



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	C Brixton	
Job Title <i>(where relevant)</i>		
Organisation <i>(where relevant)</i>	CPRE	
Address	1, Wessex Way	
Postcode	BH19 1QR	
E-mail	c.brixton@hotmail.co.uk	
Tel. Number	01929423841	

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

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 28/06/12

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 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)

5.1 Policy SD: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development.

The policy does not take sufficient account of the statements by the RT Hon Greg Clark, March 2012.

- Makes it clear that relevant policies - such as those protecting the Green Belt, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Parks and other areas - cannot be overridden by the presumption;

The last paragraph implies that mitigation would gain acceptance, when outright refusal might be a more appropriate decision.

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).

5.1
At the heart of national policy is the presumption in favour of sustainable development, *unless there is protection under National designations*. To achieve ----

Line 7.
Where permitted by the National Planning Policy -----

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):

MM37

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)

Whilst recognising that the housing numbers required are a contentious issue, there is a more urgent problem facing the AONB, which should be addressed. Using the figures in the original preamble, if 960 dwellings are required in areas, all in the AONB, of which around 260 should be affordable, then the AONB is being eroded by around 35% of actual requirement. $960 - 260 = 700$ ie 260 affordable and a questionable 440 market. (Using the 50% ratio affordable to market)

Whilst this is the alarming consequence of S106 policy, the failure to implement a much more restrictive policy in defining affordable needs exacerbates the situation for Nationally designated areas.

Whilst the Swanage figure has been amended to ‘approximately’ 200 dwellings, using the ratio above the actual requirement could be around 130 or less.

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).

Settlement extension(s) for a number of essential dwellings as determined locally under needs criteria appropriate to the AONB designation.

