

Participant	Will Edmonds (Montagu Evans)	Rep ID	2984
		Date response received	15/05/2015
Representing	South Gillingham Consortium	Response reference number	MHD041
MHD / Change reference commented on	MHD006 Council's Broad Strategy		
Summary of comment	Support the extension of the Plan period. This proposed change would obviate the need to recognise in the Plan that the housing provision at the SSA extends beyond the Plan period as previously submitted.		
Council's response	Comment noted. Make subsequential change to delete reference that delivery of housing at the southern extension extends beyond the Plan period of the SSA as previously submitted.		
Conclusions	Subsequential changes to policy and supporting text throughout LP1 as a result of suggested major modifications will be actioned at the same time.		

Participant	Will Edmonds (Montagu Evans)	Rep ID	2984
		Date response received	15/05/2015
Representing	South Gillingham Consortium	Response reference number	MHD041
MHD / Change reference commented on	MHD008 Housing Trajectory		
Summary of comment	The 'consortium' concurs that in accordance with the housing trajectory projections for the Gillingham, SSA set out within Appendix A are realistic assumptions.		
Council's response	Support noted. No further action required.		
Conclusions	No further action required.		

Participant	Will Edmonds (Montagu Evans)	Rep ID	2984
		Date response received	15/05/2015
Representing	South Gillingham Consortium	Response reference number	MHD041
MHD / Change reference commented on	MHD014 Note on the evolution of and changes to the local centre within the SSA.		
Summary of comment	<p>The 'consortium' welcomes the amendment to the Policy 21 proposals map which removes the local centre boundary and applies a star notation in its place.</p> <p>The 'consortium' noted at the Hearing that the Council agreed to include land at the garden centre (currently outside of the settlement boundary) as the last in a sequential approach to the location for provision of the local centre.</p> <p>Failure to afford such flexibility within LP1 could ultimately prejudice the successful delivery of the SSA.</p> <p>Given the 'significant issues' identified by the 'consortium' to locating the local centre within the Shaftesbury Road corridor, the garden centre must be allocated; albeit with clarification as to need to evidence a sequential style approach to site selection.</p>		
Council's response	<p>The Council acknowledges the support from the 'consortium' in the additional flexibility it has proposed to incorporate in the Policy 21 proposals map by removing the local centre boundary and applying a star notation in the Shaftesbury Road corridor. This additional flexibility was provided to overcome concerns raised by the 'consortium' that additional land they had acquired within the Shaftesbury Road corridor to be incorporated into the Council's preferred area for delivery of the local centre.</p> <p>At the Hearing the Council agreed to consider the location of the garden centre as a reserve site option for delivery of the local centre. This consideration is set out in MHD014 and identifies the garden centre as a sub-optimal option when put into the context of good planning and place-making practice. In MHD014 the Council demonstrated the potential for delivery of the local centre on available land within the Shaftesbury Road corridor on land either inside or outside the control of the 'consortium'.</p> <p>In addition, some of the land at Kingsmead Business Park, which falls within the Council's preferred area of search for the local centre within the Shaftesbury Road corridor, and where the owner had set out that he would provide the local centre on his land if an equalisation could be</p>		

	<p>agreed upon (Hopkins ID 2920 Issue 8), has recently become available for sale to the open market thereby making this land directly available to the ‘consortium’ to acquire for delivery of the local centre and further negating any need to include land outside of the settlement boundary at the garden centre as a sub-optimal location. However, the Council is not convinced that this action is necessary for the ‘consortium’ to deliver the local centre on land it already controls within the Shaftesbury Road corridor for the local centre, as set out in MHD014.</p> <p>MHD019 argued that the ‘consortium’ had already exhausted the sequential approach to delivery of the local centre within the Shaftesbury Road corridor, and that it rejected the garden centre site as a reserve option. Further, MHD041 which advocates a sequential style approach to including the garden centre as a delivery option location for the local centre highlights inconsistency in the ‘consortiums’ position. However, as set out in MHD014, the Council understands that options still remain available to the consortium to deliver the local centre within the Shaftesbury Road corridor either inside or outside of its control. Therefore, the Council cannot be confident that a change to Policy 21 to incorporate the garden centre as a reserve option or within a sequential style approach would be optimal in securing an appropriate location for the delivery of the local centre, or that the ‘consortium’ intends to pursue a sequential style approach as opposed to a garden centre first approach.</p> <p>The Council has already demonstrated flexibility in its approach, at the behest of the ‘consortium’, to open up options for delivery of the local centre within the Shaftesbury Road corridor and within the settlement boundary. This flexible approach is provided with the objective of good place-making at its heart.</p> <p>The Council retains the approach as proposed in MHD014 to further increase flexibility to deliver the local centre on land owned by the ‘consortium’ by proposing to incorporate a change to the Policy 21 proposals map of removing the local centre boundary and applying a star notation in the Shaftesbury Road corridor. The Council does not accept that incorporating the garden centre within the settlement boundary would result in a more deliverable site to provide a local centre or, by fact of its location, would contribute to place-making principles advocated by the community and endorsed by the Council, ATLAS and the South West Design Review Panel.</p>
<p>Conclusions</p>	<p>The South Gillingham ‘Consortium’ raises no new issues in relation to MHD014.</p> <p>No further action required by the Council</p>

Participant	Will Edmonds (Montagu Evans)	Rep ID	2984
		Date response received	15/05/2015
Representing	South Gillingham Consortium	Response reference number	MHD041
MHD / Change reference commented on	MHD015 Gillingham SSA Habitat Regulations Assessment		
Summary of comment	Clarification that the Master Plan Framework for the Gillingham SSA is not required to be subject to Habitat Regulation Assessment is supported.		
Council's response	Support noted. No further action by the Council required.		
Conclusions	No further action by the Council required.		

Participant	Will Edmonds (Montagu Evans)	Rep ID	2984
		Date response received	15/05/2015
Representing	South Gillingham Consortium	Response reference number	MHD041
MHD / Change reference commented on	MHD018 Schedule of Changes		
Summary of comment	<p>Change ref. 4/3/14 – the proposed wording change makes no difference to the way the sentence reads. Policy 3 will quickly become out of date due to changes introduced through Building Regulations. There should be no requirement for “detailed energy statements” when already addressed by other legislation, and other changes to Policy 3 (4/3/17). Delete this requirement.</p> <p>5/6/13 - needs to be amended in light of the proposed change in MHD006 to increase the housing target to 285dpa.</p> <p>5/6/14 – the table needs to be amended to reflect the extension of the Plan period.</p> <p>5/16/19 – the housing figures need to be amended in light of the proposed change in MHD008.</p> <p>5/8/22, 5/8/23 & 5/8/25 – notes from the hearing show that the expressed preference was for the text to refer to an ‘independent assessor’, and that no “either/or” approach was mentioned but which has found its way into the text changes. The Council has added the phrase “mutually agreeable” which the ‘consortium’ finds unacceptable.</p> <p>7/13/21 – requirement for public art provision for all large development proposals lacks flexibility and is overly prescriptive. The policy should encourage public art where appropriate and necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>9/21/15 – concerned that the proposed addition of text to deal with the event that the southern extension does not deliver housing and infrastructure at anticipated rates could result in competing sites using the reference to justify their application for allocation or approval, which would undermine delivery of the SSA.</p>		
Council’s response	<p>4/3/14 – Discussions at hearing session 2 suggested that ‘detailed energy statements to support planning applications’ should be removed from the policy text but mentioned in the supporting text to the policy. The Council’s revised approach as set out in MHD018 reflects this.</p> <p>5/6/13 – Comment noted. Subsequential changes to policy and supporting text throughout LP1 as a result of suggested major</p>		

	<p>modifications will be actioned at the same time.</p> <p>5/6/14 – Comment noted. Subsequential changes to policy and supporting text throughout LP1 as a result of suggested major modifications will be actioned at the same time.</p> <p>5/6/19 – Comment noted. Subsequential changes to policy and supporting text throughout LP1 as a result of suggested major modifications will be actioned at the same time.</p> <p>5/8/22, 5/8/23 & 5/8/25 – The Council agreed the scope of response to issues raised at the Hearing with the Inspector. The agreed scope, to which the Council has responded, sets out that the Council should widen the scope of Policy 8 to allow mutually agreed independent valuers to resolve viability disputes, rather than just the ‘District Valuer’.</p> <p>7/13/21 – The text sets out the Councils approach to ‘seek’ to have incorporated in large scale new developments such art elements as may be appropriate and support their introduction into existing developments. The text does not require public art provision for all large scale proposals, and therefore does not lack flexibility and is not overly prescriptive.</p> <p>9/21/15 – The Council agreed the scope of response to issues raised at the Hearing with the Inspector. The agreed scope, to which the Council has responded, sets out that the Council should make reference to the monitoring of the SSA, both in terms of development progress and infrastructure delivery, in the supporting text to Policy 21. The Council set out its intentions to use appropriate mechanisms to support delivery and put in place remedial actions should the monitoring of the SSA show delivery of housing, employment and infrastructure not to be at the anticipated rates.</p>
<p>Conclusions</p>	<p>4/3/14, 5/6/13, 5/6/14 & 5/16/19 – Subsequential changes to policy and supporting text throughout LP1 as a result of suggested major modifications will be actioned at the same time.</p> <p>No further new issues raised for the progression of the Local Plan.</p> <p>No further action required.</p>

Participant	Will Edmonds (Montagu Evans)	Rep ID	2984
		Date response received	15/05/2015
Representing	South Gillingham Consortium	Response reference number	MHD041
MHD / Change reference commented on	MHD018 Schedule of Changes Change Ref 7/14/13		
Summary of comment	7/14/13 – the proposed additional wording relating to the medical practice at Gillingham does not accurately reflect the likely actual requirements. Evidence provided by Gillingham Medical Practice considers that some capacity exists within the existing practice. Shaftesbury Medical Practice provided evidence of difficulties relating to funding and delivery of infrastructure requirements. The need set out in Policy 21 has not been properly evidenced and as such the specific requirement is not justified.		
Council's response	<p>The wording of the supporting text to Policy 14 will be amended to better reflect the issue raised in MHD041, to provide greater commitment to resolving issues surrounding health service provision, and specifically in relation to Gillingham.</p> <p>In response to concerns raised in MHD041, the need for GPs arising from the increase in population of the southern extension is evidenced by applying the NHS England's formula. Discussions between the Council and the Gillingham Medical Practice on 11/05/2015 established that no capacity currently exists in the existing practice and that a key issue is difficulty in the recruitment of GPs, reflecting the national crisis. The practice confirmed to the Council that it does not have the capacity to meet the need for GPs, or their accommodation, as generated by the southern extension. Policy 21 sets the framework for provision of the established need to be located where appropriate levels of accessibility to the service have been considered.</p>		
Conclusions	<p>The Council proposes the following revised change to the wording of the supporting text to Policy 14. This is an amendment to the proposed changes referenced in MHD018 as 7/14/13 and 7/14/14.</p> <p>Amended Change Reference 7/14/13:</p> <p>The Council is aware of the pressures which a number of medical practices in North Dorset are facing in terms of outdated or undersized premises and of actual or potential increases in the number of patients. A local centre is proposed to meet the needs of the new Southern Extension in Gillingham, with new health facilities including a doctor's surgery, dentist and pharmacy.</p>		

	<p>Amended Change Reference 7/14/14:</p> <p>The Council will work with local general practitioners, commissioning bodies and other stakeholders to ensure suitable sites for the location of new surgeries or health centres are identified and brought forward for development. In addition, the location of new residential development in Blandford will require careful assessment of the need for, and location of, new facilities in the town. At Gillingham, where this assessment has already taken place, a local centre is proposed to meet the needs of the new Southern Extension, with new health facilities including a doctor's surgery, dentist and pharmacy.</p> <p>No further new issues raised for the progression of the Local Plan.</p>
--	--

Participant	Will Edmonds (Montagu Evans)	Rep ID	2984
		Date response received	15/05/2015
Representing	South Gillingham Consortium	Response reference number	MHD041
MHD / Change reference commented on	MHD018 Schedule of Changes Change Ref 7/15/14		
Summary of comment	7/15/14 – the standard allotment plot sized is outdated and smaller plot sizes are generally more acceptable now. The requirement for standard sized allotment plots is not justified and the modification lacks flexibility. Remove reference to standard allotment plot sizes.		
Council's response	It is recognised that a standard allotment plot is too large for many individuals however there is a need identified through discussions with the District's Town Councils for a range of plot sizes including full sized plots. The revised approach as outlined in MHD018 is considered to be flexible enough for a range of needs to be met subject to the amendment to the change proposed in MHD018 Change Ref 7/15/14.		
Conclusions	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed wording in MHD018 Change Ref 7/15/14 did not fully reflect the Council's intentions following the discussions at the hearing sessions. The change proposed through MHD018 should read:</p> <p style="color: blue;">The Council will seek to secure the provision of one standard allotment plot for every 60 people in a settlement. The Council will seek to secure the provision of A standard allotment plot is traditionally 250m². Although many people would prefer a plot of this size, half sized plots would be acceptable if discussions with the relevant parish or town council indicate that the demand is for smaller plots. Where development is proposed, the delivery of allotments on-site will be required, where practical to do so, at or above this level in clusters of 15 plots.</p> <p>No further new issues raised for the progression of the Local Plan.</p>		