

(101)

**Gillian Clark**

---

**From:** david white - [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 January 2014 21:06  
**To:** PlanningPolicy  
**Subject:** North Dorset Local Plan part 1

Dear Sir,

I wish to make several points regarding the planned southern area extension of Gillingham and its inclusion in the local plan for North Dorset.

Regarding the supposed need for housing, I would like to ask where are the homeless that need this provision? They are certainly not in north Dorset. I suggest that this need is national and not local and has no bearing upon our own needs, but serves to fulfil the ambitions of those who wish to obey this directive from government.

With regard to this, I refer you to the 2011 Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 5. And 5.11 below:

5.10 If the council were to attempt to provide the 387 units of affordable housing each year then on the basis of the above analysis this would be likely to see significant problems within the wider housing market (large number of households moving out of the PRS with no one to replace them and increased vacancy levels). Future affordable housing provision should therefore be set against the likely delivery of additional housing which is discussed in more detail in the next section. Trend-based data suggests household growth of around 273 per annum for the period from 2011 to 2031 and so a housing delivery figure (on the basis of this figure) might be around 280 per annum (to take account of a small vacancy rate).

5.11 Provision of say 40% of additional housing as affordable would therefore see around 112 additional units being provided each year – whilst this figure falls well short of the need it would be a sensible level in the context of the role played by the PRS.

I also have concerns about potential detrimental effects upon the locality and these are:  
Environmental damage, poor drainage and potential flash flooding. Cole Street Lane floods now, without acres of concrete draining wing towards it.

The use of green field sites and loss of valuable agricultural land.

Endangering the local flora and fauna.

There are many brown field sites closer to the town centre which would assist sustainability of transport, lower heating, and the regeneration of the town centre.

Recent surveys show a reversal of the migratory effects on population. ie, immigration is stagnating as is population growth.

Traffic congestion. Anyone who travels around Gillingham will know that the traffic along Shaftesbury road is appalling from 8 until 9am and from 5 until 6 pm. It is also awful around the relief road and Brickfields. How can this be improved by having more people live here?

Sewerage. As we have seen with the recent rains, raw human excrement flowing from King John Road. How can our services cope with extra housing?

Gillingham is serviced by B roads, and has a rural location. These factors are unlikely to encourage industrial growth to match increased population and employment need, except support services. It has a railway station, but has anyone asked South West Trains, if they can cope with any kind of increase, and if so, to what level?

Gillingham has a need for more burial land. This has been on the agenda for many years. Did no one think of combining the Southern Area Extension with this need? No, is the answer, which is why I am drawn to the conclusion that this whole scheme is poorly thought out and as we have seen before with such new estates in Gillingham, managed even worse.

Overall I would like to protest at the sheer size, impact and planning of this monstrosity which can only lead to the continued decline of our rural community and quality of life.

Yours Faithfully,

Mr. David G White.