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	Mrs	
First Name	Jackie	
Last Name	Upton King	
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.

			•	
ш	~		110	~
п	u	us		2
	_		•••	0

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 is a totally arbitrary figure imposed by Central Government and has little meaning locally. The changes proposed in the Chancellor's budget could well affect this number and others. However, if that is the figure currently in use, then it is still too high for North Dorset.			
	<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 🖂			
	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 \square			
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.
	There is a case to be made for allowing limited and appropriate growth in the larger villagers to ensure their viability.
	Blandford (Forum and St Mary)
6.	Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Blandford?
	Yes
	No 🗆
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 \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
	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.
·	Shaftesbury
	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.
	Shaftesbury has already provided a disproportionate share of the new housing required.
	If one of the aims of the North Dorset strategy is to encourage more tourism then to tack onto this unique hilltop town further, poorly designed and executed, developments around the fringes destroying
	the views in and out of the town and its special nature, would seem counterproductive.
	The slopes policies should be maintained and reinforced
	Any future development should be small and within the existing settlement boundary
	All the sites in the search should be discounted at this stage

14. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Shaftesbury?

	Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements		
	If further development is permitted and it should be resisted at all costs – then inevitably the road and		
	transport systems will be put under even more pressure. A by-pass will be required, better public		
	transport to take workers to employment areas, improvements in Christies Lane to make it safer to cross.		
	Medical facilities, whilst adequate, will need reinforcing		
	Schools, whilst currently adequate, will need improving and enlarging		
	Green infrastructure – footpaths, cycleways etc needs improving		
	Integration between the east and west of the town needs to take place – community facilities in the east might help		
	Employment opportunities – A30 site should be used for smaller scale, workshops & SME activity. Improved connectivity might help with encouraging high-tech/high skilled employment. Persimmon		
	should be encouraged to sell off the land in plots rather than as a huge whole site.		
	Sturminster Newton		
15.	Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Sturminster Newton?		
	Yes		
	No \square		
16.	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.		
	If you have answered the pieuse set out what you see as the further issues.		

17. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Sturminster Newton?

Ple	ase set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.
<u>Stal</u>	<u>bridge</u>
18. Do y	ou agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Stalbridge?
Yes	
No	
	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	
	at are the most important infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential re development at Stalbridge?
Ple	ase set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.
<u>The</u>	<u>Villages</u>
eigh	ou agree with the Council's proposed approach in relation to future development at the teen larger villages within the District or do you think that the Council should consider an rative approach?
Yes	
No	
NU	

	If you have answered 'No' please set out your alternative approach and information/reasoning behind this.
	Limited development to be allowed in the larger villages. Groups of 5-10 houses built on brownfield sites by local builders using local labour and materials. Employment could be encouraged by using redundant barns.
	Villages need to be viable and sustainable and to have a certain amount of new housing to house their own children.
	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
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 $\;\boxtimes$ No $\;\Box$
	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 $\ \boxtimes $ No $\ \Box$
	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 \square

	No \square
	d. Allowing a proportion (up to 100%) of self-build plots on exception sites (with controls over the resale value of the properties). Yes \boxtimes No \square
	e. Identifying land in public ownership which would be sold only for self-build development. Yes $\ \boxtimes $ No $\ \Box$
	f. The use of Local Development Orders to facilitate self-build development. Yes $\ oxtimes$ No $\ \Box$
26.	Are there any other approaches that could be used to meet the demand for self-build housing?
	Yes □
	No \square
	If you have answered 'Yes' please outline the other approaches which the Council could pursue.
27.	Ensuring the Vitality and Viability of Town Centres Do you consider that the existing hierarchy and network of centres, as set out in LPP1, should be amended to include Stallbridge as a flocal centre?
	amended to include Stalbridge as a 'local centre'?
	Yes 🛛
	No \square
	No
	No Important Open or Wooded Areas (IOWAs)
28.	
28.	Important Open or Wooded Areas (IOWAs) . Do you agree that those IOWAs, which are protected from development by other planning policies
28.	Important Open or Wooded Areas (IOWAs) Do you agree that those IOWAs, which are protected from development by other planning policies or legislation, should be deleted?
28.	Important Open or Wooded Areas (IOWAs) Do you agree that those IOWAs, which are protected from development by other planning policies or legislation, should be deleted? Yes
	 Important Open or Wooded Areas (IOWAs) Do you agree that those IOWAs, which are protected from development by other planning policies or legislation, should be deleted? Yes □ No ⊠
	Important Open or Wooded Areas (IOWAs) 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 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
	Important Open or Wooded Areas (IOWAs) 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 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?

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.

Shaftesbury has provided a high proportion of the new housing already built and approved since the
beginning of the plan period and is only 86 homes short of the total for the entire plan period. In that
context and because of it unique topography and its iconic status as a Saxon hilltop town, no further
development should be permitted.
The opportunistic nature of proposals by Persimmon on the A30 employment site, Tizzard on the
A30/B3081 site and Savill's exploring the land on the Wiltshire border should be resisted at all costs. They
are currently attempting to exploit the hiatus created by this Plan revision and confusion about Central
Government's future approach.
Q29 – the continuing provision of land for a by-pass corridor has a bearing on all the questions answered
and this provision should be preserved and an outcome worked for with Dorset, Wiltshire and BANES.
and this provision should be preserved and an outcome worked for with borset, whitshire and BANES.

	Continue on a separate sheet if necessary
Do you wish to be contacted about future consultations rela	ting to the Local Plan Review?
Yes □	
No 🗆	
Signature:	Date:
If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.	

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