

Participant	Nicole Stacey / David Seaton (PCL Planning)	Rep ID	3085
		Date response received	15 th May 2015
Representing	Sherborne School & Cancer Research UK	Response reference number	MHD036
MHD / Change reference commented on	MHD003 MHD008 MHD009 MHD006 MHD007		
Summary of comment	<p>Support the provision of a detailed housing trajectory (MHD003 & MHD008).Concerns regarding the delivery of sites. Object to the inclusion of sites in the 5-year housing land supply on the basis of pre-application discussions i.e. Gillingham Care Home. Trajectory does not reflect lead in time and build out rates i.e the Brewery Site, Blandford & Gillingham Southern Extension. Propose adjusting SSA delivery rate down and allocate additional sites at Gillingham. Other examples include land adjacent Wincombe Business Park and Littledown, Shaftesbury.</p> <p>Object to the note on the delivery of affordable housing (MHD009). The Council has failed to place sufficient weight on meeting identified affordable housing needs. The Council have failed to correlate their identified need with projections of assessed need, since the annual identified need for additional affordable housing per annum (387 dpa) exceeds the total level of housing proposed (285 dpa). Unclear why the private rental sector plays such an important role in meeting affordable housing need and that potentially freeing up some of these units would create ‘significant problems’ in the wider housing market. Seek to identify affordable housing sites in the four main towns to reflect location of greatest need. The delivery of affordable housing exceptions sites through NP is insufficiently robust. The Council has failed to demonstrate why an increase in the total housing figure would not deliver the required number of affordable homes.</p> <p>Support the extension of the Plan period to 2031 (MHD006).</p> <p>Support the recognition (MHD006, paragraph 2.4) that LP1 should make provision for additional development over any extended period.</p> <p>Object to the inclusion of broad directions for growth within the first five years of the housing trajectory and failure to allocate sites (MHD006). Consideration should be given to including additional site allocations, in order to provide greater certainty and clarity on the delivery of development.</p>		

	<p>Support the principle for an early review of the Local Plan (MHD006). The Council has not supplied a timetable for the preparation of the new SHMA and the consequences for preparing Local Plan Part 2 and its relationship with Part1. The Council should look to formally amend settlement boundaries at the main towns (to include additional sites) and should not look to defer the allocation of sites until LP2.</p> <p>Support the approach to retain settlement boundaries at a number of more sustainable villages in order to allow infill development (MHD007). Concern raised that the Councils evidence (MHD007A) is insufficient to provide an indicative strategy for growth in the rural areas. i.e. suggest levels of growth for individual MVS.</p> <p>Object to paragraph 4.9 of MHD007 that seeks to discourage (but not exclude) communities from preparing NDP as this is not the role of the LPA.</p>
<p>Council's response</p>	<p>Support for all points raised above is noted.</p> <p>Points of clarification:</p> <p>The delivery of sites through the housing trajectory is based on the most update information available.</p> <p>The delivery of affordable housing is discussed in note (MHD009) and specific reference to increasing the Objective Assessed Need (OAN) is made in MHD010 Satnam vs Warrington.</p> <p>Broad directions for growth appear in the five year land supply on where a planning application has been granted, received or pre-application discussions are on-going, demonstrating a commitment from the developer.</p> <p>The relationship between the LP Part 1 and Part 2 is discussed in MHD006. Allocation of sites and amendment of settlement boundaries will occur in LP Part 2.</p> <p>The LP Part 1 seeks to identify an overall need for rural areas with the anticipation that either LP Part 2 or NDP will determine locally derived need for individual MSVs.</p> <p>The District Council will support all communities in the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans.</p>
<p>Conclusions</p>	<p>The comments made by Ms Stacey / Mr Seaton of PCL Planning on behalf of Sherborne School & Cancer Research UK are noted but do not raise new points not already covered in evidence and previous discussions.</p> <p>No further action required.</p>