



Purbeck District Council
Purbeck Local Plan
'Planning Purbeck's Future'
Main Modifications to the Core Strategy
Representation Form (June/July 2012)

Your Details

Agent's Details (*where relevant*)

Title	Mr	
Name	Alan	
Job Title (<i>where relevant</i>)	Tubbs	
Organisation (<i>where relevant</i>)	Wareham Town Trust	
Address	c/o 37 East Street, Wareham	
Postcode	BH20 4NW	
E-mail	hilary@eaststreet.plus.com	
Tel. Number	01929 554188	

Responses should be sent to:

Email: **ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk**

or

Post: Planning Policy, FREEPOST RSAX-LTRK-TRKE, Purbeck District Council,
Westport House, Worgret Road, Wareham, Dorset, BH20 4PP

Fax: 01929 557348

Representations will only be accepted that refer to a change shown in the Schedule of Main Modifications, or to the Habitats Regulations Assessment Update or Addendum to Sustainability Appraisal.

Return to Purbeck District Council by Tuesday 31st July 2012

Late or anonymous representations will not be accepted. All representations received will be published on the Council's website, along with your name.

An example of a completed form is available on the Council's website.

Alternatively, if you would like help completing this form please contact the Planning Policy Team.

For further information, visit http://www.dorsetforyou.com/purbeck_consultation, email **ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk** or call 01929 557359 to speak to a member of the Planning Policy Team.

You should comment only on the Main Modifications, the Habitats Regulations Assessment Statement and/or the Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal.

Responses on the above documents will be sent to the Planning Inspector. **Therefore, you do not need to repeat your previous comments or re-submit your previous representations.**

The Inspector will decide if further public hearing sessions are required as part of the examination process. All representations on matters of soundness will be fully considered by the Inspector. You may choose to request to appear at a public hearing to clarify your comments on the Main Modifications. Do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

<input type="checkbox"/> No , I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes , I wish to participate at the oral examination
---	--

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary in the space below:

The Town Trust has a wealth of background information which we can contribute to the examination to assist in the Inspector's considerations.

Please note that the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature

Date

Representations:

You are asked to comment on the Main Modifications to the Core Strategy, the Habitats Regulations Assessment Statement and/or the Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal:

Part A: Legal Compliance – Has the **process** of preparing this Core Strategy been followed in accordance with national guidance?

Part B: Soundness – Is the **content** of the Core Strategy sound, in other words, is it 'justified', 'effective' and 'consistent with national policy'?

Please use the forms overleaf to submit your response.

FORM A: Your Comments on Legal Compliance

Are the Main Modifications to the Core Strategy legally compliant?

*(In other words, has the **process** of preparing this version of the Core Strategy been followed in accordance with national guidance?)*

Yes

No

No Comment

Comments:

Please use the space below to provide more detailed comments (expand box as necessary)

This is the fourth time that the Purbeck Core Strategy has been amended with previous amendments being in 2010, 2011, 2012 just before the Examination in Public and this amendment). This means that it is very difficult to understand what the plan will be like and therefore the implications of the current consultation.

Instead of asking for comments on the amendments in our view there is a need to consult on the whole revised Core Strategy in order to be fully compliant.

FORM B: Your comments on the Schedule of Main Modifications

PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REFERENCE NUMBER

Please state the relevant reference number that you are commenting on from the Schedule of Main Modifications in the box below (e.g. MM1):

MM5

Comments without the relevant reference number will not be accepted.

Do you consider this Main Modification (in box above) proposed by the Council to be 'Sound'?

(In other words is the Main Modification 'justified', 'effective' and 'consistent with national policy')

Yes

No

No Comment

If you have chosen 'No', do you consider this change to the Core Strategy be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

It is not 'justified'

(i.e. the proposed change is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)

It is not 'effective'

(i.e. the proposed change is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)

It is not 'consistent with national policy'

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

Please use the space below to provide more detailed comments (expand box as necessary)

This policy is not sufficiently qualified to protect this particularly environmentally sensitive area. The policy should make it clear that Purbeck is of special environmental character such that the impact on the environment constrains the amount of development that would be appropriate. This needs to be also demonstrated in the policies through consideration of brownfield/less sensitive areas before designation of green belt and other constrained land for development.

Suggested Alterations:

Please use the space below to give details of what alteration(s) you consider necessary to make the Main Modification to the Core Strategy sound and why. Please suggest revised wording (expand box as necessary).

It should be made clear that areas with European and national designations will continue to be protected from development including existing green belt boundaries. There needs to be much more text explaining the special nature of the area and the emphasis on protection of sensitive areas..

Note: Please use a separate sheet when responding to more than one Main Modification. Additional sheets can be photocopied and attached to this form or downloaded from www.dorsetforyou.com/purbeck_consultation

FORM B: Your comments on the Schedule of Main Modifications

PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REFERENCE NUMBER

Please state the relevant reference number that you are commenting on from the Schedule of Main Modifications in the box below (e.g. MM1):

MM6

Comments without the relevant reference number will not be accepted.

Do you consider this Main Modification (in box above) proposed by the Council to be ‘Sound’?

(In other words is the proposed change ‘justified’, ‘effective’ and ‘consistent with national policy’)

Yes

No

No Comment

If you have chosen ‘No’, do you consider this change to the Core Strategy be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

It is not ‘justified’
(i.e. the proposed change is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn’t provide the most appropriate strategy)

It is not ‘effective’
(i.e. the proposed change is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)

It is not ‘consistent with national policy’

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

Please use the space below to provide more detailed comments (expand box as necessary)

It was clear at the Examination in Public that brown field sites in the district had not been fully investigated. Clearly the potential for development of brown field land should first be fully investigated before allocating more sensitive land for development and before considering the moving of the green belt. Green belt is considered a permanent designation given for good reason and fully justified..

In terms of deliverability there is insufficient space for 200 houses at Worgret Road in any event. There is already a shortage of playing fields and if new houses are provided not only will the playing fields need to be protected but also additional open space will be needed for the new housing.

Changing the wording to approximately lacks sufficient clarity as it could indicate more or less than 200 and it is clear that under the circumstances regarding open space provision there is insufficient space to provide 200 houses here.

For further information please refer to our statements to the Examination in Public.. ..

Suggested Alterations:

Please use the space below to give details of what alteration(s) you consider necessary to make the Main Modification to the Core Strategy sound and why. Please suggest revised wording (expand box as necessary).

Remove proposed allocation of 200 houses at Worgret Road, Wareham. Retain site within the green belt.

Note: Please use a separate sheet when responding to more than one Main Modification. Additional sheets can be photocopied and attached to this form or downloaded from www.dorsetforyou.com/purbeck_consultation

FORM B: Your comments on the Schedule of Main Modifications

PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REFERENCE NUMBER

Please state the relevant reference number that you are commenting on from the Schedule of Main Modifications to the Core Strategy in the box below (e.g. MM1):

MM7

Comments without the relevant reference number will not be accepted.

Do you consider this Main Modification (in box above) proposed by the Council to be 'Sound'?

(In other words is the proposed change 'justified', 'effective' and 'consistent with national policy')

Yes

No

No Comment

If you have chosen 'No', do you consider this Main Modification to the Core Strategy be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the proposed change is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)

It is not 'effective'
(i.e. the proposed change is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)

It is not 'consistent with national policy'

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

Please use the space below to provide more detailed comments (expand box as necessary)

It was clear at the Examination in Public that brown field sites in the district had not been fully investigated. Clearly this should be fully investigated before considering the moving of the green belt which is a permanent designation given for good reason and fully justified. In terms of deliverability there is insufficient space for 200 houses at Worgret Road in any event. Deevloping brown field sites would be a more sustainable solution that green belt land and in line with national policy.

The wording "concentrated in town centre" is unclear and needs to be properly defined if the policy is to be robust. Rather than using the woird concentrated it would need to say within and in order to be clear what lies within the town centre a boundary would need to be defined..

Suggested Alterations:

Please use the space below to give details of what alteration(s) you consider necessary to make the Main Modification to the Core Strategy sound and why. Please suggest revised wording (expand box as necessary).

remove proposed allocation of 200 houses at Worgret Road, Wareham. Reatin site within the green belt. Change wording from 'concentrated' in the town centre to 'within' the town centre and clearly define the extent of the town centre..

FORM B: Your comments on the Schedule of Main Modifications

PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REFERENCE NUMBER

Please state the relevant reference number that you are commenting on from the Schedule of Main Modifications in the box below (e.g. MM1):

MM2

Comments without the relevant reference number will not be accepted.

Do you consider this Main Modification (in box above) proposed by the Council to be 'Sound'?

(In other words is the Main Modification 'justified', 'effective' and 'consistent with national policy')

Yes

No

No Comment

If you have chosen 'No', do you consider this change to the Core Strategy be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the proposed change is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)

It is not 'effective'
(i.e. the proposed change is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)

It is not 'consistent with national policy'

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

Please use the space below to provide more detailed comments (expand box as necessary)

During the preparation of the Strategy the Council has not undertaken a full investigation of brown field sites which should be undertaken prior to allocating green belt land and/or other sensitive designations for development. It is therefore unclear how much of the existing allocations might have been transferred to brown field land. Green belt boundaries should be clearly defined following a review as necessary in the plan and should not await a review and subsequent plan as is being proposed here.

Suggested alterations

Remove the proposed development of land at Worgret Road Wareham, maintain the existing green belt boundary and investigate development of brown field land instead.

FORM B: Your comments on the Schedule of Main Modifications

PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REFERENCE NUMBER

Please state the relevant reference number that you are commenting on from the Schedule of Main Modifications in the box below (e.g. MM1):

MM3

Comments without the relevant reference number will not be accepted.

Do you consider this Main Modification (in box above) proposed by the Council to be 'Sound'?

(In other words is the Main Modification 'justified', 'effective' and 'consistent with national policy')

Yes

No

No Comment

If you have chosen 'No', do you consider this change to the Core Strategy be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the proposed change is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)

It is not 'effective'
(i.e. the proposed change is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)

It is not 'consistent with national policy'

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

Please use the space below to provide more detailed comments (expand box as necessary)

The duty to co-operate has not been fully complied with in particular the proposed development at Crossways has not been fully investigated.

Suggested alterations

Investigate with adjoining local authorities opportunities for development eg at Crossways.

FORM B: Your comments on the Schedule of Main Modifications

PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REFERENCE NUMBER

Please state the relevant reference number that you are commenting on from the Schedule of Main Modifications in the box below (e.g. MM1):

MM10

Comments without the relevant reference number will not be accepted.

Do you consider this Main Modification (in box above) proposed by the Council to be 'Sound'?

(In other words is the Main Modification 'justified', 'effective' and 'consistent with national policy')

Yes

No

No Comment

If you have chosen 'No', do you consider this change to the Core Strategy be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the proposed change is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)

It is not 'effective'
(i.e. the proposed change is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)

It is not 'consistent with national policy'

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

Please use the space below to provide more detailed comments (expand box as necessary)

The evidence base includes a retail impact assessment which is flawed, does not support this policy and should therefore be removed. The policy should be more positive and robust and reflect the professional assessment of the Council in resisting out-of-town retail development due to the expected impact that such a development would have on the town centre. Please refer to our statements to the EIP which clarify the impact

Suggested amendments

Statment regarding resisting out-of-town retailing should be more robust and make clear that this will be resisted as it is clear that such development would have a detrimental impact on the town centre. No additional floorspace be proposed.

FORM B: Your comments on the Schedule of Main Modifications

PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REFERENCE NUMBER

Please state the relevant reference number that you are commenting on from the Schedule of Main Modifications in the box below (e.g. MM1):

MM11

Comments without the relevant reference number will not be accepted.

Do you consider this Main Modification (in box above) proposed by the Council to be 'Sound'?

(In other words is the Main Modification 'justified', 'effective' and 'consistent with national policy')

Yes

No

No Comment

If you have chosen 'No', do you consider this change to the Core Strategy be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the proposed change is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)

It is not 'effective'
(i.e. the proposed change is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)

It is not 'consistent with national policy'

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

Please use the space below to provide more detailed comments (expand box as necessary)

Please refer to our statement to the examination in Public which explains that there is no need to allocate additional retail floorspace and for all the reasons already stated.

Suggested amendments

Remove proposed allocation of 1300 sq metres of retail floorspace.

FORM B: Your comments on the Schedule of Main Modifications

PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REFERENCE NUMBER

Please state the relevant reference number that you are commenting on from the Schedule of Main Modifications in the box below (e.g. MM1):

MM19

Comments without the relevant reference number will not be accepted.

Do you consider this Main Modification (in box above) proposed by the Council to be 'Sound'?

(In other words is the Main Modification 'justified', 'effective' and 'consistent with national policy')

Yes

No

No Comment

If you have chosen 'No', do you consider this change to the Core Strategy be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the proposed change is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)

It is not 'effective'
(i.e. the proposed change is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)

It is not 'consistent with national policy'

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

Please use the space below to provide more detailed comments (expand box as necessary)

t was clear at the Examination in Public that brown field sites in the district had not been fully investiagted. Clearly this should be fully investigated before considering the moving of the green belt which is a permanent designation given for good reason and fully justified. In terms of deliverability there is insufficient space for 200 houses at Worgret Road in any event.

It is clear that the allocation of land for SANGS at Holme Lane is inappropriate being much too far away to be in a position to provide suitable alternative open space.Please refer to our statements for the Examination in Public for further information.

Amend - Remove proposed allocation of 200 homes at Worgret Road, Wareham Retain land within the green belt.

FORM B: Your comments on the Schedule of Main Modifications

PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REFERENCE NUMBER

Please state the relevant reference number that you are commenting on from the Schedule of Main Modifications in the box below (e.g. MM1):

MM22

Comments without the relevant reference number will not be accepted.

Do you consider this Main Modification (in box above) proposed by the Council to be ‘Sound’?

(In other words is the Main Modification ‘justified’, ‘effective’ and ‘consistent with national policy’)

Yes

No

No Comment

If you have chosen ‘No’, do you consider this change to the Core Strategy be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

It is not ‘justified’
(i.e. the proposed change is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn’t provide the most appropriate strategy)

It is not ‘effective’
(i.e. the proposed change is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)

It is not ‘consistent with national policy’

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

Please use the space below to provide more detailed comments (expand box as necessary)

There is already a shortage of playing fields in Wareham even with the existing 2 school fields. This policy does not adequately protect the two existing school playing fields in Wareham which should be retained, preferably within the greenbelt. Additional open space would also be needed if housing is built at Worgret Road

Amend by retaining the Purbeck School and Wareham Middle School Playing Fields within the green belt, or at least as designated protected green space.

FORM B: Your comments on the Schedule of Main Modifications

PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REFERENCE NUMBER

Please state the relevant reference number that you are commenting on from the Schedule of Main Modifications in the box below (e.g. MM1):

MM24

Comments without the relevant reference number will not be accepted.

Do you consider this Main Modification (in box above) proposed by the Council to be 'Sound'?

(In other words is the Main Modification 'justified', 'effective' and 'consistent with national policy')

Yes

No

No Comment

If you have chosen 'No', do you consider this change to the Core Strategy be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the proposed change is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)

It is not 'effective'
(i.e. the proposed change is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)

It is not 'consistent with national policy'

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

Please use the space below to provide more detailed comments (expand box as necessary)

There is a shortage of playing fields in Wareham even with the existing 2 school fields. This policy does not adequately protect the two existing school playing fields in Wareham which should be retained within the greenbelt or at least designated protected green space. This policy does not appear to comply with Sport England's requirements for retention of playing fields which have not been proven to be surplus.

Amend by retaining the Purbeck School and Wareham Middle School Playing Fields within the green belt, or at least as designated protected green space.