

For office use only  
 Batch number: \_\_\_\_\_ Received: 17/1/18  
 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	Ms	/
First Name	SUE	
Last Name	CLIFFORD	
Job Title(when relevant)	RETIRED	
Organisation (when relevant)		
Address		
Postcode		
Tel. No.		
Email Address		

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

**NB NB NB I have had such difficulty using the website form that I have had to create my own – I trust the following will be acceptable.**

**Rather than putting most of the comments at the end, I have fitted them in the order of/following the questions I wish to approach.**

**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.*

It is not apparent that this figure is based on anything more than slicing a national, notional demand. Until more comprehensive planning objectives for the locality are overtly stated including employment nearby, cutting traffic generation, taking the needs of sustainability more seriously etc, anything that I might calculate will depend on assumptions which are as abstract and deracinated as yours.

The land held by developers, as yet unused, should be visible in a register demonstrating what has planning permission and what has not. Planning permissions should be taken up or forfeited within a short time.

**Employment**

3. Do you consider that there is a need to allocate additional employment land in any other part(s) of the District?

Around Shaftesbury, Employment Land available for a decade or more has not been used – neither has it been enhanced. Has it been marketed? Until we know how to attract employment, no more land is needed. Indeed a policy open to mixed uses and imaginative space sharing needs to be created, with someone to promote the idea. Encouraging housing without jobs is already leading Shaftesbury to be a commuter town. It feels as though no one has taken responsibility for positively attracting environmentally benign, relevant/particular businesses here. Rather land (including a school) has been given over, by the County for example, to house builders.... The Persimmon proposals A or B for south of the A30 should not be contemplated. Why they own this land is not clear... are they not house builders? This land should remain available for mixed employment use and be properly/ imaginatively marketed as such.

**Spatial Strategy**

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**



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

Much more cognisance should be taken of your own reference to national guiding principles:  
NDDC Main doc

5.1 Core national planning principles, as set out in paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), include that planning should 'actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling and focus significant developments in locations which are or can be made sustainable'. Furthermore, that planning should 'take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas...recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving communities within it.'

5.2 National policy, as set out in paragraph 55 of the NPPF, also states that 'To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.'

### **Shaftesbury**

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

NO

*See reasons below*

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.*

The simplistic compass point and circle approach is surely the crudest of desk-based responses from afar. Having our own planners and professionals cognisant of the complexities of the area leads me to hope that much more nuanced suggestions would be possible, based in the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework paras 17 and 55 as quoted by yourselves above.

---

Shaftesbury offers a unique face to the world, and the world knows it: Gold Hill is a global asset as well as a local, county and national treasure.

Why? Because this hilltop town has yet more to offer. It is defined by steep slopes, give and take views, assets of edge, interpenetration of built up area with combes, fields, woodland and farms. From many miles away on three sides it can be seen standing proud. Its hilltop crow's-nest commands the seas of mists or the miles of fields, downs and hillforts. Many places would give much for these assets: the integrity of Shaftesbury's local distinctiveness is well worth a detour - a fact its economic well-being will increasingly rely upon- tourists as well as residents respond positively to these things.

What of the richness of wild life? Slopes having never been under the plough harbour riches of underground life that biologists are only now beginning to fathom. Above, ravens nest in the trees of Pine Walk. People expect to see woodpeckers, swifts, bats and more common wild life as part of their daily routine. Not many people who live in towns can say they have bumped into badgers in their High Street.

Intervisibility, because the greensand spur stands high above the vale, is an ancient as well as modern asset. No further development should be contemplated around the slopes or bottoms



to the south-east, south, west and north. Only areas on the flat to the east should form part of any further searches.

St James is a surprise, a rare example in England of a surviving defined 'sub-urb' it deserves a designation for this. No additions/frilling should be allowed to denigrate its integrity further.

The various sunken lanes that make their way up to the town must be safeguarded. Again they reference its importance through time and enrich the natural assets of the place.

Are archaeologists on the brink of major break-throughs here that will send ripples through the national and international designations? Some senior members of their fraternity believe so – Shaftesbury may have an exciting future in the international world of specific tourism and pilgrimage as well as for simply offering a beautiful face to the world. The sheer size of the early Abbey is exciting.

**Area D** in particular: The Wilderness (it is so called on the first OS maps) is the overgrown source of the town's earliest stone. This along with Brinscombe Lane and linking neighbouring fields is a favourite daily dog walkers, as well as a hikers, route, from which long views, and changing weather patterns are savoured. People meet, breathe the fresh air, watch the wild life – this would be very difficult to recreate if developers began to eat away, or the school started to spray fields that have been organic for generations.

Owls, bats, birds, badgers, bees rely on the mix of big trees, shelter and the interpenetration of different habitats to give them year round foraging, living and nesting down the lane, across the fields/hedges, through the Wilderness and into town.

More – the steep slopes of area D offer the face of Shaftesbury in views **from** the AONB – from Compton Abbas tops, Fontmell Down and Melbury Hill. Is the AONB involved in this discussion?

Area D needs protection not development.

None of the areas given labels B - J should be part of any extension of the town and on the north-west side, some kind of green belt policy is needed to prevent Shaftesbury and Gillingham colliding.


Why are we not party to discussions with Wiltshire? For it is on the eastern side that most flat land and accessible infrastructure exists.

Infrastructure: what of the capabilities and capacity for our removal of waste and sewage – Lower Blandford Road suffers sewage overspill onto the road surface almost everyday. How much more eastern development and indeed employment activity can the pipes and the sewage works take, as well as their destination the rivers Sturkell and Stour?

What of other threshold analyses: sufficient protection for water gathering areas; enough school places, medical/health facilities, local employment, public transport, road capacity. And particularly what of our health and wellbeing within nature. How robust can nature remain as more noxious fumes settle around us from intercontinental trucks and domestic distribution, as well as increasing commuting and extending local demands.

**We need more nature near us, not less.**





## 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

a. Allowing serviced plots to come forward under the current development plan policies.

Yes

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

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

d. Allowing a proportion (up to 100%) of self-build plots on exception sites (with controls over the resale value of the properties).

Yes

e. Identifying land in public ownership which would be sold only for self-build development.

Yes

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

*If you have answered 'Yes' please outline the other approaches which the Council could pursue.*

? Self build Brownfield sites in acceptable places – however small might be useful. The fact that major developers, who seems to be too powerful and therefore persuasive, are not interested should be seen as an asset to allow self-build and small, local builders of high aspiration a place to work.

---

## 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

Designations are needed to inform decision makers, to reinforce the knowledge of what is rich locally. This will become increasingly important as our democracy becomes diluted by distance.

It is very important to keep woodland designations in particular since these areas are often biologically as well as aesthetically irreplaceable. Tree cover and open areas where nature is supported need to be nurtured and increased if we are to live well with nature.

## 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?

NO

But the land should not be relinquished. It may be needed for other things although these bypass ideas are truly out of date. It is time we stopped simplistically moving traffic jams a little further down the road out of our own backyards. Major, thrilling ideas are due ... linking Poole and Portland Harbours across the country needs new rail not diesel HGV/truck routes and tinkering with the odd mile here and there. Imagination/vision is increasingly necessary...

Meanwhile to hold the road land will lose nothing.

### 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.

Shaftesbury is on the edge of both county and district, likewise the abutting edge of Wiltshire. Its remoteness from the power bases seems to allow lax thinking merely to be useful to "make up the numbers" when housing increase is required.

In a county abounding in "special places" the ordinary often gets lost, so also the remote. We put up with "Welcome to Dorset - Home of the Jurassic Coast" signs, because we are proud to be neighbours. We need to have pride reciprocated – as part of the rich mix of places in the west country.

People live here, love it, know it to have a rich personality that is nevertheless vulnerable. As NDDC fades into a new Dorset County Council – we need to be taken seriously, to be cherished as an outlier with much complex potential.

---

Shaftesbury may be steeped in history but we should be a forward thinking place – energy producing not consuming, nature rich, fields for local food, young people and old making a multidimensional future open to visitors from near and far.

Having been present at consultations over the last twenty+ years - Action for Market Towns, Planning by Design and so on - one has built a carapace of suspicion, given that so many planning acceptances have been changed by developers as time progressed – in Shaftesbury our careful work to safeguard greenspace and nature, for example in the Eastern Development, has been eroded. We are also aware that Planning Permissions have not been fulfilled, and yet it seems we have to find more land for more houses even though they could be built tomorrow.