

1. Is the proposal to make limited changes to the GB justified?

East Dorset District has very few brownfield sites and most of the large ones are within 400 metres of heathland so therefore not developable. The SHLAA is current and shows the limited amount of infilling possible.

CPRE policy is to object to all building on the Green Belt, therefore it is with great reluctance that we concede that the removal of some of the GB land is necessary. What we do not consider justified is the way they have arrived at the decision over what land should be removed.

Of the original Buchanan purposes of the Green Belt, printed on page 19, Paragraph 80 of the NPPF, the planners have rather arbitrarily omitted two of the most important purposes of the Green belt.

to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

The omission of these two purposes has resulted in some of East Dorset's lovely open landscape being put forward for development.

WMC5, map 8.5. This shows the development to the north of Wimborne, either side of the Cranborne Road. This will sprawl over the countryside and spoil the setting of the old market town of Wimborne.

FWP6 & FWP7, maps 10.9 & 10.10 at West Parley. The proposed development is too much and will destroy the old settlement, it will almost be an extension of Bournemouth.

VTSW4, map 11.5 north west Verwood. It would be preferable if the proposed housing to the east of Edmondsham Road were deleted to protect the openness of the countryside. An openness already compromised by a few executive houses next to the school.

The purpose of assisting in urban regeneration does not really apply to East Dorset.

2. Have the GB boundaries been assessed to consider their capability to endure beyond the plan period, as advised in NPPF para 83?

It is unlikely that land to be removed from the Green Belt will last beyond the plan period as instructed by the NPPF para 83. This is for two reasons.

- In-migration from other areas of the UK is very high, Dorset is perceived as a desirable location. Those moving in from areas with higher house prices inflate the local house prices keeping many of our young people out of the housing market.

2. cont:

- The need to provide affordable housing and reasonably priced starter homes for our youth in order to keep them in East Dorset. This can only be done through building market housing.

The more land that is available the more Dorset will build as demand is endless. In order to protect East Dorset District and its inadequate infrastructure from unsustainable development, there needs to be an alternative way of providing affordable homes for our local young. There must also be some recognition of limitations on development caused by our unique and high quality landscape, much of it national and international designated sites.

4. Are the GB boundaries for every development proposal clearly defined on proposals maps?

Policy KS2 in the CS states that the revised GB will follow the edges of the new urban areas. Significant open spaces and SANG will remain within the GB.

The maps in the CS, using a red line, illustrate the extent of the proposed development. This includes the area to be built over, and a considerable amount of 'landscaping'. What they do not make clear is the extent of the existing GB so it is impossible to see exactly what land will be removed from the GB and where the new boundary will be. The maps are indicative only.

No surveys have been carried out, so some of the potential area of sites may change. The SANGS are marked as potential, there is no indication of what comprises a significant open space. In fact all the landscaping areas are marked as being included in the urban development. Both significant open spaces and SANGS should be within the GB. By now the individual SANG should be agreed, and at this stage we should have more certainty as to extent and location of them. Map 8.3 shows allotments within the urban development, surely these should be in the GB?

The SANGs, landscape areas and allotments should not become the 'safeguarded land' of the future. Their function is to develop into biodiverse areas to help make the new developments ecologically more sustainable.