

Reported at: 11/02/13 11:07

## Event: Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy Pre-Submission

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally complaint or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
654046	Mr David Pardy		<a href="#">PCCS119</a>	5	1.2	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	The plan is unjustified – (Christchurch has no more space, why should allotments be sacrificed for houses, no site to go to, East Dorset has more space for houses etc) & it is not consistent with National Policy (which is to preserve Green Belt land and the best agricultural land (we are Grade 2, the best in Dorset).	The Roeshot Hill Allotments to be retained & the plans to over-develop the Christchurch conurbation should be abandoned	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
654437	Mr Ron White		<a href="#">PCCS116</a>	5	1.2	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The statement allows changes to be made to the core strategy after the document is considered by the inspector. Therefore making the core strategy invalid and illegal.	The proposed changes to the core strategy have been constructed and worded so as to further confuse the electorate. The presentation to the public has been confusing and the approach low key. There are paragraphs that have been deleted, yet the wording is concealed in a different section of the core strategy document. The proposal to allow changes to be made after the document is submitted and cleared by the inspectorate invalidates the whole document.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Because I wish to put the voters and residents views forward.	
655010	Mrs S Moran		<a href="#">PCCS149</a>	5	1.2	No	No	Justified Effective	This paragraph allows the Council to make changes beyond what is specifically set out in this document. Whilst it might be appropriate to allow some finer level of detail to be documented at a later date, this wording makes it clear that further policies and site allocations will be specified undermining the purpose of this document and opening the door to changes which will endure less scrutiny.	Remove reference to future documents defining policies and site allocations. Alternatively re-draft the Core Strategy since it was prepared before NPPF.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
656832	Mr Paul Ramsey		<a href="#">PCCS284</a>	5	1.2				The reference to Burton as a site for the relocation of the allotments has been removed, as alternative sites are being investigated. However, the revised statement fails to say whether Burton is still being considered as a possible site or not. I object to this. It is deliberately vague and infers, without confirming to the public that the allotments are definitely not moving to Burton area.				
718095	Mr William C King		<a href="#">PCCS127</a>	5	1.2		No	Positively Prepared Effective	The vagueness over the future and the relocation site for the Roeshot Hill Allotments appears to be unacceptable. The vast majority of plot holders have made considerable investments in their plots. I would have thought that the location of the site is an essential element within the		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									Christchurch housing strategy and should be resolved before further decisions are taken.				
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS487</a>	10	2.11				MEM Ltd are also grateful that the supporting text recognises the role of the rural estates in the local economy and environment.				
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">PCCS101</a>	19	3.1	Yes	Yes		We support the changes to this paragraph which is broadly in line with our recommended changes in our previous representations.				
359529	Mrs Lisa Goodwin	Clerk to the Council Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS171</a>	19	3.1				There continues to be considerable concern about the highly restrictive approach to business development and diversification where it is clearly implied that this will only be permitted at the major villages. For example, when applied to the major rural industry – agriculture – only one of the twenty odd farms and small holdings in this parish which is adjacent to the major village could benefit and to apply such a restriction is quite unacceptable. The Core Strategy should not incorporate a policy that effectively caps rural development.	Page 19 para 3.1 Recommend Amended Text be changed (in red) to read: "Providing adequate land ..... Estate, as well as enabling the rural economy to diversify and flourish through the reuse of buildings and small new employment developments where they are needed."			
476036	Mr Colin Jamieson		<a href="#">PCCS159</a>	19	3.1	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The new words deny the opportunity for employment growth in small or minor villages which in the fullness of time will lead to the further decline of these villages whilst larger villages may grow to become small towns. The proposed statement is contradictory in that the proposal to remove the farm later in the document when the 45 houses are built conflicts with this statement and the Burton Conservation Appraisal and Management Plan adopted very recently (2007) after extensive consultation.	Suggest remove the words at the major villages	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I am a ward councillor. I believe that the basis on which new developments is founded is unsound, untested and is not evidenced on need. The Burton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan was adopted by Christchurch Borough Council in 2007 and has been ignored in the compilation of this strategy, and the need for 45 houses in Burton has not been evidenced. I believe that the need to redefine the Green Belt has not been evidenced because the local housing need has not been agreed by the councillors, I believe that the building of 45 or more houses in the green belt will effect the adjacent flood plain, and destroy the strategic gap between Burton and the wider conurbation.	
653893	Mr Michael Bailey		<a href="#">PCCS365</a>	19	3.1				The new and amended text quotes "enabling the rural economy to diversify and flourish through the reuse of buildings and small new developments at the major villages." This statement opens the door for Meyrick Estates to convert the old barns on Burton Farm for commercial use and their desire to turn the village into a Rural Services Centre. I object to this proposed development on the grounds that such a proposal would directly impact on the operation of the Farm with the loss of the tenant farmers and farm workers				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									livelihood. Perhaps Christchurch Council consider that the loss of rural traditional employment is less important than the establishment of commercial units. Burton Farm has been farmed by the same family for the past 135 years. It cannot be right for Meyrick Estates to summarily destroy the family's livelihood.				
656832	Mr Paul Ramsey		<a href="#">PCCS282</a>	19	3.1				In this section, a statement has been added regarding the re-use of buildings, and small new employment developments in major villages to boost rural economy. This statement could cover the justification for commercial units in the old barns on Burton Farm. I object to this development, which, if approved would cause the loss of the only working farm with the loss of the farmers' and farm workers' jobs.				
663076	Mrs Sheila Richards		<a href="#">PCCS122</a>	19	3.1				Objections to the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy Pre-Submission November 2012, as it relates to CN2 3.1 In this section, a statement has been added regarding the re-use of buildings, and small new employment developments in major villages to boost rural economy. This statement could cover justification for commercial units in the old barns on Burton Farm. It would appear that Christchurch Council is working in tandem with the Meyrick Estate who wishes to turn Burton into a Rural Services Centre. I OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT, WHICH, IF APPROVED, WOULD CAUSE THE LOSS OF A WORKING FARM WITH THE LOSS OF TENANT FARMERS' AND FARM WORKERS' LIVELIHOODS. Christchurch Council would appear to consider these potential losses of rural employment as having less importance than one or two proposed commercial units with unknown take-up.				
