

Planning Purbeck's Future



**Core Strategy Pre-Submission - 1 November - 20 December 2010
Consultation Responses
Part 10**

Contents

Narraway J	1
Nash J & N	5
National Grid	11
Natural England	24
National Farmers Union	30
North Dorset District Council	32
Oldman M	33
Omand S, Bierton E & Lees C J	39
Owermoigne Parish Council	42
Paxton-Brunning B	43
PEAT	49
Pipe M	57
PLACE	61
Property Development Partnerships Ltd	65
PULM	67
Purbeck Society	74

Narraway J



Purbeck District Council
Local Development Framework (LDF)
'Planning Purbeck's Future'
Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document
Representation Form (Nov/Dec 2010)

Your Details		Agents Details <i>(where relevant)</i>
Title	Mrs	
Name	Joan Narraway	
Job Title <i>(where relevant)</i>		
Organisation <i>(where relevant)</i>		
Address	Gaffers, East Burton Road	
Postcode	BH20 6HE	
E-mail	J.narraway@btinternet.com	
Tel. Number	01929 462812	

Responses should be sent to:

Email: ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk

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

Fax: 01929 557348

Return to Purbeck District Council by 4pm, Monday 20th December 2010

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

If you choose to type a response it would be appreciated if you could email the Microsoft Word version, making it easier to copy the responses into an examination database.

Briefings on how to complete these forms and the process involved will be held on:

- 10th November, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham
- 18th November, 7pm, Community Hall, The Mowlem, Swanage
- 1st December, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham

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 or call 01929 557273 to speak to a member of the Planning Policy Team.

As your representation will be passed to an Inspector you should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

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. 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 adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature J A Narraway

Date 17.12.10

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : x	Paragraph:	Map:
---------------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
It is not 'consistent with national policy'	<input type="checkbox"/>		

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

I support the decision to remove the proposal to build in Wool from the Core Strategy for the LDP - Planning Purbeck's Future.

In recent years there has been some large scale housing development in Wool, which, as well as offering market-priced housing, has already provided affordable housing for those on Wool's housing waiting list and to others from the surrounding areas.

The result of the Core Strategy consultation exercise (Where Shall We Build In Wool 2010-2026) made it very clear that Wool residents felt that enough was enough and that no more large scale development was required or wanted in Wool.

At the Special Council Meeting 5 and 12 October 2010 it was extremely heartening to find that Purbeck District Councillors had listened to the views of Wool Residents. It was stated by them that Wool was a village, not a small town and should remain so and they felt that Wool had already received a fair share of developments for the plan period. With no opposition (21 votes for and 1 abstention) the Council voted that

the proposed 50 dwellings at Wool should be removed from the Strategy.

I believe the Core Strategy to be justified, effective and in line with Government policy.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).



Purbeck District Council
 Local Development Framework (LDF)
'Planning Purbeck's Future'
Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document
 Representation Form (Nov/Dec 2010)

	Your Details	Agents Details (where relevant)
Title	Mr & Mrs	Mr
Name	J & N Nash	Malcolm Brown
Job Title <i>(where relevant)</i>		Planning Director
Organisation <i>(where relevant)</i>		Sibbett Gregory
Address	Burngate Mead, Duck Lane, Wool	3 Winchester Place, North Street, Poole
Postcode	BH20 6DE	BH15 1NX
E-mail		malcolm@sibbettgregory.com
Tel. Number		01202 661177

Responses should be sent to:

Email: ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk

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

Fax: 01929 557348

Return to Purbeck District Council by 4pm, Monday 20th December 2010

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

If you choose to type a response it would be appreciated if you could email the Microsoft Word version, making it easier to copy the responses into an examination database.

Briefings on how to complete these forms and the process involved will be held on:

- 10th November, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham
- 18th November, 7pm, Community Hall, The Mowlem, Swanage
- 1st December, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham

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 or call 01929 557273 to speak to a member of the Planning Policy Team.

As your representation will be passed to an Inspector you should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

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. 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:

it is necessary to probe the Local Planning Authority's justification for treating the Village in a different way to Lytchet Matravers which is a village which is smaller in size and, in my view, less sustainable.

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

Signature	Signature has been blanked out	Date 17/12/2010
-----------	--------------------------------	-----------------

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : SW: South West Purbeck	Paragraph: 7.2.8	Map:
------------------------------------	---------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because: <i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is not 'consistent with national policy'			<input type="checkbox"/>

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

Wool is the fourth largest settlement in the District after Upton and if taken together with the employment site, now known as Dorset Green Technology Park there is a much better balance of employment to residential uses. There is a significantly higher level of retail and social infrastructure than any of the other villages. It is shown in Policy LD as being a key service village as is Lytchett Matravers. The difference in terms of policy is that Lytchett Matravers is within the Green Belt whereas Wool is not and the Local Authority make proposals for a settlement extension of 50 dwellings in Lytchett Matravers but no proposals for settlement expansion at Wool.

Consideration should be given to including a settlement extension at Wool in Policy HS - Housing Supplies.

The vision for South West Purbeck insofar as Wool is concerned, is very weak and supports the enhanced role of Wool as a key service village. It refers to excellent rail links to Dorchester, Wareham and the South East Dorset conurbation. A wider service, employment and retail provision. It provides important facilities for nearby villages, such as East Burton. The policy for the South West Purbeck, however, provides no incentive which will enhance the role of the village as a key service village. The policy limits proposal for

Wool to existing housing commitments and infilling and upgrading the Wool First and St Mary's Schools to primary school (two additional years). At the same time, it proposes that Dorset Green Technology Park will see further development of up to 20 hectares for employment purposes.

Overall, in South West Purbeck, the policy provides for around 355 new dwellings over a 20 year period. 30 of those are proposed to the settlement extension of Bovington, for military housing. It was not that long ago that the Government sold off military houses at Bovington. I recall queues of people applying to buy those houses.

The concept of sustainable development would suggest the provision of housing alongside and easily accessible on foot, by bicycle and public transport to employment development. It would therefore be considered appropriate to consider Wool in the same way as Lytchett Matravers and make provision for a settlement expansion of at least 50 dwellings, including affordable housing. At paragraph 7.2.8 it states that recent major housing development at Purbeck Gate, Wool meets housing growth requirements for the plan period. In fact, that site is nearing completion, if not already completed and it does not provide for the rest of the plan period, 2012-2026.

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment identified several possible sites for additional housing, including land owned by the Respondents adjoining existing housing, close to schools and shops. I cannot understand why Wool should not be dealt with in similar terms to Lytchett Matravers which is a much smaller village with fewer facilities.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Amend Policy SW: South West Purbeck to add under the heading 'Wool':-

- The allocation of a settlement extension of approximately 50 dwellings on land to the south of the village.
- A minimum 40% dwellings which are affordable for local people
- New public open space to mitigate potential impact upon nearby heath land
- Provide improvements to walking, cycling and public transport access to the site.
- Contributions for open space/recreation provision
- Protection of existing trees and hedges

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy: HS: Housing Supply	Paragraph:	Map:
-------------------------------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because: <i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
• It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• It is not 'consistent with national policy'			<input type="checkbox"/>

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

Wool is the fourth largest settlement in the District after Upton and if taken together with the employment site, now known as Dorset Green Technology Park there is a much better balance of employment to residential uses. There is a significantly higher level of retail and social infrastructure than any of the other villages. It is shown in Policy LD as being a key service village as is Lytchett Matravers. The difference in terms of policy is that Lytchett Matravers is within the Green Belt whereas Wool is not and the Local Authority make proposals for a settlement extension of 50 dwellings in Lytchett Matravers but no proposals for settlement expansion at Wool.

Consideration should be given to including a settlement extension at Wool in Policy HS - Housing Supplies.

The vision for South West Purbeck insofar as Wool is concerned, is very weak and supports the enhanced role of Wool as a key service village. It refers to excellent rail links to Dorchester, Wareham and the South East Dorset conurbation. A wider service, employment and retail provision. It provides important facilities for nearby villages, such as East Burton. The policy for the South West Purbeck, however, provides no incentive which will enhance the role of the village as a key service village. The policy limits proposal for

Wool to existing housing commitments and infilling and upgrading the Wool First and St Mary's Schools to primary school (two additional years). At the same time, it proposes that Dorset Green Technology Park will see further development of up to 20 hectares for employment purposes.

Overall, in South West Purbeck, the policy provides for around 355 new dwellings over a 20 year period. 30 of those are proposed to the settlement extension of Bovington, for military housing. It was not that long ago that the Government sold off military houses at Bovington. I recall queues of people applying to buy those houses.

The concept of sustainable development would suggest the provision of housing alongside and easily accessible on foot, by bicycle and public transport to employment development. It would therefore be considered appropriate to consider Wool in the same way as Lytchett Matravers and make provision for a settlement expansion of at least 50 dwellings, including affordable housing.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Amend Policy HS: Housing Supply by inserting onto the line dealing with South West, the reference to a settlement extension at Wool, to put 25 houses in the column 2012-2016 and 25 houses in the column 2017-2021.

Entec

An AMEC company

Entec UK Ltd
Gables House, Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spa, Warwickshire CV32 6JX, England
Tel: +44 (0)1926 439000 Fax: +44 (0)1926 439010

Planning Policy Team
Purbeck District Council
Westport House
Worgret Road
Wareham
Dorset
BH20 4PP

Damien Holdstock
Consultant Town Planner

Tel: 01926 439127
damien.holdstock@entecuk.co.uk

20 December 2010

Dear Sir / Madam

**Purbeck District Council: Core Strategy Pre-Submission
SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID**

National Grid has recently appointed Entec to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the current consultation on the above document.

Overview – National Grid

National Grid is a leading international energy infrastructure business. In the UK National Grid's business includes electricity and gas transmission networks and gas distribution networks as described below.

Electricity Transmission

National Grid, as the holder of a licence to transmit electricity under the Electricity Act 1989, has a statutory duty to develop and maintain an efficient, co-ordinated and economical transmission system of electricity and to facilitate competition in the supply and generation of electricity.

National Grid operates the national electricity transmission network across Great Britain and owns and maintains the network in England and Wales, providing electricity supplies from generating stations to local distribution companies. We do not distribute electricity to individual premises ourselves, but our role in the wholesale market is key to ensuring a reliable and quality supply to all. National Grid's high voltage electricity system, which operates at 400,000 and 275,000 volts, is made up of approximately 22,000 pylons with an overhead line route length of 4,500 miles, 420 miles of underground cable and 337 substations. Separate regional companies own and operate the electricity distribution networks that comprise overhead lines and cables at 132,000 volts and below. It is the role of these local distribution companies to distribute electricity to homes and businesses.

To facilitate competition in the supply and generation of electricity, National Grid must offer a connection to any proposed generator, major industry or distribution network operator who wishes to generate electricity or requires a high voltage electricity supply. Often proposals for new electricity projects involve transmission reinforcements remote from the generating site, such as new overhead lines or new development at substations. If there are significant demand increases across a local distribution electricity network area then the local network distribution operator may seek reinforcements at an existing substation or a new grid supply point. In addition National Grid may undertake development works at its existing substations to meet changing patterns of generation and supply.



Registered in England & Wales No. 2190074
Registered Office: Bourne Park, Chelford Road, Kearsford, Cheshire WA16 8QZ



Gas Transmission

National Grid owns and operates the high pressure gas transmission system in England, Scotland and Wales that consists of approximately 4,300 miles of pipelines and 26 compressor stations connecting to 8 distribution networks. National Grid has a duty to develop and maintain an efficient co-ordinated and economical transmission system for the conveyance of gas and respond to requests for new gas supplies in certain circumstances.

New gas transmission infrastructure developments (pipelines and associated installations) are periodically required to meet increases in demand and changes in patterns of supply. Developments to our network are as a result of specific connection requests e.g. power stations, and requests for additional capacity on our network from gas shippers. Generally network developments to provide supplies to the local gas distribution network are as a result of overall demand growth in a region rather than site specific developments.

Gas Distribution

National Grid also owns and operates approximately 82,000 miles of lower-pressure distribution gas mains in the north west of England, the west Midlands, east of England and north London – almost half of Britain's gas distribution network, delivering gas to around 11 million homes, offices and factories. National Grid does not supply gas, but provides the networks through which it flows. Reinforcements and developments of our local distribution network generally are as a result of overall demand growth in a region rather than site specific developments. A competitive market operates for the connection of new developments.

National Grid and Local Development Plan Documents

The Energy White Paper makes clear that UK energy systems will undergo a significant change over the next 20 years. To meet the goals of the white paper it will be necessary to revise and update much of the UK's energy infrastructure during this period. There will be a requirement for:

- An expansion of national infrastructure (e.g. overhead power lines, underground cables, extending substations, new gas pipelines and associated installations).
- New forms of infrastructure (e.g. smaller scale distributed generation, gas storage sites).

Our gas and electricity infrastructure is sited across the country and many stakeholders and communities have an interest in our activities. We believe our long-term success is based on having a constructive and sustainable relationship with our stakeholders. Our transmission pipelines and overhead lines were originally routed in consultation with local planning authorities and designed to avoid major development areas but since installation much development may have taken place near our routes.

We therefore wish to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of Development Plan Documents (DPDs) which may affect our assets including policies and plans relating to the following issues:

- Any policies relating to overhead transmission lines, underground cables or gas pipeline installations
- Site specific allocations/land use policies affecting sites crossed by overhead lines, underground cables or gas transmission pipelines
- Land use policies/development proposed adjacent to existing high voltage electricity substation sites and gas above ground installations
- Any policies relating to the diverting or undergrounding of overhead transmission lines
- Other policies relating to infrastructure or utility provision
- Policies relating to development in the countryside
- Landscape policies
- Waste and mineral plans

In addition, we also want to be consulted by developers and local authorities on planning applications, which may affect our assets and are happy to provide pre-application advice. Our aim in this is to ensure that the safe and secure transportation of electricity and gas is not compromised.

National Grid infrastructure within Purbeck District Council's administrative area

Electricity Transmission

National Grid's high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines / underground cables within Purbeck District Council's administrative area that form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales include the following:

- 4VN line – 400kV route from Chickerell substation in West Dorset to Mannington substation in East Dorset

National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity transmission assets via the following internet link:

<http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/GasElectricNW>

Gas Transmission

National Grid has no gas transmission assets located within the administrative area of Purbeck District Council.

Gas Distribution

Southern Gas Networks owns and operates the local gas distribution network in Purbeck District Council's administrative area. Contact details for Southern Gas Networks can be found on the Energy Networks website. www.energynetworks.org

Further Advice

National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us. In addition the following publications are available from the National Grid website or by contacting us at the address below:

- National Grid's commitments when undertaking works in the UK – Our stakeholder, community and amenity policy
- Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure Gas Pipelines and Associated Installations – Requirements for Third Parties
- A sense of place – Design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines

Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database:

Damien Holdstock
Consultant Town Planner

damien.holdstock@entecuk.co.uk

Entec UK Ltd
Gables House
Kenilworth Road

Leamington Spa
Warwickshire
CV32 6JX

I hope the above information is useful. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

[via email]
Damien Holdstock
Consultant Town Planner

cc: Stefan Preuss, National Grid

National Grid Property Holdings



Planning Policy
Purbeck District Council
Westport House
Worgret Road
Wareham
Dorset
BH20 4PP

24 Bruton Place
London W1J 6NE

T 020 7493 6008
F 020 7491 9654

10 December 2010

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Sir/Madam

Core Strategy Pre-Submission Consultation

We are instructed by National Grid Property Holdings Limited (NGPHL) to submit the attached comments to the Core Strategy pre-submission consultation. NGPHL own the Gas Depot site on North Street in Wareham for which they are minded to seek planning permission for residential development in the near future.

I trust that the attached representations reach you well ahead of the consultation deadline on 20 December 2010 and I would be grateful if you could confirm their receipt by email.

Yours faithfully

Signature has been blanked out

Jessica McSweeney

For and on behalf of Planning Perspectives LLP

Encl

1

www.planper.com

Planning Perspectives LLP, Urbanworld Perspectives LLP and Strategic Perspectives LLP are all part of The Perspectives Group LLP
Registration No. 0C318312 Registered address: Redrow Business Centre, 65 High Street, Tolleshott, Surrey, TW20 9EY





Purbeck District Council
Local Development Framework (LDF)
'Planning Purbeck's Future'
Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document
Representation Form (Nov/Dec 2010)

Your Details		Agents Details (where relevant)
Title		MR
Name		TIM WATERS
Job Title (where relevant)		PARTNER
Organisation (where relevant)	NATIONAL GRID PROPERTY HOLDINGS LIMITED	PLANNING PERSPECTIVES LLP
Address		24 BRUTON PLACE, LONDON
Postcode		W1J 6NE
E-mail		tim.waters@planper.com
Tel. Number		(020) 7493-6008

Responses should be sent to:

Email: ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk

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

Fax: 01929 557348

Return to Purbeck District Council by 4pm, Monday 20th December 2010

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

If you choose to type a response it would be appreciated if you could email the Microsoft Word version, making it easier to copy the responses into an examination database.

Briefings on how to complete these forms and the process involved will be held on:

- 10th November, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham
- 18th November, 7pm, Community Hall, The Mowlem, Swanage
- 1st December, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham

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 or call 01929 557273 to speak to a member of the Planning Policy Team.

As your representation will be passed to an Inspector you should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

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. 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 adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature	Signature has been blanked out	Date 10/12/2010
-----------	--------------------------------	-----------------

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : POLICY HS: HOUSING SUPPLY	Paragraph:	Map:
----------------------------------------------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is not 'consistent with national policy'			<input type="checkbox"/>

(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 WE DO NOT QUESTION THE NEED FOR HOUSING IN PURBECK, WE WOULD REQUEST THE COUNCIL'S CLARIFICATION THAT THE IDENTIFIED PROVISION FOR THE CENTRAL AREA AND SPECIFICALLY WITHIN THE CATEGORY OF 'COMMITMENTS/CHARACTER AREA POTENTIAL' RECOGNISES THE POTENTIAL AFFORDED BY THE FORMER GAS DEPOT SITE ON NORTH STREET, WAREHAM AS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR SUSTAINABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ON AN URBAN BROWNFIELD SITE (CONSISTENT WITH SUCH RECOGNITION FOR THE SITE IN THE COUNCIL'S 2009 SHLAA). IF THIS IS NOT THE CASE, WE WOULD MAINTAIN THAT THE COUNCIL'S PROPOSED SUPPORT FOR A MIXED-USE SETTLEMENT EXTENSION AT WORGRET ROAD SHOULD NOT EXCLUDE A HOUSING SCHEME COMING FORWARD ON THE GAS DEPOT SITE IN THE FUTURE.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

THIRD SENTENCE SHOULD BE CHANGED TO: "HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WILL BE DIRECTED TO THE MOST SUSTAINABLE LOCATIONS, PRIORITISING PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED BROWNFIELD SITES AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICY LD: GENERAL LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT".

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : POLICY CEN: CENTRAL PURBECK	Paragraph:	Map:
--------------------------------------------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i> • It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>)</i> • It is not 'consistent with national policy' 			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

CONSISTENT WITH THE COMMENT MADE FOR POLICY HS, WE WOULD MAINTAIN THAT THE PROPOSED MIXED-USE SETTLEMENT EXTENSION AT WORGRET ROAD SHOULD NOT PREJUDICE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT COMING FORWARD ON URBAN, BROWNFIELD SITES IN WAREHAM AND MOST SPECIFICALLY ON THE FORMER GAS DEPOT SITE AT NORTH STREET.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

UNDER THE HEADING 'WAREHAM' THE INTRODUCTORY TEXT SHOULD BE AMENDED TO: "THE ROLE OF WAREHAM WILL BE SUPPORTED BY PRIORITISING THE OPPORUNITIES FOR

SUSTAINABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ON BROWNFIELD LAND AND THE MIXED-USE SETTLEMENT EXTENSION ALONG WORGET ROAD".

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : POLICY AH: AFFORDABLE HOUSING	Paragraph:	Map:
----------------------------------------------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
• It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• It is not 'consistent with national policy'			<input type="checkbox"/>

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

WE NOTE HOW THE COUNCIL IS PROPOSING A MORE RIGOROUS POLICY FROM THE APPROACH TAKEN IN THE LOCAL PLAN (UNDER POLICY MN4) SUCH THAT DEVELOPMENTS OF 2 OR MORE DWELLINGS WILL BE EXPECTED TO PROVIDE AT LEAST 40% AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN WAREHAM. SUCH A THRESHOLD IS CONSIDERED UNDULY ONEROUS AND THE COUNCIL SHOULD INSTEAD REVERT BACK TO THE APPROACH TAKEN IN THE LOCAL PLAN. NOTWITHSTANDING THIS, THE PROPOSED REPLACEMENT POLICY DOES AT LEAST ACCEPT THAT EXCEPTIONS CAN BE MADE IF JUSTIFIED THROUGH VIABILITY ASSESSMENT. THIS ELEMENT OF THE POLICY IS AT LEAST SUPPORTED.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

THE OPENING PART OF THE POLICY SHOULD BE AMENDED TO READ AS PER LOCAL PLAN POLICY MN4 TO REVISE THE THRESHOLD FOR THE PROVISION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING.



Date: 20 December 2010
Our Ref: LA/60/2
Your Ref:

Room H7
Government Buildings
Prince of Wales Road
Dorchester
DT1 1PY

Tel: 01305 257086

www.naturalengland.org.uk

Planning Policy Team Leader
Purbeck District Council
Westport House
Worgret Road
Wareham
Dorset BH20 4PP

Dear Sir

Planning Purbeck's future; core strategy pre-submission consultation

Thank you for seeking the views of Natural England about this core strategy document. We have the following comments.

General observations on treatment of environmental issues

Whilst there is much to welcome in the plan our main overall concern is that some key environmental issues are treated very much as a bolt on to development and housing issues rather than being an integral part of the plan.

This starts with the overall vision where the environment receives only a cursory mention, flows through to the visions for the different parts of Purbeck which for the most part have no environmental 'vision' at all and is then reflected in the sections on the delivery of development for each area where key environmental matters such as green infrastructure provision are omitted.

In this respect too you should also be mindful of the detailed comments of the Dorset AONB team with regard to the treatment of AONB issues within the Strategy. We agree with these comments.

4. Vision and Spatial Objectives

As far as the environment is concerned, the vision is notably lacking. The vision needs to go further than wanting part of the environmental heritage to be 'valued' but should desire enhancement of all natural habitats at landscape scale so that they can develop in ways favourable to their conservation.

6. Supply of Housing, Employment and Retail Growth

6.1 Housing Land Supply

We are concerned that apart from Habitats Regulations issues, where there is a legal requirement to be satisfied, the Strategy takes little account of the environmental effects in its assessment of what might be an appropriate level of housing growth. Now that there is no definitive housing target and given Purbeck's outstanding environment, it would be an opportune time for a re-appraisal of housing growth Purbeck with more consideration given to environmental matters. In our view the quality of the environment of Purbeck – equivalent or surpassing that in most National Parks - should be a key factor in the determination of housing numbers rather than numbers being influenced by strategic growth plans for south east Dorset, simply because the District is close to Poole and Bournemouth.

6.6 Provision of New Employment Land

The section on the supply of employment land at Holton Heath somewhat confusing. Under 6.6.3 the plan is apparently proposing an additional amount of employment land, over and above the 8ha at Holton Heath which already has planning permission, and the 4ha at Admiralty Park. It is not clear to me how this relates to the Habitat Regulations Assessment and the issue of fragmentation. In any event, if there is to be a further allocation of employment land at Holton then it is not just Habitat Regulations issues that are relevant. Any development should only proceed if it secures the enhancement and long term nature conservation management of the swathe of undeveloped land between Holton and Sandford Heaths so that a broad heathland corridor, encompassing the SSSI at Black Hill, is established.

7. Spatial distribution of development

Visions for different parts of the District (7.1.6, 7.2.7, 7.3.6, 7.4.6, 7.5.8)

These are notably lacking in any environmental content or reference to the rural parts of these areas. This is an important omission because different parts of the District have different characteristics and therefore may require a different type of planning policy to maintain or enhance their special features.

For example the southern shores of Poole Harbour and its hinterland of heaths and associated habitats has long been recognised as one of the most important areas for nature conservation in the country. But it is also important because of its wild landscapes and quiet nature and is quite unlike some of the farmed landscapes in other parts of Purbeck. The vision for Wild Purbeck is recognised within the policy of Biodiversity and Geodiversity but neither this nor any other desire for enhancement of rural areas is mentioned in the area visions. This omission is important because policy for dealing with planning issues such as campsites and re-use of buildings that may affect these areas should flow from a vision of what is trying to be achieved in different places. A one size fits all policy that deals with the things in the same way throughout the District is not appropriate in an area where some parts have a landscape that is of a quality and sensitivity equivalent to a National Park whereas other areas are not so sensitive.

In addition, none of the areas visions includes any reference to green infrastructure and how enhanced provision in and around particular towns and villages would be desirable.

7.1 North west Purbeck

7.1.8 Delivery of proposed development - Heathland Mitigation

The paragraph is very general (and pretty much the same wording is used for all of the different areas of Purbeck). The Strategy would benefit if the specific issues of heathland mitigation that apply in NW Purbeck were briefly summarised.

The sentence:-

'Alternatively where suitable mitigation for individual development sites cannot be secured, contributions from all housing development will be used to implement mitigation measures'

is at best misleading and at worst not compliant with the Habitat Regulations. There may be cases where the reason that suitable mitigation cannot be found is that mitigation for that particular development is not possible and in these circumstances the intractable problem cannot be just be given to the DPD for there is no reason to think that mitigation would be any easier to achieve through that route. The wording needs to be revised taking into account the differences between larger and smaller developments outlined below (under 8.8.6).

(The same comment applies to all of the 'Delivery – heathland mitigation' sections but I have not repeated it elsewhere)

Omissions – section 7.1.8 should include reference to the provision of green infrastructure with a brief overview of needs and opportunities in the area. I appreciate that the south east Dorset joint strategy is not yet complete but it would be unwise to await this and then find that it does not provide the necessary information to inform green infrastructure provision at the settlement level.

(The same comment applies to all of the 'Delivery' sections but I have not repeated it below)

7.2 South west Purbeck

7.2.8 Delivery of proposed development - Heathland Mitigation

The paragraph is very general. The Strategy would benefit if the specific issues of heathland mitigation that apply in SW Purbeck were briefly summarised.

7.3 Central Purbeck

Natural England is concerned that the housing allocation in Wareham is being taken forward when there is great uncertainty, acknowledged in the text, about whether appropriate mitigation measures can in practice be achieved. Because of its position in relation to the heaths mitigation of the effects of housing at Wareham is particularly difficult to achieve. We would strongly recommend that, if the housing allocation is to be progressed, further work on mitigation is done at an early stage or there is a danger that the Strategy will progress to a later stage including a proposal for housing that in practice cannot be implemented.

Under Heathland Mitigation it is indicated that ideally mitigation is put in place before the occupation of new housing. This is not just an ideal scenario but is necessary to ensure compliance with the Habitat Regulations.

7.5 South East Purbeck

The Core Strategy is proposing development within the AONB around Swanage yet there is no indication, apart from one sentence within the 'vision', of how harm to the AONB is to be avoided. The Core Strategy needs to examine the issue more rigorously; mitigation of adverse effects on the AONB issue should be one of the key elements of delivery under 7.5.10 and the mechanism through which the site allocations plan will deal with the issue should be laid out.

8. Development Policies

8.8.6 Heathlands

Natural England supports the overall aims of the text and Policy DH but have a number of specific observations.

There is a lack of clarity about the mechanism through which mitigation should be provided. Thus under 8.8.6.3 all of the responsibility for the mitigation the development proposed through the core strategy is given to the heathlands DPD.

The IPF was implemented to provide mitigation for small developments where it is not possible individual development to provide mitigation. The IPF/DPD cannot be expected to provide mitigation for larger developments, such as most of the allocations specifically proposed in the draft Core Strategy. These need mitigation that is specific to the particular problems that each would generate and measures should be an integral part of, or specifically linked to, the development proposal.

Habitat regulations assessment and omissions from the Core Strategy

Recreational effects on Poole Harbour SPA/Ramsar

Recommendations are made within the HRA for mitigation of these potential effects. There is no policy or text within the Core Strategy that enables these measures to be implemented. In order for the Strategy to be compliant with the Habitat Regulations, this issue needs to be covered.

Recreational effects on Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC and Durlston to St Aldhelms Head SAC.

Again, recommendations are made within the HRA for mitigation of these potential effects. There is no policy or text within the Core Strategy that enables these measures to be implemented. In order for the Strategy to be compliant with the Habitat Regulations, this issue needs to be covered.

Water Issues (water quality and STWs) and Poole Harbour SPA/Ramsar

The issue of water quality needs further consideration and the section within the HRA would benefit from being updated to take account of recent developments. We can provide some more specific comments if necessary..

Considering the importance of the issue and the implications for development there is a lack of reference or policy relating to the issue within the core strategy itself. Here the critical recommendation of the HRA is that mitigation is likely to be required in order to ensure that the Habitat Regulations tests are met. We would support the need for agreement of a timetable of actions (9.57, 9.61) but our view is that 'assurances' from EA and Wessex Water do not provide the degree of certainty required

In the above circumstances we would recommend that the core strategy includes policy that:-

- Links provision of housing with provision of any essential infrastructure needed for mitigation so there can be no breach of the Habitat Regulations and
- Provides a basis that, if necessary, would allow developer contributions to be levied and put towards any essential infrastructure

Below we recommend text and policy that would cover the issue within the Core Strategy if included.

Possible Text and policy for the Core Strategy

The HRA has concluded that there is a significant risk that additional development (mainly housing) would adversely affect the integrity Poole Harbour SPA and Ramsar site through increasing the nutrient loading (nitrogen) being discharged into an already eutrophic estuary. The development proposals affected are those which would be served by the six STWs that discharge, directly or indirectly, into Poole Harbour (HRA Table 12). The HRA further concludes that measures will be required to remove this adverse effect.

Policy to secure appropriate mitigation (that will remove the adverse effects on the integrity of these sites from additional development) is therefore required.

The cumulative effects of development and across the conurbation have pointed to the need for a strategic approach to the mitigation of anticipated adverse effects on these sites in conjunction with neighbouring districts also affected (Poole and West Dorset).

A joint approach (including an options appraisal and timetable of actions) covering the relevant local authority areas will be essential to ensure that mitigation measures are coordinated and consistent, and to secure their delivery. This should be worked out in the context of the Nutrient Management Plan for the Harbour, currently being developed by Natural England, the Environment Agency and Wessex Water.

At this stage it is not possible to determine which of several different options for mitigation will be most appropriate but they will broadly fall into two categories, those that tackle point sources from SWT or those that deal with diffuse pollution from agriculture.

A clear process for the funding and implementation of these measures, if necessary involving developer contributions should be laid out. Monitoring of the delivery and effectiveness of mitigation measures will be needed and if necessary, should trigger review of the phasing and/or distribution and/or scale of housing provision.

Possible Policy

i New residential development will be facilitated by measures to secure effective avoidance and mitigation policy of the potential adverse effects on the ecological integrity of the Poole Harbour internationally designated sites.

ii The council will work with neighbouring local authorities, the Environment Agency, Wessex Water and Natural England, supported by other relevant stakeholders, to secure appropriate and deliverable mitigation, and mechanisms that will fund and enable implementation of these measures.

Other water issues, Poole Harbour and the Dorset Heaths international sites

Recommendations are made within the HRA that concern water abstraction and other mechanisms that may affect these sites and consideration should be given about whether additions to the Strategy are necessary to cover these points.

Yours faithfully

Signature has been blanked out

Dr Andrew Nicholson
0300 060 4816
andrew.nicholson@naturalengland.org.uk



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

Your ref:
Our ref: ew
Email: Emma.woodhouse@nfu.org.uk
Direct line: 01392 440700
Date: 17th December 2010

Dear Sir/Madam

Planning Purbecks Future – Core Strategy Pre Submissions Public Consultation

I write as a Food & Farming Adviser with the National Farmers' Union in the South West which represents 10,000 farmer and grower members in response to Planning Purbecks Future – Core Strategy document.

As you will be aware agriculture continues to go through a considerable period of change and volatility. The markets for the past two years have been extremely volatile with fluctuating commodity prices and high input prices all at a time when globally businesses are being hit by lack of access to capital. However, to meet the demand for food from a fast growing global population and at the same time satisfy environmental regulation farm business will need to develop and this must be reflected within planning policy.

Food Security and Supporting Core Agriculture

With a rapidly growing population the pressures on land-use are greater than ever before and in a time of food security and rising costs for consumers, farmers need to become more productive, producing more whilst impacting less on the environment. Planning policy needs to allow for the much needed investment in agricultural buildings to meet the demand for increased agricultural productivity. An objective within the core strategy should see investment in core agriculture.

Sustainable Development

Planning policy should not prohibit development in the countryside, The Taylor Review of Rural Economy and Affordable Housing, commissioned by the Government considered in detail the sustainable development in rural areas:

"Planning must not determine the future development of rural communities against a narrow tick-box approach to sustainable development, assessing communities as they are now and not what they could be. In too many places this approach writes off rural communities in a 'sustainability trap' where development can only occur in places already considered to be in narrow terms 'sustainable'."

"The question planners must address is 'how will development add to or diminish the sustainability of this community?' taking a better balance of social, economic, and environmental factors together to form a long term vision for all scales of communities. A mix of housing and employment opportunities are essential for the sustainability of rural communities" (pg 26 Taylor Review)

NFU, Agriculture House, Pynes Hill, Rydon Lane, Exeter, Devon EX2 5ST
Tel: 01392 440 700 Fax: 01392 440 701 Web: www.nfuonline.com

Renewable Energy

The farming sector has the potential to contribute significantly to renewable energy targets. Farmers are being encouraged through the introduction of Feed in Tariffs to have on-farm renewable energy systems, including hydro, wind, solar and anaerobic digestion apparatus. Planning policy should reflect government incentives and support this sort of technology on farm.

Farm Diversification

Government Policy is clear in PPS 7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas that farm diversification is an important part of the rural economy. Paragraph 30 of this document is key and is set out in full below.

30. Recognising that diversification into non-agricultural activities is vital to the continuing viability of many farm enterprises, local planning authorities should:
- (i) Set out in their LDDs the criteria to be applied to planning applications for farm diversification projects;
 - (ii) Be supportive of well-conceived farm diversification schemes for business purposes that contribute to sustainable development objectives and help to sustain the agricultural enterprise, and are consistent in their scale with their rural location. This applies equally to farm diversification schemes around the fringes of urban areas; and
 - (iii) Where relevant, give favourable consideration to proposals for diversification in Green Belts where the development preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. (Where farm diversification proposals in the Green Belt would result in inappropriate development in terms of PPG2, any wider benefits of the diversification may contribute to the 'very special circumstances' required by PPG2 for a development to be granted planning permission)

Regulatory Impacts

Farmers are required to respond to regulatory changes, the new Nitrate Vulnerable Zones, for example, will require farmers to store slurry for longer periods over the winter months and this will require much larger slurry tanks and lagoons to be constructed. Planning policy needs to be sympathetic to these changes.

Agriculture needs to be recognised within the Planning Purbecks Future; Core Strategy for the importance it plays in food production, the wider rural economy, management of the environment and in mitigating climate change.

Yours sincerely

Signature has been blanked out

**Emma Woodhouse MRICS
SW Food & Farming Adviser**

North Dorset District Council

From: Ian Smith [mailto:ISmith@north-dorset.gov.uk]
Sent: 29 November 2010 11:23
To: Steve Dring
Subject: Planning Purbeck's Future - Core Strategy Pre-Submission Consultation


Good morning Steve – Trevor has asked me to respond to the consultation regarding your Core Strategy to the effect that we have no matters of significance to raise.

Kind regards.

Ian Smith BA MSc DipEP FCILT MRICS FRTP

Senior Planning Policy Officer

North Dorset District Council
Nordon
Salisbury Road
Blandford Forum
Dorset
DT11 7LL

 01258 484219



Purbeck District Council
 Local Development Framework (LDF)
 'Planning Purbeck's Future'
Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document
 Representation Form (Nov/Dec 2010)

Your Details	Agents Details <i>(where relevant)</i>
Title	Mr
Name	Michael Oldman
Job Title <i>(where relevant)</i>	
Organisation <i>(where relevant)</i>	
Address	17 Bartlemead Swanage
Postcode	BH19 1PH
E-mail	mike.oldman@yahoo.co.uk
Tel. Number	01929427698

Responses should be sent to:

Email: ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk

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

Fax: 01929 557348

Return to Purbeck District Council by 4pm, Monday 20th December 2010

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

If you choose to type a response it would be appreciated if you could email the Microsoft Word version, making it easier to copy the responses into an examination database.

Briefings on how to complete these forms and the process involved will be held on:

- 10th November, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham
- 18th November, 7pm, Community Hall, The Mowlem, Swanage
- 1st December, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham

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 or call 01929 557273 to speak to a member of the Planning Policy Team.

As your representation will be passed to an Inspector you should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

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. 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:

I only wish to appear, if the Inspector deems it necessary.

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

Signature Michael Oldman

Date 17 December 2010

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : Settlement Strategy	Paragraph:	Map:
---------------------------------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>

(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the Core Strategy 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 Core Strategy 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 consultation did not give an option for "No Houses in Swanage". The total number of houses had already been determined, based on the previous governments allocation. The current government has removed these allocated targets and therefore the entire strategy is based on a fallacy.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

The consultation needs to be done again, giving more open ended options, (i.e. If the option is for a set number of houses in either North Swanage or Herston, Then the option for a different number of houses should be given, and the option of "Neither of these locations"

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : Settlement Strategy	Paragraph:	Map:
---------------------------------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>

(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

- It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the Core Strategy 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 Core Strategy 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)

Swanage is at the end of a cul-de-sac. It has limited job opportunities, which are mainly lower paid. Under the Schools policy, it will shortly provide no education beyond 11 years old. This means that any development will result in additional car journeys for work, for education and for shopping, placing a larger burden on the single trunk road (A351). Public transport is infrequent and unreliable, so people will use cars.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Remove Swanage as an area of concentrated development. Instead direct that development to Upton and surroundings, close to schools, shops and work in Poole.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : Protection against flooding	Paragraph:	Map:
-----------------------------------------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>

(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

- It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the Core Strategy 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 Core Strategy 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)

Only water run off has been considered. The combined effect of water run off, high sea levels due to low atmospheric pressure (likely to occur at the same time) and high easterly winds has not been considered in terms of the effect on Swanage for flood risk. The high seas and winds back up the drainage channels and prevent run off water draining away, causing a flood risk, where they meet.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Add consideration of these effects to flood risk arising from development at Swanage.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy :	Paragraph:	Map:
----------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>

(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

- It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the Core Strategy 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 Core Strategy 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 very high rates of proportion of sustainable housing provision of up to 40% are not deliverable. Alternative strategies have not been considered. For example development by Housing Associations on land already owned by councils, could provide much of the affordable housing required. Providing affordable housing on the same site (with a high land cost) as normal development, makes no sense. It is better to twin a premium development with an affordable development on a site with a lower land cost.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Consider other ways of providing affordable housing.

Omand S, Bierton E & Lees C J



4947
19/10/10

Purbeck District Council
Local Development Framework (LDF)
'Planning Purbeck's Future'
Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document
Representation Form (Nov/Dec 2010)

Your Details		Agents Details (where relevant)
Title		Mr
Name	Mrs S Omond, Mrs E. Bierton & Mr C.J. Lees	OJH Chamberlain
Job Title (where relevant)	Landowners	Land Agent
Organisation (where relevant)		Chichesters Land Agents
Address	c/o Chichesters Land Agents, 33 West Borough, Wimborne, Dorset.	33 West Borough, Wimborne, Dorset.
Postcode	BH21 1LT	BH21 1LT
E-mail	info@chichesters.co.uk	ojhc@chichesters.co.uk
Tel. Number	01202 882336	01202 882336

Responses should be sent to:

Email: ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk

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

Fax: 01929 557348

Return to Purbeck District Council by 4pm, Monday 20th December 2010

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

If you choose to type a response it would be appreciated if you could email the Microsoft Word version, making it easier to copy the responses into an examination database.

Briefings on how to complete these forms and the process involved will be held on:

- 10th November, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham
- 18th November, 7pm, Community Hall, The Mowlem, Swanage
- 1st December, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham

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 or call 01929 557273 to speak to a member of the Planning Policy Team.

As your representation will be passed to an Inspector you should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

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. 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 adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature Oliver Chamberlain for and on behalf of the Landowners

Date 19th December 2010

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : NE	Paragraph: 7.4.7	Map: 11
----------------	---------------------	------------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>			<input type="checkbox"/>
It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>).</i>			<input type="checkbox"/>
It is not 'consistent with national policy'			<input type="checkbox"/>

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

We support the allocation of a settlement extension of some 70 dwellings at Policemans Lane in Policy NE as shown on Map 11.

1. The site is well positioned and forms a natural extension to Upton.
2. The site is immediately available for development.
3. The site will help to contribute to the needs and aspirations of the community for the provision of open market family housing and affordable housing to enable local people to remain in Upton.
4. It should be noted the proposed well established local developer is very familiar with the area.
5. Both the Landowners and the Developer are able to deliver the completed site.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

n/a

Owermoigne Parish Council

0485

OWERMOIGNE PARISH COUNCIL

Chair: Barry J. Hubbard 17 Chilbury Gardens Owermoigne Dorchester Dorset 01305 852260
Clerk: Mrs P Buckingham 11 Chilbury Gardens Owermoigne Dorchester Dorset 01305 852339
e-mail: owermoigne@dorsetparishes.gov.uk



30th November 2010

Mr S. Dring
Planning Policy Manager
Purbeck District Council
Westport House
Worgret Road
Wareham
Dorset
BH20 4PP

Dear Mr Dring,

Re: Planning Purbeck's Future

My council have asked me to thank you for the invitation to take part in the consultation but after consideration it has been decided that it would be inappropriate to comment.

However, I have also been asked to tell you that Owermoigne Parish Council would always be interested to know about developments which would affect the A352 corridor as this would have significance within the parish.

Yours sincerely,

Signature has been blanked out

P. M. Buckingham
Parish Clerk

Paxton-Brunning B



Purbeck District Council
Local Development Framework (LDF)
'Planning Purbeck's Future'
Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document
Representation Form (Nov/Dec 2010)

Your Details	Agents Details (where relevant)	
Title	Mrs	
Name	Bett Paxton-Brunning	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address	38 Park Road	
Postcode	BH119 2AD	
E-mail	bett138parkroad@googlemail.com	
Tel. Number	01929 421394	

Responses should be sent to:

Email: ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk

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

Fax: 01929 557348

Return to Purbeck District Council by 4pm, Monday 20th December 2010

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

If you choose to type a response it would be appreciated if you could email the Microsoft Word version, making it easier to copy the responses into an examination database.

Briefings on how to complete these forms and the process involved will be held on:

- 10th November, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham
- 18th November, 7pm, Community Hall, The Mowlem, Swanage
- 1st December, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham

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 or call 01929 557273 to speak to a member of the Planning Policy Team.

As your representation will be passed to an Inspector you should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

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. 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 adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature Bett Paxton-Brunning

Date 20/12/2010

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy :	Paragraph:	Map:
----------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
It is not 'consistent with national policy'	<input type="checkbox"/>		

(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 whole process of consultation was much too complicated. Even the title was complicated. It should have been called a 'New Local Plan' rather than 'Core Strategy' The information was not as available to all as it should have been. It seems that the whole thing was designed to alienate the public rather than include them.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy :	Paragraph:	Map:
----------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>

(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

- It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the Core Strategy 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 Core Strategy 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 Core Strategy document was created in a much different financial and political climate than exists today. There is new legislation being formulated that could change it completely.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy :	Paragraph:	Map:
----------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>

(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

- It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the Core Strategy 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 Core Strategy 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)

No reference has been made to the new World Heritage Centre which is to open at Durlston. This will increase the amount of traffic on the already very busy A351 and must be taken into account.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy :	Paragraph:	Map:
----------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>

(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

- It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the Core Strategy 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 Core Strategy 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 are already insufficient Conservation and Enforcement Officers in the beautiful area of Purbeck. The protection of the heritage of the built environment and the natural environment are already at risk without further developments into areas of AONB and extending present settlements.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).



Purbeck District Council
 Local Development Framework (LDF)
 'Planning Purbeck's Future'
Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document
 Representation Form (Nov/Dec 2010)

Your Details		Agents Details <i>(where relevant)</i>
Title	Mr	
Name	Jon Brooke	
Job Title <i>(where relevant)</i>		
Organisation <i>(where relevant)</i>	PEAT - Purbeck Environment Action Team	
Address	79 East St, Wareham, Dorset	
Postcode	BH20 4NW	
E-mail	jon@speakssoftly.co.uk	
Tel. Number	01929 558284	

Responses should be sent to:

Email: ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk

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

Fax: 01929 557348

Return to Purbeck District Council by 4pm, Monday 20th December 2010

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

If you choose to type a response it would be appreciated if you could email the Microsoft Word version, making it easier to copy the responses into an examination database.

Briefings on how to complete these forms and the process involved will be held on:

- 10th November, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham
- 18th November, 7pm, Community Hall, The Mowlem, Swanage
- 1st December, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham

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 or call 01929 557273 to speak to a member of the Planning Policy Team.

As your representation will be passed to an Inspector you should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

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. 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 adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature Jon Brooke (for PEAT)

Date 20/12/10

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : Retail Growth	Paragraph: 6.7.1	Map:
----------------------------------	----------------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because: <i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
It is not 'consistent with national policy'	<input type="checkbox"/>		

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

Paragraph 6.7.1 states "The Retail Study (2008) recommends a hierarchy of centres..." PEAT, and other organisations and individuals have pointed out many flaws in this study. However, even putting these aside, there have been changes in the the district since the delivery of the report that in any case mitigate its conclusions, not least the growth in internet food shopping and the redevelopment/expansion of the Sainsbury's supermarket in Wareham. For this reason it is wrong to refer to the study in the present as if its conclusions were still valid. Also, throughout the process of this consultation the implication in the consultation documents has always seemed to be that this extra retail provision should be in the form of one or two additional supermarkets when a range of other options could have been put forward through the documentation to stimulate debate. At the very least this could be recognised in the final document to prevent a misrepresentation of the procedures undertaken in the future.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Paragraph 6.7.1 The sentence

"The Retail Study (2008) recommends a hierarchy of centres and identifies a need for additional retail floor space of 4,000sqm over the plan period."

should be deleted, and replaced with the sentence

"The Retail Study (2008) recommended a hierarchy of centres and identified a need for additional retail floor space of 4,000sqm over the plan period based on projections for the future population of the whole of Purbeck."

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : Retail Growth	Paragraph: 6.7.3.1	Map:
----------------------------------	------------------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>

(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

- It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the Core Strategy 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 Core Strategy 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)

Paragraph 6.7.3.1 states that "...this could reduce the necessity of trips to Poole or Dorchester to larger food stores, with associated environmental benefits..." Prior to the 2010 RIA PEAT made the express recommendation that the RIA should include work to discover if this really was the case rather than a mere assumption. From its own soundings amongst members and elsewhere, PEAT is firmly of the belief that many, if not most, shopping trips to Poole or Dorchester are made in conjunction with trips to work or trips to large comparison shopping destinations and that the majority of these trips would be made anyway regardless of the provision of more supermarkett shopping in Wareham. Given that the planners did not take the opportunity to gather data on this specific question, it seems wrong that this point should be allowed to go forward in the final report with the implication not that there could be a benefit but that there would be a benefit to the environment if a supermarket were developed, which it clearly does given that no mention is made of the possible disbenefits to the environment caused by the construction of another large building, it's continuing need for heating, lighting, refrigeration, air-conditioning, the hard surfacing of a huge area of carparking etc etc. As has happened many times in this process the assumption of a benefit has been put forward as if it were a fact with no mention of the counter-argument.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Delete the words "with associated environmental benefits"

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : Retail Growth	Paragraph: 6.7.3.2	Map:
----------------------------------	------------------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because: <i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
• It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)</i>			<input type="checkbox"/>
• It is not 'consistent with national policy'			<input type="checkbox"/>

(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 paragraph understates the depth of feeling against the development of further supermarkets within the district. At the planning meeting to discuss the Core Strategy prior to this final consultation there was a turnout of around 350 concerned local people, ALL of whom were against the idea of a supermarket development, with not one organisation or individual speaking in support. The council then voted overwhelmingly against the inclusion of a supermarket within the final Core Strategy. This was not simply a decision not to put a supermarket development forwards, it was a decision to actively oppose further supermarket development and to follow a different path towards retail development in Purbeck. Again, this should be represented in the document to make clear the will of the people of Purbeck at this time and highlight that decision to any organisation that might be considering a speculative planning application for a supermarket in the district.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

The paragraph should be deleted and replaced with the following

"After much public debate, culminating in a specially convened council meeting attended by over 350 members of the public, the overwhelming feelings of local people were expressed by the District Council who voted overwhelmingly to reject the preferred option for retail growth in the district put forward during the consultation, of a new supermarket in Wareham.

This represents a continuation of previous policy by the Council, which has always been to reject plans for out-of-centre supermarkets in Wareham.

The District Council has made a clear decision to put the character and setting of Wareham and the negative impact that an out-of-centre supermarket would have on the town's character and setting and on the local economy and vibrancy of the town centre, ahead of the perceived qualitative need for additional comparison shopping of consumer goods within the wider Purbeck area as identified in the consultation documents.

The decision not to make an allocation for a food store within the Core Strategy or the subsequent Site Allocation Plan does not represent an omission by the Council, but a positive decision to foster retail growth through other channels."

Pipe M



Purbeck District Council
Local Development Framework (LDF)
'Planning Purbeck's Future'
Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document
Representation Form (Nov/Dec 2010)

3536
20/10/10

Your Details

Agents Details (where relevant)

Title	MR	
Name	MICHAEL PIPE	
Job Title (where relevant)	RETIRED ARCHITECT	
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address	16 CLUNY CRESCENT, SWANAGE	
Postcode	BH19 2BS	
E-mail	—	
Tel. Number	01929 - 424373	

Responses should be sent to:

Email: ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk

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

Fax: 01929 557348

Return to Purbeck District Council by 4pm, Monday 20th December 2010

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

If you choose to type a response it would be appreciated if you could email the Microsoft Word version, making it easier to copy the responses into an examination database.

Briefings on how to complete these forms and the process involved will be held on:

- 10th November, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham
- 18th November, 7pm, Community Hall, The Mowlem, Swanage
- 1st December, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham

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 or call 01929 557273 to speak to a member of the Planning Policy Team.

As your representation will be passed to an Inspector you should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

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. 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:

I CARE DEEPLY ABOUT THE FUTURE OF SWANSEA

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

Signature	Signature has been blanked out	Date 16.12.2010
-----------	--------------------------------	-----------------

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy :	Paragraph:	Map:
----------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is not 'consistent with national policy'			<input type="checkbox"/>

(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 Core Strategy is unjustified unless full provision is allowed for secondary education of all Swanage children in Swanage, before land is allocated for any other purpose. It is now increasingly clear that large -scale schools undermine the self-confidence of all children and most of all, often disastrously, of those from the most disadvantaged backgrounds; further, transporting children each day from Swanage to Wareham and back greatly reduces the chances of building their community spirit, is a loss of their time otherwise available for study or recreation, and is in any case unsustainable in the long term. If a two-tier system is pursued, either the present middle school site or the grammar school site should be reserved for this purpose. No consideration appears to have been given to expanding St Mark's First School by converting Jubilee Road into two closes, providing space for extra classrooms across the road and a direct link to the present school playing field; nor to relocating Herston Hall. This contained site is much more appropriate for the youngest children than the open Middle School site.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy :	Paragraph:	Map:
----------	------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because: <div style="text-align: right;"><i>(tick all that apply)</i></div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>)</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • It is not 'consistent with national policy' <input type="checkbox"/> 			

(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 Core Strategy is unjustified if it includes building on any part of Herston Fields, for the following reasons. First, it would be seriously harmful for the people of Herston. Secondly it seriously increases the spread of the town and the number of people who would live beyond convenient walking distance of the town-centre. Thirdly relocation of either Cottage Hospital or Doctors' surgery on the edge of town would be hugely inconvenient. Finally, in a country which does not at present feed its own population, when it could do so and feed others as well, in a world where already some billion people are either starving or malnourished, when global-warming is beginning to increase that number rapidly and no-one can guess what the ultimate death-toll will be, to build on any potentially arable land seems not just short-sighted and wrong-headed but immoral, particularly laid out in the space-wasting 1930's style manner proposed.

The projected housing need in Swanage appear to be based on Central Government strategies which have already been varied, or are in a state of flux.

The Core Strategy does not appear to have sufficiently considered the true potential for infill housing nearer the town-centre; for instance, a mews-style development of 30 to 40 houses on the town-council yard site. Such intimate small-scale communities are after all highly sought after in London. Nor does the effect of some relaxation of the prohibitions on sub-dividing large gardens appear to have been considered.

PLACE



Purbeck District Council
 Local Development Framework (LDF)
 'Planning Purbeck's Future'
Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document
 Representation Form (Nov/Dec 2010)

	Your Details	Agents Details (where relevant)
Title	MR	
Name	M. DAVIS	
Job Title (where relevant)	CHAIRMAN	
Organisation (where relevant)	P.L.A.C.E. (Policeman's Lane Action for Concern about our Environment)	
Address	5, POLICEMANS LANE UPTON	
Postcode	BH16 5NE	
E-mail	davism20@sky.com	
Tel. Number	01202 622870	

Responses should be sent to:

Email: ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk

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

Fax: 01929 557348

Return to Purbeck District Council by 4pm, Monday 20th December 2010

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

If you choose to type a response it would be appreciated if you could email the Microsoft Word version, making it easier to copy the responses into an examination database.

Briefings on how to complete these forms and the process involved will be held on:

- 10th November, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham
- 18th November, 7pm, Community Hall, The Mowlem, Swanage
- 1st December, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham

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 or call 01929 557273 to speak to a member of the Planning Policy Team.

As your representation will be passed to an Inspector you should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

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. 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:

I wish to share my concerns directly with the Inspector

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

Signature MIKE DAVIS

Date 20 DECEMBER 2010

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : NE	Paragraph: 7.4	Map: 11
----------------	-------------------	------------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because: <i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>).</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
It is not 'consistent with national policy'	<input type="checkbox"/>		

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

P.L.A.C.E. (Policeman's Lane Action for Concern about our Environment) is a group of Upton residents which has been formed with the object of protecting the Green Belt land between Policeman's Lane in Upton and the A35. As Chairman of the group, I represent these c. 200 residents.

P.L.A.C.E. argues that the site should not be developed because of the aggravated flood-risk which building would create, especially in view of the increasing frequency of episodes of exceptionally heavy rainfall which are associated with accelerating climate change. Photographs showing surface water flooding on the site have been submitted to PDC.

The inspector in the planning appeal for the erection of a dwelling in the garden of Oak Lodge, Policeman's Lane (Ref: APP/B1225/A/08/2073207 decision date 1/9/08) was concerned about the flooding implications of erecting one extra building in Policeman's Lane.

The inspector noted:

"...the Council has referred to evidence of flooding from the adjacent watercourse. Also, the appellant's claims about limited problems with flooding in the past do not, in the context of climate change and significant changes to rainfall patterns seen over recent years, mean that either a site is safe from flooding or

that development would not cause such a risk elsewhere...I have little alternative but to find that the proposal...would also conflict with the flood avoidance aims of local plan policy AH3." (Policy AH3: Development at risk from flooding outside river and coastal flood plains.)

The site provides an ecological link between urban gardens and the wider countryside, P.L.A.C.E. argues that development on the site, particularly as it is bordered along one side by the wildlife-unfriendly A35, would result in the fragmentation and isolation of habitats in this area

Any development on the site would necessitate an extension to Upton beyond the current settlement boundary and into the Green Belt. The site's Green Belt status was confirmed in 2006. ("Purbeck District Green Belt Review Final Report June 2006."). Rolling back the Green Belt to allow development here would create a precedent which might lead to further erosion of Green Belt land adjoining this site at some time in the future.

Building on the site would detract from the rural character of the area. Although elsewhere Upton is already developed up to the A35, it is vital that the gap between the settlements of Lytchett Minster and Upton is maintained in order that each retains its separate identity. The Policeman's Lane site plays an important role in preserving the distinctness of the two settlements.

At present the view from the A35 and from the B3067 through Lytchett Minster is of countryside and trees in the foreground merging into the Purbeck Hills in the distance. The Purbeck District Townscape Character Appraisal Draft for Public Consultation for Upton for PDC prepared by Matrix Partnership, May 2010 (the Townscape Appraisal), states, on page 11 in relation to a photograph of the western edge of Upton seen from the B3067 bridge over the A35 dual carriageway, that "this photograph demonstrates the well-contained edge that visually separates suburban sprawl from adjoining open countryside and the rural village of Lytchett Minster, off view to the right. The established hedgerow/woodland belt contains many mature oak trees and it makes a particularly successful and appropriate edge and screen to what is, in effect, the westernmost edge of the Poole/Bournemouth conurbation".

The Townscape Appraisal also points out, on page 8, that "in views from the west, around Lytchett Minster, Upton is relatively discrete, given the low height of development, and in views from higher ground from Upton Heath the settlement also remains surprisingly discrete, the relatively low buildings being substantially screened by trees in and around the settlement." P.L.A.C.E. considers that it is important to maintain these views in the manner in which they currently exist.

P.L.A.C.E. argues that Policeman's Lane is unsuitable for the increase in traffic volume which would be caused by development on the site. Access to and from the B3067 is via a steep and curving hill. Traffic on the B3067 approaching Policeman's Lane from Lytchett Minster appears from over the blind summit of a bridge. At certain times the B3067 and Policeman's Lane are very busy not only with cars but also with children walking and cycling to and from school.

At 52.1% after the first consultation period in 2009, support for PDC's "Preferred Option" in the Upton and Lytchett Matravers area was the lowest in Purbeck. After the summer 2010 consultation period only 21% of responses supported development on the Policeman's Lane site.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

This site should retain its Green Belt status, and therefore should not be allocated for development.

Property Development Partnerships Ltd

From: Stewart Drummond[SMTP:SJD@PDPL.CO.UK]

Sent: Monday, December 20, 2010 3:54:31 PM

To: email-LDF

Subject: Planning Purbeck's Future- Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document- Representation

Auto forwarded by a Rule

Dear Sirs,

I refer to the above document and request that the following submission is brought to the Inspector's attention. I would also like to reserve the right to participate at the oral part of the Examination in Public in order to fully explore the planning benefits of pursuing development on the Recreation Ground on Worgret Road, subject to the facilities being re-provided close-by on an alternative site on Worgret Road. I have no comment to make as to whether the document is legally compliant.

" I contend that the Town Council's Recreation Ground is a more appropriate location for development than those sites identified in the draft Core Strategy. It is the closest large site to the town centre- some 300 metres from the A1/A2/D1 uses on West Street, and therefore sequentially preferable to the other proposed sites. It is a more obvious in-fill site than those further west on Worgret Road which would, if developed, extend the existing built-up area of the town.

Moreover, it is unnecessary to remove sites from the Green Belt when there is a less sensitive site available for development. The adopted Local Plan, November 2004, states at Policy MN13 that the loss or reduction of public recreational open space will not be permitted unless:

- (i) The development is for buildings ancillary to, or enhancing the amenity or recreational value of, open space; or
- (ii) Alternative recreational or amenity open space is provided elsewhere within or adjacent to the settlement or neighbourhood, where it is readily accessible to the catchment population of the existing site.

The sites further west on Worgret Road identified as possible settlement extensions to Wareham would be eminently suitable for recreational use, such use on either site would be entirely consistent with Policy MN13 (ii), would not require those sites to be removed from the Green Belt, and would not result in an extension of the built-up area of the town."

If you require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Stewart Drummond BSc FRICS
Property Development Partnerships Limited
Coombe House Studio

Ferry Road
Studland
Dorset BH19 3AQ

SUBJECT TO CONTRACT

E-mail: sjd@pdp.co.uk
Telephone: 05601 794 442
Mobile: 07764 398206

Please consider our environment before printing this e-mail and/ or any attachments.

This e-mail (including any attachments) is intended only for the addressee(s) named above. It may contain confidential or privileged information and should not be read, copied or otherwise used by any other person. If you are not the intended recipient(s), please contact the sender and delete the e-mail from your system.

The addressee(s) shall not forward, disclose or copy this e-mail or attachments to any third party without the prior consent of the sender.

We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks. We cannot accept any liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses.

The sender excludes all liability in respect of this email and any attachments to the fullest extent permitted by law.

Property Development Partnerships Limited
Registered in England.
Company Number: 6462080.
Registered Office: 98 Hornchurch Road, Hornchurch RM11 1JS.



Lytchett Minster & Upton Town Plan Group

Richard Tazewell (Chairman)
181, Sandy Lane,
Upton, Poole,
Dorset BH16 5LU
Tel: 01202--632967

E.mail: candr@madasafish.com

3rd December 2010

Dear Mr Dring,

UPTON & LYTCHETT MINSTER---POLICEMAN'S LANE SITE

I understand you are currently considering this site and am writing to offer some comments in my capacity as Chairman of the Lytchett Minster & Upton Town Plan Group.

Noise/ landscape bund

Firstly, I would like to suggest that a bund should form a fundamental part of the design alongside the entire boundary of the site. This is essential both for noise-reduction purposes for those living in the new development, and equally to help integrate the site visually into the landscape. Such a bund is an established feature of development in this area, being already in place alongside the Upton By-pass to the north and north-west of Upton, so that it would be entirely appropriate and consistent to include such a feature here.

Trees, layout design

Also very important in landscape terms are the existing fine oak trees within the site area, and I urge that they should be protected and incorporated within the development. Based on my experience as a landscape architect, I am sure there will be pressure to allow development to creep up to close to protected trees, and would suggest that the best way to deal with this is to articulate any public open space, or public footways, or to lay out access roads in such a way that these trees can be associated with them, rather than being shoe-horned into gardens or surrounded by houses.

Allowing for both these possibilities might lead to a need to reduce the numbers of houses slightly. Despite the desire to maximise housing numbers on any site (especially as so few are available) 'quality of life' ought always to be an over-riding consideration.

Vehicle access

Along with others locally, I am very concerned about vehicle access and suggest that access along Sea View Road is quite impracticable at certain times of the day. The only real solution is improved access from the Dorchester Road end of

Policeman's Lane so far as I can see.

I imagine you will be considering widening the narrow section of Watery Lane, but am not at all sure there is a case for this. Currently it acts as a very effective traffic-calming measure, and it may well be that it would be best to leave it as it is, although with the insertion of a **public footway** beside it.

Drainage

has been a worry in many people's minds, and although its not directly connected to this site, I'd like to take the opportunity to advise you of a long-standing problem that has been reported to me by Charles Hancox, who is a very experienced retired drainage engineer. It concerns the small stream that flows alongside Policemans's Lane. North of the Dorchester Road this stream is culverted under Beacon Park but the alignment has reputedly been lost, and at the same time its Armcoc construction means that it is coming to the end of its life. At some point, this is likely to cause real problems.

The Recreation Ground

Could I draw your attention to pages 43 and 44 of the Lytchett Minster & Upton Town Plan, which deals with the Recreation Ground? This is one of the very few public open spaces within Upton, and no doubt the new residents of the development will want to make use of it. However, it has numerous shortcomings, many of which are set out in the Plan. Among others, it is not very attractive, being essentially an open turf playing field with little interest beyond the small play area. Parking is inadequate, and it suffers from general "invisibility" and lack of surveillance. It is a space which ought to have a lot of potential--but this is yet to be realised.

You may note that the Plan asks for a 'Design study' to be carried out try and address these problems, and that this is suggested to include the Youth Club, an important building for the Town, but one which has had a long series of ongoing problems. I'd like to suggest that improvements to the Recreation Ground and the Youth Club can both be seen significant projects that could be linked to this development.

Both the Recreation Ground and the Youth Club are owned by the Turbary Trust, and the Recreation Ground is managed by the Town Council. I do not know whether they have picked up these possibilities so far but I imagine that both they and the Youth Club would be very supportive of the aim to improve this area, not least because the Town Plan has been adopted by the Town Council.

I could write at more length but would be happy to discuss this further if that would be of help, including elaborating on other proposals in the Town Plan.

If you need to contact me directly, my phone number is 01202-632967.

Sincerely,

Richard Tazewell (PULM/ LM&TP Group Chairman)

P.U.L.M. Action Plan - Main Proposals

Selected proposals relevant to development taken from the 'Main Proposals' of the Upton and Lytchett Minster Town Plan (long version) pp 22, 29, 35, 48, 58, 67, 74 & 78, 84, 91, 97 and 103:--

[Proposals with no relevance to land-use planning have not been included]

Chapter 1-- COMMUNITY LIFE, SOCIAL FACILITIES, SAFETY

COMMUNITY LIFE

- Improvement of [a] the Upton Cross area/Town Square as a focal point for Upton and [b] the Recreation Ground, possibly funded by developer contributions

SOCIAL FACILITIES

- Cafe/Restaurant - explore possible sites and ways of funding. Pursue options for improved banking facilities
- Pursue improved public toilet provision
- Joint action with existing sports facilities (Lytchett Minster School/Lytchett Minster Sports Trust/Town Council) to maximise use and enhance facilities.
- Explore additional community uses of the library; resist downgrading of services
- Campaign to retain the Post Office in Upton
- *Improved transport - See Chapter 4. Youth facilities - See Chapter 6.*

SAFETY

- New policing arrangements to be equitable and based on the size of the Town, its Level 2 category and the anxieties about groups of youths in our surveys
- CCTV provision in line with police recommendations

Chapter 2 HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT

See Map pp 30-31

New Development - New Facilities

Alongside the dislike of new development in the Survey is a demand that if it is to take place, facilities need to be adequate to accept it.

Here or elsewhere in the Plan, new or improved facilities that are sought include:-

- A new focal point for the Town
- Major improvements to Blandford Road, upgrading traffic junctions, more pedestrian crossings.
- Upgrading narrow poorly-maintained footways, with additional lighting in several places.
- Expansion of the Upton Health Centre. Existing GP facilities are already unsatisfactory. Major expansion should be allowed for.
- A proper cycleway system, including links to Poole and Wareham.
- A cafe and restaurant in Upton.
- New or improved youth and sports facilities.
- The long-planned new school (to include on-site parking), or significant upgrading of the existing Infant and Junior schools.
- A Care Home and Level 3 care developed within an existing sheltered housing scheme.
- Good temporary accommodation facilities for homeless.
- Expansion and improvement of LUCA Community Centre, upgrade playschool equipment and play area.
- Improvements to Upton Recreation Ground, Kestrel Close Play Area and other open spaces.

The full list of proposals is in the Action Plan at the end of the Report

- Major upgrading to the Trailway.
- Improved bus services.
- Adequate water and sewage system, including upgrading existing sub-standard parts of the Town [These are not in order of importance; and the list is not comprehensive]

Main proposals

- Planning policy should take account of the findings and proposals of this Plan as an expression of local residents' views and aspirations. The Plan proposals should be incorporated into future PDC and DCC planning documents and into the operation of existing policy as far as possible.
- A thorough review of existing facilities, including their accessibility, should be carried out as a matter of urgency in the light of ongoing development pressure in Upton.
- A character assessment/ design statement of Upton should be carried out as soon as possible.
- A procedure is rapidly needed for larger new developments to contribute towards new facilities for Upton and Lytchett Minster.
- A Town Centre Plan should be prepared as soon as possible based on the findings of this Plan and further public participation. Major developments in the vicinity of the centre should be held back as premature until this new Town Centre Plan is available.
- Avenues for the Greenridge or its site to contribute to local life should be explored.
- A site brief should be urgently prepared to include the use of part of the intended school site in Sea View Road for parking and other new facilities which contribute to upgrading the 'Rec'. Improvements should be paid for through developer contributions from this site.
- All major sites which come forward should be subject to thorough local consultation exercises which include [1] Reference to the provisions of this Plan and [2] consideration of ways the site will contribute positively to the life of the Town via the provision of new facilities or other means.
- Government guidelines on parking and density should be challenged in the light of our findings.
- A Housing Needs survey should be carried out to give a steer on the level of need, suitable sizes and tenures.
- A Care Home is needed in Upton and Lytchett Minster.

Chapter 3 ENVIRONMENT, OPEN SPACES & PLAY

See Maps p 40, 41, 44

- Action to substantially improve the maintenance of pavements, pathways and open spaces, including overgrown hedges.
- A comprehensive study with DCC of work needed to bring footpaths up to acceptable standards.
- Seek review by DCC of lighting throughout the town, including the area in front of the Community Centre and the footpath to Upton Country Park.
- Improve both north and south sections of the Trailway so as to function as an effective recreational walkway/cycleway linking to Upton Country Park.
- Draw up a plan of improvements to the 'Rec.' and Youth Club in conjunction with the Turbary Trust and Town Council - to include some of the land formerly proposed for the new school site in Sea View Road.
- Any nearby housing development should be designed to improve surveillance of the Rec.
- More play opportunities including a Play Ranger and indoor play area.
- Consider the options for the use/ improvement of the existing 'Town Square' site.
- A programme for the upkeep of local woodlands should be devised with Purbeck District Council and other partners.
- Discuss the opportunities for community and school environmental schemes.
- Discussions about representing Upton interests in Upton Country Park with Poole Borough Council. Health protection and fire prevention initiatives.

The full list of proposals is in the Action Plan at the end of the Report

Chapter 4 TRANSPORT AND ROAD SAFETY

See Map p 56; bus routes p 52

DORSET COUNTY COUNCIL

Seek with Dorset County Council a **comprehensive review on transport issues** in Upton and Lytchett Minster, including a commitment to programme in necessary improvements identified through this process. Aspects include:

- (1) Blandford Road traffic problems, including narrow pavements, lack of crossings and congestion caused by school traffic
- (2) Adequacy of pedestrian crossings and bus stops, taking account of identified problems.
- (3) Need for speed control measures on identified roads in accordance with our findings
- (4) Signage, including directions to local attractions and redirecting traffic away from Upton to the dual carriageway.
- (5) Planning for a comprehensive system of cycle routes linking local schools, Upton Country Park and to Wareham. To include a route for the 'Round Poole Harbour' cycle route through the town. Provide cycle racks.
- (6) Footpath maintenance - see Chapter 3.0

BUSES

- Pursue discussions with Wilts & Dorset and DCC on the basis of our findings, particularly over the loss of buses to Hamworthy.
- Liaise with other local communities affected by Wilts & Dorset policies.
- Approach other bus companies regarding missing bus routes and the possibility of introducing new routes to nearby towns, facilities and beauty spots.

PARKING, INCLUDING SCHOOLS

- Seek a Parking Warden for the Town (or other measures) to enforce parking restrictions and clamp down on pavement parking, including school parking.
- Explore other solutions to schools parking problems
- Design of any new school should include on-site parking in order to avoid the problems caused by the existing schools.
- Discussions to try and ensure adequate public parking at local facilities e.g. Health Centre, Triangle Shops.

OTHER PROPOSALS

- Explore community mini bus and volunteer driver schemes, including sharing between different organisations.
- Publicise bus services and local transport schemes.
- A comprehensive look at bus concessions and other alternative travel assistance for all those with travel problems.

Chapter 5 RURAL LYTCHETT MINSTER & UPTON

See Maps pp 62 & 64

- Dorset County Council (DCC) to carry out a comprehensive look at transport issues - See Chapter 4
- Measures to slow traffic through villages/ hamlets and at Limberlost
- New footpaths on A35 at Slepe and other identified places including to Courtyard Craft Centre.
- Better maintenance of hedges, verges and beauty spots.
- Discuss the rural path network with DCC and South Lytchett Estate with the aim of producing a unified system.
- Draw up and publish a guide to footpaths and bridleways
- Consideration of cycle lanes to Upton Park and Wareham, including the 'Round Poole Harbour' route
- Explore the possibility of a circular transport route to connect small settlements with Upton facilities.
- A play area in Lytchett Minster; land for a trail bike course and other improvements.
- More signage and publicity for existing rural businesses.

The full list of proposals is in the Action Plan at the end of the Report

- Explore need for affordable housing in rural settlements, including the possibility of a Community Land Trust
- Closer liaison with South Lytchett Estate over community interests including new local crafts and food enterprises

Chapter 6 CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE & SCHOOLS

TRANSPORT

- Bus fare discounts
- More cycle lanes and sheds
- More bus routes to popular places e.g. Tower Park, Bournemouth
- Transport to and from local youth activities and facilities e.g. minibus scheme

MORE ACTIVITIES AND PLACES TO GO

- A cafe where young people are welcome.
- Youth Shelters
- New play and youth facilities in Upton Heath /Lytchett Minster.
- Improvements to the Recreation Ground e.g. Young People's Exercise Equipment
- Graffiti walls, competition and workshops.

HEALTH AND ADVICE

- Advice centre or a range of sessions e.g. Youth Advisory, money matters.

2nd set of proposals.....

- Firm decision about the future of Infant and Junior Schools— If the new school is not to go ahead, improvements are needed to both existing schools
- Investigate timed parking in streets around the Junior School.
- Safe cyclist access into school sites
- Secure sustainability for the Lollipop person
- Pelican crossing at the top of St. Martin's Road
- More extended hours and community use of local schools and Youth Club.
- Practical Support for Young People's Action Group.
- Full time Youth Worker for the Town area.
- The possibility of a Schools/ Community Liaison Group to discuss issues such as bullying, cycling to school, parking and the community use of school facilities could be a worthwhile idea

Chapter 7 MATURE RESIDENTS

- Develop transport schemes e.g. Poole Dial-a Ride extension.
- A local care home.

Chapter 8 HEALTH, SOCIAL CARE & WELLBEING

- Discussions with Primary Care Trusts to be started to press the question of their boundaries and the problems these cause in our area.
- Discussions with Primary Care Trusts and Social services for improvements to Health and Social Care provision, including those highlighted in this plan.
- Seek the provision of a Children's Centre in Upton as a focus of support and services for children under 8 and their families.
- Explore options for more help with transport to hospital appointments.
- Strong support for Upton Health Centre generally, including the need for significant improvements and the possibility of their acquiring a bigger building in order to promote improvements to their services.
- A study into disabled mobility should be carried out, including poor path surfaces, path maintenance, and the location of drop kerbs, with a view to action for improvements.

The full list of proposals is in the Action Plan at the end of the Report

Chapter 9 BUSINESS & EMPLOYMENT

- Clearer, more professional local signage.
- Explore scope for a local market.

Chapter 10 INFORMATION, ADVICE, LOCAL IDENTITY

- Use this Plan as a means of raising awareness of Upton and Lytchett Minster with official bodies and service providers.
- Consider undertaking a community exercise to look at the Town's identity. Look at signage and other ways of making its identity clearer and more distinct.

The full list of proposals is in the Action Plan at the end of the Report.

Purbeck Society



Purbeck District Council
 Local Development Framework (LDF)
'Planning Purbeck's Future'
Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document
 Representation Form (Nov/Dec 2010)

Your Details		Agents Details <i>(where relevant)</i>
Title	Mr	
Name	Stollery	
Job Title <i>(where relevant)</i>	Chairman	
Organisation <i>(where relevant)</i>	Purbeck Society	
Address		
Postcode		
E-mail		
Tel. Number		

Responses should be sent to:

Email: ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk

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

Fax: 01929 557348

Return to Purbeck District Council by 4pm, Monday 20th December 2010

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

If you choose to type a response it would be appreciated if you could email the Microsoft Word version, making it easier to copy the responses into an examination database.

Briefings on how to complete these forms and the process involved will be held on:

- 10th November, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham
- 18th November, 7pm, Community Hall, The Mowlem, Swanage
- 1st December, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham

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 or call 01929 557273 to speak to a member of the Planning Policy Team.

As your representation will be passed to an Inspector you should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

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. 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 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 adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature

Date

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : HS	Paragraph: 6.1.2	Map:
----------------	---------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>(i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future)</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>(i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future)</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because: <i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is not 'consistent with national policy'			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

While Habitats Regulations Assessment and preliminary transport assessment seem to indicate that 2400 dwellings across the District may be sustained by appropriate mitigation, there is no evidence that in the case of Swanage and SE Purbeck that suitable mitigation can be put in place. The evidence in fact is to the contrary and that there would be considerable adverse upon habitats. Therefore this policy is not justified, cannot be delivered and is therefore inconsistent with national policy. I would also take issue with the statements in 6.3.4

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Remove reference to 2400 houses from CS and focus on provision for the limited amount of affordable housing for local inhabitants only, for which appropriate mitigation is likely to be found.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : HS	Paragraph: 6.4.4	Map:
--------------------	-------------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
(tick all that apply)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i> 			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)</i> 			<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not 'consistent with national policy' 			<input type="checkbox"/>

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

As stated elsewhere, the 1660 figure on the housing register is an unreliable measure of housing need, rather housing demand which can be regarded as infinite. It is also admitted that there is duplication due to multiple applications. The housing trajectory graph appended to the previous para appears to show some 40% more completions than the planned completions. Are there another 1000 houses that we are not being told about?!

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Define real housing 'need' in SE Purbeck, estimated to be around 40 - 50 households currently and use this as a basis for planning.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : HS	Paragraph: 6.4.5	Map:
----------------	---------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
▪ It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
▪ It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
▪ It is not 'consistent with national policy'			<input type="checkbox"/>

(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 allocation of 900 housing units (37.5% of the 2400) is not deliverable for all the reasons stated elsewhere. The vast majority would be in Swanage, according to the stated PDC hierarchy. In 2002, a Planning Inspectorate report stated that no further building should happen in Purbeck until traffic congestion has been resolved. This has yet to occur, indeed there are no plans in prospect to ease this congestion, yet the bulk of new houses are planned for the part of the district in SE Purbeck, the least accessible from a transport perspective. These would be in addition to the many hundred since (250 since just 2006) despite the lack of any improvement and when congestion has worsened.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Re-assess definition of 'need' and re-cast the allocation policy as suggested elsewhere.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : SW	Paragraph: 7.2.8	Map:
----------------	---------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because: <i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
• It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
• It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
• It is not 'consistent with national policy'	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

SW Purbeck has greater opportunities for growth than SE Purbeck. It is not so constrained by the AONB, SSSIs etc. It has better transport links with stations on the mainline network at Wool and the potential for another at Dorset Green. There is the potential for greater employment opportunities at Dorset Green Technology Park with housing on the same site.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Amend CS to promote Dorset Green as a site for a new sustainable settlement with housing and employment, thus reducing the need for travel between work and home and the potential for having direct rail communication to Weymouth, Dorchester, Poole, Bournemouth etc

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy: CEN	Paragraph: 7.3.7	Map:
----------------	---------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
• It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)</i>			<input type="checkbox"/>
• It is not 'consistent with national policy'			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

Central Purbeck has greater opportunities for growth than SE Purbeck. It is not so constrained by the AONB, SSSIs etc. It has better transport links with stations on the mainline network at Wareham and Holton Heath. There is the potential for greater employment opportunities at Holton Heath and the potential for some housing at or nearby. Some improvement of the A351 between the Bakers Arms roundabout and Holton Heath should be considered.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Amend CS to promote Central Purbeck for some growth particularly with regard employment to Holton Heath and some associated housing at the site or nearby. Add improvement to the A351 from the Bakers Arms roundabout to the Holton Heath access point. Develop Holton Heath station as a park and ride facility to take some pressure off the A351 through Sandford. Project the Swanage - Wareham rail service to

Poole/Bournemouth to service a developed Holton Heath.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : CEN	Paragraph: 7.3.8	Map:
-----------------	---------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>

(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

- It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the Core Strategy 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 Core Strategy 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)

Bus service X43 is seasonal only, and therefore cannot be regarded as serving the needs of the resident population. Similar considerations apply to the Durlston bus, which with an extended route and an all year operation could provide a useful transport facility for Swanage residents. Regrettably there is no evidence to support the provision of finance for a daily all year service on either route. Therefore the CS is unsound as these services are not deliverable as an effective transport mode. There is no mention here of a restored Swanage - Rail link (although there is elsewhere) and none for its potential projection to Holton Heath (employment), Poole (direct access for shopping and town centre jobs and facilities) and Bournemouth for direct connections to the rest of the rail network to the Thames Valley, the Midlands, the North and Scotland.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Promote the expansion of the bus and rail services as proposed above.

Note: Additional sheets can be downloaded from the website and submitted alongside this form.



Purbeck District Council
Local Development Framework (LDF)
'Planning Purbeck's Future'
Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document
Representation Form (Nov/Dec 2010)

Your Details

Agents Details (where relevant)

Title	Mr	
Name	Stollery	
Job Title (where relevant)	Chairman	
Organisation (where relevant)	Purbeck Society	
Address		
Postcode		
E-mail		
Tel. Number		

Responses should be sent to:

Email: ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk

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

Fax: 01929 557348

Return to Purbeck District Council by 4pm, Monday 20th December 2010

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

If you choose to type a response it would be appreciated if you could email the Microsoft Word version, making it easier to copy the responses into an examination database.

Briefings on how to complete these forms and the process involved will be held on:

- 10th November, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham
- 18th November, 7pm, Community Hall, The Mowlem, Swanage
- 1st December, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham

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 or call 01929 557273 to speak to a member of the Planning Policy Team.

As your representation will be passed to an Inspector you should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

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. Do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

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 adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature

Date

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : SE	Paragraph: 7.5	Map:
----------------	-------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
It is not 'consistent with national policy'	<input type="checkbox"/>		

(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 contained in 1.2.3 is selective and misleading and therefore unsound. Parts of the Purbeck District have considerably higher proportions of second homes than stated. E.g. Worth Matravers village, as opposed to the parish overall, has an estimated 50% - 60% second homes, which has had a dire effect on the village with the closure in recent years of the village shop, post office, craft centre and cafe due to the lack of a sustainable resident population to support them.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Formulate policies to actively discourage more dwellings that can be used as second homes by controlling type of housing constructed. Government statements that AONBs have same status as National Parks. This being so formulate a policy to restrict new housing construction for sale/rent to locals who have satisfied a residential qualification.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : SE	Paragraph: 7.5	Map:
----------------	-------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i> 			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)</i> 			<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not 'consistent with national policy' 			<input type="checkbox"/>

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

Supporting para 2.4 in the Characteristics section is unsound as the figures for the average income are distorted. If the top 5% of earners are discounted from the total, the average income for the remaining 95% is around £13,000 rather than the £28,880 quoted. This means that the average house price is around 20 times (rather 11 times) the average wage of the vast majority of the population. This has the result of making the provision of affordable housing even more critical and gives a false basis for planning. It is also stated that 7% of dwellings in the District are second/holiday homes, some 7.7 times the national average. As I have stated elsewhere, some communities have up to 60% (Worth Matravers). I consider it is wrong to consider the impact of the second homes phenomenon in general terms across the District, rather than attempt to consider and formulate policies to deal with the critical problems in specific communities, exacerbating the figures in the Rowntree Foundation findings in their 2005 study. The cumulative effect is that there is a lack of housing affordable to local people in Purbeck but one that is critical in SE Purbeck.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Revise CS to give a more balanced view of the problem and formulate policies to deal with the issues that affect particular communities in the District.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : SE	Paragraph: 7.5.9	Map:
----------------	---------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>

(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

- It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the Core Strategy 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 Core Strategy 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 Society is absolutely opposed to settlement extensions. The justification for the need for them is based on false premises of the quantity of housing 'need' rather than 'demand'. It is not deliverable as suitable SANGs cannot be delivered. Opposition showed that this was untenable and settlement extensions to Swanage were withdrawn from the CS at consultation, it would therefore be inconsistent with national policy (government policy to abolish RSS targets) as well as unjust to try to add settlement extensions through the Site Allocations Plan.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Amend CS to include a plan to encourage a limited number of affordable housing for local people and to address the assesment of real 'need' for housing as opposed to the 'demand' as expressed through applications on the housing register.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : SE	Paragraph: 7.5.9	Map:
----------------	---------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
• It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
• It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
• It is not 'consistent with national policy'		<input type="checkbox"/>	

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

As stated in para 2.7 over half of the District is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) but ALL of SE Purbeck is within it. Additionally within it significant areas are also, or additionally covered by, national and international nature conservation designations (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest - SSSIs, Ramsar sites, Special Protection Areas - SPAs and Special Areas of Conservation - SACs). Additionally the 400-metre buffer around these designations, where further residential development is no longer permitted, effectively prohibits further settlement extensions and/or provision of SANGs. Settlement extensions into the AONB is therefore not sustainable and undeliverable

Para 4.2.1 states "Purbeck will be a place which retains and enhances the unique qualities of Swanage, Wareham, Upton, the villages, countryside and coast, whilst improving the quality of life for the whole community." It is our submission that to construct the number of houses proposed would be in direct contravention of this Vision.

Also para 4.3.1 states that the District Vision can be achieved through the spatial objectives, which have been developed and refined throughout preparation of the Core Strategy and link with the Purbeck Community Strategy (2009). The particular aspects on which I would comment are:

"1. Respect the character and distinctiveness of Purbeck's settlements and countryside.". The building of a

large number of houses will conflict with this, indeed the development in Swanage has already compromised parts of the quality of Swanage's unique character and distinctiveness.

"2. Meet Purbeck's housing needs." This would only do so if housing construction is limited to the provision of affordable housing for local people.

"3. Conserve and enhance Purbeck's natural habitat." This would be compromised by large scale building.

"5. Reduce vulnerability to climate change and dependence upon fossil fuels". Not so if housing "at the end of a cul de sac" results in increased traffic on Purbeck's roads and infrastructure.

"7. Conserve and enhance the landscape, historic environment and cultural heritage of the District." Building on the scale proposed would conflict with this.

"9. Provide an integrated transport system and better accessibility to services for everyday needs." The Purbeck Community Plan (part of the evidence base in para 4.1.10) has, inter alia, as a priority to:

"(b) reduce the use of the car.." and

"(d) improve the transport infrastructure, using transport interchanges to ensure infrastructure and modes of travel are well connected". There is no evidence in the CS to support this Vision and with the present disparity of transport operators is regrettably undeliverable.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Remove plans to promote settlement extensions via the Site Allocations Plan. Instead promote a policy to provide small developments of up to 20 houses within existing settlement boundaries, where policies to protect the countryside and the unique character of the built environment of Swanage and the villages of Purbeck are not compromised. As noted elsewhere promote sustainable employment and housing sites elsewhere in Purbeck, notably at Dorset Green.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : SE	Paragraph: 7.5.10	Map:
----------------	----------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i> ▪ It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)</i> ▪ It is not 'consistent with national policy' 			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(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 only limited potential for additional employment land in Swanage. It is therefore perverse to plan for a large amount of additional housing "at the end of a cul de sac", where travel to/from employment elsewhere in Purbeck or Holton Heath, Poole, Bournemouth, Dorchester or Dorset Green (Winfrith). To impliment such a policy therefore cannot be justified as it is against national and PDC policy to reduce the number of car journeys.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Recognise that the large number of houses proposed would impose further pressures on the A351 particularly through Corfe Castle and that alternative sites for large numbers of housing units (if justified) be sought. One such site exists at Dorset Green, where there is already significant employment with great potential for future jobs as well as housing. Such a settlement could take the form of a self contained village

of some 1000+ homes of sustainable construction using the latest technology. It is remote from the settlement boundary of Wool and would have little impact upon it. The opportunity also exists for the construction of a halt or station on the main line railway, which passes immediately to the north of the site.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : LD	Paragraph: 5.6	Map:
----------------	-------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
• It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
• It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
• It is not 'consistent with national policy'		<input type="checkbox"/>	

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

A zero option was never offered - the 2400 housing figure, one arbitrarily adopted by PDC in the wake of the RSS process, now discredited and about to be repealed by the Government.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Remove from the CS.

Note: Additional sheets can be downloaded from the website and submitted alongside this form.

4927
15/12/10



Purbeck District Council
Local Development Framework (LDF)
'Planning Purbeck's Future'
Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document
Representation Form (Nov/Dec 2010)

Your Details

Agents Details (where relevant)

Title	Mr	
Name	Stollery	
Job Title (where relevant)	Chairman	
Organisation (where relevant)	Purbeck Society	
Address	52 Victoria Avenue, Swanage	
Postcode	BH19 1AP	
E-mail	Mike Stollery	
Tel. Number	01929 421492	

Responses should be sent to:

Email: ldf@purbeck-dc.gov.uk

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

Fax: 01929 567348

Return to Purbeck District Council by 4pm, Monday 20th December 2010

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

If you choose to type a response it would be appreciated if you could email the Microsoft Word version, making it easier to copy the responses into an examination database.

Briefings on how to complete these forms and the process involved will be held on:

- 10th November, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham
- 18th November, 7pm, Community Hall, The Mowlem, Swanage
- 1st December, 7pm in the District Council offices, Wareham

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 or call 01929 557273 to speak to a member of the Planning Policy Team.

As your representation will be passed to an Inspector you should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

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. 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:

To amplify and clarify points made in this submission

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

Signature M A Stollery

Date 14 December 2010

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : SE	Paragraph: 7.5.1	Map:
----------------	---------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)</i>			<input type="checkbox"/>
It is not 'consistent with national policy'			<input type="checkbox"/>

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

Population of Swanage understated. 2001 census gives Swanage population of 10,500 (a difference of 10.5%) Since then the electoral has shown a small but consistent increase.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Planning for future should be based on more accurate information, especially with regard to housing provision.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : SE	Paragraph: 7.5.2 and 7.5.10	Map:
----------------	--------------------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible <u>evidence</u> base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i> 			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not <u>deliverable</u>, not <u>flexible</u> and not able to be <u>monitored</u>)</i> 			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not 'consistent with national policy' 			<input type="checkbox"/>

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

7.5.2 states that Swanage has an older population compared with other communities, with 28% of over 65s. It is therefore unreasonable to expect this population to travel edge off/out of town health centre for their routine appointments/check-ups etc.as proposed in 7.5.10. The existing health centre is only 25 years old and was purposely sited next to the bus station, railway station and taxis for ease of access and for convenience for users to do shopping,etc in the town centre. The present health centre building does not make efficient use of its site and there is scope for substantial extension/redevelopment of its facilities on its present site. Society members would vigorously oppose its relocation away from the town centre. The plan makes no mention of these issues and it is therefore considered unsound in this regard as the evidence base is not satisfactory, nor is it flexible in recognising the needs of the local population or the potential of its present site to accommodate present/future requirements. Furthermore due the problems of finding a suitable site, in addition to the likely opposition for the reasons stated, it may not be deliverable.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

The plan should recognise these issues and be flexible in recognising the needs of the local population and the potential of its present site to accommodate present/future health care requirements. The plan should also recognise the pressures on health care funding in the short/medium term - such that incremental improvements are more likely to take place than a whole new multi-million pound facility on a new site. In this way phased redevelopment/extension on the existing site is much more likely to be deliverable.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : SE	Paragraph: 7.5.4	Map:
----------------	---------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant
i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future

Yes	No	No Comment
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

2. (a) Sound
i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future

Yes	No	No Comment
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

- It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the Core Strategy 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 Core Strategy 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)

Selective reference to the Swanage Community Strategic Plan conflicts with the Core Strategy's Vision of "...maintaining and enhancing the special character and culture of Swanage's environs.." Swanage's CSP places emphasis on affordable housing - not mentioned in 7.5.4. The impression given in this paragraph is thus misleading and unsound as a basis for the CS.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Set out the need for a small number of affordable housing units as opposed to the implied support for more market housing and stress the need for a balanced housing stock. The CS should indicated the over provision already existing in Swanage of 'market' two bed flats totally unsuitable for local families and policies how to redress this balance. It should be made clear that the proposed 50%/50% market/affordable ratio will do nothing to redress the present severe imbalance.

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : SE	Paragraph: 7.5.8	Map:
----------------	---------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
• It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• It is not 'consistent with national policy'			<input type="checkbox"/>

(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 Vision will be compromised as the amount of building proposed in the CS for Swanage would have the opposite effect to the Vision by destroying green space, putting more pressure on the countryside and potentially restricting access to it. New 'green space', being finite, is therefore not deliverable making the CS unsound in this respect.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Formulate a policy limiting the amount of housing development in Swanage and SE Purbeck generally to that required to house local people/families in need - not those who just happen to have had their names put forward to the housing register. Formulate a policy to differentiate between 'need' and 'demand'.

YOUR COMMENTS -- PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : SE	Paragraph: 7.5	Map:
----------------	-------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant <i>i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. (a) Sound <i>i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment <input type="checkbox"/>
(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:			
<i>(tick all that apply)</i>			
• It is not 'justified' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or doesn't provide the most appropriate strategy)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• It is not 'effective' <i>(i.e. the Core Strategy is not deliverable, not flexible and not able to be monitored)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• It is not 'consistent with national policy'			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(For explanation of terms refer to guidance notes below)

Comments:

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

My comments relate to para, 1.2.1, as it forms part of the justification for the SE Policy. I consider that the Policy SE is not legally compliant as the para 1.2.1 arbitrarily plans an extra 120 homes for 2026/27. As I understand it there has been no public consultation on this.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Remove from CS

YOUR COMMENTS – PLEASE USE A SEPARATE SHEET FOR EACH REPRESENTATION

Please select which document you are commenting on:

'Planning Purbeck's Future' (Core Strategy) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Policy : SE	Paragraph: 7.5	Map:
----------------	-------------------	------

Do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be:

1. Legally compliant
i.e. comments on the process of preparing Planning Purbeck's Future

Yes	No	No Comment
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. (a) Sound
i.e. comments on the content of Planning Purbeck's Future

Yes	No	No Comment
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(b) If you have chosen No for (a) do you consider Planning Purbeck's Future (Core Strategy) to be unsound because:

(tick all that apply)

- It is not 'justified'
(i.e. the Core Strategy 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 Core Strategy 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)

Paras 1.1.3 & 1.2.3 refer. 1.1.3 is not consistent with the policy of the present government, which has indicated that it will scrap targets set by the Regional Spatial Strategies. Although this has been (at time of writing) successfully challenged by developers in the High Court it is clear what the present government's intentions are. It is therefore quite wrong for a development strategy for the years to 2026 to be based on an out-dated government policy which is set to change next year, possibly even before the plan is submitted to the Secretary of State and certainly before its planned adoption by the year end.

Proposed Changes:

Please use the space below to give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy policies legally compliant or sound and why. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text (expand box as necessary).

Government has indicated that local plans should be responsive to the needs and aspirations of the local community. These are clearly expressed - no more market housing, no more second homes. The CS should formulate and promote policies to promote affordable housing to meet the needs of local inhabitants.