

## EXTRACT FROM AGENDA 26 MARCH 2013

Planning Policy Manager:

### Scope of the Comments

These comments are restricted to consideration of employment land issues in relation to the proposals for a 'mixed use' scheme, including an Asda superstore, off Higher Shaftesbury Lane, Blandford Forum.

The comments focus on two main issues, which are:

- the loss of employment land; and
- the merits of the proposed employment space, which forms part of the application.

### Summary of the Employment Proposals

Outline planning permission is being sought on 1.1 hectares of the site for 2,300 square metres (gross) employment floorspace. The applicant has asked for layout and access to be determined, with appearance, landscaping and scale reserved for future consideration. The application proposes 36 employment units, with a total gross internal area of 1,561 square metres. It also indicates that these units would be served by 83 parking spaces.

It was originally envisaged that the employment units would be developed in 2 phases. It was originally proposed that 16 units (446 sq. m. – 28.6% of the total gross internal area proposed) would have been delivered alongside the Asda store as the first phase, with 20 units (1,115 sq. m. – 71.4% of the total gross internal area proposed) delivered subsequently. No further detail was given in the original Planning and Retail Report on how or when these units would be delivered or on any arrangements for their future management.

The applicant's position with regard to the delivery of the employment units has changed so that none of the proposed units would now be brought forward with the Asda store, in the event that the application was approved. In effect, it is now proposed that the employment element would only come forward when the market allows.

This position has been confirmed in an e-mail from the applicant's consultant on 08 February 2013, which states *"your (i.e. the Council's) approval of Tesco's store extension altered the economics of our entire development such that my client cannot now build space and provide infrastructure until he has sufficient pre-lets in place. The position is therefore that works will commence on the Asda store (which will itself provide in the region of 300 new jobs), with the employment space only coming forward once sufficient demand has been established."* The applicant's consultant subsequently gave a revised estimate of the number of jobs that would be created by the Asda store of 240, rather than 300.

### North Dorset District Wide Local Plan Employment Policies

The proposed Asda superstore (Use Class A1) would result in the loss of part of a defined employment area where the use is restricted to Classes B1 (business), B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution) developments. The land off

Shaftesbury Lane is identified as a 'new employment allocation' (Site E/2/6) in Policy 3.2 of the North Dorset District Wide Local Plan.

Policy 3.2 indicates that Class B1, B2 and B8 uses will be permitted on the sites identified in the policy. Policy 3.3 seeks to retain existing employment areas and uses and the supporting text in paragraph 3.13 states *"In order to maintain sites in a variety of locations, all existing employment areas will be retained. Permission for change of use or redevelopment within the defined employment areas other than for business, industrial, storage or distribution use will not be permitted, except for the retailing of bulky household, agricultural or motoring goods (see Policy 3.24)."*

Land at Shaftesbury Lane is specifically allocated for 'industrial development' by Policy BL 5 (and shown on Inset Map 2) of the North Dorset District Wide Local Plan, which only permits Class B1, B2 and B8 uses on this site. These policies have been 'saved' by the Secretary of State and continue to form part of the adopted Development Plan for North Dorset.

The original Planning and Retail Report suggested that the proposed 'mixed use' scheme of an Asda supermarket together with 36 employment units accorded with the Development Plan. However, the analysis above shows that the retail element (i.e. the Asda superstore) is clearly contrary to adopted policy.

Uses that do not fall within the four main use classes (i.e. Classes A, B, C and D), such as petrol filling stations, are classified as 'sui-generis'. The petrol filling station element of the scheme is a 'sui generis' use and is also contrary to adopted policy.

### **Draft Core Strategy Employment Policies**

Draft Core Policy 6: Economy states *"existing employment sites and sites identified for future employment use will be protected from other forms of development. Only employment uses will be permitted on an employment site, unless it can be demonstrated through the Employment Land Review process that it can be released for other purposes."*

Footnote 121 defines 'employment uses' as Use Classes B1, B2 or B8. The Employment Section of Draft Core Policy 15: Blandford indicates that the employment needs of Blandford for the period up to 2026 *"will be met through ... the development of land off Shaftesbury Lane"*. The site is also shown for 'employment expansion' on Figure 2.8.1 – Blandford Inset Diagram.

Commentary on this site is provided in Paragraph 2.8.12. This states *"The (North Dorset District Wide) Local Plan also allocates 5.1 hectares of employment land off Shaftesbury Lane. A single user has permission for the development of most of the site, but it is no longer required for this purpose. The site will, therefore, be brought forward for development by other businesses."*

Paragraph 3.65 of the original Planning and Retail Statement stated that the provision of the Asda superstore would accord with the Employment Section of Draft Core Policy 15: Blandford. This is not the case, since the superstore is a Class A1 use and therefore does not fall within the definition of 'employment uses'

used in the Draft Core Strategy (see footnote 121 on page 82). Separate provision for 'retail and other town centre uses' is made in each of the draft core policies for the District's four main towns (including Blandford), in accordance with the Council's spatial approach to maintaining thriving market towns (which is explained in more detail below). Draft Core Policy 15: Blandford does not envisage retail or other town centre uses on the land off Shaftesbury Lane.

One of the objectives of the Draft Core Strategy is to maintain thriving market towns. Paragraph 2.4.46 of the Draft Core Strategy indicates that *"the Council will work in partnership with businesses and the community to match the provision of jobs and employment land with housing growth with the aim of achieving more self-contained sustainable settlements, where the need for residents to commute to find suitable employment is reduced."*

Paragraph 2.4.47 sets out the three key elements of the strategic approach in relation to the District's three main towns (including Blandford), which are: to identify and bring forward key strategic sites for B-Class uses (such as the site off Shaftesbury Lane); to identify and bring forward mixed use regeneration sites on the edge of existing town centres with a focus on office and non B-Class employment uses; and to continue to improve town centres as the main focus for retail and leisure activities. Notwithstanding the retail impact issues, the loss of a significant proportion of the site off Shaftesbury Lane to non B-Class uses would not be in accordance with the strategic approach to maintaining thriving market towns in North Dorset.

The analysis above shows that the retail element (i.e. the Asda superstore) is clearly contrary to emerging policy in the Draft Core Strategy. The petrol filling station element of the scheme is also contrary to emerging policy in the Draft Core Strategy.

### **Consultation on Key Issues for the Revision of the Draft Core Strategy**

The Draft Core Strategy, which was produced in March 2010, was prepared to be in general conformity with the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West (emerging RSS). Since then the planning system has been reformed and there has been a major economic downturn. In October 2012, the District Council consulted the public on how the Draft Core Strategy should be revised to take account of these (and other) changes.

The issue of employment land was discussed in Section 5 of the 'Key Issues' consultation document. Updated job and employment land projections show that existing available employment land already exceeds the identified need over the next 20 years. The land off Shaftesbury Lane, Blandford is identified as one of the five 'large sites' that provide 32.8 of the 49.6 hectares of available land.

In the light of this situation, the Council indicated that it was not intending to identify or allocate any further employment sites in the revised Core Strategy. Views were also sought on whether the Council should allow a more flexible approach on employment sites to allow other uses that provide employment, but do not fall within the B-Class use definitions. However, the supporting text makes it clear that *"large-scale retail and any housing development would not be permitted on such sites"*.

The Autumn 2012 consultation on 'key issues' shows how the Council intends to move forward with policy in the light of the reforms of the planning system and the economic downturn. The retail element of the application (i.e. the Asda superstore) is clearly contrary to the suggested policy approach to development on employment sites, as set out in the 'Key Issues' consultation document. In the event that a more flexible approach is taken to non B-Class employment generating uses on employment sites, the Council would need to consider whether any revised policy should support the provision of petrol filling stations on such sites. Until a revised policy is produced, it is not clear whether the petrol filling station element would accord with, or be contrary to, the policy approach to development on employment sites set out in the 'Key Issues' consultation document.

### **Employment Land Review**

The Council undertook a review of the existing and allocated employment sites identified in the North Dorset District Wide Local Plan in 2007. These sites were assessed against market attractiveness, sustainable development and strategic planning factors. On the basis of this analysis certain sites were identified for retention, whereas others were identified for further investigation or to be released as employment sites. The employment land off Shaftesbury Lane was assessed through the review of existing sites and it was concluded that it should be retained as an employment site.

The Employment Land Review: Review of Existing Sites included a review of employment site boundaries. The purpose of the review was to identify the extent of concentrations of non-conforming (i.e. non B-Class) uses on employment sites identified in the North Dorset District Wide Local Plan. Since there were no non B-Class uses on the site off Shaftesbury Lane, the site boundary was not subject to review.

