

Participant	Stuart Williamson Amec Foster Wheeler	Rep ID	2986
		Date response received	15 th May 2015
Representing	The Crown Estate	Response reference number	MHD043
MHD / Change reference commented on	MHD008		
Summary of comment	<p>Whilst The Crown Estate supports the principle of allocating further development at Blandford, it is concerned about the proposed increase of allocation on site 2/04/0460 (land adjacent to A350/A354 junction St Mary's Hill Blandford) from 300 dwellings to 450 units. There appears to be no justification for this approach and it is not supported by the Council's own evidence base or discussions at the Examination in Public.</p> <p>Give a more balanced consideration to well-located and accessible locations to the town centre such as West Blandford and West Blandford St Mary. The site at West Blandford has consistently been identified in the Council's evidence base as the most sustainable location to provide additional housing in Blandford, a point acknowledged on numerous occasions by the Council at the Examination in Public.</p> <p>The Council also acknowledged at the Examination hearings that the revised scheme submitted by The Crown Estate as part of the examination process (for around 100 homes) removed harm to two of the identified heritage assets (Bryanston Cottage and the WWII anti-tank defence ditch). The Council's further evidence on AONB/landscape (paragraph A7 of document MHD011) then outlines that the Council considers there is scope for a smaller scheme on the site</p> <p>Therefore given the agreed sustainability credentials of the site and that the Council considers heritage and landscape impacts can be mitigated, there is no justification for the failure to include land at West Blandford to meet the housing requirement. The Local Plan should identify West Blandford as a location to meet additional development needs in the town to provide a sustainable development strategy.</p> <p>Further development at West Blandford would provide a sounder spatial strategy rather than allocating further development in less sustainable locations severed from the town by the by-pass.</p> <p>Finally, the current settlement boundaries would prevent the Council from making further allocations to meet the increased housing needs over the Plan Period. Whilst the Council is proposing some remedy for this to allow growth locations to be brought forward we believe this does not go far enough. The increased development needs in the</p>		

	<p>District up to 2031 emphasises the need to remove settlement boundaries to provide a more positive strategy which gives sufficient flexibility for land to be brought forward to deliver the District’s substantial development needs up to 2031. The boundaries are out of date and should be removed.</p>
<p>Council’s response</p>	<p>The Local Plan does not set boundaries for development sites but indicates broad locations for growth. The exact boundaries of these broad locations will be established through Local Plan part 2, neighbourhood development plans or through the application process. The Council recognises that the Land at St Mary’s Hill (SHLAA ref. 2/04/0460 alongside 2/03/0534) has the capacity to accommodate around 450 dwellings within the constraints that exist in the area.</p> <p>The Council has always looked to prioritise more accessible locations to accommodate growth whilst also having regard to the constraints within an area. The site at West Blandford (2/03/0397) was identified as an appropriate location however the impact on the heritage assets in the area is considered to be significant.</p> <p>The revised scheme for the site at West Blandford (2/03/0397) submitted by the Crown Estate mitigates some of the impact on heritage assets however there is a residual impact that has not been satisfactorily mitigated.</p> <p>The Landscape Impact Assessment included in Appendix A of MHD011 and as referenced by the Crown Estate in their response MHD043, was only part of the evidence to inform the selection of sites around Blandford. Considerations included amongst other things landscape impact, impact on heritage assets, relative accessibility and flood risk. On balance, the Council concluded that the impact of developing the sites at St Mary’s Hill is less than the impact of developing the site West of Blandford Forum.</p> <p>The Council do not believe that the removal of settlement boundaries will ‘provide a more positive strategy’ to deliver the development needs of the District.</p>
<p>Conclusions</p>	<p>Given the concerns about the impact on heritage assets that would result from development at West of Blandford Forum, the Council considers it is appropriate to exclude the site as a broad location within LP1.</p> <p>The Council will continue to use settlement boundaries as defined in the North Dorset District-wide Local Plan 2003 alongside the broad locations for housing and employment growth for development management purposes. This approach will be used until boundaries are reviewed either through Part 2 of the Local Plan or a neighbourhood development plan as set out in SUD015 Change Ref. 3/2/7.</p> <p>No further action required.</p>

Participant	Stuart Williamson Amec Foster Wheeler	Rep ID	2986
		Date response received	15 th May 2015
Representing	The Crown Estate	Response reference number	MHD043
MHD / Change reference commented on	MHD012		
Summary of comment	<p>In relation to Lower Bryanston Farm, whilst The Crown Estate remains supportive of developing a mitigation package to safeguard the habitat of Greater Horse Shoe bats at the Bryanston SSSI, it is not considered the restrictive timescale proposed in the updated housing trajectory is justified or consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Survey results show that the cockchafer beetle population is not particularly significant across the site. Bat activity surveys have shown no significant use of the site by Greater Horse Shoe bats other than boundary hedgerows which would be retained and augmented as part of a development scheme. Therefore, there is no justification to prevent development coming forward earlier if appropriate mitigation is put in place.</p>		
Council's response	<p>The Council agrees that there is no reason for development to be unnecessarily delayed on the Lower Bryanston Farm site once appropriate mitigation has been established. The Council will defer to the expertise of Natural England to inform their decisions about the mitigation package proposed to support the development of the site. The Council has passed on information received to Natural England and awaits a response.</p>		
Conclusions	<p>The Council support the broad location for growth at Lower Bryanston Farm with development commencing once proposals drawing effective mitigation can be established.</p>		