Hello all .
[ Firstly , to the very helpful ED GERRY for assisting me to deliver this email’d version to Dorset Council . Unfortunately , the reason for not placing this message on the correct form comes down to a formatting problem with my iPad ; I do not possess a Microsoft computer . ]


- " LEGAL DESECRATION of the DORSET COUNTRYSIDE under POLICY B2 of the BNP Plan , or CONCRETE over DORSET COMPETITION " .


INTRODUCTION .

This is my communication to establish outright objection to the Examiners [ and the BNP] decision relating to BNP POLICY B2 for their persistence support to provide acceptance to Dorset Council to develop land allocated potentially to the north-east of Blandford Forum , which is beyond the constraint of the Blandford Bypass [ A 354 / A 350 ] .

This unwanted residential scheme known as Phase 1 comprising 400 dwellings [ approx ] to include a mix of open market affordable and self-build and custom houses .

It is noteworthy - and not included in the current BNP plan , but relevant knowledge listing of an also unwanted background for future extended housing development , known as Phase 2 , which is to be sited on designated Pimperne ground for an additional 300 dwellings , meaning an aggregated total of 700 homes [ 400 + 300 units ] to be situated directly south of the A 354 , just beyond existing homes known as Bolney & GreenBanks .

It is important the decision-making reader is informed of this big-picture unwanted practical scenario .

[ It is very noteworthy that an adjacent Pimperne land referenced in their independent PIMPERNE Neighbourhood Plan is the same Phase 2 from above potential housing scheme Development and is a continuum of the Blandford parcel of land [ Phase 1 ] development under Policy B2 . Pimperne Parish Council cites outright rejection of this follow-on plan .

This distinction about these conjoined parcels of land needs highlighting to the reader . ]

OBJECTIONS ;

In my response [ ref 2 ] to Dorset Council back in March last year , I , along with other objectors , many of whom understand far better , and are far more qualified and knowledgeable - respective representatives
from CPRE & AONB - than I to respond professionally, particularly to the manner of the English language used in planning-speak.

Although there is a slim chance of the Planning Committee and this current Examiner - based upon his track-record, ref 3, the Examiner, Terrence Kemmann-Lane will, without doubt dismiss all comment/criticism - taking little, if any notice of what people think and say on these subject matters concerning Policy B2!

My submission highlights some of the following critical and sensitive aspects in the bigger-picture perspective, so, as one progress' reading through this contribution for what makes common-sense:

- Road System; the north-south A 350 trunk road system is already inadequate to handle increased traffic capacity. Too many, this A350 is not a slick auto-route, but ranks one of the worst highways within the whole of the U.K. road system - voted a dreadful stretch of very busy narrow width road, essentially attempting to connect between the M4 Motorway to the Bournemouth / Poole metroplex on the south coast.

One would say this is strategic in thought and try to dismiss it, but to the local plan, the BNP, it is highly relevant.

The subject of vehicle access/volume increases is not given sufficient consideration; you intend to create yet another roundabout on the A 350 - this is yet another impedance imposed upon a so-called by-pass traffic-flow: why? In fact, only access, one way in, same out, is not clever design for many reasons! Where is the sense here?

- Pedestrians; question, how do people walk, safely, from a newly configured and remote ‘bubble’ housing estate to local shops, or the new [to be] school built on the current allotment. How does one make way along the bypass?

[This is very reminiscent of the ‘wonderfully’ ill-planned GLC overspill Witham, Essex, estate erroneously positioned for re-housing London-type people remotely situated in a large field two miles out-of-town! No shops, nothing. People from London plonked in the middle of an Essex agricultural area. Clearly, unsustainable.

That plan was far from a defined success; soon, after a few years the whole design degenerated into a virtual mental decay for many dwellers, but into a case of a housing slum. Is that what you guys desire?] Therefore, remoteness is not advantageous for a majority; a lack of facilities is not advantageous - Planners, you are creating a sterile environment.

Garden Village locking-in Car Dependency! Taking this example analogy; new garden villages risk becoming car-dependent commuter-estates. The Government promised sites would be inclusive communities, with jobs locally, shops and recreational facilities.

Research has suggested these garden villages may have degenerated and little better than reviled edge-of-town estates.

The garden village concept was devised to overcome problems of local resistance to housing estates ‘bolted-on’ to small towns. Government prospectus said the concept should be largely self-sustaining and genuine mixed-use with public transport, walking, cycling enabling close access to jobs, education and services. Safety is a critical parameter, whilst boredom of some dwellers is another parameter, are very clear.

Again, it is incumbent upon planners and examiner to focus and realise what you are creating. Vehicle usage become mandatory.

- Entertainment; question, what do the estate residents do with their time outside their work and home and in the immediate local environment for relaxation?

Is there a sports club / pub facility; a social space?

What do young people do in their spare time in the evening hours?

Where is the provision?

Otherwise, you chaps have promoted a sterile housing development!

Is that what it means to be planner/assessor; quite unprofessional, not inclusive, to neglect the social aspects for over one thousand real people?

- Rail connection; I know this parameter is strategic in nature [not in respect of the local BNP plan] and really not relevant, the committee would state. But, it is relevant, and why this aspect is big-picture stuff, must not to be dismissed.
- Employment; attracting alternative good healthy Companies?
Currently, Blandford is inherently a ‘blue-collar’ town, so it is important to change this balance and attract higher level employee’s in new high-tech design and financial Companies. This is a natural progression; part of an enhancement for Blandford’s sustainable future growth, or should be. Designated employment for Blandford implies employee’s work in the town for the selfish good of the town. Typically, many of these homes could be purchased by those who work out-of-town, making their dwellings created erroneously for dormitory residence, whilst employment is sought in Poole, for example!

However, times are changing - BREXIT and Corona Vitus Pandemic - times where investment money is getting tighter, particularly also in times of austerity; more people working from home, but there is an over-arching need for entrepreneurialism.

Go for the money?
Get new business attracted to Blandford; talk to the big-boys; AMAZON [ Jeff Bezos ] or SPACE-X [ Elon Musk ], as major starters. The idea to attract them to site a modern development and product manufacturing battery-plant, or similar, for example.

‘You know what I mean’ ............ Therefor>e, houses built in this area are to accommodate ‘high-tech’ to this most beautiful area of the U.K., but not under Policy B2 - somewhere else more suitable within the ‘Blandford Circle’?

Why not?
Where is the initiative?

- Consideration of Housing Development; whilst one cannot disagree there is some genuine demand for additional in the U.K.

Question, does this apply to Blandford area?
There are those with greater knowledge than I, like people with the CPRE and AONB for Cranbourne Chase, who understand the big-picture, and researched and evaluated Dorset Council’s regional housing objective five-year housing supply. CPRE research concluded there is no deficit - short-fall in numbers - it is evident there is a potential exceedance to provide a sufficient number of back-log dwellings, not just for 3.4 years, but out to a conservative 6.48 years!
So, planners, why press ahead concreting over more areas of Dorset countryside?

- Visual Aspects to be exposed despoiling virgin countryside with this unwanted Policy B2 proposed housing development?
Already the whole eastern-aspect of Blandford is poorly planned, ‘plastered’ in the rolling and beautiful Dorset countryside.

I claim the Examiner did not look and investigate properly these features when on his practical site visit to obtain a true perspective.

Here I refer to the instant visual impact when looking from the slightly elevated B 3082 Wimborne Rd, experienced when one is driving in the Blandford direction approaching the ‘Two-Gates’ roundabout and looking in a northerly direction.

Currently, a ‘blot-on-the-landscape’ exists - horrible - only to be made worse by an additional super-imposition of 400 / 700 total dwellings. Unfortunately, the resultant view, in my opinion, is an escarpment, quite similar to, and typical to that degradation of the most poor-planning examples viewed in the Upper South Wales mining valley’s.

Why we are concerned is the change of land use [ B2 ], from 100 % ‘white-land’ agricultural usage, degraded / transformed to an urban housing development create mis-use / desecration of incredibly valuable Dorset countryside.

Only one decision; this committee of decision-makers must decide sensibly not-to-develop - find somewhere else - or, arrogantly, if they press ahead regardless to change the traditional ENGLAND landscape forever; there is no recovery once the damage is inflicted.

Committee, it is your irrevocable decision.

Henceforth, as a group, you are not listening to the words of our Prince Charles - build, build, build, is NOT the way forward - when will they [ the Committee ], the Politicians and their subordinates, take notice of these random and designed-in sprawling town developments, which are propagated by you guys, as a group, Members of Planning, Councillors [ eg, Cllr Walsh ], along with the Examiner.

Quash this proposed Policy B2 before it is too late.
Take notice; use of virginal land is our Countryside, and not the way forward; it was the philosophy - it is now an outdated philosophy and strategy.

When will you listen?
'Save-the-day', 'save the Countryside' from the developer, then one's conscience is clear, with no regrets down-stream.

- 'GAP', what 'GAP'; 'mind-the-GAP' - - - - - NO HOUSING "DEVELOPMENT-CREEP" beyond the Blandford Bypass perimeter, please.
Here the subject is "GAP MAINTENANCE"; keep your DISTANCE, is indeed topical.
Many are fearful of this unwanted aspect - the conjoining ribbon-development, which is happening latently to the land situated between Blandford and the smaller community of Pimperne, with evermore encroachment on to sacred AONB land.
Policy B2, its consequences aid and abet constructively this onward creep / compelling attraction of the two centres, just like positive and negative charged bodies in Physics.
Termence refers to his visit [ref 3, section 9.39] concerning the AONB outlook viewed from the rear garden of the private residence of GREENBANKS, in Salisbury Rd, and to a greater degree its neighbour, Bolney.
Termence distinctly dismisses our reported situation on the grounds this is not a 'damaging public harm and is not persuasive in my determination of the issues'.
Termence is wrong.
I suggest Termence makes a return visit, this time to ‘walk-the-field’, clearly to show the proposed development [Policy B2] is a total imposition when viewed from Letton Park hedge boundary - going south.
People in those Letton Park houses will get an unsavoury ‘broadside’ view of the whole development encroaching beyond the current Blandford bypass; far worse a view than that of GreenBanks/Bolney experience.

- Conclusion;
Clearly the BNP Policy B2 proposal 'makes no sense' as indicated by me and detailed by many others skilled in business of planning analysis and objection.
My broad question to you intelligent planning chaps, don't you have second thoughts about the concepts and design for this type development concluding in a common sense approach that this Policy B2 [Phase 1] proposition is a very poor starter from the outset?
Accordingly, you even convinced the examiner, Termence Kerman-Lane, to give his erroneous support and blanket approval; it is non-starter?
Suggest you, as a group, seriously think again and reconsider the clean-sweep approval result given by this poor quality examination?
Indeed, when we were first introduced to Termence Kemmann-Lane, on first impression he came over as a very understanding person, full of imagination and clear thought to provide a fair democratic cursor to the BNP proposal. Alas, most of us were deceived; Termence adopted almost 100% rejection, completely disregarding the salient points made in ALL our submissions!
Commensurate with the level of our written protests, along with a total rejection of Termence's recommendations, on this basis I support that the Planning Policy B2 decision is declared null-and-void, and, that the existing examiner is replaced with someone who can see that common sense be applied to this decision - unless, of course, Cllr Walsh [Dorset Council] up holds our complaints and decides in our favour to quash the Policy B2?
Will he?
Clearly, this Policy B2 is not a sustainable kosher development for all the reasons outlined above - someone please take notice at this juncture.
Hear the words - no housing development-creep beyond the domain of the Blandford Bypass. And, in a post Corona Virus time, plans like those proposed by the BNP, using virgin White-land in our countryside, is not the way forward - it is an outdated, irregular resultant strategy.
Please hear us.
Then more recently, the CPRE [21st May 2020], in a major article concerned with protecting the natural world; green-space, after lock-down, with respect to housing needs, be strongly reconsidered and applied by planners. Moreover, I understand there are new revised regulations emanating from Government in this regard!
Currently, as your committee promotes the desecration of the Dorset countryside; plainly, you care little about your actions in life, yet you are accountable, professionally!
Finally, last, not least, one need not forget to highlight a good-bye to nature’s farmland birds; common buzzards, jays, the blackcap, the plentiful friendly pheasants will disappear from this habitat, but only if
you guys create another example of a sterile concrete ' bubble ' unwanted housing estate ; regret this championed guilt and legacy .

Please consider seriously .
Thanks,

Barry WATSON

Sent from my iPad