The land off Shaftesbury Lane (Site E/2/6) is identified as an employment site to be retained in Table 18 on page 33 of the Employment Land Review.

### **Proposed Employment Units – Potential Additional Job Generation and Delivery**

The original Planning and Retail report contained very little detail on how the proposed employment units would be delivered or managed. Further information was set out in a subsequent letter submitted by the applicant on 12 January 2012. This now appears to have been superseded by e-mails written by the applicant's consultants on 08 February 2013.

In the letter of 12 January 2012, the applicant took the view that the proposed development did not conflict with policy. In the light of that position, the letter discussed the proposals for the employment units on their merits, rather than in terms of 'mitigation' to offset the harm caused by the loss of employment land to non B-class uses. The e-mail of 08 February 2013, notes that the consultant's client (i.e. the applicant) was surprised that the issue of the loss of employment land had been raised. This suggests that the applicant's position remains unchanged.

The applicant's letter of 12 January 2012 gave an indication of the potential maximum number of jobs that could be generated by the 36 employment units, but it did not give an estimate of the number that might realistically be provided. The letter estimated that each unit might give rise to '2 or 3' jobs and on that basis gave a maximum of 108 potential jobs (i.e. 36 x 3). However, this maximum: assumed the 'high end' of the notional employment density for all units; could not be achieved without the delivery of both phases; and made no allowance for vacancies, either due to adverse economic conditions or due to the turnover of businesses in the units. Also the potential maximum figure drew no distinction between full and part time jobs.

More fundamentally, the employment units would need to be constructed and made available to businesses for any jobs to be created. There was considerable uncertainty about how or whether delivery of the units would be achieved, even when the applicant intended to bring forward 16 units (totalling 446 sq. m. or 28.6% of the total gross internal area proposed) alongside the Asda superstore. Since no units will now be delivered alongside the Asda superstore, there is greater uncertainty about how or whether the units would be delivered.

The letter of 12 January 2012 indicated that the B1, B2 and B8 employment units would not be viable without the supermarket. It stated that the units would be effectively 'cross-subsidised' by the retail development, although the extent to which the delivery of the two elements of the scheme would be linked was not made clear. No evidence of the lack of viability of the units was provided and the level of subsidy that would have been made available at that time was not made clear. The letter of 12 January 2012 also indicated that a 'substantial marketing budget' would have been made available to market the units once provided, but again no detail was provided.

The e-mail of 08 February 2013 indicated that the Council's approval of Tesco's store extension altered the economics of the entire development such that the applicant could not now build space and provide infrastructure until there were sufficient pre-lets in place. No evidence has been provided of: how the viability of the provision of the employment units may have changed since early 2012; or of how the Council's approval of Tesco's store extension has altered the economics of the development as a whole.

For the reasons set out above, it is considered that the retail and petrol filling station element of the proposed development are contrary to adopted and emerging planning policy. The provision of employment units alongside the proposed supermarket to create additional jobs could potentially have been viewed as 'mitigation' to offset the harm caused by the loss of employment land to non B-class uses. However, the notional additional job creation potential seems unrealistically high and there is no certainty that the employment units would be delivered, especially in the light of the e-mail of 08 February 2013, which confirms the applicant's current position that no employment units will be brought forward with the proposed Asda superstore. On that basis, the employment unit element of the scheme cannot be considered to mitigate for the loss of employment land in any way.

## **Planning Policy Comments on Letter from RPS Dated 22 February 2013**

### **The Roles of the Planning System**

The letter begins by outlining the three main roles of the planning system (economic, social and environmental) in delivering sustainable development, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and seeks to demonstrate how the proposed development accords with these roles.

The letter states that, as part of its **economic role** planning should, *inter alia*, contribute to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy and support growth and innovation. It argues that the proposed development accords with these aims by bringing forward a mixed use development on a site that has not previously been developed and which will provide improved choice and competition and a number of new jobs.

The letter omits part of the wording from the NPPF in relation to planning's economic role. The NPPF states that planning should contribute to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy "*by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time*" to support growth and innovation. The application site is identified in the adopted Local Plan and the emerging Core Strategy for employment uses (i.e. Use Classes B1, B2 and B8). The Council aims to maintain thriving market towns in the District by developing key strategic sites for Class B uses (such as this site), developing mixed use sites for office and non-Class B uses on the edge of existing town centres and improving town centres as the main focus for retail and leisure activities. The proposed development does not accord with this strategy and would better used for employment development to support the growth of Blandford in the period up to 2026.

The letter indicates that despite having previously been granted planning permission for Class B uses, the site has never been developed. Three key points need to be made to clarify the situation. Firstly, planning permission was granted for Class B uses to the current owner and there was a clear expectation that Hospital Metalcraft would consolidate their activities on this site. These Class B uses did not come forward on the application site because the consolidation of activities by Hospital Metalcraft took place on other land which forms part of Blandford Heights Industrial Estate. Secondly, the provision of junction improvements was a prerequisite of the land being developed for employment purposes. The lack of this necessary infrastructure (i.e. the traffic lights at the entrance to the site) was a barrier to the site being developed prior to its provision. Thirdly, although the application site itself has not been developed, it forms part of a larger site which was allocated in the adopted Local Plan for employment purposes (E/2/6), on which some development has taken place (i.e. the Glenmore development) since the provision of the necessary transport infrastructure.

The letter states that, as part of its **social role**, planning should support strong, vibrant and healthy communities by, *inter alia*, creating a high quality built environment and accessible local services that reflect a community's needs and supports its health, social and cultural well-being. It argues that the proposed development accords with these aims by competing with the town's Tesco store and 'clawing back' trade that is leaking away to stores elsewhere (e.g. in Poole). Whilst the proposed ASDA store would compete with Tesco, it would also compete with stores in the town centre and it is accepted later in the letter that there will be adverse impacts on the town centre in relation to convenience goods. In the event that the ASDA store is permitted and built, it seems likely that the extent to which it would be able to 'claw back' trade from elsewhere would be limited to some extent by the 'claw back' that would be achieved by the Tesco store extension.

The letter argues that the proposed development accords with Government's aims in relation to planning's **environmental role** by being well designed and landscaped "*to minimise the impact on the AONB to the north*". This statement is factually incorrect as the application site is located wholly within the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB. The proposed development therefore needs to be considered in the context of paragraph 116 of the NPPF and any relevant policies relating to AONBs and the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB.

### **The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development**

The letter refers to the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF and seeks to summarise how that should be applied to decision-making. The summary does not fully reflect the way in which the presumption should be applied in decision-making, as set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF. For the avoidance of doubt the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan and the 'saved policies' of the 2003 District-wide Local Plan continue to form part of the development plan for North Dorset. Weight should be attached to its policies in accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF (i.e. weight should be given on the basis of the degree of consistency with the NPPF).

### **Sequential Test and Retail Impact Assessment**

I understand that a sequential test and a retail impact assessment have been undertaken. I note that Mark Wood is considering these and have no comments to make on their content.

### **Potential Additional Job Creation Associated with the Proposed Employment Units**

I have already commented on the potential additional job creation associated with the proposed employment units. I note that in the letter it indicates that "*up to 108*" jobs will be provided in the employment units. I remain of the view that the notional additional job creation potential seems unrealistically high. There is no certainty

that the employment units would be delivered, especially in the light of the applicant's current position that no employment units will be brought forward with the proposed ASDA superstore.

### **Loss of Employment Land – Viability and Extant Consent**

The letter states that *“in the current economic climate, the development of the site wholly for employment uses is not viable, as demonstrated by the failure to implement the extant consent”*.

The draft Core Strategy indicates that this land will be developed for Class B uses to meet the employment needs of Blandford in the period up to 2026, including the employment needs of the residents of new housing which is proposed at the town. A longer term view needs to be taken to ensure that future Class B employment needs can be met. No evidence has been submitted to support the claim that the development of the site wholly for employment uses is not viable, either in the short term or over the Plan period.

Failure to implement the extant consent does not demonstrate a lack of viability of employment on this site. The consented scheme was not implemented because the owner (Hospital Metalcraft) was able to meet the firm's needs for expansion on other land within the Blandford Heights Industrial Estate. Adjacent land (the Glenmore development) has consent and has been partially implemented.

### **Loss of Employment Land – Policy Position in Relation to Sectoral Change**

The letter refers to a statement in the draft Core Strategy about sectoral change and the increase in jobs in non-Class B uses, including retail. This change is recognised in paragraph 2.4.52 of the draft Core Strategy, but this paragraph also proposes that the policy solution should be for regeneration schemes close to town centres, rather than allowing non-Class B uses, such as retail, on employment sites.

### **Loss of Employment Land – Key Site Status in the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Workspace Strategy and Development Plan**

The letter notes that the land on which the Tesco extension has been approved was identified as a 'key site' in the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Workspace Strategy and Development Plan, produced by GVA Grimley in 2008, but that the site on which the ASDA superstore is proposed has no such designation.

In the 2008 Workspace Strategy the employment land demand is based on a macro-economic forecast that assumes 3.2% GVA growth. This is the same as the assumed rate of growth in the RSS Proposed Changes. The 2008 Workspace Strategy looked at both the demand for and the supply of employment land overall and for each District to meet this projected rate of economic growth. It identified a need for 25.3 hectares of employment land in North Dorset (for B-Class uses only)



during the period 2006 to 2026. It also identified a supply of 42.9 hectares of employment land, which included both sites with planning permission and allocated sites in the Local Plan.

North Dorset's 2007 Employment Land Review (ELR) found that the vast majority of employment sites in North Dorset were fit for purpose and also identified opportunities for mixed-use regeneration, generally in locations close to town centres, which could help to meet the needs for offices and non-B Class employment uses.

The Delivery Plan element of the 2008 GVA Grimley study also identified a series of 'key sites' for a closer assessment. Essentially the purpose of this analysis was to try and identify the constraints that vacant, available and relatively large sites face in being brought forward (as explained in paragraphs 11.1 to 11.6 of the GVA Grimley study). The site at The Brewery and Stour Park is identified as one with 'local physical constraints' and those issues are discussed in more detail in Appendix B of the study.

The site off Shaftesbury Lane, Blandford is identified as an 'available site' in Appendix A of the study. However, at the time it was envisaged that the site would be used for the relocation and expansion of Hospital Metalcraft in accordance with the relevant planning permission. Since the intention at the time was that the site would be developed by a single user that already owned the site and had their existing operation on the opposite side of Shaftesbury Lane, there was no need for GVA Grimley to assess the potential blockages to delivery through their study.

Given the circumstances at the time and taking account of the role of the Delivery Plan, it should be no surprise that it was not identified as a key site for closer assessment of delivery issues in the 2008 GVA Grimley study.

In the draft Core Strategy the Council clearly envisages this site having a role in meeting Blandford's Class B employment needs, which also recognises that the Hospital Metalcraft scheme will not now come forward.

The Employment Section of Draft Core Policy 15: Blandford indicates that the employment needs of Blandford for the period up to 2026 "*will be met through ... the development of land off Shaftesbury Lane*". The site is also shown for 'employment expansion' on Figure 2.8.1 – Blandford Inset Diagram.

Commentary on this site is provided in Paragraph 2.8.12. This states "*The (North Dorset District Wide) Local Plan also allocates 5.1 hectares of employment land off Shaftesbury Lane. A single user has permission for the development of most of the site, but it is no longer required for this purpose. The site will, therefore, be brought forward for development by other businesses.*"

## Loss of Employment Land – Updated Employment Land Projections

The letter points out that the recent updated employment land projections identify a requirement for about 30 hectares of employment land in North Dorset over the next 20 years and that a supply of 50 hectares is already available.

In October 2012, the Council consulted on key issues for the revision of the draft Core Strategy. A table in the main consultation document (reproduced below) shows the total land available, by town, and lists the available large sites at the District's four main towns.

<b>North Dorset Available Employment Land April 2011</b>		
<b>Location</b>	<b>Available land (ha)</b>	<b>Land available on large sites (ha)</b>
Blandford	10.3	The Brewery – 3.0; Land off Shaftesbury Lane – 4.8
Gillingham	17.5	Brickfields Business Park – 11.7
Shaftesbury	8.4	Land South of the A30 – 7.0
Sturminster Newton	6.7	North Dorset Business Park – 6.3
Stalbridge and the rural area	6.7	
<b>Total</b>	<b>49.6</b>	<b>32.8</b>

Although the District-wide supply of employment land exceeds demand, the “Land off Shaftesbury Lane” site (which includes land outside the application site) is important in enabling Blandford to meet its future employment needs. The table shows that the “Land off Shaftesbury Lane” site represents about half of the total available employment land in Blandford. It is also important to offer a range and spread of sites across the District, both to meet the needs of different businesses and to enable each town to meet its own employment needs. This is particularly important for Blandford, which is the only town in the south of the District, serving a comparatively large rural hinterland, as evidenced in the District's spatial portrait in the draft Core Strategy.

In the light of the fact that the level of supply is above projected future need, the Council is considering taking forward a more flexible approach to non-Class B uses on employment site, but this would not permit large-scale retail developments, such as the proposed ASDA superstore. Paragraph 5.15 of its recent consultation document on key issues for the revision of the draft Core Strategy indicated that provision of small-scale ancillary retail could help to support business on employment sites, but it also made clear that a more flexible approach “*could potentially lead to pressure for inappropriate developments and any revised policy would make it clear that large-scale retail and any housing development would not be permitted on such sites*”.

## Loss of Employment Land – NPPF Policy on the Long Term Protection of Employment Land

The letter refers to the NPPF and states that it *“makes explicit reference to the need to avoid long term protection of employment land and for alternative uses to be treated on their merits, having regard to market signals and the need for different land uses”*. What the NPPF actually says is *“where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.”*

The key phrase in this respect is *“where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use”*. There is clearly a reasonable prospect of the “Land off Shaftesbury Lane” site being used for employment uses. Firstly, it was assessed against a range of market attractiveness, sustainable development and strategic planning factors in the Council’s 2007 Employment Land Review: Review of Existing Sites and identified for retention as an employment site on the basis of that assessment. Secondly, the site has a history of planning applications for employment development being made on it. This includes both the Hospital Metalcraft permission for the application site and the application for the Glenmore development, which has been partially implemented. Thirdly, an essential prerequisite for the development of the site (i.e. the traffic lights on the site access), which may have been a barrier to employment development in the past, has been provided.

### Appeal Decisions

I have read the commentary provided in the letter on the seven appeals decisions, but I have not read any of the decision letters in full. Without doing so I am reluctant to express a view on whether any of them are relevant to the application or the policy issues set out above. However, I have made a few points on the information provided.

- Five of the seven appeal decisions listed (No.s 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7) do not relate to food stores on employment sites and of the two that do (No.s 4 and 6), one was dismissed. The dismissed appeal (No. 4) relates to a ‘small supermarket’ (i.e. not a superstore) and makes reference to a statement in the draft NPPF (i.e. *“the answer to development and growth should wherever possible be ‘yes’”*), which did not appear in the final version.
- Two of the appeal decisions relate to Class D2 (assembly and leisure) uses, one relates to a non-food retail unit, one relates to a care home and another to a hotel. None of these uses are directly comparable to the food store proposed on the application site. If the Council decides to adopt a more flexible approach to uses on employment sites in the revised Core Strategy, it will need to

consider whether its revised policies relating to the economy should permit uses such as assembly and leisure, care homes or hotels.

- Five of the appeal decisions (No.s 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7) make reference to PPS 4, which is no longer extant as it has been replaced by the NPPF.
- In appeal No. 1 there appears to be uncertainty about how the term 'employment use' is defined in policy and in the absence of the necessary clarity, the Inspector came to his own view. No such problem exists in North Dorset since the adopted Local Plan and the draft Core Strategy both make it clear that 'employment uses' mean Use Classes B1, B2 and B8.

#### Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB:

No objection.

#### Civic Society:

A supermarket and petrol filling station on the north side of the town would create better services area, and we welcome the provision of jobs. Access should be from the traffic lights in Shaftesbury Lane that have already been constructed, and the layout is appropriate.

#### Representations:

9 letters of objection have been received containing the following summarised points;

- The development would have a detrimental effect on the economy and life of the town centre and would be further unfair competition for independent small retailers,
- Another out of town supermarket would be likely to lead to more small shops closing in the town centre that would lead to a loss of jobs,
- The site is not in walking distance of the centre and there are no links,
- Concerns in relation to the impact of development on the character and rural feel of the town,
- Concerns that Morrisons and Co-op will be forced to close affecting the most vulnerable ,
- Concerns the net effect would be less jobs when other business fails,
- The site is designated for industrial units for news business,
- Concerns over road safety, a footbridge should be provided over the bypass to serve the Sunrise Business Park,
- Blandford is already well catered for, town centre traders are in a precarious situation and the proposal will have a severe detrimental effect on town centre trade,
- The Portas Review of the high street should be considered,
- Concerns over the proximity of the development to the new housing estate and noise from deliveries,
- Would not like to go back to a town centre with no centrally located supermarket.