Meeting Notes:

The notes below are not a verbatim record of the discussions that took place during the Hearing. Rather, they are an overview of the topics and key issues discussed on the day.

9.00am Hearing Convened.

1.1 The Examiner, Mr. Terrence Kemmann-Lane (Mr. KL) opened the hearing with introductions and outlined the agenda for the day. He explained that the primary aim for arranging the site visit at the start of the day was to gain a shared understanding of the landscape around Blandford Forum, and most importantly, how development proposals considered within the B+NP fit into that landscape. Prior to the site visit, attendees were given the opportunity to propose viewpoints and Mr. KL explained that he wished to encourage everyone to raise key issues at each viewpoint through open discussion. The list of site visit participants was agreed prior to the hearing and can be found in the Agenda.

9.35am Site Visit Commenced.

1.2 It was proposed by Brian Duckett, Landscape Architect, (and agreed by Mr. KL) that the order of the site visits should be changed to enable the whole group to view and discuss the development options that were appraised within B+NP and then discarded, prior to viewing development proposals on land to the N and E of Blandford Forum (Policies B2 & B3 within the plan).

1.00pm Site Visit Concluded.

1.3 All sites / viewpoints on the site visit itinerary were visited. Mr KL gave everyone the chance to discuss / raise concerns at each stop. It was agreed that the aims of the site visit had been successfully achieved.

2.00pm Hearing Re-Convened.

2.1 All parties who had previously made representations at consultation stage and had indicated they would like to participate in the hearing were invited to join the table.

Hearing Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blandford +</th>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Richard Burden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dorset Council (DC):</th>
<th>Wates Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed Gerry</td>
<td>Jeremy Farrelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Denham</td>
<td>Genesis Town Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Dodson</td>
<td>Barry Pliskin</td>
</tr>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wyatt Homes:</th>
<th>Clemmell Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Duckett</td>
<td>Barry Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Shepherd</td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
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<td>Laraine Southwood</td>
<td></td>
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| Davis Family (landowner) | |
|--------------------------||
| Cliff Lane | |
2.2 Following introductions, Mr. KL explained his original concerns that, at first sight, the new B+NP appears to contain two policies (B2 Land to the N&E Blandford & B3 Employment) that are very similar to ‘Policy 1’ submitted within the first B+NP, that had previously been found did not meet the basic conditions by the examiner. He went on to explain that in order to overturn the findings of the previous examiner and therefore to achieve a different outcome for the new B+NP, he would require clear, evidence-based justification as to what had changed.

2.3 Mr. KL invited Ed Gerry (EG) to start discussions by highlighting the key circumstances that have changed since the previous plan was submitted in 2016.

2.4 EG explained to the hearing that, in response to matters raised by the examiner, Dorset Council (DC) had submitted and published a statement1 outlining the reasons why DC now support the B+NP. EG summarised this response.

2.4.1 North Dorset Local Plan Review/Dorset Council Local Plan. The North Dorset Local Plan (LPP1) Review was not completed by the due date of November 2018. North Dorset District Council was dissolved in March 2019 and Dorset Council, which came into existence on the 1 April 2019, has taken the decision to cease work on the North Dorset Local Plan Review with the work that has been done to date in North Dorset feeding into the production of the wider Dorset Council Local Plan. A Local Development Scheme has been adopted by DC which sets out the timetable for the production of the Dorset Council Local plan including a proposed adoption date of 2023. In absence of both an adopted Local Plan, and 5 Year Housing Land Supply, the B+NP could provide Blandford with some protection from speculative development in the future.

2.4.2 Spatial Strategy for Development in North Dorset. Initial work on the Dorset Council Local Plan indicates that Blandford will continue to have a prominent place in the settlement hierarchy that is defined for the Dorset Council Local Plan. Consequently, Blandford is highly likely to continue to be a focus for growth in the North Dorset area. This is especially the case given it is one of the main service centres in North Dorset and serves a sizeable rural hinterland that contains a large number of villages. DC considers that a spatial strategy that proposes no growth for Blandford is not a realistic option.

2.4.3 Housing Need. Evidence of increased housing need is set out in the 2015 Eastern Dorset Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and is also identified by using the standard methodology that the Government has introduced for assessing housing need. DC considers that Policy B2 in the neighbourhood plan will help meet some of the increased need for housing which has been identified in the North Dorset area since the LPP1 was adopted.

2.4.4 Housing Land Supply. DC is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites for the North Dorset area. Analysis of housing monitoring data for the 2018/19 monitoring period indicates that the lack of a 5 Year Housing Land Supply (SYHLS) is likely to persist in North Dorset for the foreseeable future. This is a significant change in circumstances since the Examination of the previous version of B+NP. DC considers that the proposed allocation set out in Policy B2 of the neighbourhood plan will help improve the housing land supply situation in the North Dorset area.

2.4.5 Need for a new primary school in Blandford. Since the previous examination of B+NP, the need for a new primary school has become more time-critical. Expanding existing schools has been ruled out, maximum capacity has been reached and the system is not sustainable if pupil numbers increase as predicted. The only option for increasing primary school capacity at Blandford is by developing a new primary school (part v of Policy 16 in LPP1). DC considers that the area of land proposed for the new school (to the north of the bypass and in the vicinity of the A350 pedestrian bridge (yellow bridge)) is the most appropriate location to deliver a quality educational facility.

2.4.6 Need for employment Land. The latest published Annual Monitoring Report for North Dorset details that in April 2018 there was 28.85 hectares of land available for employment use at the four main towns, but only 4.16 hectares of this land was available at Blandford. This 4.16 hectares of land consists of a number of smaller parcels of land rather than being one site, therefore reducing its attractiveness to potential future occupiers. DC supports the proposal to allocate the additional, attractive land for employment uses in Policy B3c of the neighbourhood plan.

2.4.7 Provision of new, robust evidence. DC is satisfied that the concerns previously raised in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and the evidence base have been addressed in respect of the new B+NP. A new SA has

---

been produced that is comprehensive in its approach including in terms of considering the cumulative impacts of development and reasonable alternatives. Further to the SA, DC considers that the evidence supporting the landscape impacts of developing the proposed allocations, is far more detailed and comprehensive than the evidence that supported the previous B+NP.

2.4.8 Updates to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Guidance encourage a more integrated approach to ‘plan making’ and advise that plans at all levels should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area. EG referred to a letter2 sent by Dave Chetwyn of Urban Vision Enterprise CIC (A Locality appointed Planner supporting the neighbourhood plan) outlining the updates to the examiner.

2.5 Mr. KL referred to his notes and considerations in the agenda, particularly regarding the value placed on AONBs. He said that he wanted to focus on policies B2 and B3 in particular, asking all attendees to feed in important factors that will help him to make his decision. Mr KL reiterated that he had approached the examination with an open mind, starting from the point that the previous B+NP had gone through examination, and so he had put the onus onto Blandford + and Dorset Council to bring forward all the changes in circumstances. Mr KL then invited Richard Burden (RB) to comment on behalf of Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

2.6 Richard Burden (RB) – Asked Ed Denham (ED) whether the new primary school is needed now. ED responded by saying that there are 90 places and 139 pupils this year, so Dorset Council have already had to cope with excess demand. ED confirmed that a new school is needed now. Dorset Council is currently dealing with over capacity through ‘bulges’ in the current estate, but this is not sustainable in the longer term. ED reiterated that previous concerns raised over the proposed location and funding for the new school have also been addressed in the updated Pupil Placement Planning Statement3 (June 2019) submitted as an appendix to the examiner’s questions.

2.7 RB raised concerns that, by proposing to allocate 400 houses, the B+NP is taking on a strategic role that should instead be dealt with under the new Local Plan. RB pointed out that the area of search within the B+NP was very limited, especially considering the area is surrounded by nationally strategic and important landscape.

2.8 RB added that the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) outlines the need to consider the ‘setting’ of AONBs. RB referred to the CC&WWD AONB Management Plan, which was adopted by Dorset Council. The management plan contains policies that refer to the importance of setting. The CROW Act states that policies contained within an AONB management plan are policies of the local council, so if Dorset Council support the B+NP, this goes against the AONB management plan policies.

2.9 RB referred to the Joint Advisory committee (CCAONB + Dorset AONB + Dorset Council), stating that the shortage of the SYHLS does not negate policies in the Local Plan that relate to the setting of an AONB. RB commented that, from the earlier site visit, attendees could see that the landscape in the Dorset AONB was incised, dropping into a valley, and that the juxtaposed views across the valleys all contributed to the setting. North of Blandford (in the CCWWD AONB) is a plateau type landscape with open views, relying on vegetation to screen development, thus reducing potential options available. Trees could die back so screening could be damaged. Major strategic planting could also have an intrusive impact on the landscape.

2.10 RB also referred to NPPF Para 170 ‘Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment conserve and enhance…..’ and Para 172 ‘Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in …… Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty’. He suggested that limiting the development to a site of 1 ha would be more realistic to fit in the lie of the landscape. RB raised concerns that there appeared to be no mechanism at this stage to give details of the development and to provide assurances that mitigation will be of a high standard.

2.11 Mr KL stated that he would accept, for the moment, the areas of search identified to meet the housing need. The group had visited all the potential options during the site visit, and it appeared to Mr KL that of the sites that are available, the sites that have been discarded are understandable.

2.12 RB said that he did not disagree, but he thinks that the site to the north is even worse. He raised concerns that the level of interaction between the proposed development and the landscape and setting of the AONB are not acceptable due to the fact that the site tilts towards the AONB. He also stated that the site is outside the bypass and so is unsustainable as it is too far

---


away from the town centre, it is difficult to access, with the only way to get to the town centre by private car. He also raised concerns that the development was pulling out into open landscape, irrespective of whether the site layout includes lakes, open spaces etc.

2.13 Mr KL commented that strategic planting can be used to hide development. He added that the landscape is constantly changing, and some trees may die back, but new landscaping can, over time, become attractive and can contribute to the quality of the area.

2.14 RB counteracted Mr KL’s comment by saying that trees take time to grow, and asked how the B+NP would manage this. In order to screen the site successfully, the developer would need to put in lots of big trees, which would prove expensive. The soil in the area is thin and so is not good for trees. The developer says now that they will do the best job possible, but future costs constraints may cause the developer to cut corners, so how will this be managed?

2.15 Mr KL asked the group whether an assessment of the viability of a scheme (landscaping etc.) has to be carried as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process (as happens with a Local Plan).

2.16 Jon Dowty (JD) responded that a viability assessment is required of plan makers now, but was not at the time of submission of the B+NP. JD added that the land promoter (in this case Wyatt Homes) is promoting development of the scheme, and has confirmed it is viable.

2.17 In response to a point made by RB, EG argued that there is clear evidence of the need for development at Blandford. EG made the point that Dorset is a constrained area (i.e. Green belt, AONBs, flood plains, heath lands etc.) and, therefore, allocating possible alternative sites through the Dorset Council Local Plan would be difficult.

2.18 Mr KL stated that national policy is now clear that there is no limit to the scale of development that a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) can allocate. He then added that while Local Plans go through soundness tests, NPs are not subject to this, so he has had to make sure that the examination process is adequate for the proposals being made within the NP.

2.19 Mr KL acknowledged the approach to housing allocations within the NP, noting that DC supports the plan, recognises the lack of a SYHLS and the threat of speculative development. He added that as one of the four main towns in North Dorset, Blandford will be a focus for development in the future. He said that DC has made it clear that latest work on housing need alongside the standard methodology used by government does show additional housing is required.

2.20 RB argued again that the area of search for development options was too restrictive (3 parishes). He stated that Dorset Council shouldn’t let the B+NP do strategic work ahead of the new Local Plan, where the wider strategic view can be taken across a wider area (i.e. across Dorset).

2.21 JD referred again to the letter4 sent by Dave Chetwyn which dealt with the matter of whether a development is strategic or ‘of a scale’. The development proposed within the B+NP may be ‘of a scale’ but it is not strategic. The strategy of the Local Plan has not changed i.e. that development will be focused on the 4 main towns in North Dorset.

2.22 Mr KL acknowledged that the ‘conundrum’ for the plan was to balance the ‘great weight’ that should be given to the AONB against the need for a new school, the need for new homes and the need to support economic development.

2.23 JD stated that great efforts had been made within the Site Selection Background Paper5 to identify development land within the by-pass, but this only produced a limited potential for about 80 dwellings and very limited capacity to support sustainable development. He also added that a huge amount of work had been undertaken by AECOM (independent consultant, provided by Locality) in the Sustainability Appraisal, including the assessment of a ‘no growth’ option for Blandford. The conclusion reached was that a ‘no growth’ option would not be sustainable for Blandford, and would therefore not meet the ‘Basic Conditions’.

2.24 Mr KL asked EG what the new Local Plan could expect to see in terms of new housing requirements. EG responded that, based on standard methodology, there would be a need for approximately 30,000 new houses for the whole plan area up to 2038. However, EG also made that point that there could be unmet needs from neighbouring areas, including the

Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council area, that would need to be met within Dorset Council’s Plan Area. Mr. KL commented that the numbers proposed in the B+NP would not therefore be the ‘final score’ for Blandford.

2.25 Mr. KL then invited comments from Pimperne Parish Council

2.26 Jo Witherden (JW) raised again the issue of whether the B+NP should be allowed to deal with strategic development, or whether this should come under the remit of the new Local Plan. JW argued that due to B+NP’s limited area it should not be able to take the strategic position and that Neighbourhood Plans should be restricted to dealing with small and medium sites only. The strategy in LPP1 was for development to the South East of Blandford, and this strategy should only be changed through the Local Plan process.

2.27 JW added that the boundary between Blandford and Pimperne is not sacrosanct, and that developers intend to develop beyond the B+NP boundary into Pimperne. A scoping document submitted by the land interests to Pimperne PC in 2018 mentions up to 700 houses. A later email states 550 homes. JW commented that whatever decision is taken here will set a precedent and have a strategic impact on Pimperne, adding that this goes against national policy of what should be included in Neighbourhood Plans.

2.28 JW queried the proposal for 400 homes in the previous examination, stating that no justification was supplied for that number except that it was what the landowner deemed appropriate. JW then went on to outline alternative calculations for the future housing need in Blandford, arguing that the number of houses already approved and in the pipeline will take the figures well beyond the Local Plan review schedule.

2.29 EG counteracted JW’s calculations by saying that the housing need figures derived using the Government’s standard methodology were ‘minimum’ figures and that the 400 dwellings figure took into account most up to date housing requirement figures.

2.30 JD responded to JW’s comments on the growth strategy within LPP1 being to the SE of Blandford by saying that a modification to LPP1 was requested by Blandford + and was inserted by the examiner. Paragraph 8.12 of LPP1 allows for additional greenfield sites, beyond the bypass, to be brought forward within the plan period covered by LPP1 (up to 2031). Furthermore, it is of significance that paragraph 8.13 of LPP1 allows B+NP to supplement policies contained in LPP1 and the fact that this could include allocating additional greenfield sites beyond the bypass. This statement was a main modification signalled in the LPP1 Inspector’s Report. Moving forward to the LPP1 Review, it was agreed with Dorset Council that B+NP would take into consideration the development options identified through the Sustainability Appraisal of the ‘Issues & Options’ consultation of the Local Plan.

2.31 Cliff Lane (CL) then moved discussions onto the employment land included in the proposed development in Policy B2 and B3. He commented that the adjacent waste facility proposed is already in an adopted plan which Dorset Council is pursuing. The site is well screened along the northern boundary, it is adjacent to Sunrise Business Park and the bypass, with housing over the road. CL added that this ‘doesn’t sound like an AONB’.

2.32 CL also added that Savills have recommended changes to uses for employment land within policy B3c (matter 4.2 on the agenda).

2.33 Mr. KL instructed Blandford+ DC and Cliff Lane to work together to produce an agreed statement re. Policy B3c, and to forward for incorporation into the examiner’s report.

2.34 Mr. KL then invited Brian Duckett (BD) to comment (on behalf of Wyatt Homes) on landscape matters.

2.35 BD said he wished to raise 4 points in response to comments made by Richard Burden:

2.35.1 Regarding planting on site and in ‘thin soil’ - current ‘advanced planting’ in the area is growing well so there is nothing to suggest new planting will not also grow well.

2.35.2 Regarding viewpoints – the open landscape comprises large scale, rolling arable fields with treed horizons. Participants on the site visit could not actually see the proposed site from the viewpoints they could only see field boundaries and treed skylines. The proposed site does not contribute to the current landscape, and planting will provide a similar / consistent backdrop that will not be alien within the landscape.

2.35.3 Consideration of the ‘setting’ - all sites around Blandford are in an AONB or within the setting to AONB. There is nowhere around the town that would not break ‘AONB rules’, so all areas must be considered equally.
2.35.4 Guaranteeing that proposals put forward for planting and screening will come forward – Wyatts will be offering strategic planting to the Council as part of the overarching masterplan, rather than leaving the responsibility to the school.

2.36 Robin Shepherd (RS) also responded on behalf of Wyatt Homes by saying that the NPPF had been misquoted with regard to Neighbourhood Plans being restricted to allocating small and medium size sites only. Para 68 of the NPPF states that ‘Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area’, and Para 69 states that ‘Neighbourhood planning groups should also consider the opportunities for allocating small and medium-sized sites suitable for housing in their area.’ The NPPF is acknowledging the important role small & medium size sites have in meeting housing needs, it is not placing a constraint on the Neighbourhood Plan.

2.37 RS reiterated that the NPPF makes no mention of ‘setting’, nor does it prevent Neighbourhood Plans allocating large sites. He added that, in the masterplan for the site, no housing is being proposed within the AONB, only allotments, the school and playing fields. Para 11.b)ii of the NPPF is the test of whether the adverse impact of providing for housings and other uses would significantly outweigh the benefits.

2.38 RS noted that all options considered within the B+NP have implications on an AONB. It is impossible for Blandford to stop growing. Significant development has already taken place in the AONB, and will need to continue sensibly and through a plan led approach. The Neighbourhood Plan carries significant weight under planning law and is an appropriate mechanism to take development in Blandford forward.

2.39 RS added that heritage must also be considered when assessing the options. All previous discussions have given weight to landscape, but consideration must also be given to the considerable heritage assets around Blandford (as identified in the recent LUC Landscape & Heritage Study\(^6\) commissioned by Dorset Council).

2.40 RS assured the group that Wyatt Homes believe the development is both viable and sustainable and have considerable evidence to prove this. Wyatt Homes also supports the principle that development should be ‘plan led’, and will work within the numbers stated in the B+NP.

2.41 RS discussed the amendments to Policy B2 requested by Wyatt Homes (matter 4.3 on the agenda).

2.42 Mr. KL instructed Blandford+, DC and Wyatt Homes to work together to produce an agreed statement re. Policy B2, and to forward for incorporation into the examiner’s report.

2.43 CL also supported the principle of working within a plan led system although he said he was sceptical that Dorset Council would achieve its target date of 2023 for adoption of the new Dorset Council Local Plan. CL added that there is a major danger that if the examiner does not make the decision within the Neighbourhood Plan, and instead defers it to the Local Plan, it will cause major problems in the future across the whole of Dorset.

2.44 RB counteracted CL’s comments by referring back to the Inspector’s report on the Waste Site, saying it was by no means a ‘done deal’. He added that NPPG 039 ‘Natural Environment’ and the CROW Act referring to AONB settings are in statute and therefore are not optional.

2.45 Mr KL commented that everyone needed to understand what is included in the B+NP and what is beyond the B+NP boundary in Pimperne PC. Policy B2 of the plan says ‘approximately’ 400 dwellings. Mr. KL added that numbers generally should not be regarded as a limit and should normally be expressed as an ‘at least’ figure. He agreed with EG to give this further consideration.

2.46 JD added that the 400 dwellings was a capacity-based figure for the area within the B+NP boundary that would be further refined in the future. Future proposals should be masterplan led due to the sensitivity of the site.

2.47 Mr. KL referred to the wording of policy B2 (copied below), stating that he will be considering the way the sentence is expressed.

‘the policy acknowledges that part of the housing land north east of the town lies beyond the designated neighbourhood area in Pimperne Parish. It therefore defines that part of the scheme within the Blandford + neighbourhood area as Phase 1 and that part beyond the designated boundary as Phase 2 and requires that no part of the delivery of Phase 1 depends on the delivery of Phase 2, while recognising the need for a comprehensive masterplan for the whole of the site.’

---

2.48 Mr KL expressed concern that the areas of search shown within B+NP extend beyond the NP boundary. EG responded that the areas of search were defined within, and taken from, the North Dorset District Council ‘Issues & Options’ consultation documentation. Mr. KL suggested that the words ‘Areas of search taken from Local Plan I&O study’ be added.

2.49 BD also pointed out that the areas of search used in the LUC Landscape & Heritage Study are greater than the area of the development site, so the assessments include sensitivities of land outside of the proposed development site .

2.50 JW commented that she would like Pimperne NP constraints to be included within the B+NP constraints map i.e. important gap, Local Green Spaces etc.

2.51 Mr. KL commented that he would need to give further consideration as to whether the areas of search should be removed from the B+NP constraints plan or whether all the areas of search should continue to be shown.

2.52 Mr. KL expressed concern that Policy 16 from the LPP1, which is copied in tabular form at pages 18 to 20 in the B+NP, appears to be given greater prominence than the B+NP policies themselves, and so was considering whether it should be moved to lower prominence.

2.53 JD responded that the structure of the B+NP is reasonably standard but Policy 16 could be described in brief.

2.54 CL pointed out that P.23 of B+NP, dealing with the Dorset Waste Plan needs bringing up to date. This was also included as a suggested modification by NDDC (now DC).

2.55 RB pointed out that the B+NP needs updating re. the AONB management plans. This was also included as a suggested modification by NDDC (now DC) in the modifications that have been agreed by Blandford+.

2.56 Mr. KL then considered the representation made by Jeremy Farrelly (JF) of Genesis Town Planning (on behalf of Wates Developments Ltd)” proposing land for development between the SE boundary of Policy B3 and Pimperne Brook, and in turn, the written response received from Blandford+ (matter 4.5 in the agenda). Mr. KL commented that he was not sure how to deal with this representation, so asked JF if he wished to comment on the Blandford+ response and to specify the outcome he desired.

2.57 JF explained that Wates didn’t have an interest in the site until late in 2018. The B+NP Reg 14 to Reg 16 period was very short (in his view), so Genesis / Wates were unable to submit an earlier representation. JF expressed his disappointment that, apart from the brief mention in the Reg 14 consultation report, there was no further detailed analysis forthcoming as to how their representation has been assessed. JF requested that the examiner either includes the Wates Developments site as part of policy B2, OR allows the site (in its own right) to be included in the B+NP.

2.58 Mr. KL replied that the site could also be considered as the new Dorset Council Local Plan is progressed.

2.59 JD commented that the Dorset Council Local Plan ‘Call for Sites’ is now underway, and suggested that the Wates site should be submitted as part of that process. EG confirmed that the site has been submitted as part of the ‘Call for Sites’ process. He followed on by saying that Blandford+ had three issues with JF’s request: firstly there is no capacity within the B+NP for ‘omission sites’, secondly the SA/ SEA cannot be altered and thirdly it would require the B+NP going back to Regulation 14 consultation.

2.60 JF responded that if the site is added though a ‘modification’ to B+NP then the SEA will not necessarily need to be amended.

2.61 Mr. KL said he would consider the matter further and would make a recommendation within his report.

2.62 Mr. KL then invited Barry Pliskin (BP) to discuss concerns raised re. Policy B8 Blandford Forum Town Centre, the amendments he has requested (matter 4.7 in the agenda).

2.63 BP commented that he would like greater flexibility re. residential properties in Town Centre. He commented that the Town Centre Boundary shown on the Town Centre Policy Map submitted by NDDC (now DC) as part of its regulation 16 response, and agreed by Blandford +, includes areas that aren’t shopping areas but are residential, so he suggested amendments to Policy B8 to account for these properties (i.e. to recognise C3 uses in appropriate places).

JD responded by saying that Blandford+ is keen to preserve the Town Centre uses to maintain the vitality of town centre.

Mr. KL instructed Blandford+, DC and Barry Pliskin to work together to produce an agreed statement, and to forward for incorporation into the examiner’s report.

Any Other Matters

Mr KL invited attendees to raise any matters of relevance that had not been dealt with previously.

RB raised concerns over the thoroughness of the new LUC Landscape and Heritage Study, saying that there are lots of previous studies that he would have expected to see that have not been referenced, e.g. the AONB landscape character assessment and the AONB sensitivity study of 2007, leading him to question the thoroughness of the new study.

JW commented on the B+NP Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environment Assessment (SA/SEA). She requested Mr. KL ensures he is satisfied with SA/SEA as Pimperne PC is not happy with the reasons why Development Option E from the NDDC I&O Document was disregarded. She also queried the need for the school site, saying that the traffic it would generate had not been studied in enough detail, and that there was no underpinning evidence of traffic modelling through the SA/SEA process.

Nick Chisholm-Batten (NCB) responded by saying that Development Option E was not assessed within the SA/SEA for B+NP as it was considered that there wasn’t enough land available within area E to accommodate the development specification agreed with NDDC (now DC) for the NP, given the area included a large area of land that was already committed. NCB explained how the NP SA/SEA built upon the findings of the I&O SA and considered 5 possible options for development.

NCB also commented that it is not in the remit of the SA/SEA to undertake detailed traffic modelling. The SA/SEA looks at strategic sustainability using evidence that is readily available. Issues such as noise are considered under other categories e.g. human health, environment etc.

Barry Watson (BW) asked how the site would be accessed from the by-pass.

RS responded by saying that the masterplan that had been displayed at the hearing shows a possible way the scheme could be delivered. He added that the masterplan on display was for the purposes of the B+NP Hearing and was for information only rather than evidence.

Mr. KL thanked everyone for their contributions, saying he would give full consideration to all matters raised. He added that he would not be able to release his report until after the election period in case it is politically sensitive.

17.30 Hearing Closed
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