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS383</a>	19	3.2				Comment on Proposed Change 1.1 At the Pre-submission consultation Dorset County Council highlighted its concerns that requirements under the duty to co-operate should be more fully addressed. The Council was concerned that there is currently uncertainty that the various cross boundary issues set out in the National Planning Policy Framework are being addressed at the strategic level and that this could undermine the County's ability to provide infrastructure and other services for which it is responsible. 1.2 The response of Christchurch and East Dorset Councils (AoR para 2.13) that "the Councils... look forward to working in partnership with other neighbouring authorities and the Dorset LEP to deliver the Plan", is noted. However the change proposed at paragraph 3.2 (which makes reference to the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework but not the duty to co-operate) does not appear to address the concerns expressed by the County Council. 1.3 These concerns will only be addressed in full if there is an assurance from both Councils that they will work with neighbouring authorities and other bodies to identify and	Further change proposed Dorset County Council therefore considers that the concerns it raised on the duty to co-operate have not been addressed in the proposed changes and wishes to re-iterate these concerns and would welcome the opportunity to participate in any discussion of this issue at the Examination.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset County Council wishes to partake in any oral hearing on this matter in order to fulfil its role under the duty to cooperate and ensure that its interests are considered in the emerging Core Strategy.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally complaint or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>resolve matters of a strategic nature. It is understood that Christchurch Borough Council approved the draft "Memorandum of Understanding "on 5th September 2012. This effectively gives the assurance needed, although it is not reflected in the Plan. A similar assurance is needed from East Dorset District Council.</p> <p>1.4 It is acknowledged that, in the absence of a spatial policy framework it is currently a difficult time for plans to demonstrate how they relate to the wider area. With this in mind, the County Council would wish to see more explicit recognition of cross boundary implications in the plan and would welcome the opportunity to attend the Examination into the soundness of the plan to develop this issue.</p>				
717728	Mrs Jean Pardy		<a href="#">PCCS81</a>	19	3.2	Yes	Yes			Re-instate the sentence "the provision of a new community facility in Christchurch Town Centre will be supported."	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS309</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>1. ' The quality of this is special environment will be secured sustaining the growth of the local economy, and the welfare of its local communities, rather than being used as a reason to turn our back on growth which can be achieved sustainably'</p> <p>Whilst supporting the proposed wording as an improvement to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy, we do not consider that the changes fully address the concern we expressed at that consultation.</p> <p>Although the wording now secures the quality of the special environment, this is still in relation to sustaining growth of the local economy and welfare of local communities, with the implication that the environment has been used to turn our back on growth which can be achieved sustainably. Arguably much unsustainable growth has occurred on this area with the significant loss of habitats locally (eg 75-80% loss of heathlands) and evidence nationally shows that biodiversity is still in decline. We therefore consider that the environment should be clearly shown as one of the three strands of sustainability, important in its own right, and that all these strands should be viewed positively in order to move forward together. NPPF seeks net gains for biodiversity which is not reflected here.</p> <p>2. 'The intrinsic landscape and biodiversity value of the Dorset Heathlands, the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Christchurch Harbour, the coast, beaches and rivers will be protected and their connectivity enhanced. Improving our special environment and its green infrastructure will ensure that recreation and commercial activity sustains these areas.....'</p> <p>We support the proposed wording as it recognises the biodiversity value of the areas referred to and the need to enhance connectivity, but continue to consider that this does not fully encompass all the biodiversity of the area (such as</p>	<p>1. Change in line with NPPF (7,8,9) to reflect the three dimensions of sustainability, their mutual dependence and the need to jointly seek economic, social and environmental gains through the planning system. We suggest the following wording: This special environment underpins the local economy and quality of life and our vision is to see sustainable growth that benefits the environment, economy and local communities.</p> <p>2. Suggested change to reflect NPPF 117 'The intrinsic landscape and biodiversity value of the Dorset Heathlands, the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Christchurch Harbour, the coast, beaches, rivers and all priority habitats and species will be protected and their connectivity enhanced. Improving our special</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county, are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership. We consider that the changes proposed do not give sufficient protection or gain for the environment and would wish to contribute to an oral examination in support of this view.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									lowland deciduous and wet woodland, species rich hedgerows and grassland), and that reference is needed to priority habitats and species.	environment and its green infrastructure will ensure that recreation and commercial activity sustains these areas.....'			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS245</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	We generally support the amendments made to the Vision. We comment elsewhere on the aspiration for a Christchurch Bypass. However, we are concerned that there appears to be an implicit assumption that growth is needed to secure environmental conservation and enhancement. This is clearly not the case. The environment is worth protecting for its own sake as for the societal and economic benefits it brings.	Consideration needs to be given to the NPPF which identifies the nature of sustainable development, and the need to seek economic, social and environmental gains. The vision needs amendment to be consistent with the NPPF, particularly paragraphs 7, 8 and 9.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The Plan raises issues of nature conservation importance, matters which the RSPB is familiar and has considerable expertise. We are active in the Plan area as advocates for sustainable development and biodiversity conservation. We wish to reserve the opportunity to appear at an examination of nature conservation issues. We consider that we are in well positioned to advise an Inspector on these matters.	
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS440</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision		No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Although the revision is a slight improvement on the original, it is still negative in its approach (para 1) implying that the environment is an impediment to sustainability. The wording also indicates a continuing failure to understand <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the environment is one of the 3 strands of sustainability all of which must be addressed (NPPF para 7);</li> <li>• the requirement to move from a net loss of biodiversity to achieve net gains for nature (NPPF para 9)</li> <li>• the principles of connectivity of all habitat types on a landscape scale, not just a selected few (NPPF 113,114, 117);</li> <li>• the importance of including reference to priority habitats and species (NPPF117).</li> </ul> Despite our repeated requests for survey at appropriate times of year and in sufficient detail, no data have been presented to inform the selection of sites in the Core Strategy so it is not possible to establish how ecological networks will be supported/enhanced/created. Such survey data should have informed site selection at a much earlier stage. They are required now and should be made available for public scrutiny.	We retain our original objection and recommendations.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	As part of the East Dorset Community Partnership, ETAG's remit on biological sciences and sustainability is wider than that of Natural England or Dorset Wildlife Trust. Membership includes highly qualified natural scientists and town & parish representatives.	
476036	Mr Colin Jamieson		<a href="#">PCCS160</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The amendments to the first paragraph require a comma between the words "secured and sustaining" in order to make sense of the sentence The paragraph beginning "Housing will also continue to be delivered in our towns and villages" should be endorsed with a statement supporting the proportionate evidence and refer to a local housing needs assessment. Bournemouth Airport is two words and not a single word and that needs to be amended The new wording starting with "the challenges of supporting a significant elderly population..." needs to be reinforced with a statement regarding infrastructure because currently the infrastructure is inadequate to support significant growth	Comments included in above statement he amendments to the first paragraph require a comma between the words "secured and sustaining" in order to make sense of the sentence The paragraph beginning "Housing will also continue to be delivered in our towns and villages"		I am a ward councillor. I believe that the basis on which new developments is founded is unsound, untested and is not evidenced on need. The Burton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan was adopted by Christchurch Borough Council in 2007 and has been ignored in the compilation of this strategy, and the need for 45 houses in Burton has not been evidenced. I believe that the need to redefine the Green	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally complaint or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>in housing and associated facilities.                      The removal of the reference to "provision of a new community facility in Christchurch" should be amended to read "The Support of a new community provision in Christchurch" as the loss of support of such provision is not proportionally evidenced. The current facility is not fit for purpose, and consequently is under-utilised. This does not mean that there is no need for such a facility.</p>	<p>should be endorsed with a statement supporting the proportionate evidence and refer to a local housing needs assessment.                      Bournemouth Airport is two words and not a single word and that needs to be amended                      The new wording starting with "the challenges of supporting a significant elderly population... " needs to be reinforced with a statement regarding infrastructure because currently the infrastructure is inadequate to support significant growth in housing and associated facilities.                      The removal of the reference to "provision of a new community facility in Christchurch" should be amended to read "The Support of a new community provision in Christchurch" as the loss of support of such provision is not proportionately evidenced. The current facility is not fit for purpose, and consequently is under-utilised. This does not mean that there is no need for such a facility.</p>		<p>Belt has not been evidenced because the local housing need has not been agreed by the councilors, I believe that the building of 45 or more houses in the green belt will effect the adjacent flood plain, and destroy the strategic gap between Burton and the wider conurbation.                      There has been a lot of smoke and mirrors surrounding the retention of Druitt Hall, and whilst it is accepted that this out of date facility is not fit for purpose, the proportionate evidence to remove the provision of this facility has not been evidenced.</p>	
490815	Mrs Trish Jamieson	Clerk Burton Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS477</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision				<p>Supports specific reference to quality of a village as a special environment.                      Strengthens protection of Burton Village against unwanted and unneeded development.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
612430	Mr Nick Squirrell	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">PCCS256</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>The paragraph commencing may be strengthened by the insertion of the text:                      'The intrinsic landscape and biodiversity of the Dorset Heathlands, the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Christchurch Harbour, the coast, beaches, RIVERS AND PRIORITY HABITATS AND SPECIES will be protected and their connectivity enhanced. Improving our special environment and its green infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Vision requires modifications to be in accordance with the NPPF. Natural England has suggested some additional wording. The modifications proposed by the Dorset Wildlife Trust are supported by</p>		<p>Natural England may wish to provide specific advice to the Inspector regarding the effects of the wording on European and Internationally designated sites.</p>	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										Natural England.			
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		<a href="#">PCCS98</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>1. The previous draft says on P21: 'Perhaps most important of all, our communities will thrive... Community facilities will be safeguarded and support will be given to the community groups and organisations to develop volunteering, and to obtain premises from which to deliver services. The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported.'</p> <p>This last pledge has been deleted without any reason being given.</p> <p>2. The Localism Act is not complied with: Druitt Hall has been nominated as an Asset of Community Value. So, national policy has been ignored.</p> <p>3. Removing the hall and not replacing it as council planning brief previously agreed is not a sustainable decision as the central location of both the new and the existing hall is provided by its central location with good public transport links.</p> <p>4. The public will be disadvantaged by the removal and non-replacement of Druitt Hall as set out in this policy and especially the elderly for whom it is particularly important.</p>	Reinstate the support for a new community facility, as adopted in 2007 by the full council as their policy after extensive public consultation and a planning application approved and fundraising had commenced and was active for a considerable length of time. At that stage it was accepted that this facility was very much needed, and nothing has changed in the town to alter that assessment.			
654046	Mr David Pardy		<a href="#">PCCS139</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	Yes	No	Justified	<p>The statement that "The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported." has been deleted without justification; only recently the Christchurch Partnership was fundraising for just such a facility. A town centre community hall will be even more needed if the Council goes ahead with plans to demolish Druitt Hall.</p> <p>Furthermore this flies in the face of Policy LN6 - "Loss of facilities will be resisted unless it is shown that the facility is no longer needed. My own experience of using Druitt Hall shows that this facility IS needed</p>	Re-instate the sentence "The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported."	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
654456	Mr Elliot Marx		<a href="#">PCCS223</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>The original policy is consistent with the town centre policy of past 10 or more years.</p> <p>"The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported. "</p> <p>The amendment removed this and stated "Reference to a new community facility in Christchurch town centre has been deleted as the Council does not have an aspiration for this."</p> <p>Continued below</p> <p>This sudden recent amendment to a long standing Town Centre policy is out of line with National Policy in particular paragraphs 7, 23, 69 and 70 of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework )</p> <p>♣ Localism Act: The deletion of this line is contrary to the spirit of the Community and Localism guidance referring to the encouragement of local voluntary organisations, and a welcoming of bids to take over valued local community assets. A Nomination of the current Druitt Hall as an Asset of Community Value has been submitted ; this is an acknowledgment of the importance of a Town Centre Community Hall to the people of Christchurch.</p>	Restore the original version : "The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported. " This will be compliant with NPPF	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I want to give specific details that concern the legitimacy of this amendment. I do not believe the Council will be able to give these objectively.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally complaint or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>♣ The deletion of this line in the Core Strategy Vision is counter to the pro-active encouragement of local voluntary organisations which need an affordable place to meet (NOT as suggested in one council document the Mayor’s Parlour, a listed building on the High Street used mainly for formal occasions and requiring an attendant for security.)</p> <p>♣ Core Strategies are supposed to be aspirational not just detailed factual plans. Indeed ours refers to this in the paragraph preceding the Vision. Aspiring to the provision of a Community Hall is just such a balance between realism and aspiration. It does not infer a financial commitment to fund or run such a hall but the aspiration that such a facility will be provided. Indeed a sponsor has offered to fund the refurbishment of the current hall and keep it running until a new hall, funded by him for up to £1.5 million can be built. The Council have stated that it does not believe a town Centre Community Hall is needed.</p> <p>♣ Mary Portas Reviews have been taken on board by Government and encourage a mix of community retail leisure and recreational uses on High Street or it won’t survive-- this has big government backing-- her Pilots gave grants to lots of areas to put it into practice. Druitt Hall and its absolutely incomparable prime High Street location, make it an ideal Mary Portas Asset—and in the perfect place for a community hall. Our High Street has an unfortunate predominance of Coffee shops—a community asset is an essential draw for visitors and to increase footfall in the town centre and help the current retail outlets survive. The procedure by which this amendment was made has aroused questions * SEE APPENDIX, It is in opposition to the widely expressed public wish for continuity of a town centre community hall. The community should be consulted BEFORE considering such an amendment , given the huge popular support for keeping a town centre community hall and the fact that positive references have been made to its importance for past 10 years in Council Plans and Policy, (NO public responses in the first Core Strategy Pre Submission consultation ending June 2012 advocated such amendment) There is reason to question if the amendment was made with the agreement of all Councillors or their knowledge.</p> <p>♣ Sustainable transport and the town centre hierarchy are central to the council’s plans for sustainability. Retention of a community hall in the very centre of Christchurch accessible by public transport makes this achievable.</p> <p>♣ ‘Equalities’ --demolition of hall or removal of this aspiration would disproportionately disadvantage the less well-off (town centre hall is accessible by public transport, a short walk from bus stops, possible with rollator or wheelchair)</p> <p>♣ Although deletion of the sentence does not PRECLUDE someone building a hall, retaining the aspiration means Council would give support in spirit, also should give the land. An affordable central meeting space is essential to community self-sufficiency and resilience. This is a very</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>significant and important aspect of Town Centre vitality and viability in economic downturn..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♣ This amendment goes against all that we hear from Eric Pickles and all his policy about Community under the Localism Act</li> <li>♣ This amendment could put at risk the Open Space of Druitt Gardens, which are under a Covenant to be maintained as a town centre woodland, nature reserve and public open space for the enjoyment of the general public. Building housing on Green Belt land, such as advocated in this Council's Core Strategy, is only one step away from developing in Druitt Gardens. Demolition of the Hall will leave access for a through road, and the failure to replace it will leave land unoccupied which could be extremely lucrative if developed.</li> <li>♣ The role that the Leader of the Council has had in this matter, spearheading the move for demolition with a sudden and extremely blunt message in his Blog in October 2011, then pushing on with this ambition despite huge public opposition, makes this abrupt amendment of longstanding town centre policy appear an outcome of his personal 'Vision' rather than a considered planning strategy which has emerged after consultation with other Councillors and the public. Please see APPENDIX. This could reflect very negatively upon the public's perception of Council neutrality. People are anxiously wondering about a 'hidden agenda'</li> <li>♣ The Druitt Hall was paid for by public subscription and built on the Druitt Gardens -- land given by Charlotte Druitt as a bird sanctuary, and garden of rest for the use of the people of Christchurch. She gave them to Hampshire CC, not Christchurch, as she did not trust Christchurch to abide by her wishes. Christchurch bought it from Dorset(formerly Hants) in 2006 and on transfer it was protected with a Covenant to maintain the gardens for the purpose for which they were gifted and to maintain the hall. The spirit of this Covenant—is now being threatened by the twin Council moves to apply for planning permission to demolish the hall, and to remove from the Core strategy the aspiration to support a replacement. A large and growing popular groundswell of opinion wants to protect them.</li> </ul> <p>APPENDIX In February: 2020 signatures on petitions opposing demolition without a replacement in place.                  Opposing the recent application for demolition over 200 letters and over 1000 signatures on a petition opposing the planning application. Regular letters in both local papers feature public support for keeping the continuity of a town centre community hall.                  Druitt Hall is Christchurch's Coronation Memorial, in constant use for nearly 60 year—council proposes demolition in the Queen's Jubilee year.                  PETITION TO CHRISTCHURCH BOROUGH COUNCIL presented at the Council Meeting 18 December with speech as follows                  We, the undersigned, strongly object to the proposed</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>amendment to the Core Strategy Vision, which removes the sentence "The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported," with the note that " reference to a new community facility in Christchurch town centre has been deleted as the Council does not have an aspiration for this." We wish to question the procedure leading to the inclusion of this amendment. Within the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document of November 2012.</p> <p>MR MAYOR, TOWN CLERK, CHAPLAIN, ALDERMEN, COUNCILLORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMAN.</p> <p>MY NAME IS PETER FENNING, I AM RETIRED, AND LIVE IN BRIDGE STREET. I PRESENT A PETITION WHICH READS</p> <p>" WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CORE STRATEGY VISION WHICH REMOVES THE SENTENCE "THE PROVISION OF A NEW COMMUNITY FACILITY IN CHRISTCHURCH TOWN CENTRE WILL BE SUPPORTED" WITH THE NOTE THAT " REFERENCE TO A NEW COMMUNITY FACILITY IN CHRISTCHURCH TOWN CENTRE HAS BEEN DELETED AS THE COUNCIL DOES NOT HAVE AN ASPIRATION FOR THIS". WE WISH TO QUESTION THE PROCEDURE LEADING TO THE INCLUSION OF THIS AMENDMENT WITHIN THE SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CORE STRATEGY PRE SUBMISSION DOCUMENT OF NOVEMBER 2012.</p> <p>IT IS A SMALL PETITION WITH JUST 41 NAMES OF CONCERNED RESIDENTS.</p> <p>IT CONCERNS AN ITEM WHICH IS RARELY OUT OF THE HEADLINES; THE FUTURE OF DRUITT HALL AND ITS POSSIBLE REPLACEMENT.</p> <p>EARLIER THIS YEAR BOROUGH RESIDENTS HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON OUR FUTURE TOWN PLAN, NOW RENAMED WITH THE FUTURISTIC TITLE OF THE CORE STRATEGY.</p> <p>IN THIS DRAFT PLAN WE WERE PRESENTED WITH A CORE STRATEGY VISION WHICH INCLUDED THE SENTENCE "THE PROVISION OF A NEW COMMUNITY FACILITY IN CHRISTCHURCH TOWN CENTRE WILL BE SUPPORTED"</p> <p>RESIDENTS WERE URGED TO COMMENT ON THIS USING A COMPLEX RESPONSE FORM. THESE RESPONSES WERE ASSESSED BY OFFICERS WHO PRODUCED A DOCUMENT OF A SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED POLICY CHANGES TO THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT. THE OFFICERS STATE THAT THESE PROPOSED CHANGES HAVE BEEN MADE AS A RESULT OF THE RESPONSES RECEIVED.</p> <p>IN REVIEWING THE CHANGES WE WERE SHOCKED TO FIND A COMPLETE REVERSAL ON SUPPORTING A NEW COMMUNITY FACILITY. THIS WAS DELETED AND REPLACED WITH THE STARK CHANGE TO</p> <p>" REFERENCE TO A NEW COMMUNITY CENTRE IN</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>CHRISTCHURCH TOWN CENTRE HAS BEEN DELETED AS THE COUNCIL DOES NOT HAVE AN ASPIRATION FOR THIS".</p> <p>SO THE COMBINATION OF THE COUNCIL BEING HELL BENT ON TEARING DOWN DRUITT HALL NEXT MARCH PLUS THIS CHANGE THEN SOUNDS THE DEATH KNELL FOR A COMMUNITY HALL PRESUMABLY FOR EVER. WE LOOKED THROUGH THE LARGE TOME OF RESPONSES AND FOUND NO SIGN OF ANY RESPONSE FORM REQUESTING A CHANGE.</p> <p>ON THE 5TH NOVEMBER AT A MEETING OF THE CHRISTCHURCH CITIZENS ASSOCIATION IN THE THREATENED DRUITT HALL OUR TWO WARD COUNCILLORS PLUS ANOTHER COUNCILLOR WERE ASKED ABOUT THIS VOLTE FACE.WE SAW THREE BEWILDERED FACES -THEY KNEW NOTHING ABOUT IT. WE HAVE ASKED QUESTIONS AND PERUSED COUNCIL DOCUMENTS TO FIND OUT HOW THIS CHANGE OCCURRED. ALL WE CAN DISCOVER IS THAT APPARENTLY IN MID OCTOBER A GROUP OF OFFICERS PLUS TWO COUNCILLORS HELD A MEETING AT WHICH THIS CHANGE WAS MADE. NO MINUTES APPEAR TO EXIST AND THE GROUP NAME IS UNKNOWN, SO WE ARE UNABLE TO CHECK WHO WAS PRESENT.</p> <p>HOWEVER IT APPEARS THAT THIS GROUP SPEAKS FOR THE WHOLE COUNCIL IN THIS MATTER AND AT PRESENT IT SEEMS WE ALL WASTED OUR TIME IN FILLING IN RESPONSE FORMS.</p> <p>WE CONSIDER THIS APPROACH TO BE UNDEMOCRATIC AND QUESTION THE VALIDITY OF THIS MODE OF DECISION MAKING.</p> <p>I JUST WISH THAT COUNCILLORS HAD THE TIME YESTERDAY MORNING TO POP INTO DRUITT HALL TO ATTEND THE LONG ESTABLISHED MONDAY MARKET. I DID ATTEND AND MET SEVERAL VERY SENIOR CITIZENS, SOME OF WHOM MAKE IT INTO THE TOWN RARELY MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK BUT WERE MEETING OLD FRIENDS.THEY WERE ENJOYING A CUP OF COFFEE, PRICE 30PENCE AND A FREE MINCE PIE. THEIR MEAGRE BUDGETS DO NOT STRETCH TO THE GLITZY COFFEE SHOPS OF SAXON SQUARE WITH COFFEE AT OVER £3 A CUP.</p> <p>COUNCILLORS, WHEN A DECISION IS MADE TO TEAR DOWN AN EXISTING COMMUNITY HALL AND YOU TELL US THAT THERE IS NO NEED FOR A REPLACEMENT PLEASE TAKE A STEP BACK AND CONSIDER THOSE SENIORS. ALSO CONSIDER THE GROUPS AND OTHER CLUBS WHICH USE THIS HALL .IT IS NEARLY CHRISTMAS CAN YOU PLEASE CAST OUT MR SCROOGE.THANK YOU AND A MERRY CHRISTMAS TO YOU ALL.</p> <p>-----                      Question to the Leader of the Council from Elliot Marx                      For the Council Meeting 18 December 2012</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>How many public consultation responses from members of the public to the Pre submission Core strategy consultation document advocated deleting the line “The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported” because the “Council does not have an aspiration for this” and which Councillors and Officers proposed this amendment, which Councillors and Officers supported this and when was the amendment made? -----</p> <p>Letter to the Editor, Bournemouth Echo: A recent and sudden amendment to the Core Strategy consultation document has caused great disquiet. I therefore asked the Leader of the Council at the Christchurch Council Meeting on 18 December who was responsible for proposing or supporting this. In his reply Mr Nottage did NOT answer my question of WHO proposed this amendment. The Core Strategy Vision is the KEY aspirational statement of this Core Planning Policy which will shape our area for the next 15 years. The amendment proposes to delete the statement in this section 'Provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported.' This abruptly breaks the continuity of over 10 years of planning consultation and plans. The deleted statement in no way commits the Council to funding or running Druitt Hall. It refers to a long standing aspiration to encourage a community facility in the Town Centre. The significance of the deletion of this KEY final sentence of the Vision cannot be under-estimated. Linked with the Council's recent statements that a community facility is not needed, and that they no longer 'have an aspiration for this' it is extremely worrying. We want it made clear in the 'Vision' that the Council 's aim is to ENCOURAGE a town centre community facility. This is the meaning of the current policy before amendment. In the last stage of this public consultation members of the public made at least 23 positive references to the importance of Druitt Hall or an equivalent town centre community hall-- NONE advocated the withdrawal of the sentence in question. We believe that the decision was made without full consultation with Councillors and we wish to question the procedure leading up to the inclusion of this amendment in the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy Pre-Submission document of November 2012 Elliot Marx</p>				
654660	Ms Anne Mason	chair Transition Town Christchurch	<a href="#">PCCS166</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>This Core Strategy amendment is contrary to paras 7,23,69 and 70 of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) This amendment contravenes the spirit of Community and Localism guidance. Communities should be involved in planning decisions. This decision goes against all evidence of community wishes and needs as seen in petitions numbering 2,020 previously, and 1,000 recently, plus 200 + letters opposing the demolition of Druitt Hall without a replacement in place.</p>	The Council cannot justify this change, which goes against all evidence of the expressed needs and demands of residents, and against evidence of the continuing use of the existing hall for 60 years, and the need for a	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									NPPF says Positive Planning should guard against the loss of valued facilities which help communities to meet their every-day needs. Druitt Hall meets needs of community meeting space, reducing social isolation, supporting local groups and local small enterprise. It is on all bus routes (sustainable transport) and is a central location helping to revitalize the High Street. The growth of population means a centre hall is even more necessary. We question the procedure by which this amendment was made — without Full Council consultation..  Text should read as in original document. ("Provision of a new community facility in Christchurch Town Centre will be supported.") This would comply with the NPPF	replacement if the current hall is demolished.			
654962	Mr Christopher Chope		<a href="#">PCCS374</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	I object to the removal of the last sentence. 'The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch Town Centre will be supported.' The reason for the proposed change is specious and inconsistent with the inclusion of a new reference to supporting a significant elderly and retired population through provision of ..... community facilities'. When and how did the Councillors decide that 'The Council does not have an aspiration for this.'? I have a letter from the Chief Executive of the Council dated 20th December 2012 giving a different reason for the proposed change, namely that the original wording 'was considered to be potentially misleading as it might be inferred to mean we would provide some or all of the finance'.	It is essential that the original wording is reinstated, not least because this is a planning document. The community has an aspiration for a new community facility in Christchurch and the Council has an obligation under a Covenant to provide land for a replacement Hall. Without endorsement in the Core Strategy it could be open to the Council in the future to reject a planning application for a new community facility.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In my capacity as the Member of Parliament for the Christchurch Constituency which includes all of Christchurch Borough and a significant part of the East Dorset District Council area within its boundary.	
656832	Mr Paul Ramsey		<a href="#">PCCS283</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision				A statement has been added - 'Rural traditional employment will be supported.' I object to this development, as the Council's actions, in pursuing this development will cause the closure of the last working farm in the village, this cannot be said to support rural traditional employment.				
662364	Mr Peter Fenning		<a href="#">PCCS281</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision		No	Justified	Original Core Strategy by Council was that "The provision of a new community facility in the town centre will be supported". This was agreed by the Borough Council who approved the draft Core Strategy. The proposed change is 'Reference to a new community facility in Christchurch Town Centre has been deleted as the Council does not have an aspiration for this'. It is understood that this change was inserted simply at the request of 2 councillors, without other councillors not being informed. No response forms or documentation detailing reasons for change are available.	This document will be made 'sound' if the change proposed by just two councillors is withdrawn.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
662364	Mr Peter Fenning		<a href="#">PCCS317</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified		Return to original statement in the Core	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I consider that the change of statement in the post submission	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
								Effective Consistent with national policy		Strategy section on "Core Strategy" page 21 which states "The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported."		has been taken in an undemocratic manner without any public consultation.	
662668	Mr & Mrs A Atkins		<a href="#">PCCS169</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The Core Strategy Amendment is contrary to paras 7,23,69 and 70 of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework). It is against community and localism, the community should be involved and the numerous signatures and letters sent should be enough; also, there is a need under NPPF for valued facilities for everyday needs. It is on the bus route. There will be even more need when the new houses come. Other facilities are over-used, so that one meeting can see another clearly through glass windows.	Text should read as in original document ("Provision of a new community facility in Christchurch Town Centre will be supported.") This would comply with NPPF.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	I believe there are others better versed, but not more keen than I, who will make representations.	
663076	Mrs Sheila Richards		<a href="#">PCCS123</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision				Objections to the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy Pre-Submission November 2012, as it relates to CN2 A statement has been added - 'rural traditional employment will be supported'. I object to this development, as the Council's actions in approving this development, will instigate the closure of the farm, which does not show support for rural traditional employment.				
691333	Mr B.F Sherry		<a href="#">PCCS314</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Interpreted as referring to deletion of last sentence of the Vision - reference to community facility in Christchurch town centre. 1) No consultation on demolition. 2) At odds with previously stated aims for replacement of hall before demolition. 3) Totally at odds with the intended aims of the Drutt covenant.	Refer to original policy. Changes should not be made without consultation.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	"Yes" box ticked but no comments given.	
718880	Mr Stephen Robson		<a href="#">PCCS222</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Spread across pages 6,7,8 of The Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy Vision page 20, is a new or amended text to delete "The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported." because "...the Council does not have an aspiration for this." No mention of the aspirations of the community and people who might use it. Also this contradicts an addition to the document "The challenges of supporting ...will be planned for ... provision of...and community facilities. ..." This fits the bill of Unsound; legally compliant is questioned in that the changes propose clearly do not comply with the NPPF paras 7, 23, 69 and 70 but in particular Para 23 with the policy to promote opportunities for meetings between members of the community. The person or persons who drafted this change have done so against the clear indication of petitions and letters supporting the need for a community hall. Whilst other councils are creating or expanding community halls CBC seem intent on destroying this opportunity. That is clearly unsound if not legally unconstitutional especially as the NPPF para 70 states ...ensure that established shops, facilities ... retained for the	The proposed change to delete "The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported." must itself be deleted to leave the original document at para 20 to state "The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported." This will then comply with the NPPF as well as the aspirations of the community which have been previously acknowledged by the Council in the granting of planning permission for a new hall 8/08/0407 in July	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									benefit of the community.”	2008 and granting of a renewal in July 2011 at 8/11/0210. Previous petitions and letters support the community aspirations in addition to the fact that the hall has been in use for 60 years. No justifiable reason has been given for the proposed change. It should be noted that this does not impose a large cost to the Council as a benefactor has agreed to pay for a new facility.			
718913	Mr Denis Daly		<a href="#">PCCS181</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Local people should have control and be community based.	I will support the community centre as I always have and my family before me.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719393	Mrs Kathleen Roberts		<a href="#">PCCS287</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Changed without consultation. National policy is to support community - this change goes against the spirit of this legislation.	Return to the previous wording, i.e, "The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported."	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719400	Terry Tuck		<a href="#">PCCS290</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	There has been no public consultation response supporting this change. Wording of the amendment goes against recent central Government initiatives of community Localism Act and other policies such as support for our high streets.	Return the policy to its previous version "The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported".	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719401	Mrs Maureen Fisher		<a href="#">PCCS291</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Interpreted as referring to deletion of last sentence of vision - reference to provision of new community facility in Christchurch. No consultation. No consideration for the elderly in the area.	Refer to original policy. Changes should not have been made without consultation.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719409	Jacquetta Morris		<a href="#">PCCS292</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Changed without consultation. Council supported idea of Community Hall. Elderly and disabled will suffer - present hall easy to get to. Public policy stresses community and localism - deleting the support for a community centre goes against an important aspiration, which previously supported ideas of community. Core Strategies are supposed to include aspirations and this has been in Council policy for 10 years.	Core Strategy amendments should only be made after consultation. Return this to previous wording " The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported".	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719411	Mrs Jane Low		<a href="#">PCCS293</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Interpreted as referring to change to last sentence of vision - deletion of reference to community facility in Christchurch. 1. Changes made without consultation. 2. Against localism act.	Any proposals should have been agreed by the public in Christchurch. Community facilities	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									3. It will disadvantage the elderly and immobile who are an important part of Christchurch society.	should be maintained, safeguarded and supported.			
719418	S Rogers		<a href="#">PCCS296</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision				There has been no prior consultation. Not in the interests of residents. At variance with Localism Act.	The change should not be implemented. This part of the Core Strategy should stay in its original form.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
719435	Mr Peter Smith		<a href="#">PCCS301</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	There has been no consultation regarding the changes. It totally disregards the Localism Act. It totally disregards the wishes of the large number of regular users of the present hall. A popular facility is to be replaced by a project for which there has been no request or interest from the community - it is obviously someone's "pet project" being foisted on us.	The desirable changes would be to return the document to its previous wording.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719463	Mrs B Mullins		<a href="#">PCCS305</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Interpreted as referring to deletion of last sentence of vision - reference to a new community facility in Christchurch town centre. Council policy for the last 10 years has aspiration to support the new hall in line with new Government policy supporting community and Localism Act. Policy was changed without consultation. Mary Portas reviews stress mix of community recreation plus retail to keep our High Street alive.	Return to previous wording will be supported	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719475	Mrs Eileen Ward		<a href="#">PCCS306</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Goes against tenures of council policy. Not legally compliant. No consultation on change. Goes against localism and community aspirations. This hall is essential for equalities, access on public transport, short walk for disabled.	Return to previous wording "... will be supported"	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719483	Mr James Cain	Planning Consultant Coles Miller Solicitors	<a href="#">PCCS312</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	See attachments	The text should state "The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported" as per the previous Core Strategy Draft. This would comply with the NPPF as set out in Para 6 of this proforma and would see a continuation of the status quo of a well-used community facility that continued to satisfy a demand that has been in place for 60 years. The Council had offered no justification to delete the sentence set out above.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	It would provide the opportunity to expand and explain the comments made in this proforma and to deal with any questions that the Inspector may have.	<a href="#">2399890_0_1.pdf</a>
719484	Peter Mark Fisher		<a href="#">PCCS310</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	No consultation. No consultation for the elderly in the area.	Refer to original policy. Changes should not have been made without a meeting or consultation.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719490	Mrs Eileen Gay		<a href="#">PCCS311</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified	Interpreted to refer to deletion of last sentence of vision - reference to new community facility in Christchurch town	Text should read. "Provision of a new	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	To give important details why change is unsound.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
								Effective Consistent with national policy	centre. The amendment contravenes paras 7, 23 - 26, 69 - 70 of NPPS. Communities should be involved in planning decisions. No consultation of the loss of valued facilities which communities need to meet their everyday needs.	community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported". This would comply with NPPF.		Please note - the "No" box was ticked for question 8.	
719499	Mr Nigel Morris		<a href="#">PCCS313</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Changes without consultation. Council supported aspiration for a community hall for past 10 years. Previous policy fitted well with central government initiatives facilitating community, localism and Mary Portas reviews.	Core Strategy changes should only be made after consultation. Should be changed back to the previous wording "the provision of a new community facility in Christchurch will be supported".	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719516	Liz Evans		<a href="#">PCCS325</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	No consultation. Against Localism Act. Age discrimination against old and infirm. Disability discrimination - level access and close to transport.	Return to previous wording and fulfil community expectations, don't change previous policy just because current leader of Council disagrees with previous policy.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719520	Mrs Georgina Sherry		<a href="#">PCCS328</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	No consultation. Not taking notice of local people and saying that the hall is not needed is totally wrong.	Original policy. Changes should not be made without consultation.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Hall users should be listened to. The Council seem to be deaf to public demand.	
719569	Mr Rob Evans		<a href="#">PCCS339</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Interpreted as referring to deletion of last sentence of vision - reference to new community facility in Christchurch town centre. There has been no consultation and the proposed change shows complete disregard for the wishes and needs of the residents.	This is very simple. The change should not be accepted. The original wording should stand. This is the aspiration of the residents.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719572	Mr Paul Roberts		<a href="#">PCCS346</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Interpreted as referring to proposed deletion of last sentence of vision - reference to new community facility in Christchurch town centre. Change was not discussed. Just appeared without consultation.	Changes should have been discussed and agreement reached. Changes to Core Strategy cannot be made without consultation. Return the wording to the previous version "Provision....will be supported."	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719575	Mrs Emily Graves		<a href="#">PCCS352</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Interpreted as referring to proposed deletion of last sentence of vision - reference to new community facility in Christchurch town centre. No consultation. Against Localism Act. Discrimination against local community. Destruction of community facilities.	Return to previous wording.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
719579	Mrs Rosemary Hacker		<a href="#">PCCS353</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Interpreted as referring to proposed deletion of final sentence of vision - reference to a new community facility in Christchurch town centre. No consultation with people who use the hall on weekly basis. Where will the Farmers Market go? Will holidaymakers sit outside in the rain?	Refer to original policy.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To put the views of the hall users across, as it seems the Council is not listening to the public and not doing their job. We want a hall.	
719597	Mr Gerald Hacker		<a href="#">PCCS357</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Interpreted to refer to proposed deletion of final sentence of the vision - reference to a new community facility in Christchurch town centre. No consultation with users of the hall. Removal of the Hall without replacement does not service the interests of residents or summer visitors.	Changes should not have been made to the original document without consultation.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719606	Mrs Karen Pigott		<a href="#">PCCS360</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Interpreted to refer to proposed deletion of last sentence of vision - reference to a new community facility in Christchurch town centre. 1. Changed without prior consultation. 2. Does not support elderly residents. 3. Against Localism Act.	Any changes should have been put to the Christchurch community for consultation and agreement. You cannot just change legal documentation as wished to suit yourselves.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719610	Ms Jane Susan Fitzpatrick		<a href="#">PCCS361</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Interpreted as referring to the proposed deletion of last sentence of Vision - reference to a new community facility in Christchurch. 1. Changes made without consultation. 2. Against Localism Act. 3. Disadvantage the elderly / immobile.	Should have been agreed by the public in Christchurch. Community facilities should be safeguarded and supported.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
720046	Mrs Stephanie King		<a href="#">PCCS421</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Should not have been changed without wider consultation. Goes against long-standing Town Centre Strategy. Community Hall in town Centre has been part of local planning for over 10 years. A new hall was planned and planning permission granted— then this was extended for another 3 years in July 2011. The Council supported this aspiration then. Nothing has changed except the need is greater with the economic crisis and need to rely more on self-sufficiency and volunteers, who need somewhere to meet. Valued Community assets should be possible for the community to protect. A nomination was made to the Council. For Druitt Hall as an Asset of value. Why has Council suddenly decided a community hall is not needed? The library extension is not a big enough meeting place or able to have market or longbow archery ping pong and other activities for the community at off office hours. Why has such a big public response fallen on Deaf ears? Over 2000 on first petition. 200+ letter opposing demolition planning application and petition of over 1000. Huge opposition to demolition huge support for new hall. Why does Council say a Hall is not needed when Druitt has been inconstant use for nearly 60 years and only recently -- because council refuse booking and do not maintain it --do they now argue bookings are low!!!? This amendment is not correct planning policy based on real life in our town.	Put it back like it was. Before the line was deleted.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
720136	Mr Roger Theodore Crispin Street		<a href="#">PCCS426</a>	20	The Core Strategy Vision	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The Core Strategy document has been amended without authority by deletion of the words "The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch Town Centre will be supported".	Provision for a town centre community centre should be reinstated in the Core Strategy document, and the demolition of Druitt Hall should not be permitted until the new centre is constructed and in operation.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS315</a>	22	Objective 1	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>1. 'Impact close to designated sites will be avoided, and residential development will contribute to mitigation of development on Heathland habitats.'</p> <p>In our view, this revised wording is less appropriate than the original wording and we object to this change. Impacts should be avoided on designated sites rather than just 'close to'. With respect to heathlands, this should be consistent with ME2 and be clear that development is not acceptable on heathland, and that development near heathlands will contribute to mitigation of impacts upon this internationally protected habitat.</p> <p>2. We welcome the addition of 'and biodiversity enhancements' but consider that provision of greenspace and biodiversity enhancements should not just be restricted to major housing schemes, for example the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2012-14 requires contributions to greenspace where provision is not possible on site. New greenspace is an overall aim of the Green Infrastructure Strategy and is vital to give people access to open space/nature for health and wellbeing. NPPF 118 encourages opportunities to incorporate biodiversity enhancement in and around developments.</p> <p>3. Whilst supporting the protection and enhancement of important natural features, we do not consider that this objective fully encompasses all the biodiversity of the area and the intention of NPPF with respect to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. For example, the area supports significant areas of other priority habitats such as lowland deciduous and wet woodland, species rich hedgerows and lowland grassland. NPPF also seeks positive gains and positive planning for networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure. Thus we consider a wider statement giving protection to all priority habitats and species is required and reference to landscape scale conservation.</p>	<p>1. We suggest rewording is required to clarify that impacts should be avoided on designated sites and residential development should contribute to mitigation of impacts of development near heathland.</p> <p>2. We suggest rewording is required to clarify that not just major housing proposals will be required to provide new greenspace and biodiversity enhancements .</p> <p>3. We recommend additional wording is required to give protection to priority habitats and species and wording to reflect the vision's aim to enhance connectivity of natural features.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county, are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership. We consider that the changes proposed do not give sufficient protection or gain for the environment and would wish to contribute to an oral examination in support of this view.	
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS243</a>	22	Objective 1	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>This objective is poorly drafted. Impacts should be avoided on designated sites either through direct or indirect means. Development on designated sites is to be avoided, but development close to these sites may also cause harm (as is well known in the case of heathlands).</p> <p>Consistency is needed with the bespoke conservation policies, especially ME2, in its treatment of heathlands.</p>	Amendments are required to clarify that both direct and indirect impacts on designated (and other) sites are to be avoided.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The Plan raises issues of nature conservation importance, matters which the RSPB is familiar and has considerable expertise. We are active in the Plan area as advocates for sustainable development and biodiversity conservation. We wish to reserve the opportunity to appear at	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
												an examination of nature conservation issues. We consider that we are in well positioned to advise an Inspector on these matters.	
