

## Bradpole PC 2017 Local Plan Review “Issues & Options” Question/Answers

**Q. 3.i Do you agree with the proposed single vision being used to develop objectives and guide the strategy for development within the Local Plan area?**

**A. Yes.**

**Q. 4-i. Should more information be included in the local plan to explain what is meant by the term ‘sustainable development’?**

**A. No. There is a need to rely on national policy guidelines.**

**Q. 5-i. Do you consider that the figure of 775 dwellings per annum remains an appropriate figure for the objectively assessed need for housing in the local plan area in the light of the 2014-based household projections?**

**A. Yes, given the headroom available there is no need to increase this figure at this review.**

**Q. 5-ii. Do you agree with the level of additional housing provision proposed for the local plan area to meet needs for a further five years (i.e. at least an additional 4,520 new homes in the local plan area on top of that already identified)?**

**A. Yes, given the headroom available there is no need to increase this figure at this review. However we understand from the Housing White Paper published on 7 Feb that in due course there will be a standardised approach to assessing housing requirements.**

**Q. 6-i. Do you agree that the vast majority of the additional growth proposed for the period up to 2036 should be accommodated at Dorchester, Weymouth (including Chickerell and Littlemoor), Beaminster, Bridport, Lyme Regis, Portland, Sherborne and Crossways?**

**A. Yes but subject to 6-ii.**

**Q. 6-ii. If the local plan review is to consider identifying sites for growth at other settlements, should opportunities be considered:**

- at settlements with populations of more than 1,000; or
- at settlements with populations of more than 600; or
- at any settlement with a defined development boundary?

**A. At any settlement with a defined development boundary, and subject to either neighbourhood or parish plans.**

**Q. 6-iii. Should Policy SUS2 continue to strictly control development outside defined development boundaries, having particular regard to the need for the protection of the countryside and environmental constraints?**

**A. Yes. The Housing White Paper makes it clear that the Govt. wishes to maximise the use of brownfield sites. The strict criteria that applies to Green Belt sites should be applied to AONB sites.**

**Q. 6-iv. Should the supporting text to Policy SUS2 be amended to clarify the other matters that need to be taken into account when applying the policy to market housing developments outside DDBs, most notably:**

- national planning policy;
- Policy INT1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development;
- and the Councils’ housing land supply position?

**Q. 6-iv. (cont)**

**A. Yes. Additionally consideration should be given to policies in the Housing White Paper.**

**Q. 6-vi. Should different policy approaches apply to settlements with DDBs identified in the local plan and settlements with new DDBs identified through neighbourhood plans?**

**A. No. Policies should be consistent across all areas.**

**Q. 12-i. Bridport town (which extends into the neighbouring parishes of Allington, Bradpole, Bothenhampton and Walditch and Symondsburry) has grown at an average rate of 20 dwellings per year over the last 5 years. This development rate is likely to be increased to approximately 100 per year until 2030.**

**Should we plan for a level of growth lower than 100 per year, maintain that level of growth, or plan for a higher level of growth for the town?**

**A. No we should continue to plan for a level of growth of 100 per year and only consider increasing this if supported by a strong evidence of need.**

**Q. 12-ii. Are there any additional issues related to the development of any of the site options?**

**A. Yes. All site options are within the AONB:**

**Area A North of Bradpole ( BR4). Outside of the Development Boundary. Development here would have a significant detrimental effect on the AONB. Remote from Bridport Town centre. An area of high grade agricultural land. Additional infrastructure from the A 3066 would be needed. There is no footpath or cycle link with the rest of Bradpole village. There is a history of highway flooding. Development to the East of this site would impact upon the conservation area. The current DDB provides a barrier to further urban sprawl into the AONB, this should be maintained.**

**Area B Happy Island Way ( BR2). Outside of the Development Boundary. The site contains wildlife habitats & mature vegetation which provides a screen for the development along Jessopp Avenue. The site provides a green buffer and screen to the river and open space area. The Monarch's Way footpath crosses this site providing extensive views across the surrounding countryside.**

**The higher land to the N.E., including the area known as High Acres, is a prominent wider landscape feature. Development here would have an unacceptable impact upon the AONB.**

**There is some scope for a modest well-placed development to the S.W. of this site above the flood zone but at an elevation that would not damage the character of the landscape. There is known to be considerable local opposition to developing this well frequented site. Any small scale development would need to be on an "exception site" basis for occupiers who meet "local connection tests" and the tenure should always remain within those parameters.**

**Area C East of Lee Lane. (BR3) Outside of the Development Boundary. Development here would have a significant detrimental effect on the AONB. Approached by a single track lane with passing places and no footways. There could be concerns with the Lee Lane / A 35 junction. A sloping site, drainage issues would need to be considered. Development would affect the setting aspect, there are rural edge issues and public countryside footpaths cross the site.**

**Q. 12-iii. What are the infrastructure requirements for the development of the site options, individually or in combination with others?**

**A. In addition to Q. 12-ii there is an inadequate drainage system especially in and around the conservation area.**

**The majority of lanes throughout the village are narrow and with no footways. Traffic circulation would require consideration.**

**Q. 17-i. Should Policy HOUS1 be revised to apply the optional lower threshold in national policy and guidance within ‘rural areas’ as shown in Figure 17.1 (rather than the national 10-unit threshold), so that affordable housing contributions would not be sought on sites of 5 units or less in these areas?**

**A. Refer to the Housing White Paper for future direction.**

**Q. 17-ii. What should the priorities be for the provision of different types of affordable housing in the local plan, such as: affordable rent; social rent; shared equity; elderly persons’ affordable housing (including extra care); key worker accommodation; and specialist accommodation (for example for disabled people).**

**A. The Housing White paper addresses many of these issues. In particular there is a local requirement for affordable housing and housing to meet the needs of an elderly population.**

**Q. 17-iii. In the light of the expected statutory requirement to provide a proportion of starter homes on all reasonably sized housing sites, should the focus for the provision of other types of affordable housing be primarily on:**

**affordable housing to rent;**

**or affordable housing to buy or part-buy (for example, under a shared equity arrangement);**

**or meeting the needs of particular groups (such as the elderly – including extra care housing; key workers;**

**or people with specialised needs, including disabled people)?**

**A. All of these points are covered in the Housing White Paper**

**Q 17-iv. Should Policy HOUS2 allow market homes to cross-subsidise the provision of affordable housing on exception sites?**

**A. The Housing White Paper addresses this issue. Cross subsidy on “exception sites”, where there is a strong evidence of necessity, should be allowed with tight controls established to ensure that community interests benefit over the interests of the landowner and developer.**

**Q. 17-v. How should the provision of market homes on such sites be controlled to ensure that the emphasis remains on meeting local affordable housing needs and significant unplanned growth adjoining settlements is avoided?**

**A. Prospective occupiers should meet local connection tests and the tenure should always remain within those qualifications. The majority of the houses should meet the local affordable housing need.**

**Q. 18-i. Should serviced, self build plots be delivered to meet the demand identified on the local Self-build Register through:**

**Current approach;**

**Land allocation;**

**Housing mix;**

**Exception site; or**

**A mixture of the above**

**A. A mixture of the above.**

**Q. 18-ii. Should proposals for Low Impact Dwellings that meet a set of criteria, be considered more permissively than conventional market housing to increase the supply of self-build homes?**

**A. Yes to a limited extent subject to strict planning criteria being applied and monitored.**

**Q. 19-i. Do the figures in the revised workspace strategy provide an objective assessment of the overall need for employment land in the local plan area, especially in the light of national and local aspirations for economic growth?**

**A. Yes considered adequate at present.**

**Q. 19-ii. Do you agree with the assessment that there is no need to allocate any additional employment land in the local plan area in order to meet overall employment needs in West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland in the period up to 2036?**

**A. Yes as Q. 19-i above.**

**Q. 19-iii. Is there a need at any of the towns (or other locations) in the local plan area for additional employment land to be allocated in order to meet particular local employment needs or encourage greater self containment?**

**A. Not locally.**

**Q. 20-i. Are there “key employment sites” listed in figure 20.1 that should no longer be given the higher level of protection afforded to “key employment sites”?**  
Please tell us which ones and why.

**A. No.**

**Q. 20-ii. Are there any additional sites which should be added to the list of “key employment sites” listed in figure 20.1 and given a higher level of protection? Please tell us which ones and why.**

**A. No.**

**Q. 22-i. Do you think the definitions of Green Infrastructure offer a suitable framework for identifying green infrastructure types? See fig 22:1**

**A. Adequate.**

**Q. 23-i. Should modular housing play a more important role in meeting housing needs within the area?**

**A. Yes of a design which reflects the existing built environment in Bradpole Civil Parish.**

**Q. 23-ii. Should there be a requirement to provide a proportion of new houses at the enhanced accessibility and adaptability standards?**

**A. Yes.**

**Q. 23-iv. Should a requirement for a proportion of new houses to be suitable for wheelchair users be included within the Local Plan?**

**A. Yes.**

**Q. 23-vi. Should there be a requirement for new housing to comply with nationally described space standards?**

**A. Yes as described in the Housing White Paper.**

**Q. 24-i. Do you agree that all parts of coastline except for the defended areas of Weymouth Town Centre, West Bay Harbour and Lyme Regis Harbour should be designated as a Coastal Change Management Area?**

**A. Yes**

**Q. 24-ii. Should the council limit the type of development that should or should not occur in the CCMA as set out in Figure 24.1?**

**A. Yes**

**Q. 24-iii. Should the council introduce a rollback policy to allow development threatened by coastal erosion to obtain planning permission to be replaced and relocated further inland?**

**A. No.**

**Q. 25-i. Should the councils allocate suitable sites for wind energy through the local plan or rely on locally led initiatives such as neighbourhood plans?**

**A. Should be dealt with by the local authority with full public consultation.**

**END OF RESPONSES**

**Bradpole Parish Council March 2017**