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	Hans		
Last Name	Bray		
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.

н	o	u	S	Iľ	ng

1.	Do you consider that a housing need figure of 366 dwellings a year is an appropriate figure on 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 figure seems rather generic, as there is no breakdown for the type of dwellings. In some areas development is currently skewed to retirement properties - not useful with the identified need to bring in a younger demographic. It's also not clear whether this takes into account land already acquired but not yet developed.				
	<u>Employment</u>				
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
	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 \square
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 \Box
	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 Gillingham?
	Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.
	<u>Shaftesbury</u>
12.	Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Shaftesbury?
,	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.
	As identified, tourism is an important factor for Shaftesbury, but insufficient weight has been given to the impact of expanding the town boundaries where it will have an impact on views. Brownfield sites and potential infill within the existing town boundaries need to be exploited before further expansionist development is considered.
14.	What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future

1 development at Shaftesbury?

Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.
The doctor's surgery is already struggling with the existing population, probably exacerbated

by the elderly skew of the current population.

Green space for all and amenities for the community have already been under allocated with the recent housing developments and expansion.

Legally binding impact assessments must be in place for education, health provision, social services, employment, community amenities and green space.

S106 provisions should be strengthened and enforced.

Sturminster Newton

15.	Doy	you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Sturminster Newton?
	Yes	
	No	
16.		there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been sidered as part of the assessment process?
	Yes	
	No	
	If y	ou have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.
17.		at are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future
	deve	elopment at Sturminster Newton?
	Ple	rase set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.
		doe doe out milet you doe do the dadwid in ing. I i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
	Ctal	l <u>bridge</u>
1ጸ		you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Stalbridge?
10.	Yes	
	No	
10		there are further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been
IЭ.		there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been sidered as part of the assessment process?
	Yes	
	No	
	If y	ou have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.

20. What are the most important infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential 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 🗹
If you have answered 'No' please set out your alternative approach and information/reasoning behind this There is far greater scope within the village settlements to help meet strategic dwelling requirements through the development of brownfield sites, and renewal of run-down areas. Without growth these villages will continue to stagnate into an ageing population with reduced services and increase the isolation and inequalities of the residents. The lack of good transport and infrastructure increases the drift of elderly people to towns, such as Shaftesbury, which also suffer as a result.
Affordable Housing
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?
Yes ✓
No 🗆
23. 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 ☑
24. Do you consider that the Council should continue with its existing policy approach, which allows for a small number of market homes on rural exception sites?
Yes
No 🗸

Self-Build and Custom-Build Housing

No \square

25. 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 🗆
a. Allowing serviced plots to come forward under the current development plan policies. Yes $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $
b. Updating Policy 7 (Delivering Homes) in the Local Plan Part 1 to promote the provision of serviced plots of land for self-build housing. Yes \square No \square
 c. Requiring on sites above a certain size that serviced self-build plots should be made available as a proportion of the total number of dwellings permitted (with or without a minimum number being specified) on-site. Yes ☑ No □
d. Allowing a proportion (up to 100%) of self-build plots on exception sites (with controls over the resale value of the properties). Yes \square No \square
e. Identifying land in public ownership which would be sold only for self-build development. Yes \square No \square
f. The use of Local Development Orders to facilitate self-build development. Yes $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $
26. Are there any other approaches that could be used to meet the demand for self-build housing?
Yes ☑ No □
If you have answered 'Yes' please outline the other approaches which the Council could pursue.
Encourage the formation of Community Land Trusts or other such groups that are interested in developing sustainable, eco-friendly small developments.
 Ensuring the Vitality and Viability of Town Centres 27. Do you consider that the existing hierarchy and network of centres, as set out in LPP1, should be amended to include Stalbridge as a 'local centre'? Yes

Important Open or Wooded Areas (IOWAs)

28.		ou agree that those IOWAs, which are protected from development by other planning policies gislation, should be deleted?
	Yes	
	No	
	The A	A350 Corridor
29.	Вура	ou consider that the land which is identified and safeguarded for the Shaftesbury Outer ass and the Charlton Marshall and Spetisbury Bypass should continue to be identified and guarded for such purposes?
	Yes	
	No	
	Cor	mments
	Appr ques	u have any comments about the Issues and Options Document or the Sustainability raisal please set them out in the box below. If your comments are in relation to a specific tion or chapter of the Issues and Options Document then please state which question or the your comments relate to.

The allowing of the Shaftesbury Neighbourhood Plan to drift is a real problem for this consultation It means that residents have had little consultation on the finer details of development in and
around the town.
Some developments, which have already taken place, have not provided the promised amenities or infrastructure. This has been ignored, not addressed nor sought to be rectified in this review.
It is stated that the Sustain Appraisal is used for each of the expansion areas around the town, but otherwise it seems to have been largely ignored in the wider context.
Other than the acknowledgement of existing SSIs, AONBs and Conservation Areas there is no taking into account of the importance of wildlife more generally. For example, maintaining wildlife corridors and the natural richness and biodiversity in the district as a whole and the impact development could have on that.
Health and well-being has been ignored, particularly access to community green spaces, sports facilities and the needs of children, walkers, etc.
Other radical approaches have been ignored, for example scope for new communities to be established.
Development of brown-field sites and now redundant agricultural buildings. These are often in rural areas, but could be the basis for development. Indeed the repurposing and redevelopment of such areas should be encouraged before greenfield development is fully utilised.
Continue on a separate sheet if necessary
Do you wish to be contacted about future consultations relating to the Local Plan Review? Yes ☑ No □
Signatura
Signature: Date: If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.
ij sabilitang the joint electronically, no signature is required.

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