

**ARNE PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO THE DORSET HEATHLANDS
PLANNING FRAMEWORK 2015-2020 CONSULTATION**

The Parish Council has considered this document in detail and members have attended the District Council workshops in order to gain a better understanding of what the document is setting out. Whilst we agree with the principle objective of no net increase in residential units within the 400m area as described in Appendix C, we do have several concerns about the rules for mitigation in the 400m-5km zone.

Point 1.1: “Avoidance measures or mitigation will be required.....within 5 km of these designated sites.”

On first impression, this would leave nowhere in Purbeck to build without offering some form of mitigation. Such a blanket requirement for mitigation on all developments of any description, from affordable and market housing, to self-catering, caravan and touring holiday applications could stifle development and have an adverse effect on the tourism of the area. Unfortunately, this document indicates little support for any of these sectors; in fact, it appears likely to have the opposite effect. Although the mitigation on developments of less than 50 houses will come from “top-slicing” the CIL, it still results in additional costs for developers which may make the development unviable.

Point 3.5: This states the SPD refers to the area between the 400m zone and the 5km zone.

This statement is the key to setting out what this document is seeking to achieve and should be at the beginning as it helps to clarify its objectives. Similarly, an introduction at the front of the document to the 400m consultation area would also have been helpful.

Point 4.5: The mitigation has to be in place before development starts and is to be maintained in perpetuity.

Change is inevitable however, and there is no mention of who is going to keep paying for the upkeep of the mitigation. If a developer or landowner is required to contribute a sum of money to the District Council in order to maintain a SANG in perpetuity, how will this figure be arrived at, how will the maintenance of the SANG be policed and what will happen when the money in hand runs out? This was referred to in the workshop but the answer was not particularly satisfactory, saying the “developer would have to pay.”

5.7: Building in Poole, mitigation in Purbeck.

This seems to imply that building in Poole, Bournemouth and Christchurch could be mitigated in the Purbecks. This would seem to be confirmed by 9(b) which states that authorities can agree to fund HIPS outside their area if they consider this ... to be the best way to provide mitigation. The answer from the workshop was that Poole has been innovative in providing its own SANG within Upton Country Park. This may be sufficient for now but will not cover all the future building that will take place in Poole during the life of the Plan and no mention was made of mitigation relating to Bournemouth or Christchurch.

Appendix A: Access and Fire Management Projects – Purbeck 13.

Please note that Arne Parish wishes to be included as a consultee. This item also refers to a visitor survey. This took the form of a very random survey and was not specifically directed at local residents, just whoever happened to be walking their dog in the area at the time. Furthermore, the Parish Council was never consulted. In addition, there is no definition of “short – medium term”. We would also like to express concern that the catchment area has suddenly risen to 5+km – does this mean there may be an intention of increasing the 5km mark in the future?

Appendix D appears to set out the type of building that Natural England would consider acceptable in the 400m to 5km zone.

We find it distasteful to think that NE will have the power to decide if the residents of a proposed retirement home “are still active” and may then have an adverse effect on the habitat and, in doing so, decide whether mitigation is needed or not. This may well be the difference between that retirement home being built or not.