

For office use only

Batch number: _____ Received: _____
 Representor ID # _____ Ack: _____
 Representation # _____



NORTH DORSET LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

Issues and Options Consultation

27 November 2017 to 22 January 2018

Response Form

As part of the Local Plan Review (LPR), North Dorset District Council has prepared an Issues and Options Document for consultation. The Issues and Options Document, the Sustainability Appraisal and associated documents can be viewed online via:

<https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/planning/north-dorset/planning-policy>

Please return completed forms to:

Email: planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk

Post: Planning Policy (North Dorset), South Walks House, South Walks Road, Dorchester, DT1 1UZ

Deadline: 5pm on 22 January 2018. Representations received after this time may not be accepted.

Part A – Personal details

This part of the form must be completed by all people making representations as **anonymous comments cannot be accepted**. By submitting this response form you consent to your information being disclosed to third parties for this purpose. Personal details will not be visible on our website, although they will be shown on paper copies that will be available for inspection by members of the public and other interested parties.

*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name, Job Title and Organisation boxes in the personal details but complete the full contact details of the agent including email address. All correspondence will be sent to the agent.

Personal Details*		Agent's Details (if applicable)*
Title		Mr
First Name		Alex
Last Name		Bullock
Job Title(<i>where</i>)		Principal Planner
Organisation (<i>where relevant</i>)	John Romans Park Homes Ltd	Pegasus Group
Address	C/O Agent	██████████ ██████████████████ ██████████
Postcode		██████
Tel. No.		██████████
Email Address		██████████████████████████████

Part B – Representations

Please answer as many questions or as few questions as you wish. There is a box at the end of the form where you can provide any comments that you may have.

Housing

1. Do you consider that a housing need figure of 366 dwellings a year is an appropriate figure on which to plan for housing growth in North Dorset? If not, please set out what you consider to be an appropriate figure and provide reasons for this.

Yes

No

Please see enclosed letter.

Employment

2. Do you consider that additional employment land should be allocated for development at Blandford as part of the Local Plan Review?

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

Spatial Strategy

4. Do you consider that the existing spatial strategy, as set out in LPP1, should be amended to allow for some limited growth at Stalbridge, beyond just meeting local needs?

Yes

No

5. Do you think that the Council should consider implementing any other alternative spatial strategy through the LPR? If so, please explain your reasons why.

Yes

No

Please see enclosed letter

Blandford (Forum and St Mary)

6. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Blandford?
- Yes
- No
7. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process?
- Yes
- No

If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.

8. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Blandford?

Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.

Gillingham

9. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Gillingham?
- Yes
- No
10. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process?
- Yes
- No

If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.

11. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Gillingham?

Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.

Shaftesbury

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

Yes

No

13. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process?

Yes

No

If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.

14. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Shaftesbury?

Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.

Sturminster Newton

15. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Sturminster Newton?

Yes

No

16. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process?

Yes

No

If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.

17. What are the additional infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Sturminster Newton?

Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.

Stalbridge

18. Do you agree with the conclusions regarding the areas of search identified at Stalbridge?

Yes

No

19. Are there any further issues relating to the areas of search that you think should have been considered as part of the assessment process?

Yes

No

If you have answered 'Yes' please set out what you see as the further issues.

20. What are the most important infrastructure requirements that are likely to result from potential future development at Stalbridge?

Please set out what you see as the additional infrastructure requirements.

The Villages

21. Do you agree with the Council's proposed approach in relation to future development at the eighteen larger villages within the District or do you think that the Council should consider an alternative approach?

Yes

No

Please see enclosed letter.

Affordable Housing

22. Do you consider that the existing reference to nine dwellings in Policy 9 of LPP1 should be removed from the policy to allow larger schemes to come forward where there is evidence of local need in excess of that which could be met by the provision of nine dwellings?

Yes

No

23. Do you consider that the existing policy approach, which seeks to prevent exception sites coming forward adjacent to the four main towns within the District, should be amended?

Yes

No

24. Do you consider that the Council should continue with its existing policy approach, which allows for a small number of market homes on rural exception sites?

Yes

No

Self-Build and Custom-Build Housing

25. Do you consider that the Council should facilitate the provision of self-build housing by any, some, or all of the following options?

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

b. Updating Policy 7 (Delivering Homes) in the Local Plan Part 1 to promote the provision of serviced plots of land for self-build housing.

Yes

No

c. Requiring on sites above a certain size that serviced self-build plots should be made available as a proportion of the total number of dwellings permitted (with or without a minimum number being specified) on-site.

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

f. The use of Local Development Orders to facilitate self-build development.

Yes

No

26. Are there any other approaches that could be used to meet the demand for self-build housing?

Yes

No

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

Ensuring the Vitality and Viability of Town Centres

27. Do you consider that the existing hierarchy and network of centres, as set out in LPP1, should be amended to include Stalbridge as a 'local centre'?

Yes

No

Important Open or Wooded Areas (IOWAs)

28. Do you agree that those IOWAs, which are protected from development by other planning policies or legislation, should be deleted?

Yes

No

The A350 Corridor

29. Do you consider that the land which is identified and safeguarded for the Shaftesbury Outer Bypass and the Charlton Marshall and Spetisbury Bypass should continue to be identified and safeguarded for such purposes?

Yes

No

Comments

If you have any comments about the Issues and Options Document or the Sustainability Appraisal please set them out in the box below. If your comments are in relation to a specific question or chapter of the Issues and Options Document then please state which question or chapter your comments relate to.

Please see enclosed letter.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Do you wish to be contacted about future consultations relating to the Local Plan Review?

Yes

No


Signature: Alex Bullock

Date: 22/01/2018

If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.

When completed please send form to planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk

Copyright Pegasus Planning Group Ltd. Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Copyright. Licence number: 100042093. Promap. Licence number: 100020449. EmapSite. Licence number: 0100031673. Standard OS licence rights conditions apply. Pegasus accepts no liability for any use of this document other than for its original purpose, or by the original client, or following Pegasus' express agreement to such use. T 01285 44717 www.pegasuspg.co.uk



KEY: SITE LOCATION PLAN

 APPLICATION BOUNDARY (1.5Ha/3.7ac)

HAZELBURY BRYAN - SITE LOCATION PLAN



AJB/P17-2600

22nd January 2018

Planning Policy
North Dorset District Council
Nordon
Salisbury Road
Blandford Forum
Dorset
DT11 7LL

BY E-MAIL ONLY

Dear Sir/Madam

NORTH DORSET LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: ISSUES & OPTIONS CONSULTATION
LAND AT CHURCHFOOT LANE, HAZELBURY BRYAN

Pegasus Group has been instructed by our client John Romans Park Homes to submit representations to the North Dorset District Council Local Plan Review: Issues and Options Consultation. John Romans Park Homes have a land interest on land at Churchfoot Lane, Hazelbury Bryan which is shown on the enclosed Site Location Plan provided at Appendix 1.

APPENDIX 1 – SITE LOCATION PLAN

Overview

The North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) was adopted by North Dorset District Council (NDDC) on 15th January 2016 covering the period from 2011 to 2031. The Inspector who examined the LPP1 recommended several modifications to the plan to enable it to be adopted. One of these modifications was the need for an early review of the plan to take account of new evidence including housing need evidence detailed within the Eastern Dorset 2015 Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

The Inspector detailed that the review should be all encompassing in respect of its content and should seek to include those matters which were to form part of the Local Plan Part 2 document which will now not be pursued. Whilst a comprehensive review is being undertaken it is understood that given the Plan was adopted only two years ago the Council intends to roll many policies forward.

These representations respond directly to the questions raised within the Issues and Options document where relevant. The representations have been structured to directly correlate with the structure of the aforementioned document.

PLANNING | DESIGN | ENVIRONMENT | ECONOMICS



Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales



Housing (Question 1)

Policy 6 of LPP1 details that at least 5,700 net additional homes will need to be provided over the plan period. This equates to an average rate of approximately 285 dwellings per year. Based on the latest monitoring evidence (March 2017) shows an existing shortfall of some 424 dwellings and NDDC acknowledge that they are unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply.

We understand that the Eastern Dorset SHMA which are based on the 2012 ONS household projections equates to an annual requirement of 330 dwellings, such an increase would result in an additional 900 dwellings to be found through to 2036 (new plan end date).

As the consultation document sets out the Government is proposing to introduce a new methodology for the calculation of Objectively Assessed Need. When applying this to the North Dorset District would see a further increase to 366 per year which would result in a need to find an additional 1,620 dwellings. This equates to around a 30% increase.

The Issues and Options document proposes to proceed with this higher figure. We consider that it is positive that the Council is taking a pro-active approach. We are supportive of this but would highlight that the new methodology has yet to be adopted and therefore a review of this figure might be necessary if there are any changes to the proposed methodology.

Spatial Strategy (Questions 4 & 5)

The Issues and Options document does not propose to change the current focus of growth of the spatial strategy which sees most of development direct to the four main towns of Blandford (Forum and St Mart), Gillingham, Shaftesbury and Sturminster Newton. We agree with such a conclusion given these are the most sustainable settlements within the District.

The only substantive change that appears to be suggested is the consideration of Stalbridge for a specific allocation. Whilst we recognise that Stalbridge is a sustainable settlement, we consider that this change cannot be considered in isolation, particularly when regard is given to an increase of around 30%.

The existing LPP1 identifies within Policy 2: Core Spatial Strategy Stalbridge alongside eighteen Larger Villages, one of which is Hazelbury Bryan which is of direct relevance to my client's land interest. We consider that a fuller and more detailed individual assessment of each of these settlements is required so as to understand what level of growth can be sustainably accommodated alongside any change in focus for Stalbridge.

We are also acutely aware that the Council finds itself in a position whereby it cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply which in part is directly related to the slower delivery rates at the strategic allocations, including that at Gillingham. Accordingly, we would favour a more permissible approach at the sustainable settlements within the District, which would include the larger villages to ensure that the increase in numbers is more evenly distributed which we believe would assist delivery rates.

It is also our opinion that in rural Districts such as North Dorset all the larger villages need to consistently grow by a commensurate amount so as to ensure that the existing services

and facilities which they do benefit from are retained to ensure on-going sustainability. This, we believe, is key to a proportional and positive approach for delivering development and supporting rural communities.

As such, in response to Questions 4 and 5, we consider the Council must undertake a fuller assessment and should pursue a more balanced approach to distributing development including making specific allocations to the District's Larger Villages alongside any change in focus at Stalbridge should that be justified.

The Villages (Question 21)

We acknowledge that Hazelbury Bryan Parish Council have elected to pursue a neighbourhood plan like many the other parishes in which the larger villages are located.

The current policy approach (Policy 2) allows for the villages to meet only local rather than strategic needs. As such no specific allocation of units is made on a per settlement basis.

We consider that the 18 larger villages are within the context of a rural District sustainable locations. We also consider that by both an increased housing requirement as well as an existing spatial strategy which is failing to deliver required levels of housing a step change in approach is needed. Such an approach would see a more detailed assessment of the ability and carrying capacity of each of the 18 larger villages to accommodate growth must be undertaken.

Such an approach would then set a positive agenda for Neighbourhood Plan groups to take forward for specific land allocations. We therefore consider the Council should take an alternative approach in this regard.


Summary

We note that this is the first stage of the Local Plan Review process and that by and large the Council's existing policies are in conformity with national guidance. We particularly welcome the positive approach the Council seeks to take with pursuing a higher OAN figure which is in line with the current's expected new methodology.

Whilst the existing focus on the Districts main four settlements (Blandford, Gillingham, Shaftesbury and Sturminster Newton) shouldn't change as these are the most sustainable settlements. We consider that by virtue of the significant increase in housing numbers (around 30%) against an existing strategy which is failing to deliver appropriate numbers given the Council's failure in its 5-year supply (existing shortfall of around 400 dwellings) a more flexible and permissible approach should be pursued.

We consider such an approach would see a greater distribution across the larger villages based on a detailed assessment of the individual sustainability of those 18 settlements. Growth we believe in such locations, at the right level, should be supportive as without continued growth settlements stagnate and existing services and facilities eventually fail and as a result won't be suitable options in the future.

Yours sincerely



Alex Bullock
Principal Planner
e-mail: alex.bullock@pegasusgroup.co.uk