever. Purbeck Gate was supposed to be the limit of the expansion. Further development on the proposed scale leaves me in little doubt that in a another 5 or 10 years there will be a proposal for even more housing. Where will it end? If the same or different landowner is prepared to sell their land will it not be seen as another opportunity to build more houses?
- WS 123**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      More development - resulting in the area becoming heavily congested and causing the infrastructure to collapse  
Overburdened schools and doctors surgery  
Degradation of the natural environment
- WS 124**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      More development - resulting in the area becoming heavily congested and causing the infrastructure to collapse  
Overburdened schools and doctors surgery  
Degradation of the natural environment
- WS 125**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Wool turned into a town (even worse a commuter town)  
Unnecessary houses that won't help locals  
A supermarket
- WS 126**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      More houses being built
- WS 127**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Underage drinking and weed smoking. Chavs on scooters/mopeds
- WS 128**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Too many houses that aren't affordable for local people
- WS 129**      **WOULDN'T LIKE**      Another Purbeck Gate style development  
Holiday/ second homes - kills villages and communities.

- WS 130      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      We don't need or want loads of new houses. A select few is fine but not at the level proposed.
- WS 131      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Better services for the elderly.  
More traffic  
More housing will mean bigger pressures on the community, schools, amenities ie doctors.  
Change to the small community
- WS 132      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      We do need good facilities but I do also think we can improve and/or extend some of the things that we already have to give better provision rather necessarily doubling up and perhaps having things that people don't use.  
I believe good care of older people is essential but although there isn't a care home in the parish I'm not convinced with the available provision in Wareham, Sandford and Dorchester that one is needed in Wool, certainly not a large one anyway.  
Lots more development without the necessary facilities and infrastructure to support it.
- WS 133      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      I'm not sure how to answer this! Nobody wants to see a riot, or graffiti, but I'm sure that isn't what this question means!
- WS 134      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      More houses. More traffic. A supermarket
- WS 135      *WOULDN'T LIKE*      Anything that goes towards making our villages into towns! For example high rise builds, supermarkets.  
Large housing above 3 bedrooms. Wool has a high proportion of homes above 3 bedrooms that people can not afford so building more is unnecessary.  
The surrounding fields all built on - let's keep building to the absolute minimum!  
Housing estates that are crammed: space is needed for wellbeing, particularly green space, and for access by emergency vehicles and refuse collection.  
Current accessible green spaces destroyed.  
Current, well established hedgerows destroyed in favour of fencing or planting anew. These hedgerows serve as vital corridors for wildlife and absorb a lot of water during heavy rain.