

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

I don't think that 366 dwellings a year is an appropriate figure because it sets a target without fully appreciating how the villages/small towns of North Dorset can cope with this. I cannot give you a specific number that think would be needed, but I would argue that the larger towns who have better infrastructures should take the majority of the houses, whereas the smaller towns eg. Stalbridge should only need to build what they need. At the moment there are several small developments within Stalbridge which have not been considered when allocating possible numbers of new houses to Stalbridge. This, in my view, is wrong.

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

If you have answered 'Yes' please set out your alternative spatial strategy and provide reasoning to support it.

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.

I think that existing planning permission for either new build or development of existing sites should have been considered before developing green field sites. If, as the existing local plan states – development should only be to meet local needs, then building on these sites in Stalbridge is not justified.

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.

- Extra places at the existing school. I have been told that representative from NDDC told the public at a meeting that it wouldn't matter if local children couldn't go to their local school – Stalbridge Primary School – because they would simply be transported elsewhere. To me, as a teacher and mother, this fails our children. They need to go to a school in their local catchment area where they will be with their friends and neighbours. As a council tax payer, I also object to the principle of children being bussed at our expense to other schools, when they should be able to go to their local school. Furthermore, when Shaftesbury was developed, they were promised a new school. It took much longer for it to arrive, and children were bussed throughout the County.
- Health facilities – our doctor's surgery is on the point of closing as they cannot find any GP's to join the practice. The nearest surgery is Marnhull or Sturminster Newton. If we have new housing that has a high percentage of social housing they might not have access to transport facilities. Young children need easy access to a doctor.
- Transport – our bus service is due to be cut in February. There is no direct bus to Wincanton where I work and I have to drive by car. The bus services are very limited with the new bus services only at 2 hourly intervals. This will impact greatly on those people seeking employment outside of Stalbridge who do not have a car.
- Flooding – all the sites that have been suggested for Stalbridge suffer from serious flooding – particularly the site at Station Road. The Environment Agency has maps of significant flooding areas in Stalbridge.
- Roads – whilst the Highways Agency apparently considers the A357 to be a safe road, they should try driving through Stalbridge high street and the pinch point there. We do not need any more cars on this road, and looking at all of the proposed developments they all will be using the A357. Your document mentions improvements to the roads, but the A357 going through Stalbridge cannot be improved surely without demolishing most of the High Street.
- Social impact – there are very few areas in Stalbridge for young people to go. Although the developers maintain that they will create play areas, I am not convinced by this.
- Employment – there are very few jobs in Stalbridge. Dykes Supermarket is the main employer with the Fudges Factory workforce being mainly Eastern European. The Airfield at Henstridge apparently occasionally looks for construction workers, but they are specialist employees. Other potential employers much further afield and again workers would be constrained by transport links. Potential employers such as Thales in Templecombe are a possibility, but there is outline permission for a housing development in Templecombe for 75 houses. I cannot see how building in Stalbridge would be necessary.
- Building on the Blackmore Vale. I do think that any of the developments were allowed to go ahead then it would set a precedent for building on the Blackmore Vale. This should not be allowed.

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

If you have answered 'No' please set out your alternative approach and information/reasoning behind this.

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.

I think that it essential that each town/village situation is put into its proper context. Consistent with the present Local plan, the Town Council over the past year has given their support to several local scale housing developments in the town, for example at the former CC Moore's site at the top of Church Hill now known as 'Stalbridge Barns' (eight 3-bedroom and one 2- bedroom home), the former nursery site in Station Road (6 homes) the conversion of the former Nat West Building in the High Street into a residential property, and the conversion of the former Crown Public House into 3 flats – a minimum of 20 homes over the past year or so. The developers propose more than 400 new houses in total. The current Local Plan says that Stalbridge should only cater for **locally generated growth** and as there are just over 1200 houses here at present, I find it very hard to understand how development on this scale can meet the adopted Local Plan policy.

The impact on Stalbridge as a community and our ability to cope with a large influx of people must be given due weight when deciding any planning permission. The impact on the local primary school; medical services, roads and lack of local employment opportunities must be taken into consideration. I cannot see how Stalbridge will benefit economically from a large influx of people, particularly if there is a large amount of social housing.

Recently, developers proposed building in our neighbouring village of Henstridge. The application was finally refused (despite the Planning Officer giving it a green light). I think that some of the reasons are applicable to Stalbridge as well and relate to your document.

Ref APPLICATION NO 17/03029/OUT APPLICANT Gladman Developments PARISH: Henstridge

'Furthermore the development would be contrary to the provisions of Policy SS2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2015) in that it **does not provide employment opportunities, create or enhance community facilities or meet identified housing need in Henstridge, and its scale is not commensurate to the settlement. These impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits of the scheme.** The Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that sufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that **the development will not bring rise to flooding locally and downstream contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Stalbridge is currently the smallest town in the country, and we pride ourselves on being in the Blackmore Vale with roots in agriculture and tradition. Allow us please to develop only as we need and not just for the sake of developing. **Protect our rights and listen to our opinions.**

Empty rectangular box for form content.

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: _____

Date: _____

If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.

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