

NORTH DORSET LOCAL PLAN 2011 – 2026 PART 1 EXAMINATION

HEARING STATEMENT

ISSUE 9

Shaftesbury

March 2015

Question 9.1: Is there any evidence that the proposed residential development sites in Shaftesbury, including the development of land to the east of the town; to the south-east of Wincombe Business Park; and to the west of the A350 are not available, sustainable or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

- 1.1 The Council is not aware of any evidence that the proposed residential development sites in Shaftesbury are not available, sustainable or deliverable.
- 1.2 The development of land to the east of the town is an existing allocation in the 2003 Local Plan and therefore is considered to be available, sustainable and deliverable. Outline planning permission (2/2002/0415) was granted in May 2007 following a call-in by SoS and subsequent reserved matter applications have been approved. Since 2009 446 dwellings have been delivered on the site of which 326 are in the 2011 to 2026 Local Plan Part 1 plan period. The land is controlled by Persimmon Homes (South Coast) and pre-application discussions have indicated that reserved matter applications are expected soon for Phases 6 and 7 and as such these have been included in the 5 year housing land supply (AMR 2014). A summary of progress on the site is included as Appendix 1.
- 1.3 The development of land to the south-east of Wincombe Business Park is considered available as it has been assessed as part of the SHLAA (2/45/0463). The land is controlled by a developer (Barratt David Wilson Homes) and a full planning application (2/2014/1350) for 179 dwellings has been submitted. The application includes part of the land to the East of Shaftesbury known as the Hopkins Land that is also included in the SHLAA (2/45/0507). The site is considered deliverable as it is available now, it is suitable, there is a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered within five years and development of the site is viable. The site is sustainable as the North and north East Dorset Transportation Study (N&nETS) (INF009) concluded that this site (SHAF 2) was the most accessible, that it benefitted from potential for good access to Shaftesbury Primary School and that it was relatively near to employment sites.
- 1.4 The development of land to the west of A350 is also considered to be available as the site is included in the SHLAA (2/45/0550). The developer, Gleeson Strategic Land, have expressed an intention to develop the site and pre-application meetings have taken place with the Council and AONB officers. The developer has also sought an EIA screening opinion (2/2014/0925) under Regulation 2 and the conclusion drawn by the Council was that although the majority of the site lies within AONB it is not EIA development within the meaning of the Regulations. The Council consider the site to be deliverable as it is available now, it offers a suitable location for development and it is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. In particular the development of the

site is viable. In terms of sustainability the site was included in the N&nTS that concluded that the site was suitable for housing growth.

- 1.5 A number of potential alternative sites at Shaftesbury were submitted in the SHLAA and their suitability was examined in the Landscape Impact Assessment of Potential Housing Sites at Blandford and Shaftesbury (ECC020). For further information on the site selection process and sustainability issues please refer to the Market Town Site Selection Background Paper (MTC001) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SUD003).
- 1.6 In addition, an alternative site has been submitted by Shaftesbury LVA LLP. Land at Higher Blandford Road Shaftesbury (2/45/0006) was submitted as part of the SHLAA on 31 October 2013. Through the SHLAA process the site has been assessed as being available and suitable for housing, but is currently undeliverable as it is contrary to existing and emerging policy. Pre application discussions with the land owner have suggested a wide range of uses for the site including housing, employment and retail.

Question 9.2: Is there any evidence that the proposed economic development sites in Shaftesbury, including the development of land to the south of the A30; are not available, sustainable or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available to the Council?

- 1.7 There is no evidence that the proposed economic development sites in Shaftesbury, including the land to the south of the A30 are not available, sustainable or deliverable.
- 1.8 The key strategic site covering 7 hectares of land to the south of the A30 is allocated in the 2003 Local Plan. The site was granted outline consent (2/2006/1022) for employment purposes in May 2011. This permission has now lapsed but the technical capability of the site has been tested. The site remains 'fit for purpose' as it meets the needs of the market and is in a sustainable location, as demonstrated in the Council's Employment Land Review (SED011). The site is available as the landowner for the site, Persimmon Homes (South Coast), has instructed Woolley and Wallis to market the site. The site is deliverable as it is available now, it offers a suitable location for development and the landowner is currently in pre-application discussions with the Council to renew the permission and to produce a Master Plan for the site. The Council are also in pre-application discussion with two potential developers.
- 1.9 An alternative, although smaller site, has been submitted by Shaftesbury LVA LLP. This is the same site as listed in Paragraph 1.6 above that has been promoted for a range of uses.

Question 9.3: Can the proposed development be satisfactorily assimilated into the town without significant detriment to the character of the environment and the living conditions of nearby residents?

- 1.10 The proposed development can be satisfactorily assimilated into the town without significant detriment to the character of the environment and the living conditions of nearby residents. In the case of Land to the East of Shaftesbury development has been and will continue to be guided by the Development Brief that was adopted in 2003 as Supplementary Planning Guidance following extensive public consultation (MTC009).
- 1.11 For land to the west of A350 the pre-application discussions and the supporting information for the EIA Screening have included a Landscape Analysis and Masterplan Strategy that have been developed with the support and advice of the Council and the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB.
- 1.12 Land to the south-east of Wincombe Business Park is the subject of a planning application (2/2014/1350). A number of issues have been raised by local residents and these are being explored by the Case Officer through the development management process.
- 1.13 Both land to the west of A350 and land to the south-east of Wincombe Business Park were included in the Landscape Impact Assessment of potential housing sites at Blandford and Shaftesbury (ECC020). This concluded that both sites were suitable, although mitigation measures were required.

Question 9.4: Are all the infrastructure requirements listed in policy 18 justified and deliverable?

- 1.14 All the infrastructure requirements listed in policy 18 are justified and deliverable. To support growth in Shaftesbury the grey, social and green infrastructure proposed has been developed with the 12 core planning principles set out in Paragraph 17 of NPPF in mind. The issue of 'reasonable alternatives' has been explored through the Infrastructure Background Paper 2013 (INF002).
- 1.15 The Council have planned positively for the development and infrastructure in Shaftesbury to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the NPPF. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (SUD020) sets out what infrastructure is needed to enable the development proposed to be delivered, how much it will cost and who will deliver it.
- 1.16 Appendix A (of SUD020) sets out the various categories of infrastructure and their significance in respect of the Plan and Appendix B contains a schedule of infrastructure currently programmed/needed to support new development.

- 1.17 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be regularly reviewed and updated because development and funding arrangements are likely to change over time and so infrastructure requirements and costs will need to be realigned.

Question 9.5: Should there be a reference to the Minerals Safeguarding Area? (See rep 2783)

- 1.18 No, as the comments in Rep 2783 were made in error. The Council had worked closely with the Minerals Planning Authority (MPA) during the production of the Minerals Strategy and had negotiated that all 'included' SHLAA sites around the four main towns proposed for housing growth should be excluded from the Minerals Safeguarding Area. Following receipt of Rep 2783 clarification was sought from the MPA. In response Trevor Badley (Minerals and Waste Planning Policy) confirmed that the green areas of those SHLAA sites were removed from the safeguarded area as requested and that this was reflected in the Proposals Map of the recently adopted Minerals Strategy 2014. He explained that when he made the comments on the Local Plan that these were mistakenly based on an older version of the safeguarding data which did not show those SHLAA sites as having been removed. Hence he noted a conflict between housing growth areas 8 and 9 and the safeguarding area. He confirmed in the same email (Appendix 2) that based on the current and correct MSA layer that there is no conflict in the case of either of these growth areas.

Appendix 1 – Breakdown of figures for Land East of Shaftesbury

Net dwelling figures		S106 figs on Outline PP (2/2002/0415)	Approvals May 2013	Additional dwellings Persimmon figures May 2012	Number of Affordable Homes	% of Affordable Homes	Stage (to complete based on Housing Completions 2014)	dph (net)	Design Strategy dph	Completions (Years)					Residual	Total in phase
SHLAA ref										09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14		
2/45/0021	a	Land East of Shaftesbury (land adj Greenacres) (2/2012/0880)	140	147	70	47%	Almost Complete	38	30-55	30	44	56	0	15	2	147
2/45/0021	b	Land East of Shaftesbury (Persimmon - Phase 1)	112	121	78	64%	Complete	29	30-55	0	0	84	30	7	0	121
2/45/0021	c	Land East of Shaftesbury (Persimmon - Phase 2)	85	96	77	80%	Almost Complete	32	30-40	0	0	0	18	67	11	96
2/45/0021	d	Land East of Shaftesbury (Persimmon - Phase 3)	105	108	31	29%	Over 80% still to build	35	30-40	0	0	0	0	20	88	108
2/45/0021	e	Land East of Shaftesbury (Persimmon - Phase 4)	75	75	20	27%	Complete	42	35-55	0	46	29	0	0	0	75
2/45/0021	f	Land East of Shaftesbury (Persimmon - Phase 5)	87	130	34	26%	Not Commenced	34	30-45	0	0	0	0	0	130	130
2/45/0021	g	Land East of Shaftesbury (Persimmon - Phase 6)	66		49	tbc	Not Commenced - Planning applications expected 2014			0	0	0	0	0	49	49
2/45/0021	h	Land East of Shaftesbury (Persimmon - White Land (Phase 7))			28	tbc				0	0	0	0	0	28	28
2/45/0507		Persimmon estimate May 2012 for Hopkins Land			57	tbc				0	0	0	0	0	57	57
		Total Land East of Shaftesbury (Persimmon)	530	530	134	tbc				30	90	169	48	109	365	811

2003 ORIGINAL TOTAL - S106 Greenacres (141 gross) and Land East Persimmon Outline PP (530)	670	Running total of completions from 2009	446
2013 TOTAL APPROVALS - Greenacres (148 gross) and Land East Persimmon approvals (530) May 2013	677	Completions in new Local Plan period 2011 onwards	326
NEW APPLICATION REQUIRED for dwellings in addition to approvals	134		
REVISED TOTAL for whole site	811		

Appendix 2 – Email from Dorset County Council Minerals and Waste Planning Policy

From: Badley, Trevor G. [<mailto:t.g.badley@dorsetcc.gov.uk>]
Sent: 12 May 2014 12:14
To: Sarah Jennings
Cc: Garrity, Mike; Hardy, Sara; Smith, Gill M.; Talbott, Barbara
Subject: Minerals Safeguarding and the North Dorset Local Plan

Hi Sarah,

I am writing regarding your recent e-mail to Sara Hardy regarding minerals safeguarding and also the Mineral Planning Authority's response to your North Dorset Local Plan - Pre-submission Document consultation earlier this year.

In our response to the North Dorset Plan, we made the following comment:

It appears, from comparing Figure 8.3 - Shaftesbury Inset Diagram of the North Dorset Local Plan with the Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) of the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Strategy (designated in Policy SG1 and shown on Figure 25 of the Strategy), that Housing Growth areas 8 and 9 are in conflict with the mineral safeguarding designation. No boundaries for the Housing Growth areas are shown so it is not possible to be more definitive at this stage.

Although not yet adopted, the Minerals Strategy has been found sound following Examination and the MSA cannot be further amended to accommodate North Dorset's development aspirations. However, the Mineral Planning Authority is mindful of the delay that prior extraction of minerals can lead to and the impact this can have on built development proposals. Should these Housing Growth areas be progressed further, North Dorset will be consulting again with Dorset County Council as Mineral Planning Authority. At that stage it will be possible to consider the proposed development in more detail and determine the most appropriate course of action.

I have reviewed our response to that consultation again, along with our correspondence with yourselves regarding the sites proposed for residential development post 2016 around Shaftesbury which would be removed from the MSA (your e-mail to Sara dated 7 September 2011). In it you asked that the green areas of the SHLAA sites 2/450/0550 and 2/450/0463 be removed from the safeguarded minerals area.

I would like to make the following clarification.

The green areas of those SHLAA sites listed above were removed from our safeguarded area as requested, and this is reflected in the Proposals Map of our recently adopted Minerals Strategy 2014. Sara will be sending you the appropriate GIS layer shortly. However, when I made the more recent comments on the North Dorset Local Plan these were mistakenly based these on an older version of the safeguarding data which did not show those SHLAA sites as having been removed, hence I noted a conflict between Housing Growth Areas 8 and 9 and our safeguarding. I can confirm, based on the current and correct MSA layer, that there is no conflict in the case of either of these Growth Areas.

I have also noticed that your Housing Growth Area 7 does seem to conflict, to some extent, with the MSA. However, I understand that this development was begun some time ago and predates the MSA. I do not consider that any further action is required in this case, but please let me know if you wish to discuss this further when you have had a chance to look at the GIS information from Sara.

Regards

Trevor

Trevor Badley
Minerals and Waste Planning Policy
Dorset County Council

Tel: 01305 224675

E-mail: t.g.badley@dorsetcc.gov.uk

Website: <http://www.dorsetforyou.com/384698>