

# **Purbeck Local Development Framework**

## **Core Strategy Examination**

Statement submitted by Savills on behalf of the Scott Estate (Swanage) on Matter 2:  
General Location of Development (Policy LD).

Respondent reference: 2538

April 2012

Savills  
Wessex House  
Priors Walk  
Wimborne  
Dorset  
BH21 1PB



## **Matter 2: General Location of Development (Policy LD)**

### **Issue 2.1 What evidence led to the inclusion of each of the settlements within each category? Does the sustainability appraisal support the chosen hierarchy?**

1. The settlement hierarchy in Policy LD is based on the ranking of settlements set out in the Review of Community Facilities and Services Provision Background Paper (Purbeck District Council, May 2009). This ranked settlements according to the number of different types of facilities available, and was aimed primarily at categorising towns and villages as category A, B, or C settlements in accordance with the emerging RSS at that time.
2. Swanage and Wareham clearly function as market towns, with a full range of services and facilities. Upton is also recognised as a town in its own right, although it is less well provided for in terms of facilities than many of the Key Service Villages, as demonstrated by the ranking of settlements at paragraph 4.3 of the Core Strategy Background Paper Volume 10: Settlement Strategy, and its function is closely related to Poole with many residents travelling there for employment, leisure and shopping.

### **Issue 2.2 Is the apportionment of growth between the settlements properly justified? Why are no settlement extensions proposed at Corfe Castle, Sandford and Wool which are all identified as key service villages?**

3. Swanage is the largest town in Purbeck, it sits at the top of the settlement hierarchy and has significant growth needs. The identification of appropriate and sustainable locations for the future growth of the town is therefore considered fundamental to the overall soundness and deliverability of the Core Strategy.
4. In order to ensure a flexible and responsive supply of land is available, and to make the clear spatial choices needed in the Core Strategy, Policy LD and the accompanying proposals/inset maps should include clear reference to the location of all of the settlement extensions that are needed to implement the plan, including land at Washpond Lane, Swanage, land at Prospect Farm, Swanage, as set out in our statement on Matter 16.

**Issue 2.3 Have the proposed amendments to the green belt boundary been properly justified and has the Council's approach heeded the advice in PPG2: Green Belts? What are the exceptional circumstances that exist to justify such revisions? Has sufficient consideration been given to opportunities for development within urban areas and on other sites beyond the green belt?**

5. Paragraph 84 of the NPPF advises that when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. This should include consideration of the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.
6. The proposed approach of distributing new development to settlements both inside and outside the Green Belt has not been based on an appraisal of the opportunities for development beyond the outer Green Belt Boundary. Many of the smaller settlements within the Green Belt lie within close proximity to the South East Dorset conurbation, and rely on the conurbation for employment, services and facilities. Certain of the larger settlements beyond the Green Belt boundary, such as Swanage, offer a good range of services and facilities and have the potential to contribute to meeting the growth needs of the District in a sustainable manner; these should be fulfilling a major role in providing for the future development needs of the District.

**2.4 Paragraph 2.12 of PPG2 states that any proposals affecting green belts should be related to a timescale which is longer than that normally adopted for other aspects of the plan, in order to ensure that green belt boundaries will not need to be altered again at the end of the plan period. How does the Core Strategy address the possible need to safeguard land? Should a review of the complete green belt boundary have been undertaken?**

7. The availability of suitable and sustainable opportunities for additional growth at settlements located beyond the Green Belt boundary is an important consideration; provided the Core Strategy indicated that longer term growth can be directed towards these locations, there is no need for further alterations to Green Belt boundaries.

**2.5 How and when will settlement boundaries be reviewed?**

8. The timetable and mechanism for reviewing settlement boundaries is currently unclear. An immediate review of settlement boundaries should be undertaken to identify sufficient sites to meet identified growth needs beyond the level currently set out in the Core Strategy. The parameters of this review need to be clearly identified in the Core Strategy.

**2.6 Bearing in mind the environmental constraints within the District is there sufficient flexibility within policy LD to ensure that the formulation of the ‘subsequent plans’ is not unduly constrained?**

9. Policy LD has the effect of carrying forward existing settlement boundaries apart from the three locations where Green Belt reviews are proposed. The scope of the settlement boundary review to be undertaken in subsequent plans is not adequately defined and the approach is overly reliant on out-dated settlement boundaries that do not provide sufficient flexibility to meet the identified growth needs of the area; an immediate review of settlement boundaries is required to identify sufficient land to meet housing needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
10. The Core Strategy identifies a significant level of growth at Swanage (200 dwellings) without identifying the location or specific, deliverable sites. Given the environmental constraints in the area, this raises concerns about deliverability. As set out in our comments on Matter 16, in order to make the clear spatial choices on the location of new development that are needed, the Core Strategy should include clear reference to the location of the strategic settlement extensions to Swanage that are needed to implement the plan. This should include: the re-use of the former grammar school site for a free school, with associated housing development on part of the site; a strategic allocation for new housing, public open space, healthcare and community facilities at Washpond Lane, and; provision for smaller scale changes to settlement boundaries such as land at Prospect Farm.