

## Planning Policy

---

**From:** Barry Watson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 25 June 2020 14:34  
**To:** Planning Policy; Process Team  
**Cc:** Ed Gerry; Fiona Ajram  
**Subject:** BLANDFORD + NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2011-2033

**Categories:** Orange Category

Hello all .

[ Firstly , to the very helpful ED GERRY for assisting me to deliver this email'd version to Dorset Council . Unfortunately , the reason for not placing this message on the correct form comes down to a formatting problem with my iPad ; I do not possess a Microsoft computer . ]

SUBJECT ; BLANDFORD PLUS NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN [ 2011-2033 ] .

<https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/planning-buildings-land/planning-policy/north-dorset/neighbourhood-planning/submitted-plans/pdfs/blandford-v2/post-examination/response-form-pdf.pdf>

- “ LEGAL DESECRATION of the DORSET COUNTRYSIDE under POLICY B2 of the BNP Plan , or CONCRETE over DORSET COMPETITION “.

Ref 1. Blandford + Neighbourhood Plan [ BNP ] 2011-2033 , basic condition statement , dated January 2019 .

Ref 2. BARRY WATSON submission response form for the BNP [ 2011-2033] dated 28th March 2019 to North Dorset District Council [ NDDC ] Ref 3. Report to Dorset Council [ NDDC ] on the Examination of the BNP by Examiner Terrence Kemmann-Lane , dated 28th JANUARY 2020 [ regulation 15 stage ] .

INTRODUCTION .

This is my communication to establish outright objection to the Examiners [ and the BNP] decision relating to BNP POLICY B2 for their persistence support to provide acceptance to Dorset Council to develop land allocated potentially to the north-east of Blandford Forum , which is beyond the constraint of the Blandford Bypass [ A 354 / A 350 ] .

This unwanted residential scheme known as Phase 1 comprising 400 dwellings [ approx ] to include a mix of open market affordable and self-build and custom houses .

It is noteworthy - and not included in the current BNP plan , but relevant knowledge listing of an also unwanted background for future extended housing development , known as Phase 2 , which is to be sited on designated Pimperne ground for an additional 300 dwellings , meaning an aggregated total of 700 homes [ 400 + 300 units ] to be situated directly south of the A 354 , just beyond existing homes known as Bolney & GreenBanks .

It is important the decision-making reader is informed of this big-picture unwanted practical scenario .

[ It is very noteworthy that an adjacent Pimperne land referenced in their independent PIMPERNE Neighbourhood Plan is the same Phase 2 from above potential housing scheme Development and is a continuum of the Blandford parcel of land [ Phase 1 ] development under Policy B2 . Pimperne Parish Council cites outright rejection of this follow-on plan .

This distinction about these conjoined parcels of land needs highlighting to the reader . ]

OBJECTIONS ;

In my response [ ref 2 ] to Dorset Council back in March last year , I , along with other objectors , many of whom understand far better , and are far more qualified and knowledgeable - respective representatives

from CPRE & AONB - than I to respond professionally , particularly to the manner of the English language used in planning-speak .

Although there is a slim chance of the Planning Committee and this current Examiner - based upon his track-record , ref 3 , the Examiner , Terrence Kemmann-Lane will , without doubt dismiss all comment /criticism - taking little , if any notice of what people think and say on these subject matters concerning Policy B2 !

My submission highlights some of the following critical and sensitive aspects in the bigger-picture perspective , so , as one progress' reading through this contribution for what makes common-sense ;

- Road System ; the north -south A 350 trunk road system is already inadequate to handle increased traffic capacity . To many , this A350 is not a slick auto-route , but ranks one of the worst highways within the whole of the U.K. road system - voted a dreadful stretch of very busy narrow width road , essentially attempting to connect between the M4 Motorway to the Bournemouth / Poole metropolplex on the south coast .

One would say this is strategic in thought and try to dismiss it , but to the local plan , the BNP , it is highly relevant .

The subject of vehicle access / volume increases is not given sufficient consideration ; you intend to create yet another roundabout on the A 350 - this is yet another impedance imposed upon a so-called by-pass traffic-flow : why ? In fact , only access , one way in , same out , is not clever design for many reasons ! Where is the sense here ?

- Pedestrians ; question , how do people walk , safely , from a newly configured and remote 'bubble ' housing estate to local shops , or the new [ to be ] school built on the current allotment . How does one make way along the bypass ?

[ This is very reminiscent of the ' wonderfully ' ill- planned GLC overspill Witham , Essex, estate erroneously positioned for re-housing London-type people remotely situated in a large field two miles out-of-town ! No shops , nothing . People from London plonked in the middle of an Essex agricultural area . Clearly , unsustainable .

That plan was far from a defined success ; soon , after a few years the whole design degenerated into a virtual mental decay for many dwellers , but into a case of a housing slum. Is that what you guys desire ?] Therefore , remoteness is not advantageous for a majority ; a lack of facilities is not advantageous - Planners , you are creating a sterile environment .

Garden Village locking-in Car Dependency ! Taking this example analogy ; new garden villages risk becoming car-dependent commuter-estates . The Government promised sites would be inclusive communities , with jobs locally , shops and recreational facilities .

Research has suggested these garden villages may have degenerated and little better than reviled edge-of-town estates .

The garden village concept was devised to overcome problems of local resistance to housing estates ' bolted-on ' to small towns . Government prospectus said the concept should be largely self-sustaining and genuine mixed-use with public transport , walking , cycling enabling close access to jobs , education and services . Safety is a critical parameter , whilst boredom of some dwellers is another parameter , are very clear .

Again , it is incumbent upon planners and examiner to focus and realise what you are creating . Vehicle usage become mandatory .

- Entertainment ; question , what do the estate residents do with their time outside their work and home and in the immediate local environment for relaxation ?

Is there a sports club / pub facility ; a social space ?

What do young people do in their spare time in the evening hours ?

Where is the provision ?

Otherwise , you chaps have promoted a sterile housing development !

Is that what it means to be planner/assessor ; quite unprofessional , not inclusive , to neglect the social aspects for over one thousand real people ?

- Rail connection ; I know this parameter is strategic in nature [ not in respect of the local BNP plan ] and really not relevant , the committee would state . But, it is relevant , and why this aspect is big-picture stuff , must not to be dismissed .

- Employment ; attracting alternative good healthy Companies ?

Currently , Blandford is inherently a ' blue-collar ' town , so it is important to change this balance and attract higher level employee's in new high-tech design and financial Companies .

This is a natural progression ; part of an enhancement for Blandford's sustainable future growth , or should be . Designated employment for Blandford implies employee's work in the town for the selfish good of the town . Typically , many of these homes could be purchased by those who work out-of-town , making their dwellings created erroneously for dormitory residence , whilst employment is sought in Poole , for example !

However, times are changing - BREXIT and Corona Virus Pandemic - times where investment money is getting tighter , particularly also in times of austerity ; more people working from home , but there is an over-arching need for entrepreneurialism .

Go for the money ?

Get new business attracted to Blandford ; talk to the big-boys ; AMAZON [ Jeff Bezos ] or SPACE-X [ Elon Musk ] , as major starters . The idea to attract them to site a modern development and product manufacturing battery-plant , or similar , for example .

' You know what I mean ' .....

Therefore , houses built in this area are to accommodate 'high-tech ' to this most beautiful area of the U.K. , but not under Policy B2 - somewhere else more suitable within the ' Blandford Circle ' ?

Why not ?

Where is the initiative ?

- Consideration of Housing Development ; whilst one cannot disagree there is some genuine demand for additional in the U.K.

Question , does this apply to Blandford area ?

There are those with greater knowledge than I , like people with the CPRE and AONB for Cranbourne Chase , who understand the big-picture , and researched and evaluated Dorset Council's regional housing objective five-year housing supply . CPRE research concluded there is no deficit - short-fall in numbers - it is evident there is a potential exceedance to provide a sufficient number of back-log dwellings , not just for 3.4 years , but out to a conservative 6.48 years !

So , planners , why press ahead concreting over more areas of Dorset countryside ?

- Visual Aspects to be exposed despoiling virgin countryside with this unwanted Policy B2 proposed housing development ?

Already the whole eastern-aspect of Blandford is poorly planned , 'plastered' in the rolling and beautiful Dorset countryside .

I claim the Examiner did not look and investigate properly these features when on his practical site visit to obtain a true perspective .

Here I refer to the instant visual impact when looking from the slightly elevated B 3082 Wimborne Rd , experienced when one is driving in the Blandford direction approaching the ' Two-Gates ' roundabout and looking in a northerly direction .

Currently , a 'blot-on-the -landscape ' exists - horrible - only to be made worse by an additional super-imposition of 400 / 700 total dwellings .Unfortunately , the resultant view , in my opinion , is an escarpment ,quite similar to , and typical to that degradation of the most poor-planning examples viewed in the Upper South Wales mining valley's .

Why we are concerned is the change of land use [ B2 ] , from 100 % ' white-land ' agricultural usage , degraded / transformed to an urban housing development create mis-use / desecration of incredibly valuable Dorset countryside .

Only one decision ; this committee of decision-makers must decide sensibly not-to-develop - find somewhere else - or , arrogantly , if they press ahead regardless to change the traditional ENGLAND landscape forever ; there is no recovery once the damage is inflicted .

Committee , it is your irrevocable decision .

Henceforth , as a group , you are not listening to the words of our Prince Charles - build , build , build , is NOT the way forward - when will they [ the Committee ] , the Politicians and their subordinates , take notice of these random and designed-in sprawling town developments , which are propagated by you guys , as a group , Members of Planning , Councillors [ eg , Cllr Walsh ] , along with the Examiner .

Quash this proposed Policy B2 before it is too late .

Take notice ; use of virginal land is our Countryside , and not the way forward ; it was the philosophy - it is now an outdated philosophy and strategy .

When will you listen ?

'Save-the-day ' , 'save the Countryside ' from the developer , then one's conscience is clear , with no regrets down-stream .

- ' GAP ' , what ' GAP ' ; 'mind-the-GAP ' - - - - NO HOUSING "DEVELOPMENT-CREEP " beyond the Blandford Bypass perimeter , please.

Here the subject is " GAP MAINTENANCE " ; keep your DISTANCE , is indeed topical .

Many are fearful of this unwanted aspect - the conjoining ribbon-development , which is happening latently to the land situated between Blandford and the smaller community of Pimperne , with evermore encroachment on to sacred AONB land .

Policy B2 , it's consequences aid and abet constructively this onward creep / compelling attraction of the two centres , just like positive and negative charged bodies in Physics .

Terrence refers to his visit [ ref 3 , section 9.39 ] concerning the AONB outlook viewed from the rear garden of the private residence of GREENBANKS , in Salisbury Rd , and to a greater degree its neighbour , Bolney .

Terrence distinctly dismisses our reported situation on the grounds this is not a 'damaging public harm and is not persuasive in my determination of the issues' .

Terrence is wrong .

I suggest Terrence makes a return visit , this time to ' walk -the-field ' , clearly to show the proposed development [ Policy B2 ] is a total imposition when viewed from Letton Park hedge boundary - going south .

People in those Letton Park houses will get an unsavoury ' broadside ' view of the whole development encroaching beyond the current Blandford bypass ; far worse a view than that of GreenBanks/Bolney experience .

- Conclusion ;

Clearly the BNP Policy B2 proposal ' makes no sense ' as indicated by me and detailed by many others skilled in business of planning analysis and objection .

My broad question to you intelligent planning chaps , don't you have second thoughts about the concepts and design for this type development concluding in a common sense approach that this Policy B2 [ Phase 1 ] proposition is a very poor starter from the outset ?

Accordingly , you even convinced the examiner , Terrence Kerman-Lane , to give his erroneous support and blanket approval ; it is non-starter ?

Suggest you , as a group , seriously think again and reconsider the clean-sweep approval result given by this poor quality examination ?

Indeed , when we were first introduced to Terrence Kemmann-Lane , on first impression he came over as a very understanding person , full of imagination and clear thought to provide a fair democratic cursor to the BNP proposal . Alas , most of us were deceived ; Terrence adopted almost 100% rejection , completely disregarding the salient points made in ALL our submissions !

Commensurate with the level of our written protests , along with a total rejection of Terrence's recommendations , on this basis I support that the Planning Policy B2 decision is declared null-and-void , and , that the existing examiner is replaced with someone who can see that common sense be applied to this decision - unless , of course , Cllr Walsh [ Dorset Council ] up holds our complaints and decides in our favour to quash the Policy B2 ?

Will he ?

Clearly , this Policy B2 is not a sustainable kosher development for all the reasons outlined above - someone please take notice at this juncture .

Hear the words - no housing development-creep beyond the domain of the Blandford Bypass . And , in a post Corona Virus time , plans like those proposed by the BNP , using virgin White-land in our countryside , is not the way forward - it is an outdated , irregular resultant strategy .

Please hear us .

Then more recently , the CPRE [ 21 st May 2020 ] , in a major article concerned with protecting the natural world ; green-space , after lock-down , with respect to housing needs, be strongly reconsidered and applied by planners . Moreover , I understand there are new revised regulations emanating from Government in this regard !

Currently , as your committee promotes the desecration of the Dorset countryside ; plainly , you care little about your actions in life , yet you are accountable , professionally !

Finally , last , not least , one need not forget to highlight a good-bye to nature's farmland birds ; common buzzards , jays , the blackcap , the plentiful friendly pheasants will disappear from this habitat , but only if

you guys create another example of a sterile concrete ' bubble ' unwanted housing estate ; regret this  
championed guilt and legacy .

Please consider seriously .

Thanks,

Barry WATSON

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad