



Upgrade dorsetplanningpolicy

Home My Surveys Survey Services Plans & Pricing

+ Create Survey

NorthDorset Local Plan Pre-submi...

Design Survey Collect Responses Analyze Results

CURRENT VIEW ?

+ FILTER + COMPARE + SHOW

No rules applied ?

Rules allow you to FILTER, COMPARE and SHOW results to see trends and patterns. [Learn more »](#)

SAVED VIEWS (1) ?

Original View (No rules applied)

+ Save as...

EXPORTS ?

SHARED DATA ?

No shared data

Sharing allows you to share your survey results with others. You can share all data, a saved view, or a single question summary. [Learn more »](#)

[Share All](#)

RESPONDENTS: 33 of 33

Export All Share All

Question Summaries Data Trends Individual Responses

Respondent #28

All Pages

#28



COMPLETE

Collector: North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (Web Link)
 Started: Friday, January 24, 2014 10:07:03 AM
 Last Modified: Friday, January 24, 2014 11:20:06 AM
 Time Spent: 01:13:02
 IP Address: [REDACTED]

Edit Delete Export

PAGE 1

Q1: Personal Details

Name: S Kidner

Address 1: [REDACTED]

Address 2: [REDACTED]

City/Town: [REDACTED]

State/Province: [REDACTED]

ZIP/Postal Code: [REDACTED]

Email Address: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Q2: Agent Details (if applicable) - All correspondence will be sent to the agent.

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 2

Q3: 1. Please select the document you are commenting on:

North Dorset Local Plan 2011 to 2026 Part 1 (please complete Questions 2 to 9)

Q4: 2. To which part of the above document does your representation relate?

Policy/site Policy 17 and 21

Q5: 3. Do you consider the Local Plan to be legally compliant and prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements?

Yes

Q6: 4. Do you consider the Local Plan to be 'sound'?

No

Q7: 5. If you consider the Local Plan to be unsound please specify your reason(s) by ticking the box(es) that apply below

It is not justified

It is not effective

PAGE 3

Q8: 6. Please give specific details of why you consider the Local Plan has not been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate, legal or procedural requirement or why you consider the plan

to be unsound. Alternatively, if you wish to support any aspects of the plan please also use this box to set out your comments.

I consider that the justification and effectiveness of Policy 17 - Gillingham should be improved by setting out the relative importance of various aspects of the plan in order to maximise the realisation of benefits for Gillingham as the Plan is implemented. The challenges which Gillingham faces today and into the future until 2026 have been clearly identified within the Plan and good proposals to address these issues are included in the plan. However, greater guidance for implementing the Plan could improve its effectiveness. This relates particularly to development.

1. Prioritising Mixed Development

The plan to build 1450 houses in Gillingham is principally in response to a nation-wide demand for more homes (this demand is not generated by people living in Gillingham, or even North Dorset today). The town's ability to "host" the +/-3000 residents that the new houses will home depends on factors such as employment, schools, health service provision, transport, shops, services, recreation facilities etc. available in the town. Policy 21 shows that a few of these are planned to be provided within the SSA. In order to minimize addition traffic in the district the remainder of these "hosting facilities and services" should be provided within the town. It is understood that a levy towards the cost of these facilities and services cannot be applied to the developers of the SSA, therefore it is necessary to examine all other means of encouraging and enabling the necessary concomitant development of the "hosting facilities and services" in the existing town.

I believe that this should be done by identifying and affording priority to those aspects of development set out in the Plan that would deliver most benefit to the town, its residents and those living in the hinterlands who rely on Gillingham as their market town. This would mean that the development investment which Gillingham might attract would be aligned with those aspects of the Plan that address a broad range of issues and deliver a wide variety of benefits to as many of Gillingham's dependent population as possible. In particular new housing within the existing Settlement Boundary (excluding the SSA extension) should not be delivered on its own but as an integral part of a scheme that tackles a broader and more local range of issues other than solely the national housing shortage. Indeed, housing development alone would worsen the situation in Gillingham regarding the limited retail offer, lack of community facilities and infrastructure and would not contribute to achieving regeneration.

The Councils objective of sustainable development in Gillingham would be more likely to be achieved if the Local Plan stated that the mixed-use regeneration of the Station Road area is the highest priority for implementation.

2. Development at Bay.

The proposal for housing on the land at Bay would risk a number of objectives in Policy 17 either not being met or being made less likely to be achieved. The affected aspects of the Policy are;

8.55, last bullet: the land at Bay has been identified by both the Three Rivers Open Spaces Group Report and the Gillingham Landscapes and Open Spaces Assessment Report (Burden 2004) as an important element in enhancing the town's green infrastructure network and forms part of the Shreen Water river corridor.

8.57, 2nd paragraph: Parts of Bay are within a fluvial flood risk area and much of the western part of Bay is already subject to surface water flooding. Run off from large hard areas to the south, poor natural drainage due to the clay soil and poor built drains result in instances of surface water flooding during the winter and water-logged ground for much of the year. Even in summer water springs from tarmac pavements and drives in Barnaby Mead. I believe that an early Site Level Flood Risk Assessment should be done and that the measures necessary to eliminate or reduce the risk of subsidence due to clay heave and shrinkage should set in the Policy.

8.57 -3rd paragraph: housing on the land at Bay would not be in accord with the TDS because it would damage the towns landscape setting and destroy the sensitive transition between the town and the surrounding rural area, it would damage the Shreen Water river corridor and adversely affect views out to the open countryside. The land at Bay provides the only long view to the north from the town, presently there are important and valuable views to the Wiltshire Downs north of Mere from Keysley Down in the east to Alfreds Tower in the west. Any building on this land would reduce the view to a few tens of metres instead of 10 or more kilometres.

8.63: development at Bay would be contrary to this objective as it would not "protect and improve" the towns natural nor historic environments. The damage that would be caused to the natural environment has been described above. The local, special character of Bay would be damaged by the loss of open space between the town centre and Bay. The Gillingham Landscapes and Open Spaces Assessment Report (Burden 2004) concluded that the land at Bay "links functionally and organically with the countryside north of Bay ridge", that development on this land would "erode the calm and tranquillity of the area" and "prejudice the separateness, rural character and scale of Bay hamlet" and that "the former Buffer Zone and the important landscape gaps that link this area to the open countryside should be protected and managed to sustain their landscape features and character". The report concludes that "IOWA 17 should be enlarged to include this area and allocating the area as a publically accessible park".

As the assessment of this site in the SHLAA states access "could cause problems on the High Street.....Bay Road would need improvements". There are not any options for access to this site that will not have a negative impact on other already developed areas or on the important open spaces adjacent to it.

Given that the SHLAA shows that there is an over-supply of housing land in both the next 5 years and the 6-15 years it appears that there is an opportunity to make use of this land in way which would deliver benefits to the town and at the same time mitigate the potential damage that development of this site would cause.

Q9: 7. What change(s) do you consider are necessary to ensure that the Local Plan is legally compliant and sound? It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

1. The Sustainable Development Strategy on page 206 should be re-worded to make clear that the priority for development in Gillingham is for the mixed-use regeneration of the Station Road area and that house building should be completed as part of this scheme before house only developments can take place.

2. Paragraph 8.68 - infill development on the "land to the south and south west of Bay" should be qualified as a low priority and should only be used for building upon if the supply of housing land elsewhere in the district cannot meet the demand.

Q10: 8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate in the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate in the oral examination

Q11: 9. If you wish to participate in the oral part of the examination please outline why you consider that to be necessary. Please note that the Inspector determines who is heard at the examination.

Respondent skipped this question

Q12: 10. Please outline your comments on the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report or Habitats Regulations Assessment. Comments are not confined to 'soundness' issues, but respondents can express their opinions on the above documents and use it as a reference point on the 'soundness' of the Local Plan.