

# TREVETT

# ISSUE 6

Christine Self  
Programme Officer  
NORTH DORSET LOCAL PLAN  
Homefield House  
Homefield Road  
Saltford  
BRISTOL  
BS31 3EG

19th February 2015

Dear Mrs / Miss / Ms Self,

I would like to make the following further statements in relation to the North Dorset Local Plan 2011 to 2026 and therefore I have enclosed three copies of this letter.

### **Issue 6: The Countryside:**

The existing settlement boundaries in the villages, particularly Winterborne Stickland, should be retained, in order to allow sustainable economic growth in the countryside. Villages should be allowed to continue to accommodate sustainable economic and residential development ahead of open countryside. Without growth our villages will die. The current North Dorset Local Plan distinguishes between villages and open countryside, whereas the proposed local plan 2011 to 2026 misguidedly calls everything outside of market towns 'countryside'. This approach is incorrect and too prescriptive.

Policy 29 is not justified. The following parts, in particular, are too prescriptive:

10.160 All existing buildings, including those that have become derelict, should be allowed to be restored and re-used. They should not have to have become derelict because of accident within the last two years, which is too prescriptive. Often buildings have become disused due to other factors, but it doesn't make them any less worthy of retention and redevelopment. In fact often, it is the older buildings which became obsolete for their original purpose(s) many years ago which are most attractive and most worthy of redevelopment.

10.162 All buildings in the countryside, including those without proper foundations, which includes a very high number of rural buildings (including most farm buildings), should be allowed to be redeveloped. To say otherwise is too prescriptive. One person's view of what equals proper foundations will probably differ to the next person's, and I suspect that North Dorset District Council's view will require much more considerable foundations than any old building might have.

10.169 It is not correct to impose a maximum 500 sq m limit on buildings that can be re-used. Bigger buildings can often bring a bigger economic benefit and if they are redeveloped well they can be just as attractive as smaller buildings.

10.200 It is too prescriptive to prohibit mixed use redevelopment of existing business premises in the countryside, or even their redevelopment for purely residential purposes. Firstly, national planning policy and permitted development rights allow for business premises to be redeveloped in the countryside for residential use, amongst other uses. Secondly, if village settlement boundaries are

removed, there will be numerous business premises in villages which will illogically suddenly be re-classed as being in the countryside, as distinct to being in a village. Such premises might be located in the middle of a village and probably also in a Conservation Area, they might be surrounded by residential properties, and their redevelopment might have a considerable positive beneficial effect on their neighbouring residential properties, the village, the Conservation Area, and the countryside.

**Issue 7: Blandford Forum:**

We are against any such development on the Crown Meadows because they are prone to flooding and any development on or very close to them would be at risk from flooding.

Also, development on the Crown Meadows Option would have an extremely serious impact on traffic congestion within the town.

I thank you for considering my views and look forward to hearing from you if I can be of any further assistance.

U

---