

For office use only

Batch number: _____

Received: _____

Representor ID # _____

Ack: _____

Representation # _____

North Dorset Local Plan – Part 1

Main Modifications Consultation

24 July to 18 September 2015

Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

Response Form

For each representation you wish to make a separate response form will need to be completed.

This is a formal consultation on the legal compliance and soundness of the Local Plan as amended by main modifications. The Inspector produced a note on his preliminary findings into the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 and this was published on 9 June 2015. The Inspector and the Council wish to be informed about any representations on the proposed main modifications to the Local Plan. Details of the Main Modification documents are available on the Council's web page below:

www.dorsetforyou.com/northdorsetlocalplanmainmod

Please return completed forms to:

Email: planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk

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

Deadline: Midnight on 18 September 2015. 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**. Representations cannot be treated in confidence as Regulation 22 of the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires copies of all representations to be made publically available. 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 web site, although they will be shown on paper copies that will be sent to the Inspector and available for inspection.

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

Personal Details (if applicable)*		Agent's Details (if applicable)*
Title		Mr
First Name		James
Last Name		Cleary
Job Title(<i>where relevant</i>)		Director
Organisation (<i>where relevant</i>)	Charborough Estate	Pro Vision Planning & Design
Address		[REDACTED]
Postcode		[REDACTED]
Tel. No.		[REDACTED]
Email Address		[REDACTED]

Part B – Representation

Please tick if you wish to be updated on the progress of this document

1. Which proposed Main Modification are you commenting on? (please insert the MM reference number from column 1 in the consultation document):

Please use a separate form for each proposed modification you are commenting on.

MM3 - Policy 2 and supporting text (Main reference document MHD007)

MM5 – Policy 6 and supporting text (Main reference document MHD006/7 and 18)

2. Do you support this Main Modification? (i.e. do you think it is sound and/or legally compliant)

Yes

No

3. If no, in summary, why do you not support the proposed modification?

- It has not been positively prepared
- It is not justified
- It is not effective
- It is not consistent with national policy
- It does not comply with the law

4. What would you like to happen?

- Delete the proposed modification
- Amend the proposed modification – you should suggest amended wording below
- Add a new policy or paragraph - you should suggest new wording below

(Please give further details or suggested wording in box for Question 6)

5. If there is an additional Examination Hearing session, would you like to verbally express your views to the Inspector?

Yes, I would like to participate in the oral examination

No, I do not wish to participate in the oral examination

6. Your Comments.

Please provide more details as to

- Why you do/do not feel that the proposed modification meets the soundness criteria set out in Question 3.
- What changes to the proposed modification wording/new wording you are suggesting.
- What additional policies or wording you are suggesting.

To assist the Inspector please try to be as concise as possible. For longer responses a brief summary would also be helpful for the Inspector.

At the Examination in Public there was clear and justified concern expressed over the imbalance between allocations to the four main towns and allocations in Stalbridge and the countryside. It is noted that the balance is altered but in our view it is not gone far enough.

North Dorset has always been a rural district with almost 50% of the population living outside the four main towns. Consequently, many of the services and facilities which make for sustainable development are outside the four main towns. Further, the rural areas are generally well connected and have a good distribution of job opportunities.

It is noted that the original proposal that Stalbridge and the countryside should take 6% of new District wide housing growth has been altered to 14% (825 dwellings). This is still too low. Consequently there is an unsubstantiated imbalance with a failure to achieve positive planning for Stalbridge and the countryside.

The smaller settlements now grouped in the same category as Stalbridge, are to retain their settlement boundaries. This is justified as they are sizeable, sustainable and accessible settlements. However, they are also areas of significant housing need. If thriving rural communities are to remain the balance should be further altered. It is suggested that the figure of 825 should be changed to 1200 or at minimum 1000. This change would need to be reflected in Figure 5.1 and there should be consequent changes which could be either:

- a. An increase in the district wide figure of 5700 to 5875 or 6075; or
- b. Reductions to the level of proposed development in the four main towns especially Gillingham.

These changes would mean that the proportion of district wide housing growth to take place in Stalbridge and the countryside would be either 21% (1200 units) or 17.5% (1000 units) rather than the 14% (825 units) currently proposed in the modifications. This still falls significantly short of the percentage figure for the amount of the population of the district which resides outside of the four main towns but represents a better balance.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Signature: _____

Date: 18 September 2015

If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.

Part B – Representation

Please tick if you wish to be updated on the progress of this document

1. Which proposed Main Modification are you commenting on? (please insert the MM reference number from column 1 in the consultation document):

Please use a separate form for each proposed modification you are commenting on.

MM18 – Policy 20 and supporting text (Main reference document MHD006 and 7)

MM23 – Supporting text to Policy 29 (Main reference documents 10/29/17 of hearing change 1: 10/29/18 of MHD018)

2. Do you support this Main Modification? (i.e. do you think it is sound and/or legally compliant)

Yes

No

3. If no, in summary, why do you not support the proposed modification?

- It has not been positively prepared
- It is not justified
- It is not effective
- It is not consistent with national policy
- It does not comply with the law

4. What would you like to happen?

- Delete the proposed modification
- Amend the proposed modification – you should suggest amended wording below
- Add a new policy or paragraph - you should suggest new wording below

(Please give further details or suggested wording in box for Question 6)

5. If there is an additional Examination Hearing session, would you like to verbally express your views to the Inspector?

Yes, I would like to participate in the oral examination

No, I do not wish to participate in the oral examination

6. Your Comments.

Please provide more details as to

- Why you do/do not feel that the proposed modification meets the soundness criteria set out in Question 3.
- What changes to the proposed modification wording/new wording you are suggesting.
- What additional policies or wording you are suggesting.

To assist the Inspector please try to be as concise as possible. For longer responses a brief summary would also be .

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

The Charborough Estate is a large mainly arable country estate which extends over three Dorset administrative districts - East Dorset, North Dorset and Purbeck. The Estate, like all large country estates constantly has to consider modernization and diversification. It has a number of redundant or semi-redundant farm complexes including large farm complexes around Winterbourne Kingston. These are on the northern periphery of the estate but in the southern most part of the North Dorset District.

The intention, as with most large country estates, is that operations should be centralized and contained within a smaller number of larger agricultural complexes which should in future act as operational hubs. Consequently, there is likely to be a shift in operations and increasing need to consider either redevelopment or diversification related options for the farmsteads owned by the estate near to Winterbourne Kingston.

Winterbourne Kingston is a thriving rural community which is relatively sustainable and where there is a reasonable level of employment opportunities. Sites for new housing close to or around the village are not readily available hence the redundant farm steads are likely to be well suited for redevelopment for residential purposes.

This is a matter which was discussed at the Examination in Public during the Countryside session. The Council's Planning Officer indicated that he wished to pursue a 'light touch' in policy but did support the option of redevelopment of farmsteads for residential purposes where housing development in or around smaller villages might not be appropriate. It was also confirmed that this view had support at parish level with several parishes indicating that sites for housing in or around villages being suitable by virtue of proximity but not suitable when matters such as views towards the parish church and impact on conservation areas were taken into account.

The Council's representative went on to indicate that in his view this was not a Local Plan Part 1 matter and could be picked up within Local Plan Part 2 or in Neighborhood Plans. During the public session the Inspector clearly indicated that he disagreed with the Council's representative and suggested this should be picked up within the current Plan as a planning strategy matter. Unfortunately, the Council's representative has moved on and the matter seems to have been missed within the Modifications and consequent changes.

In order to take account of this matter we suggest that there should be a new policy which could read as follows:

Policy 20A

Housing Development around the 18 larger villages could take place either;

- a. Within defined settlement boundaries; or
- b. On land adjoining defined settlement boundaries; or
- c. On farmsteads in close proximity to the settlement where there is scope for good connectivity with the village.

Suitable sites for b and c could be identified in Neighborhood Plans.

Further, Policy 29 on the re-use of existing buildings in the countryside should be altered to allow re-use for occupational or non-occupational residential use in accord with suggested new Policy 20A.

Signature: _____

Date: 18 September 2015