For office use only Batch number:	Received: 19118
Representor ID #	Ack:
Representation #	



NORTH DORSET LOCAL PLAN REVIEW Issues and Options Consultation 27 November 2017 to 22 January 2018

Response Form

As part of the Local Plan Review (LPR), North Dorset District Council has prepared an Issues and Options Document for consultation. The Issues and Options Document, the Sustainability Appraisal and associated documents can be viewed online via:

https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/planning/north-dorset/planning-policy

Please return completed forms to:

Email: planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk

Post: Planning Policy (North Dorset), South Walks House, South Walks Road, Dorchester, DT1 1UZ

Deadline: 5pm on 22 January 2018. 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. By submitting this response form you consent to your information being disclosed to third parties for this purpose. Personal details will not be visible on our website, although they will be shown on paper copies that will be available for inspection by members of the public and other interested parties.

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

Personal Details*		Agent's Details (if applicable)*	
Title	Ms		
First Name	ANFELA		
Last Name	KIN 6		
Job Title <i>(where</i>			
Organisation (where relevant,			
Address			
Postcode			
Tel. No.			
Email Address			



Part B – Representations

Please answer as many questions or as few questions as you wish. There is a box at the end of the form where you can provide any comments that you may have.

м	α	us	ın	σ
		из		Б

1.	Do you consider that a housing need figure of 366 dwellings a year is an appropriate figure on which to plan for housing growth in North Dorset? If not, please set out what you consider to be an appropriate figure and provide reasons for this.
	Yes
	No ⊠
	If you have answered 'No' please set out an alternative housing figure and provide reasoning to support your answer. Without doing a huge amount of research this is hard to answer. While this is a random number, not based on actual planning permissions given for nouses not yet built, the area of brownfield sites available - if shafter bury is anything to go by. Has the required Housing need thanks been completed? We understand Shaftesbury's quoter by housing is already new subscribed. Improvements to the infrastructure must to me first.
	Employment
2.	Do you consider that additional employment land should be allocated for development at Blandford as part of the Local Plan Review?
	Yes
	No
3.	Do you consider that there is a need to allocate additional employment land in any other part(s) of the District?
	Yes
	No ⋈
	Spatial Strategy
4.	Do you consider that the existing spatial strategy, as set out in LPP1, should be amended to allow for some limited growth at Stalbridge, beyond just meeting local needs?
	Yes
	No 🗆
5.	Do you think that the Council should consider implementing any other alternative spatial strategy through the LPR? If so, please explain your reasons why.
	Yes 🔀
	No 🗆
	S * 3

If you have answered 'Yes' please set out your alternative spatial strategy and provide reasoning to support it. I agree with principles 5.1 and 5.2 in your Issues & oftims Consultation downent. Now 2017. He do not want to see our fowns grow together to form large converbations and would like to see green betts ring our towns & vivages. The aistrictive characteristics of each settlement nave to be reinforced, not ailuted. The re-visioning of Gilling warm Royal Forest provides a green belt between Motcombe, Gilling ham , Shaftesbury.

Blandford	(Forum and	St Mary)
-----------	------------	----------

5. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Blandford? Yes		Blandford (Forum and St Mary)
No	6.	Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Blandford?
7. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process? Yes		Yes
considered as part of the assessment process? Yes \[\begin{array}{c} \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		No 🗆
If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Blandford? Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements. Gillingham	7.	
If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Blandford? Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements. Gillingham		Yes
8. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Blandford? Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements. Gillingham 9. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Gillingham? Yes No Do you agree with the conclusions regarding to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process? Yes Do you agree with the assessment process?		No 🗆
Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements. Gillingham 9. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Gillingham? Yes □ No □ 10. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process? Yes □		If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.
Gillingham 9. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Gillingham? Yes No 10. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process? Yes	8.	
9. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Gillingham? Yes No No 10. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process? Yes		
Yes □ No □ 10. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process? Yes □		Gillingham
No □ 10. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process? Yes □	9.	Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Gillingham?
10. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process? Yes		Yes
considered as part of the assessment process? Yes □		No
	10	일을 내려지는 사용하게 되었다. 이 사용을 보고 있다면 가게 되었다면 하면 사용을 하면 하다면 하다면 하다면 하다면 하다면 하다면 하다면 하다면 하다면
No 🗆		Yes
		No □

If y	ou have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.
	at are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future elopment at Gillingham?
	ase set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements. Howard Car purking area at the rail way Station
and the second	ftesbury you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Shaftesbury?
Yes	
No	
	there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been sidered as part of the assessment process?
Yes	\checkmark
No	
1 s	ou have answered Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues. Hrongly object to the extension of the settlement boundary. In the NDDC and Plan 2011-26 pre-submission docoment 2013, the key statial as preds are occasing having largely on the feat plateau land to the last of the town and with or the 130 etc. The large new area of search here is a huge departure on the previous plan, and is wisely to destroy the character, attractiveness of integrity of this historic four that relies in creasingly on tourism.
	at are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future elopment at Shaftesbury?
T	ease set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements. Infrastruct shows preceded any development: This includes rather supplies, sewage, education, public transport, houth milities, remarks energy, cycling or path routes.

,

	Sturminster Newton
15.	Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Sturminster Newton?
	Yes
	No 🗆
16.	Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process?
	Yes
	No 🗆
	If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.
17.	What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Sturminster Newton?
	Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.
	<u>Stalbridge</u>
18.	. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Stalbridge?
	Yes
	No 🗆
19	Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process?
	Yes
	No 🗆
	If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.

		are the most important infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential e development at Stalbridge?
	Plea	ase set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.
1	The \	/illages
	eight	ou agree with the Council's proposed approach in relation to future development at the een larger villages within the District or do you think that the Council should consider an native approach?
	Yes	
	No	
	Affo	rdable Housing
	remo	ou consider that the existing reference to nine dwellings in Policy 9 of LPP1 should be oved from the policy to allow larger schemes to come forward where there is evidence of loca I in excess of that which could be met by the provision of nine dwellings?
	Yes	
	No	
		ou consider that the existing policy approach, which seeks to prevent exception sites coming ard adjacent to the four main towns within the District, should be amended?
	Yes	
	No	
		ou consider that the Council should continue with its existing policy approach, which allows small number of market homes on rural exception sites?
	Yes	
	No	

*

Self-Build and Custom-Build Housing 25. Do you consider that the Council should facilitate the provision of self-build housing by any, some, or all of the following options? Yes 📝 No 🗆 a. Allowing serviced plots to come forward under the current development plan policies. Yes W No 🗆 b. Updating Policy 7 (Delivering Homes) in the Local Plan Part 1 to promote the provision of serviced plots of land for self-build housing. Yes Z No 🗆 c. Requiring on sites above a certain size that serviced self-build plots should be made available as a proportion of the total number of dwellings permitted (with or without a minimum number being specified) on-site. Yes 🔽 No 🗆 d. Allowing a proportion (up to 100%) of self-build plots on exception sites (with controls over the resale value of the properties). Yes No 🗆 e. Identifying land in public ownership which would be sold only for self-build development. Yes V No 🗆 f. The use of Local Development Orders to facilitate self-build development. Yes No 🗆 26. Are there any other approaches that could be used to meet the demand for self-build housing? Yes No 🗆 If you have answered 'Yes' please outline the other approaches which the Council could pursue. **Ensuring the Vitality and Viability of Town Centres** 27. Do you consider that the existing hierarchy and network of centres, as set out in LPP1, should be amended to include Stalbridge as a 'local centre'? Yes

No 🗆

Important	Open or V	Vooded Are	eas (IOWAs)
-----------	-----------	------------	-------------

you agree that those IOWAs, which are protected from development by other planning policies egislation, should be deleted?
⊠ S
e A350 Corridor
you consider that the land which is identified and safeguarded for the Shaftesbury Outer bass and the Charlton Marshall and Spetisbury Bypass should continue to be identified and eguarded for such purposes?
omments
ou have any comments about the Issues and Options Document or the Sustainability praisal please set them out in the box below. If your comments are in relation to a specific estion or chapter of the Issues and Options Document then please state which question or apter your comments relate to.
spatial stategy: cont: Adequate public transport is essential to ensure the vitality of villages. We should hive to see better altractive foot paths regule routes linking settlewords. The surrounding countryword employed to provide food, everyon and healthy leisure for local people. Vision is needed to take the freight of the roads, especially from foole to routes going north. A new eva of rail ways is needed. 3. cont: In filling and building on attractive hedged and treed farmland, with probably expensive house, will not solve the perceived howing problem, and is unlikely to provide affordable, low-energy houses. Map 8.2 is very misterding and Areas A-I should be omitted from the Local Plan Review, with only the feat plateau land to the east considered - as previously. Map 8.2 is not only wrong for Shaftsbury because of its to peoply it is dangerous in that it could initiate planing application for nowses in Inappropriate areas that may result in acrimony amongst neighbours and the despoising of shaftsbury's local distinctiveness. NODC's arrent policy try shaftsbury's slopes views which does not respirit any descent policy try shaftsbury's slopes views which does not respirit any descent policy try shaftsbury's slopes views which does not

appears to have been ignored. Shafts bury is one of England's few hill-top towns, the highest in southern England. The greening sour that juts into the Blackmare vale actions a platform from which to view the slopes below and valleys beyond. Any significant inappropriate changes to training up country size to the south, so with wast and west will be detrinental to the four and surprising country side. Shat tobby has dominated its encient will top for more than a milleunium. Once home to England's largest numbery and burine prace of this country's only martyred king, it costs a series of somedated monuments not my unrivalled in the country, but potentially bearing comparison with the best-known historic vitic of the south - west. 1. Housing: Your long hasis is in housing numbers, not their type or quality, or who they are for. Surely the need is for afterdable zero carbon house to renting and buying, built in a new local refrequent that makes references to the existing older housing stock that reviewes to can districtive ness rather than deha dring from it. 28. (OWAS words and mature trees are a vital component of our country i we and are important vabitate for wirdlife. The more layers of

protection there areas have, the less tricely they are to be secrificed for ilvelopment.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Do you wish to be contacted about future of	onsultations relating to the Local Plan Review?
Yes 🗹	
No 🗆	
Signature:	Date: 18 January 2018
If submitting the form electronically, no signature	e is required.

When completed please send form to planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk