

THE NORTH DORSET LOCAL PLAN PART 1 2011-2026 (LP1)

ISSUE 6:

THE COUNTRYSIDE (POLICY 20) – INCLUDING POLICIES 28 TO 33

ON BEHALF OF MESSRS DRAKE

Pegasus Group

Pegasus House | Querns Business Centre | Whitworth Road | Cirencester | Gloucestershire | GL7 1RT
T 01285 641717 | F 01285 642348 | W www.pegasuspg.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Manchester

Planning | Environmental | Retail | Urban Design | Renewables | Landscape Design | Graphic Design | Consultation | Sustainability

CONTENTS:

	Page No:
6 ISSUE 6	1
6.1 Is sufficient support given to sustainable economic growth in the countryside (NPPF paragraph 28)?	1
6.1.1 Pegasus has no comments on this question.	1
6.2 Bearing in mind policy 20 is applicable to Stalbridge and other rural communities, is the policy too prescriptive? If it is, how should it be changed? Does the policy adequately support thriving rural communities (NPPF paragraph 17)?	2
6.3 Is policy 28 (existing dwellings in the countryside) justified? If not, how should it be changed?	4
6.4 Is policy 29 (re-use of countryside buildings) justified? If not, how should it be changed?	5
6.5 Is the advice in paragraph 10.200 (prevention of mixed use or residential schemes at existing countryside employment sites) too prescriptive? Is this supporting text a policy?	6
6.6 Is policy 31 justified? If not, how should it be changed? Should more support be given to sustainable tourism and leisure developments in the countryside, in line with advice in paragraph 28 of the NPPF?	7
6.7 Are all the requirements of policy 32 justified? If not, how should they be changed?	8
6.8 Are all the requirements of policy 33 justified? Why are temporary dwellings for rural workers (other than in agriculture) not referred to?	9
6.9 What is the justification for the threshold of 500 sqm referred to in paragraph 10.169?	10

6 ISSUE 6

6.1 Is sufficient support given to sustainable economic growth in the countryside (NPPF paragraph 28)?

6.1.1 Pegasus has no comments on this question.

- 6.2 **Bearing in mind policy 20 is applicable to Stalbridge and other rural communities, is the policy too prescriptive? If it is, how should it be changed? Does the policy adequately support thriving rural communities (NPPF paragraph 17)?**
- 6.2.1 The policy as proposed restricts development in Stalbridge and the larger villages and is reliant on a “fine grained” assessment of the needs of Stalbridge and the villages to be made by local communities which can then be addressed through neighbourhood planning. However, it is not clear how this will be delivered during the plan period.
- 6.2.2 Whilst it is acknowledged that in order to achieve sustainable development the majority of housing growth will take place in the more sustainable settlements, it is nevertheless considered that the plan needs to facilitate development in the larger villages with a range of facilities and services. An objection is therefore made to the “blanket approach” of restraint, which is considered to be inconsistent with para 55 of the NPPF.
- 6.2.3 Whilst this the Council’s proposed approach is to permit small sites for rural exception affordable housing within or on the edge of the existing built up areas of Stalbridge or the districts villages is supported, this is only to meet strictly local needs. The Council may also allow a small number of market homes as an integrated part of a rural exception schemes, but only as a last resort to contribute towards a funding gap for the provision of the rural exception affordable housing on the site and provided that any market housing is similar or smaller in size and type to the rural exception affordable homes being proposed.
- 6.2.4 The approach set out in the draft Core Strategy focusing a proportion of development towards Stalbridge and 18 of the districts larger villages of which Child Okeford is identified, should be reconsidered albeit not to accommodate a significant proportion of strategic housing growth, but to accommodate growth to meet local housing needs.

- 6.2.5 There should be a policy framework for the larger villages, to provide the context for local housing needs and also neighbourhood planning. The ambitions of the neighbourhood should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area. Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. The NPPF states that to facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area and ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. Neighbourhood Plans should reflect these policies and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them.
- 6.2.6 As currently proposed it is considered that the Local Plans approach is too restrictive and does not provide a framework for Neighbourhood Plans or enable local housing needs to be met which will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

6.3 **Is policy 28 (existing dwellings in the countryside) justified? If not, how should it be changed?**

6.3.1 Pegasus has no comments on this question.

6.4 Is policy 29 (re-use of countryside buildings) justified? If not, how should it be changed?

6.4.1 Pegasus has no comments on this question.

6.5 **Is the advice in paragraph 10.200 (prevention of mixed use or residential schemes at existing countryside employment sites) too prescriptive? Is this supporting text a policy?**

6.5.1 Pegasus has no comments on this question.

6.6 **Is policy 31 justified? If not, how should it be changed? Should more support be given to sustainable tourism and leisure developments in the countryside, in line with advice in paragraph 28 of the NPPF?**

6.6.1 Pegasus has no comments on this question.

6.7 **Are all the requirements of policy 32 justified? If not, how should they be changed?**

6.7.1 Pegasus has no comments on this question.

6.8 **Are all the requirements of policy 33 justified? Why are temporary dwellings for rural workers (other than in agriculture) not referred to?**

6.8.1 Pegasus has no comments on this question.

6.9 **What is the justification for the threshold of 500 sqm referred to in paragraph 10.169?**

6.9.1 Pegasus has no comments on this question.