

<b>Participant</b>	Mrs S Gillies	<b>Rep ID</b>	1042
		<b>Date response received</b>	11 May 2015
<b>Representing</b>	Self	<b>Response reference number</b>	MHD048
<b>MHD / Change reference commented on</b>	MHD006 MHD007		
<b>Summary of comment</b>	<p>MHD006</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerned about inclusion of second homes allowance - will prevent young people getting onto housing ladder.</li> <li>2. Agrees with extension of St Mary's Hill site as will enable additional infrastructure to be provided in Blandford but only if Blandford Hill site not allocated. Additional development can be provided in line with Blandford+ proposals as any further development on Brewery site beyond what has permission would be overdevelopment. Would prefer Blandford+ proposals to the exclusion of all other sites.</li> <li>3. Any SHMA strategy should take account of transport links and capacity of those links to absorb extra traffic. Enhancing transport links should be part of SHMA with emphasis on public transport.</li> </ol> <p>MHD007</p> <p>Council's report combines Blandford Forum and Blandford St Mary - the latter is a village and has its own identity.</p>		
<b>Council's response</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The second homes allowance has already been agreed by the Council in line with practice elsewhere. In fact, evidence in North Dorset shows that the impact of this would be minimal.</li> <li>2. The SHMA is not a strategy but an assessment of housing needs (of various types) within a specific Housing Market Area. It is for the Local Plan to articulate those needs in terms of allocations of land for residential development and to develop policies for the provision of affordable housing and so on.</li> <li>3. Reference to Blandford in MHD007 makes it clear that both Blandford Forum and Blandford St Mary are embraced by the term and it is appropriate in the context.</li> </ol>		
<b>Conclusions</b>	The respondent introduces no new issues for consideration at this stage and no further action is required.		

<b>Participant</b>	Mrs S Gillies	<b>Rep ID</b>	1042
		<b>Date response received</b>	11 May 2015
<b>Representing</b>	Self	<b>Response reference number</b>	MHD048
<b>MHD / Change reference commented on</b>	MHD008 MHD012		
<b>Summary of comment</b>	<p>1. Persimmon Homes held a public meeting on 14th May 2015 to show their plans for Dorchester Hill Blandford St Mary. There is no phasing - they plan to apply for planning permission in June 2015 and start building immediately. Persimmon's homes plan does not fit with paragraph 2.3 of MHD008 nor does it fit with the continuing consultation process and the inspectors decision making timeframes. This land should not be included in the plan at all. Natural England does not believe this land should be included in the plan at this time due to insufficient evidence. Significant weight should be afforded to this argument. All the studies should be completed before inclusion is even considered.</p> <p>2. Queries the suggested timescale of development of the Brewery site.</p> <p>3. Could promote sites where planning permission has lapsed rather than allocating new sites.</p>		
<b>Council's response</b>	<p>1. Persimmon Homes deals with its own publicity, marketing and exhibitions without reference to the Council. Full planning permission is required before development can start on the site at Dorchester Hill and no such permission has been granted. The Council is aware that additional ecological information is required for the Dorchester Hill site and is in discussion with Natural England over information which has been submitted. Mitigation measures must be agreed with Natural England before a planning consent can be issued.</p> <p>2. Based on the current status of negotiations between the Brewery and developer, the Development Services Manager has advised that the start date for development on the Brewery Site in Blandford is likely to be delayed such that it is unlikely to provide dwelling completions until 2018/19.</p> <p>3. Sites where planning permission has lapsed have been incorporated into the housing trajectory but are of such relatively insignificant numbers that there is no impact on the need to allocate additional sites in the Local Plan.</p>		
<b>Conclusions</b>	The respondent introduces no new issues for consideration at this stage		

	and no further action is required.
--	------------------------------------

<b>Participant</b>	Mrs S Gillies	<b>Rep ID</b>	1042
		<b>Date response received</b>	11 May 2015
<b>Representing</b>	Self	<b>Response reference number</b>	MHD048
<b>MHD / Change reference commented on</b>	MHD009		
<b>Summary of comment</b>	<p>Relying upon private rental sector to substitute affordable housing does not provide stability and removes affordable housing stock from open market. As the majority of landlords do not provide long term lets and others are prescriptive in their tenancies what they provide does not meet needs of the local community. Affordable housing which meets the current 6 year tenancy criteria would afford much more stability for individuals, couples and families.</p>		
<b>Council's response</b>	<p>MHD009 refers to the need for affordable housing being met in part through the private rental sector. The private rental sector is not a substitute for the provision of affordable housing but an adjunct. A fixed term tenancy would only afford stability for the period of the tenancy since it automatically comes to an end after 6 years.</p>		
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>The respondent introduces no new issues for consideration at this stage and no further action is required.</p>		

<b>Participant</b>	Mrs S Gillies	<b>Rep ID</b>	1042
		<b>Date response received</b>	11 May 2015
<b>Representing</b>	Self	<b>Response reference number</b>	MHD048
<b>MHD / Change reference commented on</b>	MHD011		
<b>Summary of comment</b>	<p>Landscape and ecological arguments relating to the extension of the St Mary's Hill site are the same as those which were presented at the time of the Bryanston Hills proposals. The Council did not show the same concerns at that time as it is showing now in respect of St Mary's Hill.</p> <p>Some of the land at St Mary's Hill is in the AONB and will detrimentally affect its character. It will also have negative ecological impacts. The Blandford+ sites are 1km away from the AONB.</p> <p>The road structure is unsuitable for further development and cannot be improved.</p>		
<b>Council's response</b>	<p>The Bryanston Hills development was completed over 15 years ago and is not comparable to the proposal at St Mary's Hill.</p> <p>The St Mary's Hill site is outside both the the Dorset AONB and Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB whereas the sites put forward by Blandford+ are within or immediately adjacent to the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB. The detailed ecological and landscape studies presented to the Council relating to the St Mary's Hill site show how development can be accommodated satisfactorily.</p> <p>The Council has been presented with detailed highway proposals relating to the St Mary's Hill proposal and Dorset County Council (the Highway Authority) finds them acceptable.</p>		
<b>Conclusions</b>	The respondent introduces no new issues for consideration at this stage and no further action is required.		