

# Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options Consultation: Summary of Informal Consultation Responses

## Contents

1.0 Spatial Portrait.....	2
2.0 Vision .....	4
3.0 Managing Future Growth	
Issue 1: How could future growth be accommodated in a sustainable manner?.....	5
Issue 2: Identifying the spatial distribution for development up to 2016.....	12
Issue 3: Identifying the spatial distribution for development post -2016.....	15
Issue 4: Accommodating growth without harming the countryside .....	18
Issue 5: Growth and Transport.....	21
Issue 6: Investment and planning obligations.....	24
Issue 7: Climate change and renewable energy .....	26
4.0 Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Built Environment	
Issue 8: The need to protect the environment .....	28
Issue 9: Impact of growth on the environment.....	30
Issue 10: The protection and promotion of green infrastructure .....	32
5.0 Economic Prosperity	
Issue 11: Location for new employment sites.....	34
Issue 12: Promote a diverse local economy.....	36
Issue 13: The retention of existing employment sites .....	38
Issue 14: Retailing .....	40
Issue 15: Promoting a higher skilled residential employment base .....	43
Issue 16: Homeworking.....	45
Issue 17: Tourism .....	47
Issue 18: Re-use of Buildings in the Countryside and Farm Diversification.....	49
6.0 Balanced Communities	
Issue 19: Affordable housing and house sizes .....	52
Issue 20: Meeting the needs of all groups in society .....	55
Issue 21: The density of development.....	57
Issue 22: Managing movements from new development .....	59
Issue 23: Environmental Design for Different Transport Modes .....	60
Issue 24: Rural accessibility.....	62
7.0 Quality of Life	
Issue 25: Quality of public spaces and design .....	64
Issue 26: Moving around without using a car .....	66
Issue 27: Built Facilities.....	68
Issue 28: Open spaces .....	70
Issue 29: Car parking .....	73

## **1.0 Spatial Portrait**

Summary of responses:

### Settlement Pattern

One respondent raised a concern about the impact growth would have on the character of the towns

### Environmental Quality

It was suggested in one response that whilst the Portrait emphasises the rural character of the district this is not followed up in the rest of the document. The point was made that the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty crosses the River Stour to include Hod Hill. The respondent also asked for the Historic Landscape characterisation work to be mentioned and stated that tranquillity, as mapped by the CPRE, is an important feature of the district and should be mentioned.

### Transport

More people commented on this than any other section. One suggested that road character is a particular issue in the AONBs. The potential difficulties in reconciling the conservation and enhancement of the landscape with transport demands should be included. The rest had views on the main roads of the district. One person felt that the portrait should reflect that there is no alternative to the A350 and the needs of traffic using the route should be recognised. Another thought that the A350 did not merit the development priority given it in recent years by the county and district authorities. It was suggested by another respondent that the importance of the A357 as an alternative to the A350 in accessing the A303 should be mentioned, along with the numerous bends on that road. The A354 as a route between Dorchester, Blandford and Salisbury was also felt to be worthy of inclusion in the portrait, in particular as it acted as a route for residents in the north-east of the district to reach Salisbury, the nearest Strategically Significant City or Town (SSCT).

### Population Growth

One respondent was concerned to read how much the district had grown and wished to see this high growth rate taken into consideration in determining future growth.

### Housing

It was requested that the district carry out a housing market assessment to gain a comprehensive overview of the housing market to inform policy. One respondent believed it would be difficult to require developers to provide affordable housing and another suggested that the reason for some dwellings being classified as unfit was due to elderly people being on fixed incomes and the high level of Council Tax. Finally, one respondent stated that the solution to high house prices is not to increase the rate of house building but to provide more affordable housing in appropriate areas.

### The Community

One respondent was concerned that increasing community size and having high density development with little personal space would lead to higher crime rates.

### General

Two general points were made. One respondent felt that village shops need to be able to offer competitive prices, perhaps with the help of supermarkets and also offer local produce. The same respondent thought that there was a need to be able to work from home and for “cottage industries” as well as for local facilities in walking distance for most villagers.

## 2.0 Vision

Summary of responses:

Four people stated that the Vision provided a clear strategic direction.

Five people replied that the Vision reflected their aspirations.

Six people responded that this is not a clear, spatial vision. One believed it did not set out a clear spatial direction to guide further growth. The main towns should be identified as service centres for the wider area and for the location of new development, reflecting their status as Development Policy B towns. Three said it does not give clarity about what the towns, villages and rural areas will look like in future.

Five people said the Vision was good. One felt it was acceptable but did not concentrate sufficiently on sustainability. Another stated it to be flawed on the basis that it would lead to growth of the district and the respondent did not wish to see the district change visually over the plan period.

One respondent used the comment on the vision to set out views on where the growth should take place, ie within the towns and some in the larger villages with exception sites being allowed for smaller settlements. Another stated that it lacks recognition of the rurality of the district and a forward view of the landscape. He suggested referring to the European Landscape Convention for a definition of landscape that combines the natural environment with the interaction of people. The point was also raised that historically population has gravitated to conurbations for employment and therefore North Dorset will become even less attractive. The district therefore is only attractive to people retiring or commuting to an SSCT.

One person was concerned that no mention was made of transport or roads. Another asked for additional points to be included. These were green transport, the aim for a carbon neutral footprint and a statement on the need to provide more of all jobs especially highly skilled ones.

### 3.0 Managing Future Growth

**Issue 1: How could future growth be accommodated in a sustainable manner?**  
**Distributing growth between the main towns and other locations in the District**

**Options:**

**To determine an appropriate distribution of growth in the future:**

<b>1a</b>	Is the recommendation that Blandford (Forum and St.Mary), Gillingham, and Shaftesbury should have Development Policy B status acceptable?
<b>1b</b>	Should any other market towns be considered for Development Policy B status?
<b>1c</b>	Is the recommendation of Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton and the larger villages for Development Policy C status acceptable?
<b>1d</b>	Which villages should have Development Policy C status?
<b>1e</b>	Which villages should not have Development Policy C status?
<b>1f</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 1	
Total number of responses	47
a Support	31 incl.1 except Shaftesbury
a Object	1
b Support	10 Sturminster Newton, 3 Stalbridge, 1 Sherborne, 1 Okeford Fitzpaine
b Object	8 No, 1 Not Sturminster Newton,
c Support	15 Stalbridge, 15 Sturminster Newton, 15 larger villages
c Object	4
d Support	4 Okeford Fitzpaine 1 Bourton 2 Child Okeford 2 Shillingstone 2 Stourpaine 2 Durweston 1 Bryanston 1 Charlton Marshall 1 Guys Marsh 1 Hazelbury Bryan 1 Hinton St. Mary 1 Iwerne Courtney

	<p>1 Motcombe  1 Marnhull  1 Spetisbury  1 Winterbourne Kingston  1 Likely and possible Development Policy C status.  Viable villages as per Local Plan.  Villages with a facilities ranking of 8 or more.  Villages with a population over 1000  There should be the opportunity for each individual village to choose.  Those able to support essential infrastructure and with good and sustainable transport links in main directions.</p>
d Object	1 No villages
e Support	<p>2 Hazelbury Bryan  1 All  1 Ashmore  1 Belchalwell Street  1 Bourton  1 Fontmell Magna  1 Hinton St.Mary  1 Ibberton  1 Iwerne Minster  1 King's Stag  1 Lydlinch  1 Mappowder  1 Milton Abbas  1 Stoke Wake  1 Stour Provost  1 Winterborne Kingston  1 Winterborne Houghton  1 Winterborne Stickland  1 Winterborne Clenston  1 Winterborne Whitechurch  1 Woolland  Villages with facilities ranking of less than 8 and with no primary school.  Smaller villages.  Villages without settlement boundaries.  Those not able to support essential infrastructure and without good and sustainable transport links in main directions.  There should be the opportunity for each individual village to choose.  Small villages &lt;500 persons or without amenities or employment.  No Policy C settlements required.</p>
e Object	N/A
Alternative Option	Consider accommodating future growth on

	<p>brownfield sites only, regardless of location;  A strict moratorium on all greenfield and extra development boundary building until all brownfield and in fill sites have been used;  Affordable housing must be permitted and some economic development to sustain community life in villages or they become 'top-heavy' with old, retired and second homes. Sustainable transport (bus services) should be promoted;  Provide a Development Policy D status to villages to allow them to grow organically and by scale of use rather than the principle of the use;  Shaftesbury should not be a Dev Policy B Town;  The recent permission on the east side of town and potential job centre to the south of the A30 is quite sufficient for this hillside town – which is badly served by public transport. It is only 5 miles from Gillingham. Brownfield locations which are still available within the town should be used instead. The A350/C13 corridor is inappropriate for more large scale development if sustainability is to be ensured;  If the panel conducting the EIP into the RSS Review suggest that housing numbers in Dorset should be increased, particularly outside the SE Dorset Conurbation, then Blandford should be upgraded to a SSCT.</p>
--	--

Summary of responses:

Option 1a

66% of respondents to Issue 1 supported Option 1a the recommendation that Blandford (Forum and St.Mary), Gillingham, and Shaftesbury should have Development Policy B Status. Only 1 of the responses to Issue 1 did not support Option 1a and is opposed to the settlement hierarchy and suggests that a wider range of villages should be allowed to grow in an organic way.

Support was shown for the recommendation that Blandford (Forum and St.Mary), Gillingham, and Shaftesbury should have Development Policy B status, based on their size and the employment, services and facilities they offer, and their potential to develop public transport provision.

16% of responses mentioned Blandford in particular, mainly due to its geographical location close to the strategic road network and local distributor routes and its range of town centre facilities. One response suggested that Blandford should be re-categorised as a primary growth Strategically Significant Town (SSCT).

The reference to the need to identify Policy B towns to increase self-containment was welcomed. Awareness and concern of sustainability is evident. Although there is general support for Blandford (Forum and St.Mary), Gillingham, and Shaftesbury to have Development Policy B status, there is

also concern that the level of growth allocated to them should be within sustainable limits and not result in overdevelopment, encroachment to other settlements, environmental and landscape degradation, and increased commuting on the district's roads.

2 responses expressed concern that the historical levels of growth have been unsustainably high and that the infrastructure cannot cope and that North Dorset's unique landscape is being sacrificed.

#### Option 1b

Of the responses to Issue 1: 22% commented on Option 1b and recommended Sturminster Newton to be considered for Development Policy B status; 6% recommended that Stalbridge be considered for Development Policy B status; 1 response recommended that Sherborne be considered (this town is not located in North Dorset); and, 1 recommended that Okeford Fitzpaine be considered, although this is clearly not a market town. 17% of respondents to Issue 1 commented on Option 1b and recommend that no other market towns should be considered for Development Policy B status, and 1 response recommended that Sturminster Newton should not have Development Policy B status.

The responses that supported, and those that did not support, Sturminster Newton to be considered for Development Policy B status referred to the level of services and facilities that are offered in the town. Some responses suggested that the level was appropriate, others suggested that the levels were insufficient. The interdependence of the surrounding villages was highlighted as a factor to support Development Policy B status, although restricted accessibility to both Sturminster Newton and Stalbridge was highlighted as a factor not to support Development Policy B status.

One response suggested that Okeford Fitzpaine be elevated to the Development Policy B category, based on the potential of a single brownfield site within the village.

One response suggested that a SSCT outside of the District be downgraded to a Development Policy B status.

#### Option 1c

Of the responses to Issue 1: 32% commented on Option 1c and supported the recommendation that Stalbridge, Sturminster Newton and the larger villages were acceptable for Development Policy C status. 8% did not agree that the recommendation of Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton and the larger villages for Development Policy C status was acceptable.

The recommendation that Sturminster Newton, Stalbridge and the larger villages be considered for Development Policy C status is generally accepted and seemingly non controversial. One response however did suggest that Sturminster Newton has already had its fair share of development.

#### Option 1d

Of the responses to Issue 1, the following villages were recommended for Development Policy C status in response to Option 1d: 8% Okeford Fitzpaine; 4% Durweston; 4% Stourpaine; 2% Bourton; 2% Bryanston; 2% Charlton Marshall; 4% Child Okeford; 2% Guys Marsh; 2% Hazelbury Bryan; 2% Hinton St.Mary; 2% Iwerne Courtney; 2% Marnhull; 2% Motcombe; 4%

Shillingstone; 2% Spetisbury; and, 2% Winterborne Kingston. 2% recommended that the villages that should have Development Policy C status should be: the settlements identified as 'likely and possible Development Policy C status' in the supporting report; villages identified with a facilities ranking of 8 or more in the supporting document; villages identified as viable in the Local Plan; villages able to support essential infrastructure and with good and sustainable transport links in main directions; and, each village should have the opportunity to choose whether to have Development Policy C status. 1 response recommended that no villages should have Development Policy C status.

The evidence of the supporting document was welcomed as a first step to assisting identification of Development Policy C settlements based on their role and function within the local area.

The larger villages that were suggested for Development Policy C status were reasoned on their sustainable location, employment, facilities and services, and in some cases the opportunity of use of sustainable travel modes. Significant expansion of villages in the far south and far north of the District raised concern that this would put additional pressure on the strategic road network.

One response recommended allowing all of the villages to grow organically and that there should be an additional development category to allow the villages to achieve this.

It was supported that the villages listed under both the 'Likely' and 'Possible' Development Policy C settlement categories, as set out in the supporting document, should have this status as they already are identified to have good levels of population and range of facilities and so they should be permitted to continue to thrive and achieve a degree of self-containment and improve their sustainability.

Suggestions were made that villages that can demonstrate self-containment should have Development Policy C status but that the interdependence of villages needs to be recognised as a positive feature, for example where schools depend upon the population of the surrounding villages as with the example given of Spetisbury and Charlton Marshall.

It was suggested that villages with a population over 1,000 people should be considered for Development Policy C status.

Bourton in particular had collected evidence by attempting to survey all households in the village and achieved a response rate of 87%. The results of the survey strongly supported the retention of the settlement boundary and the ability to allow some development in the village through the Development Policy C status.

Okeford Fitzpaine was suggested for Development Policy C status based primarily on the potential on an employment site. The road links with Blandford and Sturminster Newton, and the educational and community facilities were suggested as making it appropriate to have Development Policy C status.

One response suggested that should Hinton St.Mary have Development Policy C status that the resposdee may be able to facilitate the use of land for a permanent footpath and cycleway between Hinton St.Mary and Sturminster Newton.

Concern was raised about a blanket policy of no new houses in small villages as a risk of declining populations insufficient to support core services such as public transport and that villages should be protected from unsuitable development which ruins their inherent character. Concern was also raised that no development would lead to fossilisation of smaller villages as the population would be insufficient to support any community life and would result in sterile dormitories.

#### Option 1e

Of the responses to Issue 1, the following villages were recommended not to have Development Policy C status in response to Option 1e: 2% Ashmore; 2% Belchalwell Street; 2% Bourton; 2% Fontmell Magna; 4% Hazelbury Bryan; 2% Ibberton; 2% Iwerne Minster; 2% Hinton St.Mary; 2% King's Stag; 2% Lydlinch; 2% Mappowder; 2% Milton Abbas; 2% Stoke Wake; 2% Stour Provost; 2% Woolland; 2% Winterborne Clenston; 2% Winterborne Houghton; 2% Winterborne Stickland; 2% Winterborne Whitchurch; and, 2% all villages. 2% recommended that the villages that should not have Development Policy C status should be: villages without settlement boundaries; villages not able to support essential infrastructure and without good and sustainable transport links in main directions; villages with a population smaller than 500 persons or without amenities or employment; villages identified with a facilities ranking of less than 8 in the supporting document; each village should have the opportunity to choose whether to have Development Policy C status; and, 4% recommended that small villages should not have development Policy C status.

General suggestions were that small villages absolutely without facilities, or without a sufficient range of facilities to enable self containment, should not have Development Policy C status. One response suggested that on the perception that the labour force is immobile, development should be restricted to SSCTs which would negate the requirement for Development Policy C settlements. In particular it was suggested that Hazelbury Bryan should not have Development Policy C status due to its unique arrangement of hamlets with insufficient facilities and services between them to support further development, coupled with inadequate transportation routes to other settlements.

It is also welcomed that villages such as King's Stag and Lydlinch have the opportunity to suggest that they should not have Development Policy C status.

Suggestions were made that development linked to local needs, such as affordable housing, employment and facilities, should be considered in settlements without Development Policy C status.

#### Option 1f

In response to Issue1, Option 1f, the following Alternative Options were suggested:

Consider accommodating future growth on brownfield sites only, regardless of location;

A strict moratorium on all greenfield and extra development boundary building until all brownfield and in fill sites have been used;

Affordable housing must be permitted and some economic development to sustain community life in villages or they become 'top-heavy' with old, retired and second homes. Sustainable transport (bus services) should be promoted; Provide a Development Policy D status to villages to allow them to grow organically and by scale of use rather than the principle of the use;

Shaftesbury should not be a Dev Policy B Town. The recent permission on the east side of town and potential job centre to the south of the A30 is quite sufficient for this hillside town – which is badly served by public transport. It is only 5 miles from Gillingham. Brownfield locations which are still available within the town should be used instead. The A350/C13 corridor is inappropriate for more large scale development if sustainability is to be ensured;

If the panel conducting the EIP into the RSS Review suggest that housing numbers in Dorset should be increased, particularly outside the SE Dorset Conurbation, then Blandford should be upgraded to a SSCT.

**Issue 2: Identifying the spatial distribution for development up to 2016  
How could growth over the next 10 years be accommodated  
in a sustainable manner?**

**Options:**

**To focus the requirement to identify land suitable for housing development in the period up to 2016 (in addition to that already identified) should the Council:**

<b>2a</b>	Have a rural emphasis with 65% in Blandford (Forum and St. Mary), Gillingham, and Shaftesbury and 35% in Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton and the larger villages?
<b>2b</b>	Have an urban emphasis with 70% in Blandford (Forum and St. Mary), Gillingham, and Shaftesbury and 30% in Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton and the larger villages?
<b>2c</b>	Have a greater urban emphasis with 75% in Blandford (Forum and St. Mary), Gillingham, and Shaftesbury and 25% in Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton and the larger villages?
<b>2d</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 2	
Total number of responses	45
a Support	9
a Object	2
b Support	8
b Object	3
c Support	9
c Object	1
Alternative Option	Gillingham and Blandford should be Strategically Significant Towns (SSCT); 80% Blandford (Forum and St.Mary), Gillingham and Shaftesbury (with the emphasis on Blandford), and 20% Stalbridge, Sturminster Newton and the larger villages; Community determination through a mandated process; Detailed analysis of each settlement, including land availability and development needs, required; 50% urban and 50% rural; Allow infrastructure to catch up in the Development Policy B towns before accommodating further growth;

	<p>Redevelop previously developed land, wherever it is located;  Development in villages is the only way to help self-containment and sustainability;  Population needs to be constrained:  Two will do, one is fun (family planning incentives to reduce family size).</p>
--	---

Summary of responses:

Option 2a

20% of respondents to Issue 2 supported Option 2a that development pre 2016 should have a rural emphasis and that Blandford (Forum and St.Mary), Gillingham, and Shaftesbury should have 65% and Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton and the larger villages should have 35%. 4% of the respondents to Issue 2 did not support the suggestion in Option 2a.

A rural emphasis was generally supported by suggestion that Stalbridge, Sturminster Newton and the larger villages should be able to accommodate some expansion to create a balance of development across the District. It was suggested that this Option would enable affordable housing to be delivered where needed, and that it would assist in allowing these communities to become more sustainable and prevent a situation of dormitory villages with increased traffic on the surrounding rural road network.

Option 2b

18% of respondents to Issue 2 supported Option 2b that development pre 2016 should have an urban emphasis and that Blandford (Forum and St.Mary), Gillingham, and Shaftesbury should have 70% and Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton and the larger villages should have 30%. 7% of the respondents to Issue 2 did not support the suggestion in Option 2b.

An urban emphasis was generally supported in recognition that the focus on the market towns locations was generally more sustainable. However, caution was expressed not to create a disproportionate imbalance with the villages whereby the lack of supply would increase property values further which would disadvantage local people. A suggestion was made to assess potential landscape impacts of accommodating growth in the rural areas.

Option 2c

20% of respondents to Issue 2 supported Option 2c that development pre 2016 should have a greater urban emphasis and that Blandford (Forum and St.Mary), Gillingham, and Shaftesbury should have 75% and Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton and the larger villages should have 25%. 2% of the respondents to Issue 2 did not support the suggestion in Option 2c.

A greater urban emphasis was generally supported as being in accordance with the sustainable strategy identified by the Regional Spatial Strategy and that this would deliver affordable housing in accordance with the location of greatest need, as identified in the Housing Needs Survey. However, caution

was expressed that there is a risk that the market towns would suffer from lack of infrastructure provision to support the growth and that overdevelopment would be a result.

#### Option 2d

In response to Issue 2, Option 2d, the following Alternative Options were suggested:

Gillingham and Blandford should be Strategically Significant Towns (SSCTs);  
80% Blandford (Forum and St.Mary), Gillingham and Shaftesbury (with the emphasis on Blandford), and 20% Stalbridge, Sturminster Newton and the larger villages;

Community determination through a mandated process;

Detailed analysis of each settlement, including land availability and development needs, required;

50% urban and 50% rural;

Allow infrastructure to catch up in the Development Policy B towns before accommodating further growth;

Redevelop previously developed land, wherever it is located;

Development in villages is the only way to help self-containment and sustainability;

Population needs to be constrained: Two will do, one is fun (family planning incentives to reduce family size).

**Issue 3: Identifying the spatial distribution for development post-2016  
How could longer term growth be accommodated in a sustainable manner?**

**Options:**

**To focus the requirement to identify land suitable for housing development post 2016 should the Council seek to:**

<b>3a</b>	Redevelop brownfield land and regenerate Blandford (Forum and St. Mary), Gillingham, Shaftesbury, Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton and the larger villages?
<b>3b</b>	Expand onto greenfield land beyond the edges of Blandford (Forum and St. Mary), Gillingham, and Shaftesbury within the limit of environmental capacity?
<b>3c</b>	A mixture of Options a & b?
<b>3d</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 3	
Total number of responses	42
a Support	18
a Object	0
b Support	4
b Object	3
c Support	15
c Object	2
Alternative Option	It will be essential to consider in detail the capacity of each of the towns and villages before assessing whether development should go ahead. As determined by local community. The Gillingham option. Brownfield sites should be identified now for housing allocations before considering any residual requirement for greenfield land. Greenfield sites should be spared.

Summary of responses:

Option 3a

43% of respondents to Issue 3 supported Option 3a that the Council should seek to redevelop brownfield land and regenerate Blandford (Forum and St.Mary), Gillingham, Shaftesbury, Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton and the larger villages post 2016.

The general support for Option 3a was recognised as forming part of the sustainability strategy issued as guidance from central Government and the Regional Assembly. To support the hierarchical selection of settlements it was suggested that regeneration of brownfield ahead of greenfield was acceptable, provided that the sites are in sustainable locations and contribute towards self-containment. It was acknowledged that this Option would also assist in protecting the countryside and reduce the risk of landscape impacts. It was suggested that in the pursuit of this Option, urban design principles be adopted so that appropriate form and function enhance the vitality of market towns. However, it was recognised that brownfield sites may take longer to bring forward and that deliverability should remain a key objective. It was also suggested that the Options for Issue 3 be illustrated by maps showing alternative distributions of development up to 2016 and post 2016.

#### Option 3b

10% of respondents to Issue 3 supported Option 3b that the Council should expand onto greenfield land beyond the edges of Blandford (Forum and St.Mary), Gillingham and Shaftesbury, within the limit of environmental capacity, post 2016. 7% of the respondents to Issue 3 did not support the suggestion in Option 3b.

This option was supported as a means to securing greatest community benefits whilst having regard to landscape and nature conservation. However, it was also supported only as a last resort.

#### Option 3c

36% of respondents to Issue 3 supported Option 3c that the Council should seek a mixture of redeveloping brownfield land and regenerate Blandford (Forum and St.Mary), Gillingham, Shaftesbury, Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton and the larger villages, with expanding onto greenfield land beyond the edges of Blandford (Forum and St.Mary), Gillingham and Shaftesbury, within the limit of environmental capacity, post 2016. 5% of the respondents to Issue 3 did not support the suggestion in Option 3c.

The general support for this Option mainly focussed on the requirement for the Council to be able to demonstrate available and deliverable sites, with emphasis on brownfield before greenfield. It was recognised that previously developed land may not be in the most sustainable locations and that a mixture of brownfield and greenfield would be necessary within the District, in line with the settlement strategy identified. It was highlighted that, at a later stage in the production of the LDF, the strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment would identify potential sites for housing.

Although one response supported the 'proposal' for an increased level of growth at Gillingham, due to its perceived low level of constraints and its range of facilities and services, it was also expressed as premature to suggest that Gillingham could accommodate an increased level of growth as this had not been clearly evidenced nor was it identified as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy.

#### Option 3d

In response to Issue 3, Option 3d, the following Alternative Options were suggested:

It will be essential to consider in detail the capacity of each of the towns and villages before assessing whether development should go ahead;  
As determined by local community;  
The Gillingham option;  
Brownfield sites should be identified now for housing allocations before considering any residual requirement for greenfield land;  
Greenfield sites should be spared.

**Issue 4: Accommodating growth without harming the countryside  
The supply and development of previously developed land**

**Options:**

**How should land for development be identified?**

<b>4a</b>	About 50% previously developed land and 50% greenfield in line with the regional target?
<b>4b</b>	About 35% previously developed land and 65% greenfield, which is below the overall regional target, but reflects past performance locally?
<b>4c</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 4	
Total number of responses	43
a Support	17
a Object	0
b Support	7
b Object	2
Alternative Option	<p>It is essential that studies take place in order to ascertain what previously developed land might be available within the plan period, and what capacity exists without harming the landscape;</p> <p>Determined by local community.</p> <p>Only brownfield;</p> <p>Carbon neutral development becomes imperative possibly only greenfield sites can provide capacity for local renewable energy generation. Land with sustainable transport links and its own energy sources that would not damage the countryside and are not liable to flooding;</p> <p>Whenever possible brownfield sites before greenfield sites;</p> <p>The lowest proportion of greenfield land possible;</p> <p>60-70% brownfield and 30-40% greenfield;</p> <p>65% pdl and 35% greenfield.</p> <p>Higher than the 50% suggested;</p> <p>Brownfield should not include development of private gardens;</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be identified</p>

	<p>now for housing allocations before considering any residual requirement for greenfield land;  50% pdl should be made essential not a target to be broken and greenfield should only be developed according to strict need and for affordable housing;  75% brownfield by identifying privately and publicly owned land, and mixed use developments.</p>
--	--

Summary of responses:

Option 4a

40% of respondents to Issue 4 supported Option 4a the recommendation that the target for land for development should be identified as 50% on previously developed land and 50% on greenfield, in line with the regional target. General support for this option was to avoid the environmental impacts of development on greenfield, increasing sustainability, reducing the potential of urban sprawl, and with a re-stated emphasis on the brownfield first approach. One respondent suggested that as the previous target for development on previously developed land was set at a lower level, that it did not indicate the potential of what could be achieved. Whereas, a different response suggested that past performance indicates that a higher level would not be achievable and that focus should be on the maintenance of sustainable development patterns. However, it was remarked upon that the target in Option 4a should only apply as long as the infrastructure could be secured using this approach.

Option 4b

16% of respondents to Issue 4 supported Option 4b the recommendation that the target for land for development should be identified as 35% on previously developed land and 65% on greenfield, reflecting past local performance. 5% of the responses to Issue 4 did not support the suggestion in Option 4b. This option was generally supported as a continuation of past performance on the basis of a perception of the amount of brownfield that would be available in the future. It was suggested that greenfield development would be more likely to bring forward additional facilities and services, although it was highlighted that a comprehensive transport assessment supporting alternative modes of transport would need to be provided regardless of whether the development was on greenfield or brownfield.

Option 4c

In response to Issue 4, Option 4c, the following Alternative Options were suggested:  
It is essential that studies take place in order to ascertain what previously developed land might be available within the plan period, and what capacity exists without harming the landscape;  
Determined by local community.

Only brownfield;  
Carbon neutral development becomes imperative possibly only greenfield sites can provide capacity for local renewable energy generation. Land with sustainable transport links and its own energy sources that would not damage the countryside and are not liable to flooding;  
Whenever possible brownfield sites before greenfield sites;  
The lowest proportion of greenfield land possible;  
60-70% brownfield and 30-40% greenfield;  
65% pdl and 35% greenfield.  
Higher than the 50% suggested;  
Brownfield should not include development of private gardens;  
Brownfield sites should be identified now for housing allocations before considering any residual requirement for greenfield land;  
50% pdl should be made essential not a target to be broken and greenfield should only be developed according to strict need and for affordable housing;  
75% brownfield by identifying privately and publicly owned land, and mixed use developments.

**Issue 5: Growth and Transport****How can poor transport infrastructure and high reliance on private cars be addressed?****Options:****Should green travel plans be required for:**

<b>5a</b>	All development?
<b>5b</b>	Any development that may generate significant volumes of traffic of any kind?
<b>5c</b>	Any development that may give rise to an increase in car-based travel patterns?
<b>5d</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 5	
Total number of responses	40
a Support	7
a Object	2
b Support	23
b Object	0
c Support	6
c Object	2
Alternative Option	<p>Develop at Gillingham to take advantage of existing transport infrastructure;</p> <p>A serious look should be taken at providing cycleways which do not depend on road routes – such as the Trailway. Independent cycleways on the continent are heavily used by cycling commuters;</p> <p>Important that all potential routes, e.g. old railway lines, are kept open to accommodate alternative travel;</p> <p>Through frequent bus service route A350 and A37(!) from Gillingham and Stalbridge to Dorchester with park and ride in villages will have feed in from other areas and settlements;</p> <p>Extensive free and cheap car parking at public transport nodes and connection points to limit personal car journeys to rural areas;</p> <p>Include rickshaws;</p> <p>Employers to provide transport.</p>

Summary of responses:

#### Option 5a

17% of respondents to Issue 5 supported Option 5a that green travel plans should be required for all development. 5% of the responses to Issue 5 did not support the suggestion in Option 5a.

A response suggested that this Option could assist in discouraging long distance commuting by private car. Another response suggested that the North Dorset Trailway should have a higher priority to complete in order to become a viable option for green travel plans.

#### Option 5b

57% of respondents to Issue 5 supported Option 5b that green travel plans should be required for any development that may generate significant volumes of traffic of any kind.

The general support for this Option was to specify a threshold for larger sized developments that generate a significant volume of traffic as it was considered uneconomical and ineffective to apply to small developments with low levels of traffic generation. It was also suggested that 'significant volumes' should be defined and that meaningful measures with quantitative targets and monitoring requirements should be stated and that the resource impacts for the LPA be recognised.

It was highlighted that the settlement strategy would encourage sustainable travel patterns and that the green travel plans could manage all forms of travel in an integrated way and would assist a modal shift.

#### Option 5c

15% of respondents to Issue 5 supported Option 5c that green travel plans should be required for any development that may give rise to an increase in car-based travel. 5% of the responses to Issue 5 did not support the suggestion in Option 5c.

A response suggested that there is a clear link between this Option and improving the public transport provision within the District, although it was queried how this solution could be contributed to by private companies. It was also suggested that new developments should be located close to primary and strategic road networks to reduce the potential of travel on less sustainable roads.

#### Option 5d

In response to Issue 5, Option 5d, the following Alternative Options were suggested:

Develop at Gillingham to take advantage of existing transport infrastructure;  
A serious look should be taken at providing cycleways which do not depend on road routes – such as the Trailway. Independent cycleways on the continent are heavily used by cycling commuters;  
Important that all potential routes, e.g. old railway lines, are kept open to accommodate alternative travel;

Through frequent bus service route A350 and A37(!) from Gillingham and Stalbridge to Dorchester with park and ride in villages will have feed in from other areas and settlements;

Extensive free and cheap car parking at public transport nodes and connection points to limit personal car journeys to rural areas;

Include rickshaws;

Employers to provide transport.

**Issue 6: Investment and planning obligations**

**How to fund affordable housing, community facilities and transport to be able to implement the District's housing strategy**

**Options:**

**How can investment be secured:**

<b>6a</b>	Rely on public funding?
<b>6b</b>	Maximise funding from development including negotiating for a wider range of infrastructure than takes place currently?
<b>6c</b>	A combination of both as well as searching for more innovative opportunities from other funding sources?
<b>6d</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 6	
Total number of responses	40
a Support	1
a Object	1
b Support	5
b Object	1
c Support	29
c Object	1
Alternative Option	Run a local lottery; Interest rates and Council Tax; Community Land Trusts; PFI Schemes for affordable housing; Low carbon or biodiesel (not from rainforest destruction) community transport part funded by local taxation;

Summary of responses:

Option 6a

2% of respondents to Issue 6 supported Option 6a that investment for infrastructure should be secured through public funding. 2% of the responses to Issue 6 did not support the suggestion in Option 6a.

The general response to support this option suggested that land supply is jeopardised because of decreased profitability through planning obligations, therefore investment should come from public funding.

### Option 6b

12% of respondents to Issue 6 supported Option 6b to maximise funding from development including negotiating for a wider range of infrastructure than takes place currently. 2% of the responses to Issue 6 did not support the suggestion in Option 6b.

It was suggested that the Highways Agency is unable to obtain funding and would therefore seek that any improvements to the strategic road network are funded wholly by the developer. It was suggested that the range of infrastructure should include halls and shops located on estates and new leisure activities, and that this should be supported by a Supplementary Planning Document setting out what achievements are expected from S106 agreements.

### Option 6c

72% of respondents to Issue 6 supported Option 6c a combination of both Options 6a&b as well as searching for more innovative opportunities from other funding sources. 2% of the responses to Issue 6 did not support the suggestion in Option 6c.

General support for this Option recognised that solely relying on public or developer funding would not maximise the opportunities available and that a combined approach, as well as seeking more innovative opportunities, would secure the most benefit for the community. It was highlighted that securing a particular planning gain with significant corporate priority would reduce the range of contributions that could be provided, and that Circular 05/05 must be adhered to in expecting planning gain to be relevant and reasonable. It was suggested that, in the absence of Planning Gain Supplement support from central Government, an extension of the planning obligations for the provision of community infrastructure policy would be welcomed.

Identification of local infrastructure needs through Parishes and Partnerships was suggested and that Option 6c may reduce the risk of adopting fall back position of claiming insufficient funding.

### Option 6d

In response to Issue 6, Option 6d, the following Alternative Options were suggested:

Run a local lottery;

Interest rates and Council Tax;

Community Land Trusts;

PFI Schemes for affordable housing;

Low carbon or bio-diesel (not from rainforest destruction) community transport part funded by local taxation.

## Issue 7: Climate change and renewable energy

### Options:

To reduce the contribution to and effects of climate change and to promote renewable energy, should we:

<b>7a</b>	Seek to secure development that reaches best practice standards, such as BREEAM 'very good' or 'excellent', which are higher than the current statutory targets?
<b>7b</b>	Seek the provision of micro-renewable schemes (for example domestic wind turbines on new houses) as part of development proposals?
<b>7c</b>	Identify opportunities for renewable energy schemes?
<b>7d</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 7	
Total number of responses	38
a Support	24
a Object	0
b Support	17
b Object	1
c Support	19
c Object	0
Alternative Option	10

### Summary of responses:

The options for issue 7 are not mutually exclusive. 12 out of the 38 respondents have agreed with 3 or more of the options. Half of the respondents have added comments, some of them quite lengthy.

#### Option 7a

A majority of respondents supported this option although one respondent did acknowledge that it may be sensible to await national standards. The point was made that English standards are lower than many across Europe. It was also recommended that standards should apply to extensions. The effect that renewable energy installations could have on traditional house design was raised as a concern.

#### Option 7b

Micro renewable technology should be designed in at an early stage. Otherwise, similar comments to those made on BREEAM standards were made.

#### Option 7c

Half of respondents supported this option, but several qualified their support, for example by stating that medium height community wind turbines are preferable and one respondent clearly stated that large wind turbines are not supported. Biomass schemes were specifically supported by one respondent.

#### Option 7d

There were several alternative options put forward. Most of these supported the ideas contained in the other options but felt that the issue should be addressed through using building regulations, government guidance, emerging RSS policy or measuring CO<sub>2</sub> reduction instead of the percentage of renewable energy achieved. Only one implied that the other options were not supported at all, and that climate change could be mitigated purely by restricting car use. One other stated that the other options may be detrimental on design grounds and that the issue should therefore be addressed on a case by case basis through the Design and Access Statement.

#### General Comments

Other points were raised including: the need for rainwater collection and biodegrading systems; not building on flood plains; and, the opportunity for building local technical excellence through the use of the new renewable energy technologies. One respondent to Issue 9, although may be better represented under Issue 7, has suggested that communities consider the “Transition Town Initiative” which aims to reduce energy use.

## 4.0 Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Built Environment

<b>Issue 8: The need to protect the environment</b> <b>Protecting important environmental assets and resources</b>
---

**Options:**

**Should the Council seek to conserve the environment:**

<b>8a</b>	By focusing primarily on the protection of designated sites?
<b>8b</b>	By taking a wider view of environmental protection?
<b>8c</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option.

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 8	
Total number of responses	38
a Support	9
a Object	2
b Support	28
b Object	2
Alternative Option	6

Summary of responses:

17 respondents added a comment to their preferred option. The responses reflect the points already raised in the I&AO document, with a majority favouring a wider approach to environmental protection than that offered purely by statutory designations.

Option 8a

One respondent stated that these should be only the “statutory” designations, but one other specifically referred to including the “local” list of historic gardens.

Option 8b

Comments supporting this option included widening protection to include “enhancement” in accordance with government policy. Further comments on climate change, landscape character assessment and biodiversity covered a wide range of other factors that need to be considered, including: reference to the South West Nature Map; and, there should be no net loss to biodiversity as a result of development. The comment that development has the potential to contribute to biodiversity widens the range still further. Existing specialised and community research and audits were also referred to as contributing to the Council’s evidence base.

### Option 8c

2 of the 6 responses concentrated on establishing working partnerships to manage non designated areas of land using a carrot rather than a stick approach. 2 others pointed out that designated areas may, on balance, be more sustainable locations for development but recognised that a rigorous examination in line with PPS7 would need to be undertaken.

**Issue 9: Impact of growth on the environment**  
**Reconciling the need for growth with environmental protection**

**Options:**

**To balance growth with protecting and enhancing the environment, should we:**

<b>9a</b>	Prioritise the protection of environmental assets and resources above the development needs of the local community?
<b>9b</b>	Seek to protect environmental assets and resources, where possible when meeting the development needs of the local community?
<b>9c</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option.

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 9	
Total number of responses	38
a Support	15
a Object	1
b Support	18
b Object	2
Alternative Option	5

Summary of responses:

There was more or less equal support for options 9a and 9b. The comment of one respondent who chose option (a) was more in line with option (b). Half of the 38 respondents added comments.

Option 9a

Several respondents make the point that the Council is obliged to prioritise the protection of the environment in line with government and European legislation and that this is not therefore a true option. Extra information on biodiversity is also highlighted. Notwithstanding the choice of this option, one respondent suggests that there is still scope for attracting suitable employment for existing residents and raises the issue that it is only the more wealthy who can afford to live in the better locations (i.e. away from traffic).

Option 9b

Slightly more respondents chose this option. Comments emphasised that need should be identified locally and that some development would be required to help communities thrive, especially where settlements bordered the AONB. Mitigation measures and strict criteria however should be applied.

Option 9c

An alternative as set out in PPS7 paragraph 15 - a hierarchical approach depending on status of assets - was suggested by 2 respondents - and others also suggested slightly different wording which reflected a similar approach.

#### General Comments

In addition to the above a number of other issues relating to the environment were suggested and the Environment Agency web site is suggested for further guidance.

**Issue 10: The protection and promotion of green infrastructure  
Green infrastructure's provision, management and  
maintenance**

**Options:**

**To meet the community's need for multi-functional green infrastructure:**

<b>10a</b>	Is the Council's current approach to providing 'green space' adequate?
<b>10b</b>	Is there a need for a more integrated approach to the planning, delivery and maintenance of 'green infrastructure'?
<b>10c</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option.

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 10	
Total number of responses	34
a Support	3
a Object	5
b Support	25 + 1 implied
b Object	1
Alternative Option	1 + 4 implied

Summary of responses:

There was much stronger support for option 10b. Half of the 34 respondents added a further comment

Option 10a

Only 2 respondents were happy with the Council's current approach although 1 other felt that it was appropriate on smaller, non greenfield sites where contributions could be collected for district wide facilities but that b was preferable for larger greenfield sites.

Option 10b

The majority chose this option with a number emphasising that the Council's current approach is not adequate. The need to use open space to boost biodiversity / wildlife and maximise environmental / social benefits was highlighted. There was also an emphasis on using community input and research rather than relying on "experts".

Option 10c

Although only one respondent stated option 10c there were other alternatives suggested. The small size of garden on modern estates was raised as an issue which should be addressed by more trees, wider greener paths and larger play areas in the layout. The options were felt by one respondent to be too urban focussed and another felt that the Open Spaces study should be used and linked to developer contributions.

Overall, the responses indicate that the Core Strategy offers an opportunity to promote a more integrated approach to greenspace policy in the District.

## 5.0 Economic Prosperity

### Issue 11: Location for new employment sites

The Council will need to allocate further employment land to keep pace with any new housing / population growth and to promote economic prosperity

#### Option:

#### To identify sufficient land suitable for development for employment use

11a	Should new employment sites only be designated within or adjacent to the three main towns of Blandford (Forum and St. Mary), Gillingham and Shaftesbury as these towns have the benefit of better access and facilities as well as allowing greater opportunity for people to live and work in the same place?
11b	Should existing employment sites (those identified in the current Local Plan which includes sites in smaller settlements) be extended where appropriate, to meet the employment land requirement?
11c	Identify other sustainable sites for employment use, such as in the larger villages or well located to transport routes.
11d	Suggest an Alternative Option

Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options	
Summary of Responses to Issue 11	
Total number of responses	38
a Support	13
a Object	3
b Support	19
b Object	2
c Support	19
c Object	1
Alternative Option	4

Summary of responses:

#### Option 11a

One respondent viewed that option 11a was too prescriptive, while other respondents viewed that this strategy should be employed as far as possible. One respondent viewed that all large employment sites should be close to heavily populated areas with small-scale workshops acceptable elsewhere, giving the example of the conversion of existing rural buildings. A specific response supported this option, particularly in increasing the supply of employment land in the Blandford area where it is stated that there is a current shortage of available land or premises, which is not being met by available employment land elsewhere in the District, particularly around Gillingham. Another respondent identifies that Shaftesbury does not have good access, but agrees that job and housing locations should be balanced. A number of responses supported this option as the most sustainable option

due to the towns' current role within the District, as well as relatively good accessibility.

#### Option 11b

One respondent agreed with this option only if it meets local needs. A respondent supported this option with the proviso that it should only be implemented when every available site already allocated had been developed, giving the example of the North Dorset Business Park, which it is stated has remained partly undeveloped for 22 years. Two respondents support this option, specifically identifying Blandford as an area where further employment land should be allocated, with one of those identifying Sunrise Business Park where land could be allocated adjacent to the current employment site. One respondent supports this option with the proviso that incoming employers employ local workers except for key staff.

#### Option 11c

One respondent prefers this option as it is seen as more 'opportunistic'. One respondent conditionally supports this option but only in small measure, for example stating that much more sympathetic consideration should be given to applications for 'live-work' units. Another respondent views that small-scale workshops could be acceptable elsewhere for example the conversion of exiting buildings. Support for this option was given by one respondent, with the request that adequate landscaping be required. One respondent views that in order to support the aims of the AONB, rural diversification is a key issue and the identification of suitable sites in large villages is important in helping to ensure the longer term sustainability of the more rural communities.

#### Option 11d

One respondent recommends the creation of a business register in order to direct employers to available sites. One respondent supports the identification of mixed use sites, for example on land adjacent to Sunrise Business Park.

#### Other Comments

One respondent viewed that all of the options could be supported if they were locally determined. A small number of respondents supported a combination of all three options, where they could be adopted as part of a package of proposals. A number of respondents raised concerns over the current shortfall of employment land available within the District and primarily within the Blandford area. One respondent viewed that the best option would be to stop developing in the District and sustain/protect the environment as the primary objective of the Council.

**Issue 12: Promote a diverse local economy**

**Maintain and enhance a diverse and sustainable local economy**

**Option:**

**To encourage growth and diversity of demand for employment, should we**

<b>12a</b>	Allocate new sites for employment without controlling the type of employment uses that will be permitted?
<b>12b</b>	Allocate new sites for particular employment uses where the type of employment use permitted will be strictly controlled?
<b>12c</b>	Allocate new sites for employment where part of the site is specifically allocated for particular employment uses and where its permitted use will be strictly controlled?
<b>12d</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 12	
Total number of responses	36
a Support	5
a Object	6
b Support	15
b Object	1
c Support	5
c Object	3
Alternative Option	2

Summary of responses:

Option 12a

A number of respondents viewed that the Council should not attempt to restrict employment uses on any future employment allocations, stating that it would significantly lessen the opportunities for diverse and varied employment to take place. Some respondents viewed that flexibility was key to providing for employment requirements in the future. However certain respondents viewed that it would be preferred to support control, particularly with 'land hungry' uses. One respondent supported this option conditionally if it sought to protect existing neighbouring amenities and protected viable and vital retail/town centres.

Option 12b

No specific comments were received concerning this option. There was a high level of support for this option, with one respondent specifically objecting to it.

Option 12c

Five respondents specifically supported this option while three objected to it. One respondent objected to this option stating that the control of just part of a site would inevitably lead to conflict, citing the example of NDDC's refuse vehicle servicing depot at Roll's Mill clashing with the two food-handling enterprises already established.

#### Option 12d

Two respondents suggested alternative options. One recommended that heavy and inappropriate manufacturing or land-intensive industries, like storage and warehousing, should not be permitted within the District. One respondent supported greater concentration on farm diversification where suitable, particularly in the larger villages.

#### Other Comments

A number of other comments were made concerning this issue, some of which were not directly related at managing employment types on employment sites, but concerning employment in general. Two respondents viewed that the Council should seek to allocate sites for employment based on the needs and demands of specific areas. One suggested that new sites for development should be allowed in smaller settlements where it will create local employment. Another suggested the setting up of a business register, as mentioned in the response to Issue 11. One highlighted that it is essential for the Council to take into account environmental, social and accessibility constraints when allocating land for employment. One respondent highlighted that different industrial uses have different associated road requirements at differing times of the day, and supported the allocation of land where it reduces the need to travel.

**Issue 13: The retention of existing employment sites**

The creation of a well balanced and appropriate supply of employment land is critical for the economic and social well-being of the District

**Options:****To protect land use identified as viable for employment**

<b>13a</b>	Protect all committed and allocated employment sites?
<b>13b</b>	Protect all committed and allocated sites apart from those three sites listed in the 'Employment Land Review' which after further investigation may be more suitable for mixed use development?
<b>13c</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

**Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options**

## Summary of Responses to Issue 13

Total number of responses	34
a Support	6
a Object	1
b Support	20
b Object	0
Alternative Option	4

## Summary of responses:

There were few specific comments on this issue, with the majority of respondents listing their preference without any detailed explanation.

Option 13a

There was only one specific comment concerning this option, while there was general support for this option made by six respondents. One respondent objected to this option as being too inflexible.

Option 13b

One respondent supported this option with reservations. Another respondent supported this option with a caveat stating that should it be established that demand in the future for particular sites is unlikely, consideration to at least mixed use should be made. One respondent gave firm support for the proposal as set out in the Employment Land Review that the Blandford brewery site is reconsidered as a mixed use redevelopment site. One respondent supported the retention of the Shaftesbury Lane, Blandford employment site (E/2/6).

Option 13c

One respondent states that workers seeking employment in heavy and inappropriate manufacturing or land-intensive industries, like storage and warehousing, should seek it elsewhere and not in North Dorset. One respondent states that there should be flexibility to allow different

development, including mixed use, community facilities, care and nursing homes. Another respondent suggested that all options should be reconsidered for low-carbon lifestyles.

#### Other Comments

One respondent commented that whether or not existing employment sites should be retained is a matter of objective and professional judgement, continuing that some existing employment sites are badly located and will be better re-developed for other purposes, however, many are entirely satisfactory and should be retained. Another respondent stated that both Options 13a and 13b are fine in principle, but there should be some flexibility, stating if land has been left for a long period consideration should be given to some other desirable form of development e.g. residential with a large element of affordable housing.

**Issue 14: Retailing**

**Town centres and villages with a Local Centre need to be supported and improved in order to promote their role and function**

**Out of town retailing is often detrimental to the viability of town centres**

**Options:**

**To enable retail centres to thrive, should we**

<b>14a</b>	Retain the current retail hierarchy, supporting the towns of Blandford (Forum and St. Mary), Gillingham, Shaftesbury and Sturminster Newton as Primary Retail Centres, and support Marnhull and Stalbridge as Local Retail Centres?
<b>14b</b>	Identify other settlements which may act as Local Retail Centres?
<b>14c</b>	Reassess primary and secondary shopping designations as a result of the recommendations of the forthcoming retail study?
<b>14d</b>	Formalise town centre designations following the recommendations of the forthcoming retail study in order to promote the 'town centres first' approach?
<b>14e</b>	Allocate suitable sites for retail or mixed use development to meet, in particular, identified retail needs in the main towns?
<b>14f</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 14	
Total number of responses	34
a Support	18
a Object	0
b Support	2
b Object	1
c Support	8
c Object	1
d Support	13
d Object	1
e Support	7
e Object	0
Alternative Option	2

Summary of responses:

A number of respondents viewed that they could not make adequate comments until the production of the forthcoming District-wide retail study. This study will be completed by experienced retail consultants, with a draft report produced before the end of 2007 with a final report completed by early 2008.

#### Option 14a

All respondents who commented on this option supported it. One respondent supported this but considered that this needs to be widened to include supporting the village shops in Policy C and D villages in the District; a number of other respondents agreed with greater support for village shops. One respondent stated that the option is broadly supported in pursuing sustainable travel patterns, and that in helping to deliver AONB objectives, the encouragement of the supply and provision of high quality local foods/crafts etc. should be supported. One respondent viewed that consideration for Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton should also be made and land potentially allocated for retail in the future. Another respondent supported the option but would welcome the Council's support of village shops and services and in particular the role that can be played by farm shops providing suitable facilities in remote areas.

#### Option 14b

Only two respondents supported this option. One respondent viewed that consideration of new retail centres should only be made after the reassessment of primary and secondary shopping frontages and retail needs in the current retail centres.

#### Option 14c

Support for this option was shown that primary and secondary shopping designations should be re-assessed following the outcome of the forthcoming retail study.

#### Option 14d

13 respondents supported this option, with one objecting to it. One respondent stated that additional development as proposed in this option should be pursued in all local centres and primary retail centres identified to date. One respondent commented that it is not merely the number of shops but also the range and quality that are important, stating that Gillingham has a Waitrose within walking distance of the town centre, while Blandford only has a smaller store which seriously reduces its utility as a shopping centre.

#### Option 14e

All respondents who commented on this option supported it. One respondent supports the option as long as it's not at the expense of smaller villages i.e. compete with existing village retailing.

#### Option 14f

There were two comments suggesting alternative options. One respondent suggested that the Council should offer community entertainment e.g. plays, sport, group projects instead of more retail. One respondent commented that the Council ought to consider the provision of additional retail/service units in villages which would assist in promoting sustainable communities.

#### Other Comments

One respondent commented that all retailing options should be judged on their merits and in order to provide retailing opportunities that would be used by the majority of the public, adequate access, parking and other facilities are necessary, continuing that it may well be that out of town retailers will need to be considered favourably. One respondent viewed that it will be the market that decides rather than planning policies. Another respondent viewed that it was difficult to comment without the retail study, but that the question of the physical capacity of the town centres to accommodate development is an issue that the Council will need to have regard to. One respondent welcomed the identification for the need to provide appropriate retail facilities in smaller settlements within which to support local needs, contributing to the self-containment of settlements and reducing the need to travel. The respondent continued that it supports the provision of mixed use development in order to create viable town and local centres where the need to travel is minimised, while it would not support a level of retail growth that would create a new 'destination' encouraging trips from further afield.

**Issue 15: Promoting a higher skilled residential employment base**  
**Skills and employment opportunities are inherently linked. Improving the skills base is likely to attract higher skilled employment growth within North Dorset, increasing average wage levels.**

**Option:**

**To increase the opportunity to raise skills levels, should we:**

<b>15a</b>	Introduce the requirement for a planning obligation to be made on all development in the District that will contribute towards a fund to develop employee's skills levels within the District?
<b>15b</b>	Set a threshold above which developer contributions have to be made towards developing employee's skills levels within the District?
<b>15c</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 15	
Total number of responses	33
a Support	9
a Object	8
b Support	1
b Object	9
Alternative Option	3

Summary of responses:

Option 15a

A relatively large number of respondents objected to this and Option 15b on the basis that any requirement for developer contributions would be too prescriptive and unworkable. One respondent commented that they would not be confident that a fund would be correctly spent, illustrating the recent 'Train to Gain' programme, which the respondent stated had been poorly supported by employers. Another commented that it would be very difficult for the Council to enforce, while another viewed that skills training would be better addressed through education and training programmes funded by central government, local authorities and employers, without recourse to planning gain contributions. One respondent stated that it should be up to employers to finance skills and not new development, which should collect contributions towards community, infrastructure and other worthy projects. Finally, one respondent stated that raising skills levels is not a planning matter and that the Council does not have the skills to undertake such a task. A number of respondents supported this option, however none made specific comments.

Option 15b

Apart from objections to both Options 15a and 15b a small number of respondents commented specifically on this Option. One respondent

supported this option, stating that this option makes more stringent demands on employers to improve skills levels for their workforce, although the respondent comments that it would be unlikely to be enforced. Another respondent specifically supported this option as it would be more likely to be implemented.

#### Option 15c

There were three alternative options suggested. One respondent suggested that the Council should encourage interested employers of a high calibre to foster a learning environment, another suggested that skills growth should be encouraged at a local level, while another suggested that the Council should be more proactive in promoting the qualities of the District for employment.

**Issue 16: Homeworking**

Homeworking is seen as an attractive option for an increasing number of people, placing a greater demand for both normal housing and live/work units. Homeworking can lead to both positive and negative outcomes.

**Option:**

**To promote sustainable working patterns, should we:**

<b>16a</b>	Specifically promote homeworking through the greater emphasis on live/work units?
<b>16b</b>	Develop housing/employment policies in the LDF to allow homeworking where this is acceptable?
<b>16c</b>	Not specifically promote homeworking as it may lead to negative impacts particularly concerning the affordability of housing in the more rural areas
<b>16d</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 16	
Total number of responses	36
a Support	9
a Object	0
b Support	21
b Object	0
c Support	3
c Object	0
Alternative Option	2

Summary of responses:

Option 16a

Nine respondents supported this option while none objected to it. One respondent commented that the promotion of homeworking would reduce some of the negative pressure on development in the larger towns and villages by re-targeting some of the unit numbers to the rural areas. The respondent continues that there are a number of rural buildings which are capable of conversion to residential accommodation for this purpose and which would be sustainable if restricted to such a use.

Option 16b

There was a high level of support for this option, with no respondents objecting. One respondent stated that they support the option, however they identify that live/work units have not always been successful in the past and that it would be wrong to impose the provision of such units in a development scheme. Another respondent commented that flexible housing policies should allow developers to respond to local market demand for the provision of

live/work units, however, the respondent states that there should be no specific change to the settlement strategy as people working from home still need to access a range of shops and community facilities that are best provided in the main towns.

#### Option 16c

Two respondents suggested an alternative option to those presented in the Issues & Options consultation paper. One respondent suggested that the Council should encourage local employers to allow employees, particularly returning mothers, to work from home one or two days a week. Another respondent suggests a mix of the two options suggested, with the LDF supporting homeworking with a greater emphasis on local employment units and the development of housing policies to allow working in suitable locations.

#### Other Comments

One respondent commented that homeworking should be supported in all settlements and with the re-use of rural buildings that are appropriate for such live/work purposes. Another respondent stated that homeworking is the future for highly skilled, highly paid non-manual work and a major opportunity for areas like North Dorset, which can offer unspoiled, idyllic conditions to people who can work anywhere in the country. The respondent continues that the concern about ill-effects on the housing market is a nonsense as the type of property desired is already out of the reach of ordinary local people. One respondent states that the issue of homeworking seems to be a relatively small matter and is not of sufficient scale or importance to be included in the Council's Core Strategy. Finally a respondent commented that homeworking and the concept of live/work units should be supported as they minimise the need to travel, particularly in more rural areas.

**Issue 17: Tourism**

**The District has the potential to promote high-quality tourism accommodation and attractions**

**Option:**

**To meet the demand for high quality tourism should we:**

<b>17a</b>	Support proposals to increase the quality of the tourism available, promoting investment in existing attractions and destinations?
<b>17b</b>	Promote more sustainable forms of tourism, for example: improving accessibility and reducing the need to travel; retaining visitor spending in the local economy; promoting the sourcing of materials locally; and, meeting the training needs of potential employees?
<b>17c</b>	Promote the retention of quality accommodation to support North Dorset as a quality tourism destination?
<b>17d</b>	Promote new tourism development where there is evidence that this can be appropriately accommodated, based on realistic, and well evidenced, measures of demand in the most locally accessible locations?
<b>17e</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 17	
Total number of responses	35
a Support	13
a Object	1
b Support	21
b Object	0
c Support	16
c Object	0
d Support	19
d Object	0
Alternative Option	0

Summary of responses:

A number of respondents supported a number of the options presented for increasing the provision of suitable, appropriate and sustainable forms of tourism. A number of respondents viewed that North Dorset is a major attraction for the tourist industry given the quality of its countryside.

Option 17a

Apart from the high level of support for this option one respondent objected, stating that this option would be likely to lead to “tacky glitter development” and should not be supported by the Council.

Option 17b

This option had the largest support with no respondents objecting to it. One respondent states that as sustainability is the main concern of the Issues & Options paper, so promoting tourism that reduces the need to travel by car, and which promoted walking, cycling, riding and similar green types of tourism is the obvious direction in which the Council should be heading towards. Another respondent states that this option supports more sustainable forms of tourism that reduces the need to travel by improving accessibility and sourcing local materials.

#### Option 17c

This option also received a high level of support. One respondent states that this option recognises the importance of the environmental benefits that attract tourism, which is supported.

#### Option 17d

While supporting this option, one respondent suggests that the word 'quality' should be omitted from any policy concerning accommodation, stating for example that caravan sites allow people to stay longer in a locality, spending more in North Dorset, than people staying overnight in hotels or lodges.

#### Other Comments

One respondent identifies that tourism should be promoted through relevant policies and farm diversification and the expansion of existing small-scale tourism B&B facilities should be encouraged. Another respondent views tourism as a tricky subject, as although it brings money into the local economy, it also increases the desire for visitors to relocate, increasing pressure on the housing stock and affordability. The respondent's conclusion is not in favour of following money as the means of measuring success. One respondent views that while tourism is clearly important, they view that it is likely to be small in an inland area like North Dorset, and therefore should be a subsidiary issue rather than a core one. A respondent identifies that the draft Regional Spatial Strategy and the Regional Tourism Strategy call for sustainable tourism, and this was also supported in the draft replacement Structure Plan. Another respondent viewed that the Council should not let 'perceived' economic gains from higher levels of development overshadow and harm the natural and built assets of North Dorset.

**Issue 18: Re-use of Buildings in the Countryside and Farm Diversification**

**In order to promote viable communities and to support agriculture, certain economic development in the countryside may be acceptable, managed primarily by local and regional planning policies.**

**Option:**

**To enable sustainable re-use of buildings and rural diversification, should we:**

<b>18a</b>	Promote the re-use of buildings for specific uses (e.g. tourism, business use) that will diversify the rural economy?
<b>18b</b>	Develop farm diversification policies to support farming enterprises, where this is acceptable in other respects?
<b>18c</b>	Set out criteria to ensure a balance between promoting a diverse and healthy rural economy and other objectives including the protection and promotion of the countryside?
<b>18d</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 18	
Total number of responses	36
a Support	13
a Object	1
b Support	12
b Object	0
c Support	21
c Object	0
Alternative Option	0

Summary of responses:

Many of the respondents supported all the options presented, while a number commented specifically on one or more options.

Option 18a

36% of respondents to Issue 18 supported this option, while one objected to it. One respondent states that it is important to re-introduce the promotion of re-use of buildings in the countryside for specific uses, as housing growth and the associated economic growth is re-focused towards the larger towns and villages. The respondent continues that these buildings provide a lifeline for the rural areas and smaller villages to sustain their smaller economies, concluding re-use for live/work units, tourism and business use should all be considered where appropriate. One respondent supported Options 18a and 18b where that would promote equestrian related developments. One respondent commented that any future policy should also include the option of

residential development. A respondent stated that Option 18a is out of date in relation to PPS7 which allows for residential conversion of rural buildings where appropriate, and following the findings of a number of Planning Inspectors, who have concluded that residential use of barns can be more sustainable than employment use. However, the respondent does view that employment and tourist uses can be the most appropriate option in some instances.

#### Option 18b

This option received a high level of general support with no objections. One respondent commented specifically on this option, stating that in general they support the supportive text to this issue, strongly welcoming the emphasis to consider appropriate development in the countryside in terms of its scale and impact rather than an exhaustive list of typical rural developments. However, the respondent states that there is no such thing as a typical form of rural development and most forms of development could be accommodated without any harm. The respondent continues that they broadly support Option 18b, and that Option 18c could be amalgamated into this to ensure that a balance between promoting the rural economy and other objectives is achieved.

#### Option 18c

This option gained the highest level of support, with no objections to it. One respondent stated that they would like the Council to explore re-use of existing buildings for affordable housing to meet local needs, with these sites being classed as exception sites. Another respondent commented that out of town retail outlets should be discouraged. One respondent commented that the re-use of existing buildings and farm diversification are a positive opportunity and would support this option. The respondent continues that retaining workers in local communities and reducing their need to travel to work through the re-use of existing rural buildings would be beneficial to both local communities and the overall objectives of sustaining a living and working in the countryside.

#### Other Comments

A number of respondents commented on this issue in general terms. One respondent stated that PPS7 supports the re-use of rural buildings, however states that NDDC has not been as supportive as it could have been in encouraging the re-use of rural buildings and farm diversification. The respondent continues that if the agricultural industry is to go further into decline, it will be necessary for suitable viable uses to be provided to assist the rural economy and sustain local services and facilities. Another respondent commented that PPS7 deals with Sustainable Development in Rural Areas very well, continuing that any District objectives should not just be aimed at supporting farming enterprises but should support the wider rural economy, and the Council should support re-use where this is acceptable in other respects. One respondent states that there is an ideal opportunity for the re-use of farm buildings for mixed use, with some for business/tourist related activities with some housing available to let. The respondent continues that the holiday let market is oversupplied and there is a shortage of

reasonably priced rented accommodation. One respondent comments that all of the options presented are relevant but that in recent years many equestrian enterprises have been allowed which change the landscape and character of the area for the worse.

## 6.0 Balanced Communities

### Issue 19: Affordable housing and house sizes

High house prices and low income levels mean that houses are not affordable and the size of properties built does not match need

#### Options:

To meet the needs of the community for increased levels of affordable housing and choice of tenure, should we:

19a	Negotiate for a higher proportion of affordable housing than in the past, based on the needs of the District?
19b	Negotiate affordable housing on smaller sites than previously?
19c	Negotiate for a financial contribution on the smallest sites, including proposals for sites of one dwelling?
19d	Require a mix of housing in terms of size and type to meet known local needs plus one of the above?
19e	Should rural exception sites be allowed only in the larger villages which have a range of facilities?
19f	Should rural exception sites be allowed adjacent to <i>or</i> within the smaller villages?
19g	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 19	
Total number of responses	47
a Support	21
a Object	2
b Support	17
b Object	3
c Support	13
c Object	4
d Support	18
d Object	3
e Support	18
e Object	4
f Support	18
f Object	3
Alternative Option	4

Summary of responses:

There was support for all Options 19a to 19f. The number of objections was low.

#### Option 19a

One response stated that the proportion should be at least 30% of all development and another suggested 35%. Another proposed targets up to 40% but stated that this figure must be underpinned by a Housing Market Assessment and viability assessment in line with PPS3. A further respondent said that higher targets should not be adopted without examining the individual site and taking into consideration the difference in economies of developing greenfield and brownfield sites. Two respondents felt that larger greenfield sites offer the greatest percentage for delivering affordable housing. One person stated that a higher proportion could be negotiated based on need but it depends on other contributions required and economic viability. Another supported the view that the higher proportion should only be relevant in areas of greatest need.

#### Option 19b

Thresholds could be set as low as 10 in Gillingham, Shaftesbury, Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton and as low as 2 in rural areas and smaller settlements, if justification can be demonstrated through the HMA and feasibility assessment. Higher thresholds for brownfield sites will affect the economics of developing the sites and therefore should apply to greenfield sites only. Another felt that this should only apply to greenfield sites. Lower thresholds are required or a per dwelling contribution. One person stated that 50% of all dwellings should be one or two bedroomed.

#### Option 19c

The comment was made by one respondent that contributions taken from smaller sites could be used on larger sites to underpin their viability. Another respondent stated that they supported off site contributions but only from sites of one dwelling. They felt that off site provision is difficult due to problems over land identification and acquisition.

#### Option 19d

One response indicated that there should be a mix of housing required but that Options 19a, 19b and 19c should not be linked to this. There were 3 responses supporting linking Option 19d with 19a and one with 19c and one which did not want this option linked with any other. Another response recommended that 50% of all sites should be 1 or 2 bed properties. One person felt that the mix would depend on the site and the character of the area.

#### Option 19e and 19f

The comments on exception sites applied to both 19e and 19f. Concern was expressed that if villages do not grow, service provision will not be attracted and the question was asked as to how small villages become sustainable without growth. One respondent suggested that only villages with a range of facilities should have exception sites whilst two others felt that exceptions sites should be related to need not village size. Another wished exception

sites to be allowed as long as they did not encourage excess traffic. Concern was raised in one response that exception sites need to be allowed or the countryside will not be inclusive. One respondent stated that affordable housing should only be considered in the smallest villages in extraordinary circumstances as these villages do not have the infrastructure to support expansion and another objected to f as small villages do not have facilities.

#### Option 19g

One response indicated that the Council should look for innovative ways of providing affordable housing, working with developers and housing trusts. Two others said that the planning system is best able to deliver affordable housing on large allocated greenfield sites. Another said need should be assessed.

#### General Comments

One respondent said that documents should make it clear that there is a need for social rented and intermediate affordable housing and policies are needed on the size and type of dwellings, as required by PPS3. Another said that policy will be framed by national and regional policy, a Housing Market Assessment, a housing needs survey and understanding of site viability. A view was expressed that building houses for sale does not decrease house prices. People in the south-east will always have more money than those in Dorset.

**Issue 20: Meeting the needs of all groups in society**

**There is a shortage of pitches for gypsies and travellers**

**Options:**

**To identify sufficient land suitable for Gypsy and Traveller pitches**

<b>20a</b>	Should sites for gypsies and travellers be found in and around the towns where access to facilities is easier?
<b>20b</b>	Should sites be found in and around the villages, if these meet the needs of gypsies and travellers?
<b>20c</b>	Should sites be found around the rural areas?
<b>20d</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 20	
Total number of responses	24
a Support	12
a Object	2
b Support	7
b Object	1
c Support	6
c Object	1
Alternative Option	2

Summary of responses:

Option 20a, 20b, 20c

The majority of support in Issue 20 was shown for Option 20a where it was recognised that the need to identify sites should relate to the sustainability strategy and locate sites near to facilities. However, one respondent supported Option 20b as they believed travelling to be traditionally a rural pursuit. One respondent felt that a mix of Options 20a, 20b and 20c was required, and one respondent supported all of the options. There was little comment provided to qualify choice of each option.

Option 20d

In response to Issue 20, the following Alternative Options were made:

The organisers of the Steam Fair should be responsible for providing a site for the fair visitors;

The advice on requirements from the Police and other emergency services should be sought.

General Comments

The needs of travelling showmen for winter bases to be considered, in line with government advice. These need to be near facilities including schools.

Permanent sites should be located near schools and facilities.  
Transit sites should be near main travel routes.  
A number of small sites should be developed rather than one large one.  
Sites should be left clean.  
Gypsies and travellers should be asked for their views.  
Gypsies and travellers have different needs.  
This requires further debate and consultation.  
The needs of other groups such as black and minority ethnic, migrant workers, older people and disabled people should be included.

**Issue 21: The density of development**

**How can higher density development help to make the best use of land?**

**Options:**

**To accommodate housing development whilst making efficient use of land, should we**

<b>21a</b>	Continue to allow densities at 30 dwellings per hectare (dpha)?
<b>21b</b>	Allow lower densities than 30dpha to protect the character and amenity of areas but define other areas where density can be higher?
<b>21c</b>	Look for Greenfield sites when the housing targets cannot be met by the limited supply of brownfield sites and the introduction of lower densities in some areas?
<b>21d</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 21	
Total number of responses	38
a Support	6
a Object	2
b Support	20
b Object	0
c Support	8
c Object	3
Alternative Option	7

Summary of responses:

A clear majority of respondents supported Option 21b which suggested that some areas could be developed at densities higher and lower than 30 dpha.

Option 21a

No comments were made for Option 21a.

Option 21b

One respondent stated that sites should be developed at the highest compatible density, balanced against site characteristics with another suggesting that whilst higher densities may be appropriate at times, lower densities may be appropriate for others. Another thought that very high densities are not suitable for a rural district and a fourth said that densities less than 30dpha should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances. There was a further suggestion that there is a requirement for family housing with private amenity space which will not occur if high densities are insisted upon.

### Option 21c

There was a mixed response to this issue. One respondent stated that there should be no building on greenfield sites. Another believed that greenfield sites are necessary to deliver family housing as this cannot be delivered on brownfield sites. A third respondent suggested that both greenfield and brownfield sites will need to be provided to ensure continuous delivery. Another raised concerns over town cramming resulting from the high density development of brownfield sites. They felt that greenfield sites would have to be sought rather than compromise the quality of life within towns by allowing poorly designed, high density brownfield development.

### Option 21d

There were 7 suggestions of alternative approaches. One respondent was concerned that there was no mention of the possibility of being able to build a large house in a village, for example a new manor house. Another wished to see the allocation of brownfield sites prior to the development of greenfield allocations which do not have planning permission. The remaining five responses dealt with the introduction of more subtle policies on density. Three suggested allowing higher densities, perhaps of 30 to 50 dpha generally but less where the character and amenity of areas need protecting. One of these stated that this should apply to greenfield and brownfield sites. Another suggested that on greenfield sites lower density development could take place towards the urban fringe and also recommended that the Council carries out a District Wide Character assessment in accordance with PPS3 to identify where higher and lower densities would be appropriate. The final suggestion was that urban extensions could be developed with a range of densities decreasing towards the edge of the development. This type of urban extension could take place in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

**Issue 22: Managing movements from new development**  
**Separation of working and living environments creates the need to travel**

**Options:**

**Do you feel that developments for living and working should be located:**

<b>22a</b>	Together ("mixed use")?
<b>22b</b>	On separate estates?
<b>22c</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 22	
Total number of responses	38
a Support	24
a Object	1
b Support	8
b Object	1
Alternative Option	6

Summary of responses:

A clear majority supported option a.

Option 22a

Two supported the concept of mixed development only if it related to live/work units. A mixed development could be achieved around Sunrise Business Park. It was suggested that mixed use can increase security but may reduce quality of life for residents.

Option 22b

Two respondents recognised there was a need for both types of development depending on the type of employment. A further four respondents echoed this in stating their support for Options 22a and 22b and another suggested this under 22c as an alternative option.

Option 22c

Four respondents accepted that there would need to be some split of uses but that employment and housing should be located near each other and accessible by a choice of modes. One of these suggested that this type of development could take place in larger villages. A further response recommended mixed use in larger developments of over 50 dwellings. One respondent requested that trading estates were required on the edge of towns to keep HGVs out of town centres.

**Issue 23: Environmental Design for Different Transport Modes****Impact from choice of transport can be mitigated partly through design****Options:****Do you think that development designs should:**

<b>23a</b>	Have separate lanes for pedestrians, cyclists, buses and other forms of transport, even if this not particularly efficient in terms of land use and providing effective routes?
<b>23b</b>	Have land-efficient shared space that provides convenient and safe shared routes for movement of all types of transport?
<b>23c</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

**Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options**

## Summary of Responses to Issue 23

Total number of responses	35
a Support	4
a Object	0
b Support	19
b Object	2
Alternative Option	3

## Summary of responses:

Whilst the text stated that this Issue applied to new development, it is clear that some respondents thought it was to be applied to existing roads.

Option 23a

One respondent felt there are not enough buses in the district to warrant bus lanes. Two felt that separate lanes were only required in major towns and a further respondent stated that whilst this option was desirable it was not always achievable especially on existing roads.

Option 23b

A clear number of people supported Option 23b, although two respondents objected to this and others expressed concern. Two respondents believe that shared space is to be encouraged outside of the main towns. One thought there may be a need for specific routes and another that road space should be shared except where short cuts were needed for cyclists and pedestrians. A further respondent said that agricultural vehicles and HGVs sharing country lanes with cyclists and pedestrians was not convenient or safe, however this comment was based on the misconception that the option applied to existing roads as opposed to new development.

23a and b) Six people felt that both options were applicable, depending on the location and route.

Option 23c

It was suggested that cyclists and pedestrians should be separated from motorised traffic to encourage both modes. Another respondent suggested that there should be green routes and separate cycle lanes especially on routes to school. A further comment was made, proposing routes for cyclist and pedestrians within open spaces. The introduction of very slow speeds, 15 to 20 mph was made for built up areas to enable a mix of modes to take place. Another response suggested providing incentives for users. One respondent stated that bus lanes reduce the capacity of roads giving rise to concerns and may cause road safety problems.

## Issue 24: Rural accessibility

### Community ownership of Transport Plans

#### Options:

To help communities be proactive in accessing public and community transport services

<b>24a</b>	Do you feel land should be identified within your village or community that would make a good accessible, perhaps central, location as a main passenger collection point for demand responsive transport?
<b>24b</b>	Do you feel land should be identified within your village or community that would make a good connection route that does not exist at the moment for demand responsive transport to use?
<b>24c</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 24	
Total number of responses	31
a Support	16
a Object	3
b Support	9
b Object	3
Alternative Option	6

Summary of responses:

There was clear support for Option 24a.

#### Option 24a

There was clear support for this option. Two people supported this but said there should still be provision for the elderly and disabled to be picked up from home. Another said sites were required in Hilton and Ansty. A further comment was that sites can be provided in all villages.

#### Option 24b

One respondent said a connection route can be provided for all villages and another requested a safer collection stop at Hilton, with shelters. It was suggested that part of a car park or lay-by could be used. The practicality of this option was questioned for linear villages.

#### Option 24c

Six respondents suggested the following alternatives:

A frequent bus service is needed on the A350 and A37 from Gillingham and Stalbridge to Dorchester with park and rides in villages, fed by the wider area;

Car parking should be made more expensive, then employers would lay on buses which could also carry fare paying passengers, as could school buses if both started and ended journeys in the town centres;

Demand responsive transport is a way of the Council not providing transport.

Need to look at Holland, Belgium and Scandinavia for practical ideas;

Regular buses are needed with well publicised routes and timetables;

Adequate parking is needed at Gillingham station, the line should be double tracked and reasonable fares are required with a regular bus service serving the station;

A railway should provide sustainable transport to local centres;

Better bus services are required;

Public transport could be improved through subsidy and by contributions from development for specific projects;

Bus stations should be provided in towns only with well sited bus stops being in towns and stop on demand elsewhere;

Bus timetables should be more user friendly.

### General Comments

One respondent suggested that people should be encouraged to car share and another supported demand responsive transport. Finally, one respondent was encouraged by the options which would lead to more demand responsive transport for more rural communities.

## 7.0 Quality of Life

### Issue 25: Quality of public spaces and design

How well designed are new developments?

Can design effect an improvement in anti-social behaviour?

#### Options:

To protect our built heritage and encourage high standards of design, should we:

<b>25a</b>	Ensure there are policies which require high standards of design for all development including roads and road management schemes?
<b>25b</b>	Encourage all settlements with settlement boundaries to produce a Design Statement?
<b>25c</b>	Where policies are developed which refer to the regeneration of sites in, or adjacent to, the town centre, should mixed use development be promoted to ensure 24 hour natural surveillance?
<b>25d</b>	Should policies ensuring the implementation of “designing out crime” in all new development be developed to ensure the Council meets its legal requirements?
<b>25e</b>	Should the provision of leisure facilities be encouraged, especially those that appeal to young people, as well as require youth shelters, skate ramps and other facilities in residential development?
<b>25f</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 25	
Total number of responses	32
a Support	27
a Object	1
b Support	20
b Object	1
c Support	19
c Object	0
d Support	20
d Object	0
e Support	19
e Object	0
Alternative Option	0

Summary of responses:

There was support for all options with only two objections. No alternatives were proposed. Three people said all the options should be used where applicable with one of these requesting that in villages they were used in consultation with the community.

#### Option 25a

One person stated that Design Statements are not required in villages which will have no development and questions the need for them in larger ones where the growth will only be 3 to 4 houses a year. Another felt that it was up to the Planning Authority to judge the quality of design and that VDSs are over prescriptive and unnecessary. One respondent stated that high quality design should include eco-development and that existing roads should be improved if necessary, new ones should not be built. A further comment was that high quality design was essential to protect historic buildings and the natural environment.

#### Option 25c

One respondent pointed out that the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires councils to take account of crime and disorder in exercising their responsibilities. All proposals need assessing to ensure they reduce the potential for crime. A well designed high quality public realm will create a sense of place and strengthen community identity, resulting in well used public space which offers fewer opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour. Well designed developments are less likely to experience difficulties in selling.

#### Options 25b, 25d, 25e

No comments were made for selection of these options.

**Issue 26: Moving around without using a car**  
**People rely on cars to make journeys**

**Options:**

**To reduce reliance on unsustainable modes of transport, should we:**

<b>26a</b>	Improve facilities for cyclists and pedestrians in the towns so that community facilities, open space, schools, employment and shopping areas can be accessed more easily?
<b>26b</b>	Locate new facilities of all kinds so that they are within walking and cycling distance of residential areas?
<b>26c</b>	Design new residential areas so that residents and visitors can move around easily without needing to use a car and locate them so they are accessible to facilities and the town centre?
<b>26d</b>	Encourage linking villages near to the towns with footpaths and cycleways including the protection of the old railway line from development to encourage its use as a trailway?
<b>26e</b>	Encourage forms of public transport which allow for people to get to all types of destinations?
<b>26f</b>	Seek contributions from developers for improvements to footpaths and cycleways to link their development with facilities, employment areas and town centres?
<b>26g</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 26	
Total number of responses	36
a Support	20
a Object	0
b Support	17
b Object	1
c Support	19
c Object	0
d Support	19
d Object	0
e Support	22
e Object	0
f Support	19
f Object	0
Alternative Option	4

Summary of responses:

There was a similar amount of support for each option and only one objection.

12 respondents wished to see all options used. One of these stated that after a long period of using cars, it will require a culture change to other forms of transport. If provision is made for walking and cycling safely and car use costs rise, they will be used. Another supported all options to reduce reliance on unsustainable modes of transport and felt that a combination of the proposals would be most effective in tackling car use.

#### Option 26b

One person felt that there should be small shops within housing areas so it was not always necessary to travel to the town centre. Another stated that this option was only possible in the large towns.

#### Option 26d

Two people supported the trailway and wished to see it fully developed. Another believed that purchasing the whole line, now in private ownership would have compensation implications and suggested that other routes were developed instead. He pointed out that the old lines could be used for other transport links.

#### Option 26e

One person believed that this option was over optimistic whilst another wished to see improvements to public transport, saying that two buses a week for some villages was insufficient for those without their own transport. Another respondent wished to see community transport included in this option.

#### Option 26f

One respondent pointed out that contributions must be in line with the government guidance set out in Circular 5/05.

#### Option 26g

The following alternatives were suggested:

Car parking should be made more expensive, then employers would lay on buses which could also carry fare paying passengers, as could school buses if both started and ended journeys in the town centres;

A Rural Transport Strategy needs to be developed to provide rural bus services;

Developing large mixed urban extensions would facilitate the reduction in reliance of cars by providing sufficient development to secure facilities close to where people live, coupled with non car links to existing facilities. This should be considered for Blandford;

Developer contributions should be sought to subsidise transport provision.

#### General Comments

The first was that this subject needs a complete study. One was that all options except d are a wish list until people can live in the district and not commute out. One person raised a concern about cycling and walking on unlit paths. Another stated that the car is important in rural areas. Finally, a respondent asked that the needs of the elderly and disabled should be considered.

**Issue 27: Built Facilities**

**The growth of facilities has not kept pace with the growth of the population and does not meet the needs of the District**

**Options:**

**To enable the provision of facilities in accordance with the community's needs, should we:**

<b>27a</b>	Protect existing community facilities from development for other uses?
<b>27b</b>	Ensure that where policies are developed for regenerating sites within or adjacent to town centre, they are for mixed development which includes sites for community use?
<b>27c</b>	Require developers of large sites to include community facilities where there is a need for them?
<b>27d</b>	Require developers of all sites to contribute to the provision of community facilities on sites allocated in the future as a result of community requirements?
<b>27e</b>	Option 27c or 27d and require facilities to be in place or planned prior to residential development taking place?
<b>27f</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

<b>Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options</b>	
Summary of Responses to Issue 27	
Total number of responses	34
a Support	18
a Object	0
b Support	13
b Object	0
c Support	19
c Object	0
d Support	16
d Object	2
e Support	20
e Object	3
Alternative Option	2

Summary of responses:

There was support for all the options although there were 2 objections to Option 27d and 3 to Option 27e.

Option 27a

Support option but add "unless as part of the process facilities are re-provided elsewhere".

#### Option 27b

No comments were added to the selection of this option.

#### Option27c

One respondent suggests that a new community hall could be built south of Ham Farm as part of other development. Another believes that it should be made clear that the option conforms to Circular 5/05.

#### Option 27d

One of the objectors said they could not support this option unless facilities are identified in advance and there was clear linkage between the development and the facility.

#### Option 27e

One of the objectors to Option 27e felt that this would conflict with PPS3. Another stated it would be inappropriate to require facilities in advance of development. Provision will be in the hands of others. A phased approach to development is needed. Only one supporter of Option 27e stated which of Option 27c and Option 27d they wished to choose. This respondent chose Option 27c.

#### Option 27f

One respondent suggested that facilities should be provided using a combination of public funding, developer contributions and creative opportunities from other sources. The second wished contributions to be sought on the basis of a level charge set as a matter of policy for specifically identified projects.

#### General Comments

One respondent asked for information on current developer contributions to be made available. Another suggested that existing facilities should be improved, using contributions prior to new facilities being built. It was also suggested that the development of large mixed use sustainable urban extensions would facilitate the provision of facilities. Development opportunities which provide critical mass to maximise funding should be provided. Finally, another respondent stated that policies were needed which promoted and protected facilities and the provision of new facilities to meet needs generated by new development. Protection policies are required to prevent the loss of a facility unless it can be proved it is no longer required or is to be replaced elsewhere. This would prevent loss where land values become higher for alternative uses.

**Issue 28: Open spaces**

Open spaces need to be protected and enhanced and new spaces provided

**Options:**

To enable the provision of sufficient multi-functional open space, should we:

<b>28a</b>	Protect existing open space?
<b>28b</b>	Work with owners of open space to improve existing open space?
<b>28c</b>	Secure the improvement of existing open space through development where appropriate?
<b>28d</b>	Carry on seeking contributions from developers for open space and expand categories of open space to include green corridors including the railway?
<b>28e</b>	Develop a strategy on the provision of open space, concentrating on the provision of larger sites in the towns?
<b>28f</b>	Develop a strategy which focuses on smaller sites in the towns and villages?
<b>28g</b>	Examine the Audit of Open Space and determine with the community whether any spaces are inappropriate and are no longer suitable and then determine whether it is possible to use sites for another form of recreation or whether they should be redeveloped?
<b>28h</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

**Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options**

Summary of Responses to Issue 28

Total number of responses	29
a Support	17
a Object	
b Support	15
b Object	
c Support	11
c Object	
d Support	17
d Object	
e Support	13
e Object	1
f Support	14
f Object	1
g Support	15
g Object	1
h Support	
h Object	
Alternative Option	3

Summary of responses:

All the options were supported to much the same level. Three options had single objections.

Option 28a

One respondent supported this as long as the space is valued by the community.

Option 28b

One person felt that this option was not a land use planning issue.

Option 28c

This was only felt to be to be appropriate where the improvement of existing open space is associated with the development or would increase the capacity of open space. Improvement was thought to be a revenues expense normally.

Option 28d

One respondent felt this option was only acceptable if open space is linked to the proposed development.

Option 28e

There was one objection to this option on the grounds that it was too blanket a policy. It was felt that this policy may lead to honeypot sites which may draw users in from a wide area and so increase travel.

Option 28e and 28f

The suggestion was made that a combination of Options 28e and 28f should be carried out.

Option 28g

One person wished this option to apply to redevelopment cases only. Another said this was not acceptable if the Local planning Authority is seeking to collect contributions from developers towards the provision of open space in the locality of the site, which the authority seek to re allocate to another form of development.

Option 28h

There were three alternative options suggested:

Develop a strategy for providing a range of play and recreation areas for 0 to 19 year olds;

Have share holding in open space on a non profit making basis, prevented from selling land commercially. This would give “ownership” of land in all ways;

Proposed open space sites should be subject to public consultation;

General Comments

Six respondents made general comments about this issue. One felt that further open spaces should be provided through discussion and negotiation. Another wished to see existing small areas of open space improved so that they are valued by the community and another felt that the management of open space is important. One respondent suggested that the development of large urban extensions would facilitate bringing about open space by providing sufficient development, securing open space close to homes, coupled with improved links to other open spaces and green infrastructure. Finally, one stated that this issue and others on green infrastructure emphasise the urban focus of the document and that the health of the countryside as a whole was a more significant matter for a Core Strategy.

**Issue 29: Car parking****How much car parking should be allowed?****Options:****Residential Parking**

<b>29a</b>	Set parking standards for residential development which provide well designed and restrained parking throughout the District, promoting good design and efficient use of land?
<b>29b</b>	Set parking standards for residential development which provide well designed and restrained parking throughout the District but varies across the District depending on accessibility to facilities and other forms of transport?
<b>29c</b>	Set parking standards for residential development that allow high amounts of parking, recognising that this will have an effect on the living environment, quality of design and the environment in general?
<b>29d</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

**Destination parking**

<b>29e</b>	Set parking standards for other development which limits the amount of parking available, looks to make dual use of car parks and promotes good design and efficient use of land?
<b>29f</b>	Set parking standards for other development which limits the amount of parking where other forms of transport serve the location?
<b>29g</b>	Set parking standards for other development which accepts an unrestrained amount of parking, recognising that this will have an effect on the living environment, quality of design and the environment in general?
<b>29h</b>	Suggest an Alternative Option

**Core Strategy: Issues and Alternative Options****Summary of Responses to Issue 29**

Total number of responses	35
a Support	10
a Object	2
b Support	24
b Object	1
c Support	0
c Object	2
Alternative Option	3
e Support	19
e Object	1
f Support	17
f Object	2
g Support	1
g Object	3

Alternative Option	2
--------------------	---

Summary of responses:

Residential Parking

Responses varied from: setting minimum parking standards in relation to their location to reduce inconvenience to residents; setting maximum parking standards in relation to their location, to support sustainable development objectives; and, general restraint is preferable, except on roads where parking will act to slow down moving traffic and reduce the need for car parks.

Option 29a

29% of respondents to Issue 29 supported Option 29a to set parking standards for residential development which provide well designed and restrained parking throughout the District, promoting good design and efficient use of land. 6% of the responses to Issue 29 did not support the suggestion in Option 29a.

Option 29b

69% of respondents to Issue 29 supported Option 29b to set parking standards for residential development which provide well designed and restrained parking throughout the District, but varies across the District depending on accessibility to facilities and other forms of transport. 3% of the responses to Issue 29 did not support the suggestion in Option 29b.

Option 29c

None of respondents to Issue 29 supported Option 29c to set parking standards for residential development that allow high amounts of parking, recognising that this will have an effect on the living environment, quality of design and the environment in general. 6% of the responses to Issue 29 did not support the suggestion in Option 29c.

Option 29d

In response to Issue 29, Option 29d, the following Alternative Options were suggested:

A design led approach where restraint will reflect the practicalities of the site and its context;

Build homes where parking issues already exist thereby creating disincentive and restricting the number and size of additional vehicles;

Include Parish Councils in evidence gathering of safety aspect of on street parking.

Destination Parking

Responses varied from: multi storey car park provision at Gillingham station; no multi storey car park provision at Gillingham station, but use problem as an opportunity to develop tomorrow's solution; dual use of car parks; broader standards than just for business needs; and, consider advice in PPG13.

Option 29e

54% of respondents to Issue 29 supported Option 29e to set parking standards for other development which limits the amount of parking available, looks to dual use of car parks and promotes good design and efficient use of land. 3% of the responses to Issue 29 did not support the suggestion in Option 29e.

#### Option 29f

49% of respondents to Issue 29 supported Option 29f to set parking standards for other development which limits the amount of parking where other forms of transport serve the location. 6% of the responses to Issue 29 did not support the suggestion in Option 29f.

#### Option 29g

3% of respondents to Issue 29 supported Option 29g to set parking standards for other development which accepts an unrestrained amount of parking, recognising that this will have an effect on the living environment, quality of design and the environment in general. 9% of the responses to Issue 29 did not support the suggestion in Option 29g.

#### Option 29h

In response to Issue 29, Option 29h, the following Alternative Options were suggested:

Create parking facilities which will only accept modest sized vehicles;  
Set parking standards necessary for the development, taking into account that public transport is very poor, infrequent and generally unavailable through the District.