

From: Steve Mackenzie <SteveMackenzie@purbeck-dc.gov.uk>  
Date: Thu, 16 Jun 2016 at 23:23  
Subject: RE: complaint

Dear Mr Anderson

I would like to start by apologising for not responding earlier to your complaint. As you know I had intended to respond last Friday afternoon but something cropped up, to which I had to attend, which took up most of the afternoon.

Turning to your complaint about the content of paragraph 63 of the Options document, you have complained that the statement "Relatively strong support. Acceptable for 1000 homes" is misleading and does not accurately reflect the results of the Issues and Options Consultation.

I would like to break down the statement and deal with each part separately. You will notice that each of the sites contains two statements in the third column. The first statement refers to the results of the public consultation, the second statement refers to the feedback from the various statutory consultees. The statutory consultees include bodies such as Natural England, the Environment Agency, the Highways Agency and the County Council.

I think the introduction to the table shown in paragraph 63 could have better explained the role of public and statutory consultees and the table could have better differentiated between them. Such an explanation would have prevented people (including yourself) mistakenly thinking the full statement "Relatively strong support. Acceptable for 1000 homes" refers to public consultation. The phrase "Acceptable for 1000 homes" represents a summary of the overall views of the statutory consultees.

The results of the Issues and Options Consultation, in terms of public support, shows that 90 people support 1000 homes on the site to the west of Wool and a further 102 support some development on the site but less than 1000 homes and 70 do not support any development. Consequently, I agree with your interpretation of the basic results. The issue is then whether the results of the public consultation support the conclusion that there is "Relatively strong public support." I think the results show there is relatively strong public support for some homes on the identified site to the west of Wool (192 out of 262) but they do not show there is relatively strong public support for 1000 homes to the west of Wool (90 out of 262). Consequently, the statement "Relatively strong public support" could be considered to be misleading.

Despite the content of the statement in the Options document, Councillors are under no illusion that there is strong local support for any of the sites in the document. They are aware that local communities see the provision of new homes as an imposition on their communities. However, they are also aware that if they fail to achieve the number of new homes that the Government's methodology demands without good reason, new homes will be located where landowners, developers and the Government's Planning Inspectorate decide they would like to put them. This would prevent the new homes contributing properly to the development of the new infrastructure that their provision makes necessary.

As you will be aware, the public consultation on the Options document has started. I believe it is most appropriate to let the consultation continue despite my conclusions

set out above. A statement that there is relatively strong public support is more likely to result in people responding to the consultation with clarity. However, I will ensure the Councillors leading the Partial Review of the Local Plan and Wool Councillors are aware of the contents of my e-mail so that they take account of it when considering the results of this consultation.

Yours sincerely

Steve Mackenzie

Chief Executive

Purbeck District Council, Westport House Worgret Road Wareham Dorset BH20 4PP