

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	Ms	
First Name	Sheila	
Last Name	Brown	
Job Title(<i>where</i>)	■■■■	
Organisation (<i>where relevant</i>)	■■■■	
Address	■■■■■■■■■■ ■■■■■■■■■■	
Postcode	■■■■■■	
Tel. No.	■■■■■■■■■■	
Email Address	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■	

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.

Yes

No

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

Not something I can really provide, insofar as it is a figure which is imposed upon us. But since we are told that there has been an undersupply for the last however many years, presumably you need to play catchup, not simply add in proportion to the original figure. You have not provided a comment box on the questions 2 and 3, but clearly if there is more housing, and the original Local Plan allocated sufficient employment, more will be needed to cater for the extra numbers seeking work. Employment land in Blandford does at last appear to be being taken up, so the conclusion has to be that more is needed. Similarly across the district.

Employment

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

No

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

No

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

No

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

The suggestion of development off Tin Pot Lane seems fine until you consider that it is an unclassified road which already serves a very busy industrial estate due to the failure of local authorities to secure the link road through Blandford Heights into Clump Farm.

The suggestion of development west of Blandford St Mary, together with the deletion of the protected route of the Spetisbury/Charlton Marshall bypass, removes any possibility of removing an increasing amount of traffic on the already inadequate A350. Current proposals for Charlton Marshall are already raising significant concerns on those grounds, as have those for the St Mary's Hill site at Blandford St Mary. No doubt the Highway Authority will declare that its fine, as they have done with those already in the planning process, but experience (and particularly that of the temporary closure of the Blandford roadbridge and peak hour traffic on the single carriageway Blandford bypass) suggests otherwise.

It would have been helpful to know how many homes the sites being put forward can actually accommodate, and whether and where the total required is likely to be met. Also the total required around Blandford (as opposed to across the whole of North Dorset)I asked at the consultation at Nordon but was given no answer.

It would also be interesting to know why you are now promoting sites A/B having objected to them as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process.

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.

Health services are already raising objections to further development in the absence of further surgery facilities. (See recent application for Charlton Marshall).

Education services have already indicated the need for a new primary school. Maybe they'll need two, and a bigger secondary school?

As noted above, the roads have difficulty in taking extra traffic. Public transport is a joke, so any suggestion that people are going to use it to get to wherever they want to get to at the right time is unrealistic – particularly when you consider that most people already have a car. So, as noted above, better provision for private transport. And walking and cycling links – most of the suggested sites no doubt are relying on the North Dorset Trailway, so a bit of investment there as well as on public rights of way beyond the actual development sites.

The Leisure Centre is in danger of losing subsidy, and sports facilities will need extra capacity.

Gillingham

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

Yes

No

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

No

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

No real experience of this area so unable to answer questions 9 and 10.

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.

See above

Shaftesbury

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

Yes

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

No

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

As above (questions 10 and 11)

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.

See above (questions 10 to 13)

Sturminster Newton

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

Yes

No

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?

Yes

No

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

See above (questions 10 to 14)

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

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

See above (questions 10 to 16)

Stalbridge

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

Yes

No

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?

Yes

No

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

See above (questions 10 to 18)

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.

See above (questions 10 to 18)

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

No

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

No

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?

Yes

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

No

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.

Question 22: Any specific number is invidious. If ten are needed and the limit is nine, what happens to the last person in the queue?

Question 25: The answers largely depend on the demand for self-build, which appears to have been limited in this area.

Question 27: Some of the larger villages are, or could be, arguably more sustainable than Stalbridge, so why single it out?

Question 28: A blanket removal would be unreasonable. I seem to remember you were meant to be carrying out a review of IOWAs, since some are more necessary than others.

Question 29: The deletion of the Shaftesbury and Spetisbury/Charlton Marshall bypass protected corridor simply because it may not be achievable in the next 15 years would be short-sighted (given that it has been there for more than 15 years already, and that it would remove any possibility of achieving anything in the future)

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

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

Yes

No

Signature: _____

Date: _____

If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.

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