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.

to the agent.		
	Personal Details*	Agent's Details (if applicable)*
Title	Ms	
First Name	Pam	
Last Name	Kelly	
Job Title <i>(where</i>		
Organisation (where relevant)	N/A	
Address		
Postcode		
Tel. No.		



Part B – Representations

No \square

	rait b Representations
Em	ail Address
	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.
	<u>Housing</u>
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 x□
	If you have answered 'No' please set out an alternative housing figure and provide reasoning to support your answer.
	So long as there are sufficient play areas, schools and medical facilities then probably around 250 == more than this would ruin all Shaftesbury's historic beauty.
	<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 \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 X
	No 🗆
	If you have answered 'Yes' please set out your alternative spatial strategy and provide reasoning to support it.
	The open spaces, especially on the area above St.James, should be preserved
	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 🗆
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 □x
No 🗆
If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.
There is nothing at all about the environment or sustainability – these considerations should be essential.
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 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 🗆
You have completely ignored sustainability. wildlife and the environment, all necessary to maintaining both the beauty and historic significance of Shaftesbury.
14. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Shaftesbury?
Already the Health Centre is overstretched. Where is the extra capacity to come from? This needs

to be addressed before planning more housing.— Have the schools enough places? Can the sewerage system cope? Road traffic pollution is a problem already. Why make it worse? Are green spaces to be destroyed?

	paces going to be? All of these things must come first and the protective measures be legally nforceable.
<u>St</u> ı	urminster Newton
·	you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Sturminster Newton?
	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.
	hat are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future evelopment at Sturminster Newton?
P	lease set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.
<u>Sta</u>	<u>albridge</u>
18. Do	you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Stalbridge?
Ye	s 🗆
No	

19.	considered as part of the assessment process?
	Yes X
	No 🗆
	If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.
	See my answer to 18 above
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 \square
	If you have answered 'No' please set out your alternative approach and information/reasoning behind this.
	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 $\ \Box$
	No \square
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?

Υ	es 🗆
Ν	lo 🗆
<u>s</u>	elf-Build and Custom-Build Housing
	Oo you consider that the Council should facilitate the provision of self-build housing by any, some, or all of the following options?
Υ	es 🗆
Ν	lo 🗆
	x
	a. Allowing serviced plots to come forward under the current development plan policies. Yes $x \square$
	No □
	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 \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 □ x
	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 🗆 x
	No
	e. Identifying land in public ownership which would be sold only for self-build development. Yes $\ \Box$ X No $\ \Box$
	f. The use of Local Development Orders to facilitate self-build development. Yes $\ \square$ No $\ \square$
26 4	Are there any other approaches that could be used to meet the demand for self-build housing?
	es □
Ν	
	If you have answered 'Yes' please outline the other approaches which the Council could pursue.

Ensuring the Vitality and Viability of Town Centres

27.		you consider that the existing hierarchy and network of centres, as set out in LPP1, should be ended to include Stalbridge as a 'local centre'?
	Yes	
	No	
	<u>lmp</u>	ortant Open or Wooded Areas (IOWAs)
28.		you agree that those IOWAs, which are protected from development by other planning policies egislation, should be deleted?
	Yes	
	No	$x\square$
	<u>The</u>	A350 Corridor
29.	Вур	you 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 eguarded for such purposes?
	Yes	$x\square$
	No	

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.

Have current developers honoured agreements to provide facilities and infrastructure? If not, surely this should be addressed before any further development is even considered.	
Where are the safeguards for health and well-being? For wildlife?	
What about any land already acquired for development – why has this not been built on?	
We heard about this form only by accident, from other concerned residents. Consultation becomes invalid if it is not brought to everyone's notice – through the post, by email and text. At the moment it smacks of encroachment by stealth.	

	Continue on a separate sheet if necessary
	Do you wish to be contacted about future consultations relating to the Local Plan Review?
	Yes x□ No □
Signature: P A Kelly Date: 22/01/18	

If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.