

**For office use only**

Batch number: \_\_\_\_\_

Received: \_\_\_\_\_

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](mailto: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                         | Mrs                                    |                                  |
| First Name                    | Karen                                  |                                  |
| Last Name                     | Tippins                                |                                  |
| Job Title(where               | Secretary for the purpose of this form |                                  |
| Organisation (where relevant) | Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group          |                                  |
| Address                       | ██████████<br>██████████<br>██████████ |                                  |
| 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.

### Housing

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.

No

*If you have answered 'No' please set out an alternative housing figure and provide reasoning to support your answer.*

(Please note form received from J Parker, Chair of Open Spaces Group are his own views and this form represents the views of the group as agreed at the SPOG meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> Jan 2018).

No evidence based or data supplied by NDDC to base a reasoned response, however our research has found the following:-

- the figure is not based on an NDDC issued 'Housing Need Analysis. Therefore, this figure 366 pa is not evidence based as being appropriate for North Dorset, which is defined as a 'rural' region.

- Nddc have failed to meet their current target of 280 houses pa because of market conditions not lack of approvals. Increasing the figure to 366, without adequate 'evidence based' justification, makes it worse. I continue to argue for building in large towns where infrastructure exists but the mechanisms are not there despite continued government tinkering with the planning system.

- The 366 houses increase is applied 'broad brush' to all North Dorset towns and villages in North Dorset in a seemingly haphazard manner without taking into account that Shaftesbury is 'ahead' of target; where as Gillingham is seriously lagging 'behind' housing build target. Also, to note that the Planning Committee North Dorset 10<sup>th</sup> Oct minutes:- ...'The officer drew attention to the fact that the Council could not at present demonstrate a five year housing land supply. However, in the context of Shaftesbury, there was an argument to state there are no problems regarding housing land supply. ..'

- Brownfield sites housing numbers missing for Shaftesbury – 75 houses have been built in Shaftesbury, none of these numbers were in the original LP estimates of 1140 (2011-2026). It has been calculated that in the housing supply for Shaftesbury that the numbers are underdeclared by 350 houses. This is from a short fall of 10 houses for Churchill – 42 dwelling approved as opposed to only 32 dwellings stated in the AMR 2017 document, Cattle Market is on the SHLAA for 25 dwellings, former Budgen site – unlikely to sell as retail – potential for more housing, Persimmon A30 Employment land could potentially have a further 125 – 200 houses based on the recent consultation event held by Persimmon.

### 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

*If you have answered 'Yes' please set out your alternative spatial strategy and provide reasoning to support it.*

**Blandford (Forum and St Mary)**

6. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Blandford?

Yes

No

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

No

*If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.*

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

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

No

*If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.*

11. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Gillingham?

*Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.*

**Shaftesbury**

12. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Shaftesbury?

**No**

13. 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.*

Shaftesbury is a unique hilltop town with unparalleled views of countryside merging into town and beyond. This will be threatened by any development going beyond the existing town settlement boundaries and impact upon the economy, tourism and well-being of inhabitants in Shaftesbury. Shaftesbury has exceptional topography and steep slopes should be identified as constraints on the plan as well as critical views in and out.

There needs to be a green belt which prevents Gillingham, Motcombe and Shaftesbury becoming one large conurbation.

## Making Sense of These Numbers

| Town                  | 2011-2017 | % contribution   | 2018-2022 | % contribution   | Burden to 2022 |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|
| Blandford             | 309       | 24%              | 504       | 34%              | 29.5%          |
| Gillingham            | 52        | 4%               | 233       | 16%              | 10.3%          |
| Shaftesbury           | 644       | 50%              | 401       | 27%              | 37.9%          |
| Sturminster Newton    | 29        | 2.2%             | 71        | 4.8%             | 3.6%           |
| Stalbridge & Villages | 252       | 19.6%            | 264       | 17.9%            | 18.7%          |
| TOTALS                | 1286      | 99.8% (rounding) | 1473      | 99.7% (rounding) | 100%           |

- Shaftesbury as a town should be excluded from the 'Area of Search' exercise for building houses outside the designated Settlement Boundary due to the fact that Shaftesbury has been building houses at a rate faster than defined in the original Local Plan signed in Jan 2016.
- The rate of housing growth for Shaftesbury, as shown in the table above, is 10 times faster than Gillingham (2011-2017 Gillingham 52 houses versus - Shaftesbury 644 houses for the same period). Gillingham was nominated as the 1<sup>st</sup> sustainable town in 2007 NDDC assessment for housing growth based on the fact it has a Train Station and Community Leisure Facility & population 11,000. Blandford was ranked second, because its town already supported over 11,000 people and has a Community Leisure Facility.
- Shaftesbury was ranked third for growth sustainability in 2007 with population over 7,000, but is currently growing and predicted to grow at the fastest rate in district. Gillingham's housing growth over the next 5 years is predicted to be 233 houses versus 401 for Shaftesbury.
- North Dorset District Council should only be undertaking the 'Area of Search' exercise for towns that have proven 'sustainability' infrastructure and also have missed their housing build targets. NDDC should be concentrating on the Area of Search on Gillingham as a priority and exclude Shaftesbury until 2022/2026.

14. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Shaftesbury?

*Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.*

Water supplies, sewage, education at all levels, health provision and social services, employment, amenities and green space for all.

Legally binding impact assessments must be in place for all of the above. NDDC should Green Infrastructure Strategy as does South East Dorset. Open Space standards and facilities apply to the whole of North Dorset and should meet the national standards, eg FITS and should include cycleways and footpaths and should link in existing open spaces and the town centre and facilities and the countryside beyond.

### **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.*

### **Stalbridge**

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.*

20. What are the most important infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Stalbridge?

*Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.*

### **The Villages**

21. Do you agree with the Council's proposed approach in relation to future development at the eighteen larger villages within the District or do you think that the Council should consider an alternative approach?

Yes

No

*If you have answered 'No' please set out your alternative approach and information/reasoning behind this.*

### **Affordable Housing**

22. Do you consider that the existing reference to nine dwellings in Policy 9 of LPP1 should be removed from the policy to allow larger schemes to come forward where there is evidence of local need in excess of that which could be met by the provision of nine dwellings?

Yes

No

23. Do you consider that the existing policy approach, which seeks to prevent exception sites coming forward adjacent to the four main towns within the District, should be amended?

Yes

No

24. Do you consider that the Council should continue with its existing policy approach, which allows for a 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

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

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

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 Wooded Areas (IOWAs)**

28. Do you agree that those IOWAs, which are protected from development by other planning policies or legislation, should be deleted?

**No**

### **The A350 Corridor**

29. Do you consider that the land which is identified and safeguarded for the Shaftesbury Outer Bypass and the Charlton Marshall and Spetisbury Bypass should continue to be identified and safeguarded for such purposes?

**Yes**

## **Comments**

If you have any comments about the Issues and Options Document or the Sustainability Appraisal please set them out in the box below. If your comments are in relation to a specific question or chapter of the Issues and Options Document then please state which question or chapter your comments relate to.

This form is difficult to access, understand and complete so we feel consultation is not welcome

- The Sustainability Appraisal seems to have been largely ignored
- Health and Well-being (e.g. walkers, dog walkers, cyclists, the needs of children and teenagers) have been ignored
- Wildlife, particularly wildlife corridors, and Shaftesbury's natural richness has been ignored
- Some land already acquired for development has not been developed and this has been ignored
- Some developments which have taken place have not provided the promised amenities or infrastructure and this has been ignored.

We need to ensure PROPER consultation takes place with all local people to see what the Shaftesbury community actually needs and wants.

[Empty rectangular box for signature or stamp]

Do you wish to be contacted about future consultations relating to the Local Plan Review?

**Yes**

Signature: Karen Tippins & Bernie Ede

Date: 22/01/2018

*If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.*

When completed please send form to [planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk)