

<b>Participant</b>	Lynne Evans (Southern Planning Practice)	<b>Rep ID</b>	748
		<b>Date response received</b>	15 <sup>th</sup> May 2015
<b>Representing</b>	Hall & Woodhouse	<b>Response reference number</b>	MHD039
<b>MHD / Change reference commented on</b>	MHD006 MHD007 MHD018 ref 4/4/46, 5/6/13, 5/16/19, 7/15/11, 7/15/12, 1/15/16 to 7/15/19, 8/16/11, 8/17/6, 8/18/10, 8/19/25. 10/27/1 and APP/D/7		
<b>Summary of comment</b>	<p>Support the principle for an early review of the Local Plan (MHD006). The Local Plan Part 1 needs to include a definite commitment to a timescale for this review to give clarity and certainty to all users of the Plan, including local communities and the development industry.</p> <p>Support in part the Council’s revised approach to development in the Countryside (MHD007) in particular the reinstatement of settlement boundaries around the larger of the Districts villages. Concerned that an up to date assessment has not been undertaken to ensure the approach encompasses enough villages given the restrictive nature of the policy and no current proposal to review. Object to the statement ‘other villages would be discouraged from preparing a Neighbourhood Plan’. Reserve the right to comment on the re-wording of relevant plan objectives, policies and supporting text as wording will be critical to ensuring a comprehensive approach to the supporting a robust and sustainable rural economy is achieved.</p> <p>Support deletion of the reference to the greenbelt at paragraph 4.105 (MHD018 ref 4/4/46). Continue to object to reference to the Local Green Spaces under Policy 15, as Policy 4 deals with the natural environment.</p> <p>Support is given to the approach of presenting the figures with the words ‘at least’ (MHD018 ref 5/6/13). Policy 6 should recognise the figure of 280 dwg is subject to further consideration.</p> <p>The final paragraph of policy 6 does not appear to have been reviewed in line with the revised approach to the larger villages to ensure a strong rural economy and thriving rural communities (MHD018 ref 5/6/19).</p> <p>Support wording amendments as helpful clarifications (MHD018 ref 7/5/11 &amp; 7/5/12).</p> <p>Support the deletion of the references to Green Infrastructure Strategy in Policy 15 (MHD018 ref 7/15/16 through to 7/15/19). Helpful to amend the final paragraph of policy 15 wording to make it more explicit that such designations are not appropriate for most green areas or</p>		

	<p>open spaces.</p> <p>Support wording change for all the four towns to promote development within the settlement boundaries rather than unnecessarily restricted to the built up areas (MHD018 ref 8/16/11, 8/17/6, 8/18/10 &amp; 9/19/25).</p> <p>Object to proposed policy wording to Policy 27 which serves to complicate rather than clarify the policy approach (MHD018 ref 10/27/1). Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out that plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. The final paragraph of the policy fails this test; it is not necessary and should be deleted.</p> <p>Support the inclusion and definition of 'infilling' within the glossary as helpful clarification (MHD018 ref APP/D/7).</p>
<p><b>Council's response</b></p>	<p>Support for all points raised above is noted.</p> <p>Points of clarification:</p> <p>The Council are conscious for the need for an early review of the Local Plan and have published a timetable within the latest Local Development Scheme November 2014 (SUD021). That timetable reflects the statutory process for preparation and the resources available.</p> <p>The list of villages to retain settlement boundaries reflects Option 3a described in the Core Submission Document COD008 'Moving Forward with the Spatial Strategy', March 2012. Evidence used to identify the Most Sustainable Villages (MSVs) included population size; range of services; and proximity to services (document SDS001 Sustainable Development Strategy Background Paper, November 2013). The Council undertook an initial assessment of settlements based on population and facilities as part of early work on the Core Strategy. The approach for Stalbridge and the villages is discussed at paragraph 5.15 through to 5.27. A range of 'cut of points' were considered but the preferred definition was a population of between 400 and 650 with four or more of the seven frequently used facilities; or a population greater than 650 with at least three of the seven frequently used facilities. Obviously facilities can (and do) come and go and over time such changes would give a different perspective on any assessment of the relative sustainability of settlements. This policy will be monitored over the Plan period.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector has not requested a further clarification note on the Policy location of Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>The District Council recognise that a further schedule of changes will be needed to reflect recommendations emerging from the Mid Hearing Documents (MHD005-MHD017) if agreed i.e. reference to 280 dwg and the final paragraph of Policy 6.</p> <p>On balance the replication of NPPF paragraph 77 'Local Green Space</p>

	<p>designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space' is not considered helpful in this instance.</p> <p>Proposed policy wording to Policy 27 (MHD018 ref 10/27/1) seeks to respond to objections received during the examination that reference to 'viability' and the 'importance to the community' had been missed.</p>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>The comments made by Mrs Evans of Southern Planning Practice on behalf of Hall &amp; Woodhouse are noted but do not raise new points not already covered in evidence and previous discussions.</p> <p>No further action required.</p>