NorthDorset Local Plan Pre-su   CURRENT VIEW   + FILTER + COMPARE + SHOW	ubmi					ate Survey
		ni Design Survey Collect Responses Analyze Resu				
+ FILTER + COMPARE + SHOW	RESPONDENTS:	33 of 33		Ex	port All	Share All
	Question	Data	Individual			
No rules applied	III Summaries	() Trends	Responses			
Rules allow you to FILTER. COMPARE and SHOW	Respondent #19				All Pages	
results to see trends and patterns. Learn more »						
	#19	COMPLETE		Ed	it Delete	Expo
SAVED VIEWS (1)		Started: Thurso	h Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (Web day, January 23, 2014 4:00:32 PM Thursday, January 23, 2014 5:00	٨		
Original View (No rules applied)		Time Spent: 01				
+ Save as	fair and a					
EXPORTS	PAGE 1					
SHARED DATA	Q1: Personal Detai	ils				
No shared data	Name:		belinda ridout			
Sharing allows you to share your survey results with	Address 1:	1				
others. You can share all data, a saved view, or a single question summary. Learn more »	City/Town:					
Share All	State/Province:					
	ZIP/Postal Code:	i.				
	Country:					
	Email Address:					
	Phone Number:	8				
	Q2: Agent Details (	(if applicable) - i	All correspondence will be s	ent to the agent.		
	Respondent skipped	l this question				
	PAGE 2					
		the document	tuou are commonting on			
			t you are commenting on:			
	2 to 9)	cal Plan 2011 to 2	2026 Part 1 (please complete Que	estions		
	Q4: 2. To which pa	rt of the above	document does your represe	ntation relate?		
	Paragraph number	er	9.60 9.71			
	Policy/site		Gillingham southern Extension			
			Plan to be legally compliant a edural requirements?	ind prepared in acco	ordance wi	ith the
	Yes					
	Q6: 4. Do you cons	ider the Local F	Plan to be 'sound'?			
	No					
	Q7: 5. If you consid (es) that apply belo		an to be unsound please spe	cify your reason(s)	by ticking	the box
	It has not been	positively prepared	d			

to be unsound. Alternatively, if you wish to support any aspects of the plan please also use this box to set out your comments.

Gillingham southern Extension, grey Infrastructure 9.60/9.71 page 254/256. ' Principal Street' through the development, linking Shaftesbury Road B3081 with New Road B3092.

If the idea of the 'Principal Street' is to enable the traffic accessing Brickfields Business Park and other existing development off New Road to do so without having to use the busy New Road/Shaftesbury road junction, my concern lies with the fact that this link road will become increasingly busy with high volumes of traffic and a high percentage of HGV use through what is essential a residential area. The design of the 'principal street' will have to be robust enough to take such capacity, yet it is within a residential area and how this will impact upon the amenity of the residents living along the route.

The 'principal street' will become an alternative route, via New Road, for vehicles trying to access the town from the south, especially when queues build up on Shaftesbury Road. Likewise, those going south may well take the New Road route at the Shaftesbury Road/New Road junction, to escape traffic congestion on Shaftesbury Road. This would increase capacity/congestion issues on New Road and put enormous pressure on the New Road/Shaftesbury Road junction.

9.71 recognises the fact that there are capacity issues with the New Road/Shaftesbury Road junction and states that there will be upgrading of this junction to increase capacity but no mention of improvements to New Road from the Brickfields entrance to the New Road/Shaftesbury Road junction. This stretch of New Road has considerable congestion and safety issues and would not be suitable for any increased usage.

Q9: 7. What change(s) do you consider are necessary to ensure that the Local Plan is legally compliant and sound? It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

That vehicular use of New Road, from the Brickfields Business Park to the New Road/Shaftesbury Road junction is restricted to vehicles up to 7.5ton, as in the centre of town. This would help to alleviate the problems of congestion caused by HGV's trying to pass each other at the very sharp bend on the approach to the junction with Shaftesbury Road.

Q10: 8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate in the oral part of the examination?

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

Q11: 9. If you wish to participate in the oral part of the examination please outline why you consider that to be necessary. Please note that the Inspector determines who is heard at the examination.

Respondent skipped this question

Q12: 10. Please outline your comments on the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report or Habitats Regulations Assessment. Comments are not confined to 'soundness' issues, but respondents can express their opinions on the above documents and use it as a reference point on the 'soundness' of the Local Plan.

Respondent skipped this question

Q13: 11. Do you wish to be notified of any of the following? Please tick all that apply. We will contact you using the details you have given above.

That the Local Plan Part 1 has been submitted for independent examination

The adoption of the Local Plan Part 1.

Community: Developers · Facebook · Twitter · LinkedIn · Our Blog · Google+ · YouTube About Us: Management Team · Board of Directors · Partners · Newsroom · Contact Us · Jobs · Sitemap · Help Policies: Terms of Use · Privacy Policy · Anti-Spam Policy · Security Statement



Language: English · Español · Portuguès · Deutsch · Nederlands · Français · Русский · Italiano · Dansk · Svenska · 日本語 · 哲국어 · 中文(繁微) · Türkçe · Norsk · Suomi

Copyright © 1999-2014 SurveyMonkey