| For office use only | |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Batch number: | Received: |
| Representor ID # | Ack: |
| Representation # | |



NORTH DORSET LOCAL PLAN REVIEW Issues and Options Consultation 27 November 2017 to 22 January 2018

Response Form

As part of the Local Plan Review (LPR), North Dorset District Council has prepared an Issues and Options Document for consultation. The Issues and Options Document, the Sustainability Appraisal and associated documents can be viewed online via:

https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/planning/north-dorset/planning-policy

Please return completed forms to:

Email: planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk

Post: Planning Policy (North Dorset), South Walks House, South Walks Road, Dorchester, DT1 1UZ

Deadline: 5pm on 22 January 2018. Representations received after this time may not be accepted.

Part A - Personal details

This part of the form must be completed by all people making representations as **anonymous comments cannot be accepted.** By submitting this response form you consent to your information being disclosed to third parties for this purpose. Personal details will not be visible on our website, although they will be shown on paper copies that will be available for inspection by members of the public and other interested parties.

*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name, Job Title and Organisation boxes in the personal details but complete the full contact details of the agent including email address. All correspondence will be sent to the agent.

| | Personal Details* | Agent's Details (if applicable)* |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Title | Mr. | |
| First Name | Alan | |
| Last Name | Kirkham | |
| Job Title <i>(where</i> | | |
| Organisation (where relevant) | | |
| Address | | |
| Postcode | | |
| Tel. No. | | |
| Email Address | | |



Part B – Representations

Please answer as many questions or as few questions as you wish. There is a box at the end of the form where you can provide any comments that you may have.

1. Do you consider that a housing need figure of 366 dwellings a year is an appropriate figure on

| Н | 0 | u | S | П | n | g |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | which to plan for housing growth in North Dorset? If not, please set out what you consider to be an appropriate figure and provide reasons for this. |
|----|---|
| | Yes |
| | No 🗵 |
| | If you have answered 'No' please set out an alternative housing figure and provide reasoning to support your answer. |
| | This is impossible for a layperson to answer but brown field sites need to be considered and provision of additional services such as Heath Centre, Schools etc., plus local employment or better public transport. |
| | Employment |
| 2. | Do you consider that additional employment land should be allocated for development at Blandford as part of the Local Plan Review? |
| | Yes ⊠ |
| | No 🗆 |
| 3. | Do you consider that there is a need to allocate additional employment land in any other part(s) of the District? |
| | Yes ⊠ |
| | No \square |
| | Spatial Strategy |
| 4. | Do you consider that the existing spatial strategy, as set out in LPP1, should be amended to allow for some limited growth at Stalbridge, beyond just meeting local needs? |
| | Yes |
| | No 🗆 |
| 5. | Do you think that the Council should consider implementing any other alternative spatial strategy through the LPR? If so, please explain your reasons why. |
| | Yes |
| | No 🗆 |
| | |

| | If you have answered 'Yes' please set out your alternative spatial strategy and provide reasoning to support it. |
|-----|--|
| | Blandford (Forum and St Mary) |
| 6. | Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Blandford? |
| | Yes |
| | No \square |
| 7. | Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process? |
| | Yes |
| | No \square |
| | If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues. |
| 8. | What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Blandford? |
| | Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements. |
| | <u>Gillingham</u> |
| 9. | Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Gillingham? |
| | Yes |
| | No 🗆 |
| 10. | Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process? |
| | Yes |
| | No \square |

| If | you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues. |
|-----------|---|
| | |
| | hat are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future velopment at Gillingham? |
| Pi | lease set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements. |
| <u>Sh</u> | aftesbur <u>y</u> |
| | you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Shaftesbury? |
| | s 🗆 |
| No | |
| | e there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been nsidered as part of the assessment process? |
| Ye | s 🗵 |
| No | |
| If | you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues. |
| N | o new houses unless there is local employment or provision of adequate public transport. |
| N | eed to contain green belt between Shaftesbury & Gillingham |
| N | ot building over proposed route of Shaftesbury outer bypass |
| | hat are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future velopment at Shaftesbury? |
| P | Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements. |
| | Vater & sewage provision; education – all levels; Healthcare provision; green space; employment rovision; significantly improved public transport |
| | |

Sturminster Newton

| 15. | Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Sturminster Newton? |
|-----|--|
| | Yes |
| | No \square |
| | Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process? |
| | Yes |
| | No 🗆 |
| | |
| | If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Sturminster Newton? |
| | Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | <u>Stalbridge</u> |
| | Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Stalbridge? |
| | Yes |
| | No □ |
| | Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been |
| | considered as part of the assessment process? |
| | Yes |
| | No 🗆 |
| | |
| | If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| | future development at Stalbridge? |
|-------------|--|
| | Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements. |
| | The Villages |
| 21 . | Do you agree with the Council's proposed approach in relation to future development at the eighteen larger villages within the District or do you think that the Council should consider an alternative approach? |
| | Yes |
| | No □ |
| | |
| | |
| | Affordable Housing |
| 22. | Affordable Housing Do you consider that the existing reference to nine dwellings in Policy 9 of LPP1 should be removed from the policy to allow larger schemes to come forward where there is evidence of local need in excess of that which could be met by the provision of nine dwellings? |
| 22. | Do you consider that the existing reference to nine dwellings in Policy 9 of LPP1 should be removed from the policy to allow larger schemes to come forward where there is evidence of local |
| 22. | Do you consider that the existing reference to nine dwellings in Policy 9 of LPP1 should be removed from the policy to allow larger schemes to come forward where there is evidence of local need in excess of that which could be met by the provision of nine dwellings? |
| | Do you consider that the existing reference to nine dwellings in Policy 9 of LPP1 should be removed from the policy to allow larger schemes to come forward where there is evidence of local need in excess of that which could be met by the provision of nine dwellings? Yes |
| | Do you consider that the existing reference to nine dwellings in Policy 9 of LPP1 should be removed from the policy to allow larger schemes to come forward where there is evidence of local need in excess of that which could be met by the provision of nine dwellings? Yes No Do you consider that the existing policy approach, which seeks to prevent exception sites coming |
| | Do you consider that the existing reference to nine dwellings in Policy 9 of LPP1 should be removed from the policy to allow larger schemes to come forward where there is evidence of local need in excess of that which could be met by the provision of nine dwellings? Yes No Do you consider that the existing policy approach, which seeks to prevent exception sites coming forward adjacent to the four main towns within the District, should be amended? |
| 23. | Do you consider that the existing reference to nine dwellings in Policy 9 of LPP1 should be removed from the policy to allow larger schemes to come forward where there is evidence of local need in excess of that which could be met by the provision of nine dwellings? Yes No Do you consider that the existing policy approach, which seeks to prevent exception sites coming forward adjacent to the four main towns within the District, should be amended? Yes |
| 23. | Do you consider that the existing reference to nine dwellings in Policy 9 of LPP1 should be removed from the policy to allow larger schemes to come forward where there is evidence of local need in excess of that which could be met by the provision of nine dwellings? Yes No Do you consider that the existing policy approach, which seeks to prevent exception sites coming forward adjacent to the four main towns within the District, should be amended? Yes No Do you consider that the Council should continue with its existing policy approach, which allows |

Self-Build and Custom-Build Housing

No \square

| | 5. Do you consider that the Council should facilitate the provision of self-build housing by any, some, or all of the following options? | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|--|--|
| | Yes | | | | |
| | No | | | | |
| | | Allowing serviced plots to come forward under the current development plan policies. $\hfill\Box$ | | | |
| | of la | Jpdating Policy 7 (Delivering Homes) in the Local Plan Part 1 to promote the provision of serviced plots and for self-build housing. □ □ □ | | | |
| | pro spe Yes | equiring on sites above a certain size that serviced self-build plots should be made available as a portion of the total number of dwellings permitted (with or without a minimum number being cified) on-site. | | | |
| | valı Yes | Allowing a proportion (up to 100%) of self-build plots on exception sites (with controls over the resale ue of the properties). | | | |
| | | dentifying land in public ownership which would be sold only for self-build development. | | | |
| | Yes | he use of Local Development Orders to facilitate self-build development. | | | |
| 26. | Are t | there any other approaches that could be used to meet the demand for self-build housing? | | | |
| | Yes | | | | |
| | No | | | | |
| | If yo | ou have answered 'Yes' please outline the other approaches which the Council could pursue. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Ensu | ring the Vitality and Viability of Town Centres | | | |
| | - | ou consider that the existing hierarchy and network of centres, as set out in LPP1, should be nded to include Stalbridge as a 'local centre'? | | | |
| | Yes | | | | |

Important Open or Wooded Areas (IOWAs)

| 28. | Do you agree that those IOWAs, which are protected from development by other planning policies or legislation, should be deleted? | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|--|--|
| | Yes | | | | |
| | No 🗵 | | | | |
| | The A350 Corridor | | | | |
| 29. | Do you consider that the land which is identified and safeguarded for the Shaftesbury Outer Bypass and the Charlton Marshall and Spetisbury Bypass should continue to be identified and safeguarded for such purposes? | | | | |
| | Yes ⊠ | | | | |
| | No \square | | | | |
| | Comments | | | | |
| | If you have any comments about the Issues and Options Document or the Sustainability Appraisal please set them out in the box below. If your comments are in relation to a specific question or chapter of the Issues and Options Document then please state which question or chapter your comments relate to. | | | | |
| | Q29. No mention of protecting villages from increased traffic flow, especially HGV.s – Impossible to walk through village of Melbury Abbas – no mention of protecting pedestrians or other vulnerable road users. | | | | |
| | Cannot expand housing, employment in Shaftesbury etc. without addressing need to improve A350 & bypass Melbury Abbas. | | | | |
| | There is also a shortage of affordable housing for young single people, many of whom are forced to move from area (if they find work) or face living on benefits or even homelessness. | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | Continue on a separate sheet if necessary |
|--|---|
| | |
| | |
| Do you wish to be contacted about future consultations relating | g to the Local Plan Review? |
| Yes | |
| | |
| No \square | |
| | |
| Signature: | Date |
| | Date: |
| If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required. | |

When completed please send form to planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk