

From: [Dorset For You](#)
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: Form submission from article Planning Policy (North Dorset) on www.dorsetforyou.com
Date: 08 May 2015 14:18:16

Online Form Submission

Form [Generalcontactform](#) (1088649)

Article [Planning Policy \(North Dorset\)](#) (396487)

Form submission from Dorset for you

Label

Your name

James Cleary

Your email

[REDACTED]

Comments/questions

North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 - additional Mid Hearing Written Material

Dear Sir

I write further to the hearing sessions already held and following the publication of the additional mid-hearing written material. Pro Vision represent the Charborough Estate (ID No 641) and we attended the hearing session for Issue 6: The Countryside, held on Tuesday 17 March 2015. Our response on behalf of the Charborough Estate is set out below.

The comments relate specifically to the note on re-appraising the Council's Approach to Development in the Countryside to Promote a Strong Rural Economy (document reference MHD007) and the Schedule of Changes arising from the Hearings (document reference MHD018) - change reference 10/29/18, policy 29 on page 27.

At the Examination in Public we and a

number of other participants expressed concern over the basic strategy which sought to remove settlement boundaries from the majority of villages within the District and steer virtually all new housing to the four main towns. It was pointed out that if this strategy was pursued only 6% of new dwellings would be built within the area which currently contains between 45 - 50% of the population of the District. Further, the District has historically been mainly rural and many of the settlements proposed for settlement boundary removal are sustainable settlements with a good range of services and employment opportunities.

The Estate supports the reinstatement of settlement boundaries as outlined in Document reference MHD007. In particular, it supports the reinstatement of the settlement boundary for Winterbourne Kingston. However, the new proposals are still 'growth inhibiting' in terms of the wider rural areas.

It would now be reasonable to expect that a significantly higher proportion of dwellings should be built in either Stalbridge or the 18 More Sustainable Villages. With the suggested changes it appears that it is now proposed that just under 14.5% of the dwelling requirement be met within the area which contains between 45 - 50% of the population of the District. This is unlikely to ensure that the 'objectively assessed needs' of that area are met.

Further, it is not appropriate to say that the requirement for development outside the four main towns should be met in Stalbridge and the 18 MSVs. The requirement should be met in or around Stalbridge and the 18 MSVs.

In the session we attended we made reference to the current situation on the Charborough Estate which extends across several local authority areas. The northern most part of the Estate includes three farmsteads close to Winterbourne Kingston. The Estate is undergoing a review of operations and,

as with most large country estates, the preferred operational hubs are likely to be central and not on the Estate periphery. Hence, the farmsteads close to Winterbourne Kingston are currently or could soon become agriculturally redundant and may be available for development or redevelopment. With this in mind we indicated that some of the requirement for new housing in the Winterbournes and in particular close to the sustainable settlement of Winterbourne Kingston, could be met at one or more of these farmsteads.

When this was discussed, Mr Warrick, on behalf of the Council, indicated that there had already been discussions with Parishes and Neighbourhood Planning groups that held concerns over the negative effects of possible edge of village housing sites and were inclined, as an alternative, to steer new village development towards nearby farmsteads rather than pursue inappropriate sites within or around villages. Mr Warrick made the specific reference to it being preferential to identify potential development sites at farmsteads rather than sites which might block views to a local church or similar. Mr Warrick went on to indicate that this was a Local Plan Part 2 matter.

We indicated that it was a strategy point and that it really ought to be referred to in Local Plan Part 1. The Inspector clearly agreed and asked Mr Warrick to take this into account. However, it does not appear to have been picked up either within document reference MHD007 or the Schedule of Changes.

I have been referred by Policy Officers to Change Ref 10/29/18. The suggested change reads:

"10(f) proposals for the re-use of buildings in the countryside may be identified through the preparation of Local Plan Part 2 or by Local Communities in their Neighbourhood Plans."

This does not cover the relevant point at all. As well as a change to the main strategy which should indicate that new development for the area outside the four main towns could be built in or around the more sustainable villages there needs to be express reference to the potential for nearby farmsteads, where appropriate, to help meet local housing requirements.

The Charborough Estate would be grateful if this matter could be picked up and appropriately addressed as soon as possible.

James Cleary

8 May 2015

Do not fill