

For office use only

Batch number: _____ Received: _____

Representor ID # _____ Ack: _____

Representation # _____

NORTH DORSET LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

Issues and Options Consultation

27 November 2017 to 22 January 2018

Response Form

As part of the Local Plan Review (LPR), North Dorset District Council has prepared an Issues and Options Document for consultation. The Issues and Options Document, the Sustainability Appraisal and associated documents can be viewed online via:

<https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/planning/north-dorset/planning-policy>

Please return completed forms to:

Email: planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk

Post: Planning Policy (North Dorset), South Walks House, South Walks Road, Dorchester, DT1 1UZ

Deadline: 5pm on 22 January 2018. Representations received after this time may not be accepted.

Part A – Personal details

This part of the form must be completed by all people making representations as **anonymous comments cannot be accepted**. By submitting this response form you consent to your information being disclosed to third parties for this purpose. Personal details will not be visible on our website, although they will be shown on paper copies that will be available for inspection by members of the public and other interested parties.

*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name, Job Title and Organisation boxes in the personal details but complete the full contact details of the agent including email address. All correspondence will be sent to the agent.

Personal Details*		Agent's Details (if applicable)*
Title	Dr	
First Name	Richard	
Last Name	Tippins	
Job Title(<i>where</i>)		
Organisation (<i>where relevant</i>)		
Address	<div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 15px;"></div>	
Postcode	<div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 15px;"></div>	
Tel. No.	<div style="background-color: black; width: 150px; height: 15px;"></div>	
Email Address	<div style="background-color: black; width: 150px; height: 15px;"></div>	

Part B – Representations

Please answer as many questions or as few questions as you wish. There is a box at the end of the form where you can provide any comments that you may have.

Housing

1. Do you consider that a housing need figure of 366 dwellings a year is an appropriate figure on which to plan for housing growth in North Dorset? If not, please set out what you consider to be an appropriate figure and provide reasons for this.

No

If you have answered 'No' please set out an alternative housing figure and provide reasoning to support your answer.

I have answered 'No' because:-

- Shaftesbury as a town should be excluded from the 'Area of Search' exercise for building houses outside the designated Settlement Boundary due to the fact that Shaftesbury has exceeded the amount of houses defined NDDC Local Plan signed in Jan 2016. (Gillingham 52 houses from 2011-2017; Shaftesbury over 644 houses for the same time period).

There are some questionable figures e.g. Brownfield sites housing numbers missing for Shaftesbury, calculated under-declared by NDDC by 350 houses for Shaftesbury – 75 houses have been built in Shaftesbury, none of these numbers were in the original LP estimates of 1140 (2011-2026). Numbers missing are Churchill – 42 (nearly ready for occupation) the NDDC AMR states 32 houses for this site therefore under declared by 10, Cattle Market is on the SHLAA for 25 dwellings.

The focus for new development in North Dorset should not be Shaftesbury due to the over development on the Eastern side of Shaftesbury. Whereas Gillingham has not had any significant development in the last 5-10 years.

Where is the housing needs analysis for North Dorset – this seems to be a major omission

Employment

2. Do you consider that additional employment land should be allocated for development at Blandford as part of the Local Plan Review?

Yes

3. Do you consider that there is a need to allocate additional employment land in any other part(s) of the District?

Yes

There is a disconnect between providing land for employment and actually supplying employment into the town). Note the Land South of A30 in Shaftesbury which is designated as employment land has not attracted any serious bids in over 10 years.

Not a good idea to sell employment land to house developer – who then land banks it for housing!

Spatial Strategy

4. Do you consider that the existing spatial strategy, as set out in LPP1, should be amended to allow for some limited growth at Stalbridge, beyond just meeting local needs?

Yes

5. Do you think that the Council should consider implementing any other alternative spatial strategy through the LPR? If so, please explain your reasons why.

Yes

No

If you have answered 'Yes' please set out your alternative spatial strategy and provide reasoning to support it.

?

Blandford (Forum and St Mary)

6. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Blandford?

Yes

7. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process?

Yes

If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.

Blandford was identified as being the second town in North Dorset for housing growth after Gillingham in the 2007 sustainability report issued by NDDC. However, the town's housing development has fallen significantly short of the housing targets and as a consequence of this, NDDC have been approving planning applications in Shaftesbury as an attempt to make up the short fall of housing growth. This is not a good strategy and has led to significant infrastructure issues in Shaftesbury. (i.e lack of infrastructure)

8. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Blandford?

Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.

There should be an action plan issued by NDDC to publically state why Blandford and Gillingham are behind on their housing targets to the expense of Shaftesbury.

It's not a viable excuse to state NDDC cannot enforce developers to build houses.

Gillingham

9. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Gillingham?

Yes

10. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process?

Yes

If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.

Gillingham was identified in the 2007, NDDC Sustainability document as being the most appropriate town within North Dorset which could sustain housing growth. In the Annual Monitoring Report 2017, it is clear that there is a serious problem with Gillingham and underperforming on housing growth.

11. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Gillingham?

Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.

Current infrastructure can support several thousand more houses in Gillingham

Shaftesbury

12. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Shaftesbury?

No

13. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process?

Yes

If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.

Shaftesbury is a unique hilltop town with unparalleled views of countryside merging into town and beyond. This will be threatened by any development going beyond the existing town settlement boundaries and impact upon the economy, tourism and well-being of inhabitants in Shaftesbury.

There needs to be a green belt which prevents Gillingham, Motcombe and Shaftesbury becoming one large conurbation.

- Shaftesbury as a town should be excluded from the 'Area of Search' exercise for building houses outside the designated Settlement Boundary due to the fact that Shaftesbury has been building houses at a rate faster than defined in the original Local Plan signed in Jan 2016.

- The rate of housing growth for Shaftesbury is 10 times faster than Gillingham (2011-2016 Gillingham 52 houses versus Shaftesbury 644 houses for the same period). Gillingham was nominated as the 1st sustainable town in 2007 NDDC assessment for housing growth based on the fact it has a Station and Community Leisure Facility. Blandford was ranked second, because its town already supported over 11,000 people and has a Community Leisure Facility.
- Shaftesbury was ranked third for growth sustainability in May 2007 NDDC Sustainability Report with population over 7,000, but is currently growing and predicted to grow at the fastest rate. Gillingham's housing growth over the next 5 years is predicted to be 233 houses versus 401 for Shaftesbury.
- North Dorset District Council should only be undertaking the 'Area of Search' exercise for towns that have proven 'sustainability' infrastructure and also have missed the housing build targets. NDDC should be concentrating on the Area of Search on Gillingham as a priority and exclude Shaftesbury until 2022/2026.
- certain areas identified for housing development are actually in Wiltshire, or in fact outside the Shaftesbury Parish Boundary, outside the Settlement Boundary and outside the Shaftesbury designated area for Neighbourhood plan, into Motcombe or Mebury Abbas/Cann which means the new housing developments will access all Shaftesbury's overloaded infrastructure [medical centre, schools, etc] while actually paying their council tax and Developers Contributions (s106) to other authorities.
- The proposed additional Shaftesbury housing is to compensate for Gillingham's shortfall in building new houses. This is unacceptable.
- Some of the proposed development areas are in protected AONB zones, which implies that NDDC wants to relax its policy regarding building in sensitive sites. Zone A, which is close to Cranbourne Chase AONB, and moves into Wiltshire should never have been included in the 'Area of Search' by NDDC Planning Policy.
- **The current settlement boundary should be retained in Shaftesbury.**
- **No further expansion on East of Shaftesbury (especially area A next to ANOB)**
- **The reserved Bypass corridor should be retained.**
- **Only brown field development should be allowed for the next local plan period. e.g cattlemarket site. There are a number of sites that have been given planning but have not yet started building (Baratt's – Littledown etc)**

14. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Shaftesbury?

Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.

Education at all levels, health provision and social services, Water supplies, sewage, employment, amenities and green space for all.

Sturminster Newton

15. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Sturminster Newton?

Yes

16. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process?

