



# Dorset Council Local Plan



## Gillingham 2021 Consultation Summary of Responses



January 2023



Dorset  
Council

## Contents

Contents.....	2
1. Gillingham .....	3
1.1. Introduction .....	3
1.2. Vision for Gillingham.....	3
1.3. Development strategy.....	3
1.4. Town centre strategy .....	4
1.5. Policy GILL1: The Station Road regeneration area.....	5
1.6. Main development opportunities.....	6
1.7. Town Wide Issues .....	6
1.8. Policy GILL2: Gillingham Southern Extension .....	8
1.9. Policy GILL3: Land at Common Mead Lane.....	12
1.10. Optional Urban Extension (Land to the West of Peacemarsh).....	15
1.11. Omission sites .....	22

## 1. Gillingham

### 1.1. Introduction

#### Paragraph 29.1.3

##### Motcombe Parish Council

- Paragraph 29.1.3 - implies that Kings Court Palace is in Gillingham when it is in Motcombe.

#### Paragraph 29.1.4 - Neighbourhood Plan

##### Gillingham Town Council

- NP currently under review and should be taken into account.

##### Public response

- The Gillingham NP should be taken into consideration as it was adopted in July 2018.

### 1.2. Vision for Gillingham

#### Paragraph 29.2.1

##### Gillingham Town Council

- Concern that Gillingham will become a dormitory town contrary to the vision.

##### Persimmon Homes

- Persimmon supports the 'Vision for Gillingham' set out within section 29.2.
- Bay Road could help realise some of the objectives in the vision for Gillingham, particularly in relation to housing.

##### P Joyce (Landowner)

- The vision for Gillingham is well thought out by Dorset Council.

##### Dorset Wildlife Trust

- Vision - welcome the need to deliver good quality green infrastructure.
- Support the need for schemes to improve the green space network, connect to the three rivers, and help deliver the Gillingham Royal Forest project.
- Contributions could be made to enhancements nearby, for great crested newts and for catchment management.

### 1.3. Development strategy

#### Paragraph 29.3.1

##### Cranborne Chase AONB

- Paragraph 29.3.1 - Gillingham is important as it provides a major sustainable transport link, but this potential will be limited if the Local Plan does not make substantial provision for parking to enable those living in the countryside to be able to find affordable parking.

## Paragraph 29.3.2 - Development opportunities

### Buckhorn Weston & Kington Magna Parish Council

- The level of growth at Gillingham is high compared to Sherborne and Shaftesbury.
- Expansion at Gillingham leads to sprawl which has a detrimental impact on the open countryside and local communities.

### Public response

- Wrong to plan for further expansion at Gillingham until the effect of the southern extension development is better judged.
- Need to redevelop brownfield sites before greenfield - regenerate the town centre and invest in schools to make Gillingham a place people want to move to.
- Because of the AONB and coast, there's little room where new homes can be built in Dorset – this is unfair on residents of north and west Dorset who value countryside just as much as those in AONB/ coastal regions.
- Support for the development boundary on Figure 29.1 as it enables smaller infill sites to be developed.
- Create a new town elsewhere so not to cause disruption to existing residents.

## Paragraph 29.3.3

### Gillingham Town Council

- Para 29.3.3 - more detail needed to explain what “a more diverse economy” is.

## 1.4. Town centre strategy

## Paragraph 29.4.1 - Town Centre

### Buckhorn Weston & Kington Magna Parish Council

- Very few facilities in the town - few shops, no community centres, no hospital and very little sports and recreation facilities
- High number of supermarkets in the town.

### Public response

- Gillingham needs a better high street, less empty shops, a cinema and other leisure uses.
- Former Co-op site in the High Street is an ideal opportunity for a Cinema/Theatre.
- Gillingham does not have 70 shops in the town centre.
- Gillingham Town Centre needs a boost to attract visitors.
- Lack of diversity of shops in the town centre - and no arts/music/community venue.
- Consider shops on the High Street and how they can be adapted to future needs.
- Gillingham is crying out for hotels and family restaurants.
- Potential implications of proposed allocations (that are not included within the town centre) on Gillingham Town Centre.

### Paragraph 29.4.3

---

#### Gillingham Town Council

- Paragraph 29.4.3 - Do not agree there is a need for more convenience goods floorspace but there is a need for new comparison goods floorspace.

### Paragraph 29.4.4

---

#### Gillingham Town Council

- Paragraph 29.4.4 - Some info is out of date.
- Petrol Station now built.

### Paragraph 29.4.5

---

#### Gillingham Town Council

- Paragraph 29.4.5 - Regarding former Co-op site, amend last sentence to read “As a large site in the centre of the town, this could be an ideal site to meet the needs of mixed commercial, retail, residential, and community development to comply with the policies of the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan.”

### Heritage

---

#### Historic England

- Recommend a new policy for Gillingham Town Centre that encourages development that conserves and enhances the historic environment and positively contributes to local character and distinctiveness.
- Policy should direct users to Dorset Historic Towns Survey for Gillingham and a new conservation area appraisal and management plan.

## 1.5. Policy GILL1: The Station Road regeneration area

### Paragraph 29.4.6 - Regeneration Area

---

#### P Joyce (Landowner)

- Concern regarding the emphasis on the Station Road area being the next area to be regenerated as the actual town centre needs much attention.

### Paragraph 29.4.7 - Station Road Masterplan

---

#### Gillingham Town Council

- Support the production of a detailed masterplan – this should be sooner rather than later in consultation with GTC.

#### Public response

- Masterplan should be developed as a matter of urgency to provide extra housing on a brownfield site.

## Paragraph 29.4.7 - Housing Capacity

---

### Gillingham Town Council

- The location of the 200 homes needs to be more specific and made a requirement.

### Walsingham Planning on behalf of Vistry Group Ltd & Hallam Land Ltd

- To ensure soundness, the Council should publish further information demonstrating that the housing capacity of the regeneration area can be achieved within the plan period.

## Station Parking

---

### North Dorset CPRE

- Does not mention increasing car parking capacity at the station, which will be vital once new houses are built out.

### Public response

- Gillingham railway station has limited parking and usually only 3 coaches on the trains.

## Flood risk

---

### Environment Agency

- Current and future flood risk needs to be considered within the SFRA for this site.
- No development within the floodplain.
- Consider buffer zones from the main rivers.

## 1.6. Main development opportunities

The following sections include summaries of representation received regarding the following policies:

- Town wide issues
- Policy GILL2: Gillingham Southern Extension
- Policy GILL3: Land at Common Mead Lane
- Optional Urban Extension (Land to the West of Peacemarsh)

## 1.7. Town Wide Issues

### Housing Need

---

#### Public response

- Gillingham doesn't need more housing.
- Number of homes needs to be managed to protect the countryside.
- Gillingham needs affordable housing for teachers, nurses and farm workers.
- Concerns over extra housing in Gillingham - a high proportion of residents are elderly and would not benefit and prefer to adapt their existing homes to cater for personal disabilities.
- Bottom-up approach to new housing necessary.

## Landscape

---

### Public response

- Don't want to see beautiful green land built on and enclosed.
- Gillingham needs woodland.
- Gillingham should be a quiet country town.
- The plan must not impact adversely on the lives of those who have chosen to have a rural environment at their doorstep.

## Green Gap between Colesbrook and Milton-on-the-Stour

---

### Gillingham Town Council

- A clearer definition of the open green space between Colesbrook and Milton-on Stour is needed to prevent any development outside the settlement boundary.

### Public response

- The green gap between Colesbrook and Milton-on-Stour conservation area should be maintained. It is an area of natural beauty with views of the listed Purns Mill - originally painted by Constable and the listed Purns Mill House and the listed church at Milton-on-stour and is a flood risk from the Shreen Water.

## Heritage

---

### Public response

- Heritage assets must be protected.

## Flood risk

---

### Public response

- Consider more the impact on the environment, including loss of floodplain.

## Highways

---

### Buckhorn Weston & Kington Magna Parish Council

- Town has the impression of a through route drawing in shoppers simply to the supermarkets and adding to the local congestion in the process.

### Public response

- Roads linking to the A303 are busy and dangerous.
- Time to have a ring-road around Gillingham.
- Little additional road construction in Northern Dorset to support growing population.

## Infrastructure Requirements

---

### Gillingham Town Council

- Make improvements to telecommunications a requirement.

### Public response

- Infrastructure cannot cope / infrastructure at Gillingham is over-stretched before the planned expansions go ahead / concern over the capacity of roads, and other social infrastructure.

## Education

---

### Gillingham Town Council

- Provision of a FE college should be included in the plan.

### Buckhorn Weston & Kington Magna Parish Council

- Capacity issues at Gillingham school.

### Public response

- Document refers to primary school provision but nothing at secondary level.
- An independent group should oversee the development and the delivery of infrastructure.
- Ensure land adjacent to schools is protected to allow for expansion.

## Health

---

### Gillingham Town Council

- Need for an A&E hospital between Gillingham and Shaftesbury for the expanding population.

## Amenity

---

### Royal Mencap Society

- The odour buffer around the sewage treatment works in Gillingham seems excessive and its size should be reviewed.

## Multi-functional Park

---

### Public response

- Gillingham lacks a larger, multi-functional park - this should be addressed.

## Cemetery Provision

---

### Public response

- Could some of the land at Land West of Peasemars be purchased for a cemetery?

## 1.8. Policy GILL2: Gillingham Southern Extension

### Principal of development

---

#### North Dorset CPRE

- Concern that if Welbeck Land parcel does not go ahead then there is a 961 home deficit.

#### Persimmon Homes

- The Council should be cautious regarding the delivery rate of the GSE.
- A review of the delivery expectations for the site may necessitate consideration of alternative sites – such as the site at Bay Road that Persimmon is promoting (see omission sites below).

#### P Joyce (Landowner)

- Disappointing that this area has taken so long for building to start.



## Public response

- Southern Extension is taking too long. To help, other developments (anything over 5 dwellings) should be put on hold.

## Paragraph 29.5.1 - Local Centre

---

### Thornhackett Parish Council

- Concerns should be raised that the Local Centre proposed as part of development should not have an adverse effect on Gillingham Town Centre.
- Proper consideration of Paragraphs 85 to 90 of the NPPF particularly the application of the sequential test should be given in all developments in the Southern Extension.

## Paragraph 29.5.2 - Tenure Mix

---

### Savills on behalf of Taylor Wimpey (developer of Lodden Lakes)

- Policy HOUS2 introduces a revised tenure mix – should be clarified that this does not apply to GILL2 as not reasonable for a site that has been subject to an extensive period of planning.

## Paragraph 29.5.2 - Affordable Housing

---

### Savills on behalf of Taylor Wimpey (developer of Lodden Lakes)

- Paragraph 29.5.2 - concern regarding the requirement that later phases will be expected to make up the difference for affordable housing – this may be reasonable for a single ownership parcel but is not for the whole SSA.

## Paragraph 29.5.3 - Masterplan

---

### Gillingham Town Council

- Masterplan framework must be officially adopted.

## Paragraph 29.5.3 & Appendix 5 - Design Principals

---

### Dorset Wildlife Trust

- Welcome the need to retain/enhance landscape and ecological assets as specified in Appendix 5 – Design Principles.

## Paragraph 29.5.5 - Employment Land

---

### Sigma Aldrich (owner of land south of Brickfields)

- Support for quantum of employment land (11.6ha) at this site.
- Employment uses on this site should be flexible to ensure it is attractive to the market - any uses would be subject to approval by Sigma-Aldrich.
- We are in discussions with a potential developer to bring forward employment development on the Brickfields extension.

### Gillingham Town Council

- Council will need to lead bringing forward the employment land for development.

## Paragraph 29.5.5 - Waste Recycling Centre

---

### Sigma Aldrich (owner of land south of Brickfields)

- We are against the proposals for a household recycling centre as set out in the Waste Plan.

### Public response

- Waste Recycling centre at Gillingham is overdue and needed.

## Infrastructure Requirements

---

### Gillingham Town Council

- Support as will bring forward infrastructure in a comprehensive and coherent manner.
- Add requirement for 5G.

### Sigma Aldrich (owner of land south of Brickfields)

- Development of the Brickfields extension should not be liable to developer contributions arising from other parts of the southern extension.

### Sport England

- Agree with the principles of providing sports land and infrastructure, but what is the rationale/justification? Suggest it comes from the adopted playing pitch strategy.
- Concern that the allocation may just focus on football and not the other sports.
- The infrastructure may not have inclusion for secondary spend to ensure the site is financially self-sustainable.

## Flood risk

---

### Environment Agency

- Flood risk needs to be considered.
- Avoid the floodplain and consider buffer zones around the main rivers.

## Highways

---

### Wiltshire Council

- Likely to have impact on road network in Wiltshire – keep us informed of relevant traffic modelling work, etc.

### Bournemouth Transport Ltd trading as Yellow Buses

- Urban extension will need public transport connections to Gillingham Rail Station and Shaftesbury Town Centre at least hourly. This is likely to require 2 vehicles. The pump prime funding is likely to be £650k over 4 years. If there is an existing network in place, this could be modified to serve the new estate, and the funding required would be £350k over 4 years.

### Public response

- Recent road improvements not adequate for the additional vehicles from the southern extension.
- Needs an hourly bus service to railway station and Shaftesbury Town Centre - this requires funding.

## Green Infrastructure

---

### Environment Agency

- Pleased to see that green infrastructure will be incorporated into the site. This should include areas of wildlife habitat and seek to link up any existing green corridors. Wetland features in the site should be considered if appropriate.

## Gap between Gillingham and Motcombe

---

### Buckhorn Weston & Kington Magna Parish Council

- Impact of expansion in housing on neighbouring villages and communities - development sprawling towards Motcombe.

## Heritage

---

### Historic England

- Include conserving and enhancing the setting and significance of the grade II listed Park Farmhouse in the criteria.

### Public response

- Concern that development at the Park Farm area will have a detrimental impact on the historic Royal Deer Park.

## Policy GILL2

---

### Gillingham Town Council

- Amend homes to dwellings when referring to AH requirement.
- Amend words like “should” to “will” or “must”.

## Criterion I

---

### Natural England

- Clause I - Support for the requirement for a minimum area of informal public open space.

## Criterion III

---

### Natural England

- Clause III - Policy should require a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity.

### Dorset Wildlife Trust

- An additional bullet under criteria III would be appropriate to “contribute to biodiversity enhancement on site and within the Gillingham Royal Forest project.”

## Criterion VIII

---

### Natural England

- Clause VIII - Welcomes minimum green infrastructure standards for the development.
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet - Policy should clarify that all important trees be retained.
  - 4<sup>th</sup> bullet - Policy should require the provision of high-quality, multifunctional SuDS.
  - 6<sup>th</sup> bullet - Policy should support the establishment of the Gillingham Royal Forest.

### Dorset Wildlife Trust

- Add the need to retain/enhance river corridors, ponds, and other natural features within public open spaces, as already specified for trees/hedgerows in VIII bullet 3.

## Additional criterion

---

### Dorset Wildlife Trust

- Policy should include a link to the aspirations of the Gillingham Royal Forest Project.

## 1.9. Policy GILL3: Land at Common Mead Lane

### Principal of development

---

#### Fairfax Acquisitions Ltd

- Site can deliver more than 70 units.
- Site forms a logical extension to the built-up area of the town.
- The neighbourhood plan identifies other sites for allotments and there is no evidence to suggest there is a requirement for sports provision.

#### Gillingham Town Council

- Strongly object – site allocated for outdoor sports in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- There are deficits of outdoor sports and amenity space.
- Homes on this site will be detrimental to the delivery of key infrastructure in the town.
- Policy should be changed to protect site against development.

#### North Dorset CPRE

- Not needed to plug short-term gap as Southern Extension is going ahead.

#### Royal Mencap Society

- We disagree with the inclusion of the site as an additional site option within the Local Plan for residential development.

#### P Joyce (Landowner)

- Do not understand the case for this as it was allocated as a leisure/recreation area.

#### Public response

- Used by the community.
- One of the last accessible green spaces; Site was needed during the pandemic and helps people's mental wellbeing; Retain for recreation.
- Gillingham NP identifies site for green space; Redevelop the town centre first.
- Loss of amenity to the care home.
- Is there room for housing as well as sports pitches?
- Area not large enough to deliver everything being claimed.
- Development here could be a disincentive for developers of the Southern Extension.

## Landscape

---

#### Fairfax Acquisitions Ltd

- No landscape designations - tree belts/hedgerows obscure views from west and north.

### Buckhorn Weston & Kington Magna Parish Council

- Impact on open countryside and local communities to the west.

#### Public response

- Incursion into the countryside.
- Use landscaping to protect the setting of Wyke Conservation Area.
- New trees should not be saplings.
- The density of the development should reflect the transition from town to countryside.

## Heritage

---

### Historic England

- Object – delete or undertake further heritage impact assessment.
- Depending on results, amend policy to ensure harm to affected heritage assets is avoided and minimised and enhancement maximised.

## Biodiversity

---

### Natural England

- Policy should require at least a 10% biodiversity net gain.

### Environment Agency

- Green space should be incorporated into the site where possible, incl. areas of wildlife habitat, and link up existing green corridors.
- Wetland features in the site should be considered if appropriate.

#### Public response

- Impact on priority and protected species.
- Concern regarding Great Crested Newts that are found in the area.

## Highways & Public Transport

---

### Gillingham Town Council

- There is a need for public transport serving this part of Gillingham, therefore a regular bus service should be mandatory.

### Royal Mencap Society

- It will place additional stress on the local transport infrastructure when other potential sites closer to the town centre could achieve the desired output in terms of housing.

#### Public response

- Will increase car use.
- Need a bus service to connect the development to the town centre.
- Vehicular access to Wyke Road needs to be improved to prevent the use of the 'Eccliffe' route.
- Common Mead Lane is a narrow rat-run and is unable to accept any more traffic.

## Footpaths

---

### Dorset Wildlife Trust

- Policy should require improved public access to the countryside along with a requirement for some informal green infrastructure.

### Natural England

- Clause IV: Policy should include measures to facilitate access to the countryside.

### Public response

- Will new rights of way in the countryside be created?

## Infrastructure Requirements

---

### Gillingham Town Team

- This development is close enough to existing infrastructure.

### Fairfax Acquisitions Ltd

- Close to services and facilities.
- Town Council has indicated they would prefer informal play rather than equipped provision.

### Public response

- Lack of infrastructure capacity.
- Infrastructure needed: Community Hall, Theatre/Cinema, Wider range of shops, Recreational Areas, Expanded Youth Activities Centre, Proper Cycle Tracks, Upgraded access roads.
- Need for a secure off-lead dog exercising area.
- Formal open space and play facilities should be provided on-site.
- Concern over lack of facilities (e.g., shops) in this part of town.
- Limited employment.

## Dark Skies

---

### Public response

- Reduce streetlight / protect night skies.

## Water and Sewage

---

### Wessex Water

- There must be no surface water connections to foul sewers.

## Amenity

---

### Public response

- Concern for amenity of existing residents and the need to screen the estate from the existing houses.

## 1.10. Optional Urban Extension (Land to the West of Peacemarsh)

### Principal of development

#### Walsingham Planning on behalf of Vistry Group Ltd & Hallam Land Ltd

- This site should be allocated as it could meet longer term housing needs for the town and deliver further infrastructure improvements.
- We have prepared a Vision Document which demonstrates how this site can deliver 800 new homes and provide the opportunity to deliver a distinct, well connected and sustainable new strategic extension.
- The experience of the Southern Extension shows that it is necessary to plan ahead to ensure delivery.

#### S Joyce (landowner)

- The development to the North of Wavering Lane/West of Peacemarsh is a beneficial development for the town, as it is first and foremost, a “Natural Infill”.
- This site has been discussed for many years.

#### P Joyce (landowner)

- Opportunity for housing, green space, school, allotments and other similar uses.
- It is also possible to walk to the town centre and railway station in 10 minutes via paths avoiding the use of cars.
- Natural infill site.
- Development would benefit those leaving London and young families.
- Development could provide more diverse housing / social housing / needs of an ageing population.

#### Vortal Homes Ltd

- Disagree with allocation.
- SHLAA considered the west of Peacemarsh an unsuitable site.
- Other sites identified as unsuitable in the SHLAA around Gillingham are not identified for potential future development.
- Promoting an alternative site – see omission sites below.

#### Persimmon Homes

- Strong reservations about whether this site is deliverable / developable.
- Not appropriate for the Council to partially commit to the site by just referring to it in the supporting text.
- Criteria for potential allocation show that there is considerable uncertainty as to whether the site is a developable / deliverable housing site.
- Paragraph 29.5.11 - the criteria (except bullet point 5) could equally be applied to the Bay Road site.
- Currently no developer involved in the site, so delivery is not certain.
- Bay Road site (see omission sites below) scores better than Peacemarsh site in the SA including community, ecology etc, flooding and landscape and heritage issues can be overcome.

### Savills on behalf of Sampson Properties

- We also support the optional urban extension at Land west of Peacemarsh, which proposes the provision of an additional 600 homes.

### Bourton Parish Council

- It is inappropriate for this green field site to be proposed as a potential extension to Gillingham.

### Public response

- Brownfield alternatives - town centre / Co-op building / etc.
- Wrong side of town.
- Peacemarsh or Shaftesbury Road are better options than Common Mead Lane.
- Fields around the town should be bought so the town can decide what to do with them.

## Paragraph 29.5.10 - Housing Delivery & Phasing

---

### Walsingham Planning on behalf of Vistry Group Ltd & Hallam Land Ltd

- Concern about the need to phase so as not to inhibit the southern extension is unfounded.
- Without any phasing the site would not begin delivering houses until 2027/28 - by this time, the southern extension will be underway.
- Market saturation unlikely to be an issue and it will lead to more housing choice and more affordability.
- However, we would be open to an appropriately worded requirement for the development to be phased so as not to inhibit the delivery of the Southern Extension.
- A housing trajectory should be prepared for the Dorset-wide area and the functional areas.

### P Joyce (landowner)

- Southern Extension may not be built out quickly enough - an alternative area which overlaps this development in time would seem like a sensible strategy.

### Persimmon Homes

- Allocating land at Peacemarsh may impact upon the delivery rate of housing in Gillingham due to competition.

### Terence O'Rourke on behalf of Bargate Homes

- It seems unlikely this development will come forward at the pace the council is anticipating.

### Wessex Water

- Do not support this development preceding construction of the Southern Extension.

### Bourton Parish Council

- Should it be allocated for the proposed '...around 600 new homes' it will doubtless have a negative impact on the progression of the Gillingham Southern Extension development.

### Public response

- Should only be permitted after Southern Extension is at least 90% built with all the necessary infrastructure in place, to prevent overloading the town's infrastructure.
- New infrastructure should start to be provided before housebuilding begins.
- Undermines delivery of the Southern Extension.



## Affordable housing

---

### Walsingham Planning on behalf of Vistry Group Ltd & Hallam Land Ltd

- The development would provide a range of house types and tenures informed by an assessment of local need and including a policy compliant provision of affordable housing.

### Public response

- Affordability of the new homes - Not affordable to young Gillingham residents.
- New homes should be zero carbon.

## Infrastructure Requirements

---

### Walsingham Planning on behalf of Vistry Group Ltd & Hallam Land Ltd

- The proposal in the Vision Document includes land for the provision of additional education provision, which could be a primary school or secondary subject to need.

### S Joyce (landowner)

- A possible additional school to meet the needs of an increased population.

### P Joyce (Landowner)

- Gillingham needs the input of fresh shops and more facilities to improve the quality of life for those living in Gillingham - more people living in Gillingham would attract companies, shops, facilities, etc.

### Savills on behalf of Sampson Properties

- Further to the provision of dwellings, the optional urban extension may also deliver infrastructure improvements, a cemetery, sports pitches, allotments, and increased schools capacity. Significant public benefits to providing a modern replacement tennis court facility. This could also incorporate the relocation of the existing tennis courts at Mere Road.

### Gillingham Town Council

- Strongly object – development will be piecemeal and will not contribute towards the delivery of social, community or key infrastructure.

### Motcombe Parish Council

- This proposed development at Peacemarsch is opposed by Motcombe Parish Council as it would impose additional, and unacceptable, pressure on local infrastructure. The need for yet further large-scale developments in the Gillingham area is also questionable.
- This would also create the need for additional sites for employment in the area.

### Bourton Parish Council

- If Land West of Peacemarsch is considered for the proposed development in addition to the GSE it will risk overwhelming Gillingham's infrastructure, especially schools, roads and healthcare provision.

### Wessex Water

- Significant investment will be required to serve this potential allocation.

### Public response

- Infrastructure capacity - Schools, doctors, dentists, etc., Lack of employment / jobs.

- Would be a good location for a new technology college.
- Gillingham is a sad, outdated, empty town - lack of decent restaurants, pubs or shops - concern that further development without investment would exacerbate this.

## Flood risk

---

### S Joyce (landowner)

- The fields within the development area are drier, loamier type soils, and freer draining normally.
- The fields to the west have been used for crops, this makes them prone to be much wetter and stickier, due to the lack of soil structure from continual cultivation.
- There is a small stream/ditch that runs from Slaughtergate Farm fields eastwards, over the development area, through a 12 inch water pipe, until it converges again into a small stream/ditch going further eastwards. The pipe is not large enough.

### Public response

- Boggy/clay soil.
- Area floods regularly.
- Flood plain.
- Concern with increased flood risk.

## Highways & Public Transport

---

### Walsingham Planning on behalf of Vistry Group Ltd & Hallam Land Ltd

- A single vehicular access from Wavering Lane with an additional connection to the west of the site which could also function as an 'emergency access'.
- The site offers a key opportunity to connect into the recent development at Peacemarsh across the River Stour by an existing footbridge and establish a new open space corridor and riverside walk to the town centre.

### S Joyce (landowner)

- The site has good access for vehicles, local buses, cyclists, and walkers to the town itself.
- The site benefits from a wide, open, through road, along Rollsbridge way/Cemetery way, and westwards giving easy access to our neighbouring villages, to the town of Wincanton, and more importantly, to the A303, and beyond.

### Bournemouth Transport Ltd trading as Yellow Buses

- Likely that the bus route serving Wyke could be extended to serve this site. Similar costs to those outlined with respect to the Southern Extension.

### North Dorset CPRE

- Without provision to improve access to the north of Gillingham, this is an unsuitable location.

### South Western Railway

- This is a good sustainable option as long as there are good cycling links to the station along with high quality shared transport options such as e-bikes.
- Gillingham is well located for public transport access, particularly by rail.
- Locating more development here would help support the case for improved rail services on the West of England line towards Salisbury and Exeter.

- Would also help to justify and fund improvements at the rail station such as additional car and cycle parking and the provision of accessible lifts.
- Would also make local bus services more financially sustainable in the long term.

### Public response

- Increases car dependency.
- Lanes are too narrow and widening them would ruin the character of the area.
- Existing issues with cars speeding.
- A single land road – unsuitable for more traffic.
- Requires a bus service.
- It needs a principal street linking the two B Roads between the Rugby Club and The Kendalls.

## Biodiversity and Environment

---

### Walsingham Planning on behalf of Vistry Group Ltd & Hallam Land Ltd

- Proposed open space, green infrastructure proposals and ecological enhancements would aim to provide a net gain in biodiversity on the site.

### S Joyce (landowner)

- Accept some impact however the site will retain as many hedges and trees as possible, and will have some green open spaces, small untouched, natural areas for insects, reptiles, birds, bug/bee hotels etc.

### Environment Agency

- R. Stour has been heavily modified and straightened – any development should consider river restoration works to reintroduce meanders.
- Development contributions towards the upgrading of telemetry in Gillingham should be included in order to continue issuing effective flood warnings.
- Green space should be incorporated into the site where possible, this should include areas of wildlife habitat, and seek to link up any existing green corridors. Wetland features in the site should be considered if appropriate.
- Historic landfill site - should be taken into consideration.

### Natural England

- An ecological assessment of the site should be completed prior to its allocation.
- If allocated there should be requirements for informal public greenspace, biodiversity net gain, multifunctional SuDS and support for the Gillingham Royal Forest project.

### Public response

- Next to the River Stour.
- Will be another environmental disaster.
- Concern with pollution of the river from litter.
- In view of climate emergency, plant trees in the field.

## Green Infrastructure

---

### Walsingham Planning on behalf of Vistry Group Ltd & Hallam Land Ltd

- The illustrative concept masterplan allows for extensive public open space, including allotments and play areas.

- The proposal would create open space in the area adjoining the River Stour to protect and enhance the river corridor, facilitate the delivery of a riverside walk and incorporate sustainable urban drainage.

### S Joyce (landowner)

- There will also be some green areas/play areas incorporated into the site, biodiversity habitats with green open space areas near the existing cycleway/footpath, adjacent to the river.

### Dorset Wildlife Trust

- Opportunities for green space and nature recovery networks should be planned on a more strategic basis and not on an individual site-by-site basis – particularly regarding the River Stour corridor.

### Public response

- Does not deliver high quality GI.
- Loss of recreation – attractive area for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Loss of countryside for children to explore and learn.
- Loss of productive farmland.
- Allow for wild spaces big enough for large trees.

---

## Landscape

### Walsingham Planning on behalf of Vistry Group Ltd & Hallam Land Ltd

- Development of the site would not harm landscape and heritage assets.

### Public response

- Loss of natural beauty.
- General visual impact on the area.
- Consider the town's country charm, the existing infrastructure, and the environmental impacts of the development.

---

## Gap between Gillingham and Milton on Stour

### S Joyce (landowner)

- Would not like to see any development encroaching right to the boundary of Milton-on-Stour.
- The boundary of the development area at the northern end has a large, very wide 8ft/10ft hedge. Adamant that this will stop any further development towards Milton completely.

### Motcombe Parish Council

- The River Stour and associated green routes (including the Stour Valley Way) would cease to form the natural northern boundary for development in the town.

### Public response

- Loss of gap between Gillingham and Milton on Stour.

## Heritage

---

### Walsingham Planning on behalf of Vistry Group Ltd & Hallam Land Ltd

- With regard Milton on Stour Conservation Area, which lies c. 200m to the north of the Site, the finding of the heritage review was that the asset primarily drew its special interest from the built form of the historic settlement core, as well as its constituent green spaces and road network.
- Whilst the immediately surrounding farmland was considered to contribute positively, by comparison the Site lay beyond its setting (with the exception of the northern boundary hedge), obscured as it is by the local topography and intervening vegetated environment as noted in the landscape review.

### S Joyce (landowner)

- This development is well away from both the residential conservation areas of Wyke, and of Milton.

### Historic England

- Further heritage impact assessment and masterplanning is needed to assess site's suitability and capacity for development.
- Produce/update appraisals and management plans for Milton-on-Stour and Wyke Conservation Areas.
- Depending on the results, the inclusion of specific policy criteria to ensure harm to affected heritage assets is avoided and minimised and enhancements are maximised.

### Public response

- Need to preserve the village character.
- Harm to conservation areas.
- Diminish the setting of Wyke Hall (listed building).
- Archaeology – arrow heads discovered.

## Amenity

---

### Public response

- Area popular during lockdown.
- Rural idyll -> mid-estate nightmare.
- River walks and fields are important to mental health.
- Increase in light and air pollution.
- Increase in crime/anti-social behaviour.
- Concern over speed of growth and how well the new community becomes absorbed into the current town.
- Concern with pollution of the river and conservation area from litter.

## 1.11. Omission sites

### Land north of Bay Road (LA/GILL/002)

#### Terence O'Rourke on behalf of Bargate Homes

- Further allocations at Gillingham are needed as southern extension has yet to deliver homes and the anticipated delivery rate is lower than when originally allocated.
- Land North of Bay Road should be considered for inclusion as an additional allocation to help guarantee a continuous supply of homes at the town.
- The site has the capacity to accommodate c. 230-300 homes.
- There is an excellent opportunity to deliver further multifunctional green and blue infrastructure in Gillingham along the Sheen corridor.
- The site is in good proximity to the town centre and can be connected to the footpath and cycle network. There is a bus stop located 250m to the west and the Station is located 1 mile away.
- In respect of landscape, the site can be developed whilst avoiding the higher, more sensitive slopes.

### Land at Chantry Field, Le Neubourg Way (LA/GILL/004)

#### Royal Mencap Society, British Heart Foundation, Clic Sargent, Dorset County Hospital Charity, Cancer Research UK

- Land at Chantry Field (9.96 ha) could be available for development for approximately 200 dwellings.
- Odour mitigation measures can be put in place to mitigate against odour nuisance, by utilising specialist equipment.
- Intuitive planning to minimise the visual impact and flood alleviation works to mitigate risk of flooding.

### Land to the west of Colesbrook Farm (LA/GILL/006, 007 & 008)

#### Vortal Homes

- Should be allocated for landscape-led residential development including self-build and custom housebuilding development with associated community facilities.
- Suggestion that a scheme to the north of the town on all or part of SHLAA Ref 006/007 and 008 could mitigate against all of the identified issues and could also satisfy the requirement for sports pitches (GNP Policy 17, 19 & 22).
- Pitches could be situated to the north of the site giving a permanent protected open gap between Gillingham and Milton on Stour.
- Straightforward access - abuts the existing highway network.
- Allocation of smaller and medium sized sites which could be delivered more quickly, instead of a substantial urban extension, can help make an important contribution to meeting the local housing needs.
- Reference to attached location plan.
- Approximately a mile from the town centre of Gillingham, is available for development.
- Could also help to make provision for care facilities alongside helping to meet the demand for housing in the wider area.

## Land south of Bay Road (LA/GILL/012)

---

### Persimmon Homes

- Land south of Bay Road is a sustainable and deliverable opportunity, which should be reconsidered for allocation, for the reasons in the deliverability statement.
- We believe that the net developable area of the site is around 10.3ha, which provides a potential capacity of about 350 dwellings.
- The site benefits from its proximity to a range of local services by foot, cycle and public transport including jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and community services.
- The site can be accessed from Bay Road.
- The site can be developed without giving rise to any material landscape or visual effects.
- The scheduled monument (SM) of Kings Court Palace (a moated site) is located approximately 350m to the south. This monument is screened from the site by the railway line and significant landscaping in the form of mature tree belts.
- A new SM was recently designated within the site boundary. Discussions are ongoing with Historic England to accommodate the SM.
- An Ecological Impact Assessment has been carried out and as part of the proposals a biodiversity management plan will be produced.
- The site lies outside of the River Lodden Flood Plain, except for a small part of the Southeast corner of the site.
- The site is suitable, available, and achievable. The opportunities and influences have informed an indicative masterplan.
- The deliverability statement shows that Land south of Bay Road is a less constrained, more sustainable site than Peacemarsh, with a greater chance of delivery in the plan period. It could also deliver the community uses described with the Peacemarsh proposal, but in the short to medium term.

## Land at Mere Road (LA/GILL/019)

---

### Savills on behalf of Sampson Properties

- Land at Mere Road, Gillingham (LA/GILL/019) should be allocated for housing - suitable to deliver 15-20 dwellings and can help with the supply of small and medium sized sites.
- The existing commercial use has been marketed without interest for two years.
- The Site is well located adjacent to existing residential development to the south and would therefore not adversely impact the existing landscape and townscape character.

## Land south of the Southern Extension (LA/GILL/021 & 022)

---

### Sturt & Company on behalf of Lagan Farms

- Gillingham is a sustainable settlement, and these housing numbers are the minimum.
- Should be considered for more housing in the future.
- The site is a natural extension to the settlement and will benefit from the infrastructure being proposed.

## Land South of Wyke Road (LA/GILL/024)

---

### Land Value Alliances

- Land South of Wyke Road, Gillingham should be allocated for residential development.

- A link road through the area should be provided to connect Wyke Road and Common Mead Lane and can substantially enhance the public right of way network in this area.
- This will provide key highway infrastructure improvements to the western side of Gillingham, helping to relieve additional traffic pressures on the town.
- The site allocation at Common Mead Lane has limited capacity to provide the policy infrastructure – this site is therefore required to support delivery of Policy GILL3.
- The site can be delivered in a highly attractive manner, providing an aesthetically pleasing point of entrance from the B3081 into the growth area that is complimentary to the nearby conservation area.