

For office use only

Batch number: _____
Representor ID # _____
Representation # _____

Received: _____
Ack: _____

NORTH DORSET
DISTRICT COUNCIL

20 JAN 2014

POST ROOM



North Dorset Local Plan Part 1

Pre-submission Consultation 29 November 2013 to 24 January 2014

Regulation 19 of Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012)

Response Form

For each representation you wish to make a separate response form will need to be completed.

This is a formal consultation on the legal compliance and soundness of the Local Plan before it is submitted to the Secretary of State for examination by an Inspector. For advice on how to respond to the consultation and fill in this form please see the 'Guidance Notes for Making Representations' that can be found on the Council's website at www.dorsetforyou.com/planning/north-dorset/planning-policy

Please return completed forms to:

Email: planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk

Post: Planning Policy, North Dorset District Council, Nordon, Salisbury Road, Blandford Forum, Dorset DT11 7LL

Alternatively you can submit your comments online at: www.surveymonkey.com/s/NorthDorsetLocalPlan

Deadline: 5pm on 24 January 2014. Representations received after this time may not be accepted.

Part A – Personal details

This part of the form must be completed by all people making representations as **anonymous comments cannot be accepted**. Representations cannot be treated in confidence as Regulation 22 of the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires copies of all representations to be made publically available. By submitting this response form on the pre-submission North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 you consent to your information being disclosed to third parties for this purpose, but signatures, private telephone numbers and e-mail addresses or private addresses will not be visible on our web site, although they will be shown on paper copies that will be sent to the Inspector and available for inspection.

*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes to the personal details but complete the full contact details of the agent. All correspondence will be sent to the agent.

Personal Details (if applicable)*	Agent's Details (if applicable)*
Title	MR
First Name	PETER
Last Name	MADDOCK
Job Title (where relevant)	/
Organisation (where relevant)	/
Address	[Redacted]
Postcode	[Redacted]
Tel. No.	[Redacted]
Email Address	[Redacted]

Part B – Representation

The North Dorset Local Plan 2011 to 2026 Part 1 and its supporting documents have been published in order for representations to be made prior to submission to the Secretary of State for examination. The purpose of the examination is to consider whether the Local Plan complies with the **legal requirements** and is **'sound'**.

If you are seeking to make a representation on the **way** in which documents have been prepared it is likely that your comments or objections will relate to a matter of **legal compliance**.

If you are seeking to make representations on the **content** of the documents it is likely that your comments or objections relate to the **soundness** of the plans and whether it is justified, effective or consistent with national policy.

Further information on the matter of legal compliance and the issue of soundness can be found in the 'Guidance Notes for Making Representations'.

If you need help completing the response form please see a member of the Planning Policy Team at one of the consultation exhibitions or call 01258 484201.

1. Please select which document you are commenting on:

- North Dorset Local Plan 2011 to 2026 Part 1 (please complete Questions 2 to 9)
- Final Sustainability Appraisal Report (please complete Questions 2 and 10)
- Habitats Regulations Assessment (please complete Questions 2 and 10)

2. Please state the part of that document you are commenting on:

Paragraph number: <i>8.70</i>	Policy/site: <i>POLICY 17i</i>	Policies map: <i>PAGE 205</i> <i>FIGURE 8.2</i>
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

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 No

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

- Yes No

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

- It has not been positively prepared *- SEE POLICY 17i WHICH CONFLICTS WITH POLICY 17D (RIVER SHREEN CORRIDOR)*
- It is not justified
- It is not effective
- It is not consistent with national policy

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 object to the development of the land lying between the Barnaby Mead Estate and Bay Lane. The highly detailed Burden Report (November 2003) Pages 48 to 53 appears to have been ignored yet remains very valid today. The Atkins Report (December 2009) at para 4.81 states that further development of sites to the N.E. compare poorly with other areas and SPECIFICALLY that development of ATKINS REFERENCE ATK 21 - land between Barnaby Mead and Bay Lane was neither a prudent use of resources and contrary to Environmental Protection (Atkins Para 4.84). On 25 April 2010 I made representations on the New Plan for North Dorset which SPECIFICALLY objected to the development of this land. These objections are valid today and to avoid repetition I request that you accept the contents of the letter at appendix 1 attached. You will be familiar with all the references contained therein.

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.

The development of this land would contravene the stipulations as detailed in Paras 7.121 to 7.126. (Appendix 2 attached). It would finally close up the ONLY remaining access to the South Bank River side of the Green Water and would join the Hamlet of Bay to the Town the absorption of which would destroy Bay as an "Area of Local Character" to the Detriment of Gillingham's Environment. The land should be an ^{Amenity} ^{Green Space}.

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
- Yes, I would like to participate in the oral examination

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.

I WOULD LIKE TO BUT AM PROFOUNDLY DEAF

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.

Attempts to resist the development of this piece of land have been actively followed by N.D.D.C since 2002 and are well recorded such as making it a "Buffer Zone" Designating it as a "Green Area", etc. An opportunity to fulfill all these previous policies is now presented closing the River Bank finally and swallowing the hamlet of Bay would contravene para 8.63 of Policy 17 which wishes to protect the natural and historic environment. The land should be retained as an amenity space and a green corridor and protect an area of local character of Bay Hamlet.

11. Do you wish to be notified of any of the following? Please tick all that apply. We will contact you using the details you have given above.

- That the Local Plan Part 1 has been submitted for independent examination
- The publication of the recommendations of any person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the Local Plan Part 1
- The adoption of the Local Plan Part 1.

Signature: 

If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.

Date: 18 January 2014

Submit Form

This button should attach your form to a pre-addressed email, if it does not, please save the form and send it to planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk

COPY

APPENDIX 1

Planning Policy,
North Dorset District Council,
Nordon,
Salisbury Road,
Blandford Forum, DT11 7LL

Cherry End Cottage,
Bay Lane,
Gillingham,
Dorset, SP8 4ER

Tel: (01747) 824719

E-mail: petjoy@perrocat.freemove.co.uk

Sunday, 25 April 2010

Dear Sir,

The New Plan for North Dorset.
Consultation Period: April/May 2010

It is understood that the dead-line for receipt of representations regarding the "Public Consultation" Period for the North Dorset New Plan has been extended to 14th May, 2010 and accordingly I wish to record my objections to the Proposals.

2. I object to the development of the Land to the East of Barnaby Mead which is understood to be termed "Zone E" and adjoining the built-on extension to Barnaby Mead previously referred to as "C" and to any further extensions to the Barnaby Mead Estate Eastwards towards that part of the Bay Area of Bay Lane situated within the Bay "Area of Local Character".

3. It is noted that amongst others the Policies 1.1 through to 1.9 and 1.12 (River Valleys) of the adopted North Dorset Local Plan to 2011 have been saved and brought forward to the New Plan.

4. The DWLP 2011 includes under Policy GH3 at "Sites Allocated for Development" 15.3.6, Policy 2.4 (1) Site C, Barnaby Mead (44 Dwellings) the development of which has been completed. It is noted that the Dwelling Numbers represent figures likely to be achieved due to Permissions granted *in Full or in Principle*. The reference is Inset Map 15 – H/15/1 Site C Barnaby Mead. This development has now been full-filled.

5. Policy GH3 designates Bay as an "Area of Local Character" and any development of Zone E – a previously designated "Buffer Zone" – by a third extension of Barnaby Mead would overwhelm the Bay Area and swallow its distinction of Local Character.. The currently and partly still open corridor to the valley of the Shreen Water would be closed off from Bay Bridge through to its confluence with the River Stour in the Town.

Light and Noise pollution, Surface Water Pollution and a detrimental impact on Wild Life must result. The Shreen Water is bounded in its final stretch by Bay Road to the North and to enclose its South West bank completely by further development would destroy the Bay "Area of Local Character" which would be detrimental to the interests of Gillingham as a whole and contradictory to the New Policies for the development of the Town towards the South on the Shaftesbury side of Gillingham. In the face of the stated objectives of the New Plan 2016/2026 the pursuit of taking forward from the out-going Local Plan 2011 any lingering aspirations to develop in the North East are contradictory. On numerous occasions District Council Planning has clearly shown its preference to retaining the area of land in question (Zone E) as a "Buffer Zone" now termed by the District Council as an "Important Green Gap" and for the variety of reasons offered by the Planning Authority in past years nothing can have changed from the principles they then expounded. The absorption of Bay by the Town and loss of its identity as a Hamlet has always been unacceptable to the District Council Planning Authority and this was strongly supported in the Burden Report commissioned by the Authority wherein Pages 48 through to 53 detail the unacceptability and environmental impact of the further extension of Barnaby Mead. A letter dated 9 May 2002 from NDDC stated that as this Land concerned was a "Greenfield" the Council would have good reasons for refusing any application for housing development... etc

6. The open field between Barnaby Mead has historically been described as a "Buffer Zone". Under Policy GH1-2 The Environment, paras 15.2.1, 15.2.2, 15.2.4 and 15.2.5. The Council was prompted to consider future environmental constraints as the development of Gillingham spread and the environmental capacity of areas within Gillingham Town and its environs were endangered; Bay was of particular concern. The Council reluctantly followed the recommendations of the Local Plan 2011 presiding Inspector and deleted the "Buffer Zone" Area Policy and Title. However the Council stated that it ***did not intend to allocate any part of the Buffer Zone Areas for development (at this stage)*** and that further assessment and guidance would be sought. It was at this point the designation of "IMPORTANT GREEN GAP" was adopted.

7. Thus at this stage no development on the Land had taken place or was intended. Whilst all policies demanded its protection for the future.

8. Appendix A – Summary of Relevant Local Plan “Saved” Policies at Local Plan Policy 1.1 – Sustainable Development Strategy states that development will be permitted where it is compatible with the aims of the Sustainable Development Strategy stating (a) “...contain the spread of development through the promotion of the re-use of previously developed land and through *realistic restraint on greenfield development* ...” and (b) “...conserve the built and the natural heritage character by identifying those areas where restraint and sensitive control of development are required...”. Any further development of Barnaby Mead to the West to Bay and Bay Lane would be in direct contradiction to Policy 1.1 which has been advanced to the NEW PLAN and concerned a field which the Planning Authority had declared its dedication to protect from any development.

9. At the end of March 2007 the Local Plan 2011 (sub-Area Housing) provision figures for Blandford, Gillingham and the Rural Area stated that they had already been *exceeded* and the actual rate of housing development in the District was 28% *above* the planned rate of provision. Thus at the time further consideration of any possible development and the Westward extension of a third stage to the Barnaby Mead Estate would not be necessitated by the future proposals which were defined at that time (and now in the New Plan) that the Southern Segment of Gillingham on the Shaftesbury Road would be scheduled for any major Housing Development; and this intention would avoid the unnecessary increased traffic access (from Barnaby Mead) directly into the Town’s busy and expanding High Street at a sensitive point adjacent to the Town Bridge. At that time it had been recognised that the increase in vehicular traffic from an additional 50 dwellings in Barnaby Mead was undesirable.

10. The New Plan – Consultation April/May 2010.

At para 1.3.28 reference is made to the delivery of Housing growth “...that does not harm key environmental features...and to safeguard amenity...”. It is my contention that the further development of the Barnaby Mead Estate will have a detrimental influence on the Bay Area. The area of land (Zone E) is bordered to the North by Bay Road with its dwellings and the Shreen Water flowing between the two whilst Bay Lane lies to the West. To the South there is a major Public Footpath running East to West providing direct access into the Town High Street. This area has clearly and consistently been considered as a point of segregation of the Town from Bay and is designated an Important Green Gap (in lieu of Buffer Zone). As an Important Green Gap its retention would be of far greater advantage to Gillingham and would act as a Public Recreational “lung” for many residents including those dwelling in

the existing Barnaby Mead where no specific recreational areas are defined. The fact that this area is bounded by the Public Footpath and which leads to Gillingham School emphasises the ease of pedestrian access.

11. The New Plan vision of North Dorset in 20 years time states at para 5 that it will have a protected and enhanced local distinctive built and natural environment that retains the qualities that makes the District's Urban and Rural areas even more attractive and desirable places to live and work and visit. These worthy aspirations *conflict* with any plans that might permit the swamping and absorption of Bay an Area of Local Character. Destroying the identity of any small Hamlet within proximity of a Town which in this instance would occur if Barnaby Mead is extended to Bay Lane is not the intention of the Policies or principles of the NEW PLAN. Further intensification and density of the development of Barnaby Mead will NOT maximise the quality of life and well-being of either residents of the Town, of Barnaby Mead, of Bay Road or Bay Lane. The general public – Gillingham residents - will be those who will lose for ever the opportunity of having an Open Space (Important Green Gap), easily accessed yet close enough to the expanding Town to be of great benefit.

Likewise the retention of this segment of Open Land accords with the intention of sensitively blending the Town into its rural hinterland, cherishing and managing its built and natural environment and valuing and conserving its unique heritage. Future residents of Gillingham will not see the benefits of these aspirations if Gillingham is permitted to develop into a compacted Town of high density dominated by vehicular traffic and lacking the amenities it is enjoying at the present.

12. Much emphasis in the New Plan at Objective 5 is placed on the quality of life and clearly the development of an extended Barnaby Mead will certainly not lead to the success of such an intention. The present residents of Barnaby Mead Estate will suffer a substantial increase in vehicular traffic generated from 50 additional dwellings and all passing through their internal estate roads. No improvement in the quality of life of those living in Bay Road or Bay Lane where their "Local Character" and identity will have been lost. Figure 2.2.1 (Part 2), Issues (Section 1.3), Objectives (Section 2.2) 3B, 3C and 3D are particularly relevant to the sensitivity of this Land.

13. Reference to Amenity at 2.3.39 demands that development should not have an adverse impact on the enjoyment of privately or publicly owned land in order to maintain environmental

quality and the quality of life of residents. Draft Development Management Policy 4 with its clear intentions refers.

14. Draft Core Policy 2: Delivering sustainable Forms Of Development requires at (d) ... that full account of the potential of previously developed land ...etc. I contend that the already completed Two staged development of the Barnaby Mead Estate was acceptable to the Planning Authorities as long as the remaining piece of land (now Zone E) was not committed or intended for development but would continue to act, in the consideration of those planning, as a “protection” (or Buffer Zone/Important Green Gap) thereby improving the character and quality of the area in which it was located. This has always been the view of District Council for the Bay area since the introduction of the Local Plan concept.

15. With regard to Development Policy C – Settlements – at para 2.4.20 it is understood that the Land Site adjoining Barnaby Mead to the East has NO planning permission for any development and that no actual allocation for housing is in the Local Pan 2011.

16. Draft Core Policy 13 places emphasis on the Green Infrastructure and within this concept the land between Barnaby Mead and Bay Lane provides an accessible multi-functional site as broadly referred to in paras 2.6.55, 56, 57 and 58 in respect of Amenity Green Space, Natural and Semi-Natural Urban Greenspaces and Green Corridors. The strategy detailed in paras 2.6.59 and 60 is applicable also and particularly economic development.

17. Under Provision and Enhancement of Green Infrastructure the strategy requires provision of a range of Open Spaces to serve new development and the land in question does now provide this facility for the residents of Barnaby Mead in particular from the Apartment Blocks (Old Town Mill) commencing at the only point of road access on the High Street through to the Western Boundary of the last Stage Two development. Retention of this land (Zone E) as an Important Green Gap is qualified under paras 2.6.67 through to 2.6.70 and should remain as a Strategic Open Space to comply with Draft Core Policy 13. In fact it was compliance with Option 13 (1)b that the land had earlier been designated as a Buffer Zone (subsequently “Important Green Gap”).

18. Para 2.7.8 requires that Development should be capable of being accommodated in an area *without detracting* from its intrinsic qualities. Clearly any development on this land would

completely detract from a unique part of a sole remaining piece of landscape and particularly by sealing off the final Reaches of the Shreen Water from Bay Bridge to the point where it joins the River Stour near the Town High Street. Draft Core Policy 14, para c refers however and it is noted that para 2.8.54 would be contravened if the access to the corridor of the Shreen Water to the South of Bay Bridge were blocked or enclosed by development as far as Bay Lane.

19. Draft Core Policy 16 - Gillingham. New Plan.

Essentially housing growth is to be focused (para 2.8.31) to the South of the Town which is the preferred option and the *Town Centre is to be enhanced*. However para 2.8.32 identifies land to the South and South West of Bay and at para 2.8.33 for the accommodation of about 50 dwellings with good links to the Town Centre. This "land at Bay" does not fit the development criteria already detailed in the New Plan. In particular the **ONLY ACCESS** into Barnaby Mead Estate leads directly at a right angle on to the main Town High Street Shopping Centre and which it has already been stated is to be revitalised. This access is not satisfactorily able to accept the increase of vehicular traffic generated by an additional 50 Dwellings. The internal Estate roads will be compromised as will the ease and speed of movement desirable for Public Service and Emergency vehicles – Ambulance, Fire Service and Police. All will require to negotiate deeper and further through the existing dwellings and then on for another 50 dwellings as far as Bay Lane. It is emphasised here that there is **NO OTHER VEHICULAR ACCESS SITE** than that existing into the High Street which itself is projected to become more busy. No access is possible from Bay Lane and a Bridge over the Shreen Water across the Flood Plain would require to be constructed to gain access on to Bay Road. The present residents of Barnaby Mead would have their quality of life seriously disturbed by the increase in vehicular traffic within the Estate.

20. It is considered that an increase in the density of this development would create a variety of problems having as it does a single point of access and the additional number of vehicles entering and leaving Barnaby Mead on the High Street at a point close to the Town Bridge over the River Stour across which the High Street is carried. There can be no advantage to Gillingham to lose the character and identity of Bay, to lose a close-by Important Green Gap for recreational purposes or to unnecessarily generate further traffic strictures. In fact further development in Barnaby Mead directly contravenes many of the various Policies outlined in the New Plan and expressly intended to retain Gillingham's identity and dignity. A requirement for another 50

dwellings should and could be met in the Preferred Area to the South of the Town. It is questioned as to whether any in depth transport assessment has been undertaken in respect of a Barnaby Mead increase in vehicular traffic in the context of the New Plan “enhanced and busy” future High Street.

21. It is requested that any proposal for development of the Land to the South and West of Bay be reviewed in the Site Allocations DPD and that this Land be retained as an Important Green Gap. The retention of Local Plan Policy GH3 into the New Plan identifies “Areas of Local Character” remains also and it is clear that the further development and expansion of Barnaby Mead to the East will destroy the identity of the old Hamlet of Bay as an Area of Local Character.

22. Any further advances towards development of this land must demand an Environmental Impact Assessment and an Equality Impact Assessment to give full and proper consideration to (a) the sole access via the Town High Street for vehicular traffic to the Estate, (b) the absorption and ultimate destruction of Bay as an Area of Local Character and (c) the effect on the quality of life on the existing residents of Barnaby Mead, the residents of Bay Road and Bay Lane. Equally an up-dated Flood Risk Assessment is essential to evaluate any influence of the Flood Valley of the Shreen Water especially in view of climatic and higher rainfall developments projected over recent years

23. It is noted that the Atkins’ Report at Page 119, Item 8.50 considered that the future growth of the Town will generate a need for further Open Space in the Town. The field South and West of Bay offers an opportunity to meet in part this requirement and, as an Important Green Gap, satisfies the previous and strongly defended concept of having a “Buffer Zone” retained between the Town and Bay to keep its identity and character and complying with the Green Infrastructure demands of Atkins’ Proposals at their para 8.

24. The Atkins’ Report provides in its Table 4.3 - Evaluation of Major Sites at Reference ATK21 a Score Rating of 33 for the Site Assessment findings of this Zone E site with Site scorings showing poorly in the North East of the Town. Top scoring sites being in the Preferred area located in the South. The Barnaby Mead extension scores a bottom Score Rating of 1 for the “Prudent Use of Resources”.

25. The Burden Report commissioned by North Dorset District Council – November 2003/March 2004 at Pages 48 through to 53 with Sub-Head “Bay and Lodbourne” provides the most devastating appraisal of this Land and its suitability for development and I can best include this as an extract as follows:-

“...I recommend that the former Buffer Zone and the important landscape gaps that link this area to the open countryside be protected and managed to sustain their landscape features and landscape character. Careful consideration should, therefore, be given to policies and procedures to achieve these aims, including enlarging IOWA 17 to extend over the area of the former Buffer Zone. I also recommend allocating the area as a publicly accessible park (see the proposal on page 70).....”.

Some of the terminology contained in this Extract has been amended but the spirit and intention is clear.

26. Despite amendments to housing targets and the growth in Dwellings demanded for the New Plan to 2016/2026 and the increased density of development for Gillingham the Professional advices already obtained by the District Council have clearly projected the best practice for the retention of an acceptable environment and quality of life for the Bay Area and these coupled with the natural environment *have not changed* and remain just as valid *today*. The New Plan unequivocally states that the Preferred Area for future Development for Housing is to the South/South East of the Town. You are therefore requested to refuse any form of development on the Zone E to the North East and retain it as an Important Green Gap.

If I may I would like to request your permission to be permitted to add further to this letter but I shall hope to have done so if necessary prior to the 14 May 2010. Unless I hear to the contrary I shall assume that this is agreeable to you.

Yours sincerely

P.J.Maddock

January 2014

7.121 The different types of site that make up the green infrastructure network in North Dorset and their primary functions are set out in Figure 7.1.

Figure 7.1: Types and Functions of Green Infrastructure

Type	Examples	Primary Functions
Outdoor recreation facilities, parks and gardens	Sports pitches and greens, playgrounds, urban parks, formal gardens	Offer opportunities for sports, play and recreation and to enable easy access to the countryside (for example Blandford Leisure Centre and recreation ground)
Amenity greenspace	Informal recreation spaces, housing green spaces, country parks, landscape planting, green roofs, domestic gardens, trees, village greens, urban commons, other incidental space	Creating attractive and pleasant built environments, providing community and private outdoor leisure space (for example The Slopes in Shaftesbury)
Natural and semi-natural urban greenspaces	Nature reserves, woodland and scrub, grassland, heathlands, moors, wetlands, ponds, open and running water, landscape planting	Creating areas for biodiversity, access to education associated with the natural environment (for example Butts Pond Nature Reserve in Sturminster Newton)
Green corridors	Rivers and canals including their banks and floodplains, trees, hedgerows, dry stone walls, road and rail corridors, cycling routes, pedestrian paths, rights of way	Creating a sustainable travel network promoting walking and cycling, enhancements to semi-natural habitats and integrating micro green infrastructure into urban areas (for example up and downstream of Lodden Bridge in Gillingham)
Local character areas	Churchyards, treed areas, roadside verges, landscape screening, setting of a building, open gaps, views	Creates a sense of character within a settlement contributing to the attractiveness of an area or building. (for example Church Field in Shillingstone)
Other	Allotments, community gardens, orchards, cemeteries and churchyards	Providing accessible facilities to meet needs within settlements, enable local food production (for example Pond Walk allotments in Stalbridge)

A Green Infrastructure Strategy

7.122 The Council will produce a Green Infrastructure Strategy to inform the production of the Local Plan Part 2. This will enable the coordinated provision of an integrated green infrastructure network across the whole district where individual elements

contribute to achieving the wider objectives of the Local Plan. The key benefits that the Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Council more generally will seek to deliver are set out in Figure 7.2. These key benefits of green infrastructure fit within the broad ecosystem services categories as outlined in Policy 4 – The Natural Environment.

- 7.123 An assessment of current resources was prepared in the Council's Open Space Audit & Assessment of Local Need . This Audit assessed a range of sites including recreational grounds, amenity spaces and formal gardens, allotments, cemeteries and sports pitches. Although the Audit assessed a wide range of sites, not just those with sport and amenity uses, their value was assessed primarily from an open space access and quality perspective, rather than in terms of the wider green infrastructure benefits they could offer.
- 7.124 The Council will use the results of the Audit to aid the development of its Green Infrastructure Strategy by:
- assessing the existing situation;
 - assessing the multi-functionality of sites to capitalise on the benefits of green infrastructure;
 - identifying areas where there are deficiencies in provision or where links can be made through the development of local standards where appropriate;
 - linking to other initiatives and plans (such as the South West Nature Map, the North Dorset Trailway Project and the Local Community Partnerships) to help deliver their objectives; and
 - prioritising areas where development will take place as these offer opportunities for improving green infrastructure provision.
- 7.125 Across the district there are opportunities to enhance green infrastructure provision both quantitatively but also qualitatively, through the Green Infrastructure Strategy and other mechanisms. Enhancement of existing and the provision of new green infrastructure will help to support the needs of the growing population and help to deliver the wider benefits outlined in Figure 7.2.
- 7.126 In the four main towns, the green infrastructure network will be enhanced as a result of the sites identified for growth being developed. In addition, the existing green infrastructure elements will be enhanced and connected to each other to provide a network to deliver wider benefits to the towns and surrounding areas. These linkages will, alongside other benefits, seek to provide safe walking and cycling routes to and from town centres and other key facilities such as schools.