Fiona Ajram

From:devcontrol NDDCSent:22 January 2018 16:45To:PlanningPolicy NDDC

Subject: FW: LOCAL PLAN ISSUES & OPTIONS DOCUMENT & PROPOSED 961 HOUSING

DEVELOPMENT IN GILLINGHAM

One for you....

Business Support (Development Management)

Dorset Councils Partnership serving:

North Dorset District Council, West Dorset District Council and Weymouth & Portland Borough Council

From: Thomas Myatt

Sent: 22 January 2018 10:20

To: devcontrol NDDC

Subject: LOCAL PLAN ISSUES & OPTIONS DOCUMENT & PROPOSED 961 HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN GILLINGHAM

Dear Sir,

I read the article in the Blackmore Vale magazine (Page 6) regarding Local Plan Issues and Options document and the proposed housing development of 961 houses by Welbeck Land on the south west edge of Gillingham. The latter is a ridiculously large proposed localised development when viewed in the context of the current planning basis which is for 285 new homes per year across the whole of North Dorset. The B3081 is already experiencing heavy traffic with regular congestion at rush hours, particularly where the B3081 and B3092 converge.

Feedback was invited on 5 subjects:

- 1. How much land should be allocated for Residential Development We disagree with identifying additional land for residential development as we do not believe that the required development of amenities and infrastructure associated with the existing planned development are being met. e.g. congestion on B roads, inadequate doctor's surgery capacity, pressures on schools. I'm also concerned as to where geographically the employment opportunities exist to support the increased residents.
- 2. Where new development should be located I agree with the distribution of development to include Stalbridge, but believe this should be addressed in ensuring commensurate development of infrastructure and amenities.
- 3. Extra employment land at Blandford We support redressing the shortfall of employment land in Blandford.
- 4. <u>Affordable Housing Exceptional Sites</u> It was unclear what the proposal involved other than lifting the extant restriction. i.e. why the original rationale for the restricted capacity of exceptional sites should be changed.
- 5. <u>The A350 Corridor</u> We support the continued land being identified and safeguarded for the Shaftesbury Bypass and suggest that a similar requirement exists for Gillingham.

Yours faithfully Thomas and Suzie Myatt