No

If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.

17. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Sturminster Newton?

Employment

Stalbridge

18. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Stalbridge?

Yes

19. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process?

No

If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.

20. What are the most important infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Stalbridge?

Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.

The Villages

21. Do you agree with the Council's proposed approach in relation to future development at the eighteen larger villages within the District or do you think that the Council should consider an alternative approach?

Yes

If you have answered 'No' please set out your alternative approach and information/reasoning behind this.

Affordable Housing

22. Do you consider that the existing reference to nine dwellings in Policy 9 of LPP1 should be removed from the policy to allow larger schemes to come forward where there is evidence of local need in excess of that which could be met by the provision of nine dwellings?

Yes

No

23. Do you consider that the existing policy approach, which seeks to prevent exception sites coming forward adjacent to the four main towns within the District, should be amended?

Yes

No

24. Do you consider that the Council should continue with its existing policy approach, which allows for a small number of market homes on rural exception sites?

Yes

No

Self-Build and Custom-Build Housing

25. Do you consider that the Council should facilitate the provision of self-build housing by any, some, or all of the following options?

Yes

No

a. Allowing serviced plots to come forward under the current development plan policies.

Yes

No

b. Updating Policy 7 (Delivering Homes) in the Local Plan Part 1 to promote the provision of serviced plots of land for self-build housing.

Yes

No

c. Requiring on sites above a certain size that serviced self-build plots should be made available as a proportion of the total number of dwellings permitted (with or without a minimum number being specified) on-site.

Yes

No

d. Allowing a proportion (up to 100%) of self-build plots on exception sites (with controls over the resale value of the properties).

Yes

No

e. Identifying land in public ownership which would be sold only for self-build development.

Yes

No

f. The use of Local Development Orders to facilitate self-build development.

Yes

No

26. Are there any other approaches that could be used to meet the demand for self-build housing?

Yes

No

If you have answered 'Yes' please outline the other approaches which the Council could pursue.

Ensuring the Vitality and Viability of Town Centres

27. Do you consider that the existing hierarchy and network of centres, as set out in LPP1, should be amended to include Stalbridge as a 'local centre'?

Yes

Important Open or Wooded Areas (IOWAs)

28. Do you agree that those IOWAs, which are protected from development by other planning policies or legislation, should be deleted?

No

The A350 Corridor

29. Do you consider that the land which is identified and safeguarded for the Shaftesbury Outer Bypass and the Charlton Marshall and Spetisbury Bypass should continue to be identified and safeguarded for such purposes?

Yes

Comments

If you have any comments about the Issues and Options Document or the Sustainability Appraisal please set them out in the box below. If your comments are in relation to a specific question or chapter of the Issues and Options Document then please state which question or chapter your comments relate to.

This form is difficult to access, understand and complete so we feel consultation is not welcome

- The Sustainability Appraisal seems to have been largely ignored
- Health and Well-being (e.g. walkers, dog walkers, cyclists, the needs of children and teenagers) have been ignored
- Wildlife, particularly wildlife corridors, and Shaftesbury's natural richness has been ignored
- Some land already acquired for development has not been developed and this has been ignored
- Some developments which have taken place have not provided the promised amenities or infrastructure and this has been ignored.

We need to ensure PROPER consultation takes place with all local people to see what the Shaftesbury community actually needs and wants.

- this consultation appears to have been started prematurely, it should have occurred after NDDC issued the Annual Monitoring Report 2017 and the 'Area of Search' should have been based on which towns are not full-filling their housing build obligations. - Proposing to build outside the Settlement Boundary and outside Shaftesbury Parish Council for Shaftesbury is making a nonsense of the Designated Neighbourhood Plan area, which is only applicable to Shaftesbury Parish Council Boundary.

Producing a plan for increased housing without conducting a housing needs analysis seems to be a flawed approach.

[Empty rectangular box for signature or stamp]

Do you wish to be contacted about future consultations relating to the Local Plan Review?

Yes

Signature: Richard Tippins

Date: 22/01/2018

If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.

When completed please send form to planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk