

PURBECK DISTRICT COUNCIL

CORE STRATEGY

EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC

Hearing Statement by Andrew Charles Robinson BSc FRICS FAAV of Symonds & Sampson LLP, 5 West Street, Wimborne, Dorset in relation to Matter 10 Countryside (Policy CO).

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This statement is submitted by Andrew Robinson of Symonds & Sampson to Matter 10 (Countryside) (Policy CO) of the examination in public into the Purbeck District Core Strategy Examination.
- 1.2 This statement is specifically intended to respond to the Inspector's questions and set out Symonds & Sampson's case on matters of soundness,

2. RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR'S QUESTIONS

- 2.1 Matter 10 Issue 10.1. Is sufficient protection afforded to the AONB?
- 2.2 Symonds & Sampson would contend that it is vital for land owners and farmers to be able to diversify their businesses and to make good economic use of buildings no longer needed for agricultural purposes.

Policy CO currently states "development outside settlement boundaries will be permitted where it does not have a significant adverse impact either individually or cumulatively on the environment visually, ecologically or from traffic movements".
- 2.3 This would seem to give immense protection to the AONB and provide an unnecessarily restrictive policy with regard to the re-use of farm buildings. The NPPF Paragraph 55 widens the possibility of housing use to "development that would re-use redundant or disused buildings (n rural areas) leading to an enhancement to the immediate setting.
- 2.4 With many farmers in the Purbeck District on village or town outskirts, there is no reason why thus type of development should not be permitted within the core strategy.
- 2.5 Matter 10. Issue 10.2. Is the Council's approach towards the re-use and extension to rural buildings justified?

The Council's approach to re-use, alteration, extension or replacement of rural buildings is too restrictive. As stated above, it disregards the Government directive set out in Paragraph 55 of the NPPF.

2.6. The Core Strategy therefore fails Paragraph 182 of the NPPF because:

- a) Justified? It is not the most appropriate strategy because it ignores the possibilities for the re-use of redundant or disused rural buildings.
- b) The policy should be amended by adding the wording “where: housing development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting”.

.....

Andrew C Robinson BSc FRICS FAAV

Date: