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	Miss	
First Name	Kate	
Last Name	O'Farrell	
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.	<b>Housing</b> 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 $\square$ No $\square$ x	
	If you have answered 'No' please set out an alternative housing figure and provide reasoning to support your answer. It is unfair to ask an untrained person for a figure. But bearing in mind the recent large housing developments, and planned developments, some with permission some seeking it on land acquired, 366 houses a year seems unnecessarily high, and unsustainable in a small market town with regard to education, health, transport, employment, social services etc	
	Employment	
2.	Do you consider that additional employment land should be allocated for development at Blandford as part of the Local Plan Review?  Yes	
3.	No $\ \square$ Do you consider that there is a need to allocate additional employment land in any other part(s) of the District? Yes $\ \square$ 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 $\Box$ No $\Box$	
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.	

6.	Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Blandford? Yes $\ \square$
	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.
	Gillingham
9.	Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Gillingham? Yes $\Box$
	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 $\square$
	No □
	If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.
11.	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 $\Box x$
13.	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 □X
	_
	No $\square$
	If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues. The green belt separating the
	distinct towns/communities of Shaftesbury, Gillingham and Motcombe needs to be protected. Shaftesbury
	is popular, including with tourists, because of it's views, and it's personality as a rural market town, which
	will be damaged beyond repair by over-development and expansion.
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. Education which is already
	strained and non-existent for mature students. Health services which we all know are at breaking point. It
	is simply a case of too many people and not enough investment in services which will only get worse if
	there is too much development. Also water, sewage, road use, social services, employment services, open
	green spaces and leisure facilities.
	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 $\square$
	If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.
	1

17. 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 $\ \square$	
	No □	
	If you 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 notantial	
	What are the most important infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Stalbridge?	
	ratare development at Statishage.	
	Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.	
	The Willeres	
	<u>The Villages</u> 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	
	If you have answered 'No' please set out your alternative approach and information/reasoning behind this.	

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 $\Box$ No $\Box$
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  \[ \Boxedot     \]  No \[ \Boxedot     \]
25.	Self-Build and Custom-Build Housing Do you consider that the Council should facilitate the provision of self-build housing by any, some, or all of the following options?  Yes $\Box$ No $\Box$
	a. Allowing serviced plots to come forward under the current development plan policies. Yes $\ \square$ No $\ \square$
	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 $\Box$ 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 $\Box$ No $\Box$
	d. Allowing a proportion (up to 100%) of self-build plots on exception sites (with controls over the resale value of the properties). Yes $\Box$ No $\Box$
	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 $\ \square$ No $\ \square$
26.	Are there any other approaches that could be used to meet the demand for self-build housing? Yes $\Box$

If you have answered 'Yes' please outline the other approaches which the Council could pursue.
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 Stalbridge as a 'local centre'?  Yes   No   The state of the Vitality and Viability of Town Centres  The state of the Vitality and Viability of Town Centres  The state of Town
mportant 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   X This is unclear. I feel the IOWAs should be protected from development
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 or such purposes?  Yes   No   No   No   No   No   No   No   N
Comments
ou have any comments about the Issues and Options Document or the Sustainability Appraisal ase set them out in the box below. If your comments are in relation to a specific question or pter of the Issues and Options Document then please state which question or chapter your aments relate to.

This consultation was carried out over the Christmas period when many people are busy and distracted. At any other time of year you would undoubtedly get better response figures. Can this consultation be extended now that Christmas is over, and well publicised to give people a fair chance to respond and make their feelings known. I imagine it is hard to get much of a response to a consultation but many people need it to be easier to understand the implications and easier to respond.

Likewise the form is hard to understand, in fact the first question is enough to put many people off. It is also not clear how to get an electronic form that is not 'read only' from the website.

The developments that have already been built failed to provide many of the facilities that to trust that the much needed facilities will be built to match the massive planned population increase for Shaftesbury.

townspeople were lead to believe would be built including a school, allotments and parks. Every new development seems to promise the same things but there never appear so it seems unwise The consultation seems to largely ignore wild life open spaces and sustainability, at a time when the whole world is talking about the need to reduce our impact. There is already a lot of local land acquired for development which has not been taken in to account in this plan. Brownfield land should be looked at properly to reduce the impact on vital greenbelt.

	Continue on a separate sheet if necessary
	,
Do you wish to be contacted about future consultations relating to	the Local Plan Review?
Yes □	and Edda. Fidit Neview.
No □	
IVO 🗀	
Signature: D	Pate:
If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.	

When completed please send form to <a href="mailto:planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk">planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk</a>