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS441</a>	22	Objective 1		No	Positively Prepared Justified Consistent with national policy	The revised wording has made it worse and changes have been made to the wrong bit of the first sentence. The phraseology still implies that development takes place on heathlands. The intent is not entirely clear and we advise that all wording should be unambiguous to avoid any difficulties at the Planning Application stages of developments. We support the inclusion of biodiversity enhancements but advise that the objective still fails to address the issue of landscape scale coherent ecological networks and does not comply with NPPF 165 which requires an assessment of existing and potential components of ecological networks. "Priority habitats" have been omitted so failing to comply with NPPF 117 bullet point 3: there is nowhere else in the Objectives for reference to be made to priority habitats.	We retain our objection and recommendations.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	As part of the East Dorset Community Partnership, ETAG's remit on biological sciences and sustainability is wider than that of Natural England or Dorset Wildlife Trust. Membership includes highly qualified natural scientists and town & parish representatives.	
612430	Mr Nick Squirrell	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">PCCS262</a>	22	Objective 1	Yes	Yes	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy		Natural England support the modifications made.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		<a href="#">PCCS423</a>	22	Objective 1	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The criteria as set out regarding the Green Belt, nature conservation, sensitive heathland, congested roads, etc, are not protected in this document. This document has to address the housing pressure problem in ways other than endlessly building (what's going to be built over in the next Plan? It can't go on) where the above-mentioned habitats are lost or threatened and congestion can only worsen. Crucial to this is defending the Green Belt, which is not being done. That's the only way to protect the habitats and considerations described.	Please note - The respondee has suggested deleting text which has not been altered in the Schedule of Proposed Changes.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
654962	Mr Christopher Choape		<a href="#">PCCS375</a>	22	Objective 1	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	I object to the change of wording from 'impact on designated sites' to 'impact close to designated sites'. 'Close to' is vague and subjective and the rewording dilutes the key objective which is to avoid any impact on designated sites.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In my capacity as the Member of Parliament for the Christchurch Constituency which includes all of Christchurch Borough and a significant part of the East Dorset District Council area within its boundary.	
656626	Mr Michael Madgwick	Rural Surveyor The National Trust	<a href="#">PCCS97</a>	22	Objective 1	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The change to the wording in the second sentence seems to make things less clear than it was before. It is the impact on the designated sites from development elsewhere that needs to be avoided not the impact on areas close by. Another way of looking at it would be, it is the impact from development close by that needs to be avoided. In addition, the phrase 'residential development will contribute to mitigation of development on Heathland habitats' seems to imply that development on Heathland habitats can take place.	Suggested change to the wording of the second sentence; Impact on designated sites from development close to them will be avoided and residential development elsewhere will contribute to mitigation for the effects of development on Heathland habitats.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
719394	Ms Jade Ellis	Assistant Planner Turley Associates	<a href="#">PCCS288</a>	22	Objective 1		No	Effective	The first part of the second sentence has been altered to, 'impact CLOSE TO DESIGNATED SITES will be avoided'. The words 'close to' is not sufficiently precise to be effective, as it will lead to debates over the definition of 'close to.' The objective is surely to avoid or where necessary mitigate harmful impacts on designated sites wherever possible. In addition, the proposed additional wording alongside the word 'avoided' is not flexible enough to be effective over the plan period, as the policies of the Core Strategy DPD will have impacts on or close to 'designated sites', an example being SPA's. This cannot be 'avoided' if the Council are to fulfil its housing objectives. However, it can be effectively mitigated through the provision of compensatory SANG. There are other designations where mitigation is more appropriate on balance than avoidance, particularly where this results in wider benefits or net gains.	Add words, 'or mitigated where this is not possible,' after 'avoided' and delete the words 'close to'.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I would like to confirm that we would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of clients' interests at Wimborne/Colehill.	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS316</a>	22	Objective 3		No	Consistent with national policy	We support the inclusion of reference to important ecosystem services and wish to see this retained, but the policy as written is restricted to on-site measures that are incorporated as part of developments. NPPF (109) states that the planning system should recognise the wider benefits of ecosystem services and we therefore consider reference should be made here to the importance of natural ecosystem services.	We suggest an additional sentence is inserted after ".....public transport." that recognises the wider value of ecosystem services. This would then lead on to the contribution development could make to supporting these services.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county, are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership. We consider that the changes proposed do not sufficiently reflect NPPF and would wish to contribute to an oral examination in support of this view.	
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS226</a>	22	Objective 3	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	We are unclear why there has been a reduction to 10%.	We would welcome clarification of the basis for this significant amendment.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS442</a>	22	Objective 3		No	Effective Consistent with national policy	i) While welcoming the inclusion of a reference to ecosystem services to comply with NPPF 109, the way in which it has been done in this objective implies that any consideration will only be in relation to development. This is not what is required in NPPF which states The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:... • recognizing the wider benefits of ecosystem services ... While individual development must make a contribution to this, it is the local plan process as a whole that should deliver ecosystem services on a landscape scale. ii) We do not support the reduction of aspirational targets for renewable energy provision (see comments on ME5). Arguments about viability cannot be sustained when the technology that might be applicable to any site over the Plan period is unknown as is the level of Government incentives. We should be striving to achieve the maximum that is	In our response to Core Strategy 2012, we highlighted the issues that should be taken into consideration Adaptation to the challenges of climate change include recognition of the role of ecosystem services (including carbon sequestration through retention and appropriate management of permanent vegetation such as grassland and heathland, and habitat	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	As part of the East Dorset Community Partnership, ETAG's remit on biological sciences and sustainability is wider than that of Natural England or Dorset Wildlife Trust. Membership includes highly qualified natural scientists and town & parish representatives.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									technically possible.	restoration and creation), watershed protection and flood risk attenuation, pollination, pest and disease control (NPPF para 109) Ensuring we have resilient and coherent ecological networks on a landscape scale is an essential part of our adaptation to climate change.			
612430	Mr Nick Squirrell	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">PCCS263</a>	22	Objective 3	Yes	Yes	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	NE support the modifications made. The proposed additional text suggested by the Dorset Wildlife Trust would provide additional clarification about the multiple value/functionality of ecosystem services.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
654817	Mr Alan Spencer		<a href="#">PCCS132</a>	22	Objective 3		No	Positively Prepared Consistent with national policy	The objective, by reducing its target from 15% to 10%, is ignoring that future innovation can have an impact in reducing the effects of Climate Change. It also gives a message to developers and the public that climate change is not a serious issue. 10% is a soft target; it is quite easily achievable with modern materials and processes. This objective does not go far enough in mitigating the effects of Climate Change as required by the NPPF. The council has received several suggestions on how to reduce the effects of Climate Change, but its planners have ignored this, continuing to chase and increase dwelling numbers in the strategy thereby increasing the burden on natural resources rather than mitigating the effect of soaring additional energy consumption.	Revert the objective back to 15%. Identify that this is a target and will be revised as future development and innovation impacts materials and processes in future years. To be compliant with the NPPF a development site within the Core Strategy needs to be identified for energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I consider that EDDC have not made sufficient provision for the effects of climate change in the Core Strategy and have not taken into account the requirements of the NPPF in this regard. It is incumbent on us all to preserve this planet for future generations. I believe there are sites within the plan whereby energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources can take place.	
717890	Angela Pooley	Co-ordinator East Dorset Friends of the Earth	<a href="#">PCCS121</a>	22	Objective 3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Reducing the target % of renewables from 15% to 10% is totally unsound and is evidence of a serious lack of commitment to addressing Climate Change. It is also contrary to the commitments in the Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole Renewable Energy Strategy.	At a very minimum the target should be left at 15% or ideally raised to 20%	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">PCCS102</a>	23	Objective 5	Yes	Yes		We support the changes to this paragraph which is broadly in line with our recommended changes in our previous representations.				
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS443</a>	23	Objective 5		Yes		We support the inclusion of the reference to lifetime homes to ensure sustainability.				
490815	Mrs Trish Jamieson	Clerk Burton Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS479</a>	23	Objective 5				Supports reference to need for housing to meet people's needs at all stages of life. General increase of elderly population in Burton		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		<a href="#">PCCS430</a>	23	Objective 5	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Not enough provision for affordable housing: both for rent and purchase, by local people. Increase considerably the % of affordable housing and link it to local residents as a condition.	We have to do all we can to control the rate of influx of people from outside, which is the biggest factor in housing being	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	Is it unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										unaffordable for our own residents.			
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS444</a>	23	Objective 6		No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The new wording has summarised the proposals but not addressed the issues we raised previously. We retain our objection and recommendations.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
476036	Mr Colin Jamieson		<a href="#">PCCS161</a>	23	Objective 6	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Effective	This is unsound because it does not recognise the need to improve highway infrastructure between Christchurch and Bournemouth Airport which has previously in this document been identified as an employment centre and a main travel interchange. No reference is made of an effective highway link to Bournemouth Airport or of a public transport infrastructure	There continues to be an aspiration for a Christchurch Bypass to allow the free movement of traffic without accessing the town centre. This will allow the town centre to reassert itself and enhance the economic vibrancy.		I am a County Councillor for part of Christchurch. I believe it is vital to be able to promote the aspiration of effective highway routes and an improved infrastructure to enhance the economic, social and environment facilities at this time, which may take some time to bring to fruition.	
490815	Mrs Trish Jamieson	Clerk Burton Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS480</a>	23	Objective 6				Objects to removal of specific reference to Stony Lane / Staple Cross junctions Even without the proposed development west of Salisbury Road these junctions cannot cope with the traffic load from Burton. The position of the Borough Council, that further housing should not be accepted without infrastructure improvements, applies to these trouble spots.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
654046	Mr David Pardy		<a href="#">PCCS141</a>	23	Objective 6	No	No	Justified Effective	The proposed improvements to the road system particularly the A35 corridor through Christchurch are unlikely to have a significant impact on current traffic congestion & any urban extension should be deferred until a proper bypass for Christchurch is built (ref The Core Strategy Vision: which should be strengthened to say that an urban extension until a bypass is built cannot be pursued). The Road Safety issues arising from the urban extension would be serious & for this reason I believe the proposals are not legally compliant.	Add; A bypass must be provided for Christchurch before any major expansion or urban extension can go ahead.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
654962	Mr Christopher Chope		<a href="#">PCCS376</a>	23	Objective 6	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	I object to the amended text. The proposed modification of a fundamental strategic objective at the behest of the County Council undermines the role of the strategy which is to set out the improved infrastructure which local people and their Councillors would like to see, rather than merely describing what Dorset County Council is willing to deliver currently.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In my capacity as the Member of Parliament for the Christchurch Constituency which includes all of Christchurch Borough and a significant part of the East Dorset District Council area within its boundary.	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS319</a>	25	New Policy KS13	Yes	Yes		Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of KS13. In particular, we support the need to find solutions that secure development which improves all three strands of sustainability, which includes the environment.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS445</a>	25	New Policy KS13		Yes		We support the policy but advise that it is essential that the Strategy defines unequivocally what is meant by sustainability - not just the standard definition but what sustainability means in practical terms for the implementation of policies. There must be no room for doubt or risk of different interpretation by different users of the Strategy leading to legal challenge. We welcome recognition of the requirement to secure improvement in all three				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									strands of sustainability We have been advised by the Planners that a glossary will be included to define what the Strategy means by other frequently used terms such as significant, adequately and major.				
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS489</a>	25	New Policy KS13				Please note that with the new policy additions KS13 and ME8 the previous objections about these omissions have now been overcome.				
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS193</a>	25	New Policy KS13		Yes		The inclusion of the new policy to reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development is supported		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS202</a>	25	New Policy KS13		Yes		The inclusion of the new policy to reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development is supported.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719394	Ms Jade Ellis	Assistant Planner Turley Associates	<a href="#">PCCS294</a>	25	New Policy KS13		No	Consistent with national policy	Inclusion of words 'unless material considerations indicate otherwise' does not reflect the wording of Paragraph 14 of NPPF. This unacceptably dilutes the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development intended by NPPF, providing an opportunity to thwart its application. The Joint Authorities have not presented evidence of local circumstances that justify a departure from national policy in this regard.	The sentence should be revised to better reflect Paragraph 14 of NPPF.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I would like to confirm that we would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of clients' interests at Wimborne/Colehill.	
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	<a href="#">PCCS364</a>	27	KS2	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Our clients object to the wording of this policy as the boundary of the proposed Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace at the Christchurch urban extension is yet to be determined and therefore revised Green Belt boundaries cannot as yet be shown. Accordingly we propose revised wording as follows: 'Sang provision is required for the Christchurch urban extension, some of which may fall outside the administrative boundary. Once SANG is established it will remain within the Green Belt where this designation currently applies.'		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To provide expert evidence on relevant aspects of the policy.	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS318</a>	27	KS2	Yes	Yes		Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of significant open space and SANGs within the Green Belt. We also support the need for development proposals on sites considered as previously developed sites within the Green Belt to require a development brief, travel plan and wildlife strategy as detailed in the proposed amended text.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS232</a>	27	KS2	Yes	Yes		We welcome the confirmation that SANGs and open space will be created in the Green Belt. We also welcome the addition of a 'wildlife strategy' as a prerequisite to these sites being brought forward.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS446</a>	27	KS2		Yes		We support the inclusion of significant open space and SANGs within the Green Belt. We welcome the requirement for previously developed sites to be considered against sustainable development criteria and including agreement of a wildlife strategy.				
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS447</a>	27	KS2		No	Positively Prepared Consistent with national policy	The wording has not addressed our concern regarding the selection of just two of the Green Belt criteria. For Christchurch and Wimborne, the setting of historic towns		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									(NPPF80) is equally important.				
476036	Mr Colin Jamieson		<a href="#">PCCS162</a>	27	KS2	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The Green Belt, particularly related to Burton protects the character of the village and supports the Burton Conservation Area Management Plan in that it significantly protects the local village centred farm and supports the Strategic Gap between Burton and the wider conurbation of Christchurch.	The proposed amendment to the green belt is predicated on housing growth which does not accord with the local housing need and the proposed housing that would be the catalyst to the demise of the Conservation Area does not identify any local housing for local people	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To demonstrate effectively the need to retain the green belt	
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS496</a>	27	KS2	Yes	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	The plan as revised is not consistent with National Policy as it does not include a proposals map showing the extent of the green belt as required by the NPPF paragraph 83. It clearly states that Local Plans must establish Green Belt boundaries to set the framework for settlement policy. As the Green Belt boundary must endure for the long term it is necessary to establish it now. MEM Ltd believe the Green Belt boundary at Roeshot should be revised to run along the railway line to allow the urban extension as envisaged in policy CN1 to occur and should encompass all land east of Salisbury Road at Burton. MEM Ltd have already advised that they believe the Green Belt boundary should be altered to accommodate further development at Burton in their previous representation with regard to policy CN2 (1) Legally compliant: Yes No (2) Sound*: Yes No Positively Prepared: Justified: Effective: Consistent with national policy: and have shown in detail the extent of the inset to the Green Belt at Burton required to make the core strategy sound. The proposed revised policy wording is not effective as it is not possible to show the geographic extent SANGs on the proposals map at this stage as they are subject to detailed negotiation on their nature and extent. In addition it is not an effective policy as it is not possible to show the geographic extent of SANGs that fall outside the administrative areas of CBC and EDDC.	MEM Ltd believe the practical solution is to show a symbol on the proposal map at this stage indicating the potential locations of SANGs to serve development in the fashion of a 'key diagram' or as areas of search as shown on the draft Heathlands DPD. The SANG for Roeshot should be shown as a symbol/ or area of search north of the railway line. Please	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	MEM's client is the landowner of the potential SANG at Roeshot to serve site CN1.	
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS190</a>	27	KS2		No	Effective	The need to amend Policy KS2 to clarify that Green Belt boundaries will be shown on Proposals Maps for each of the developments proposed is recognized and supported. However, we are concerned that the proposed wording does not adequately clarify this issue. The revisions to the text suggests the Green Belt boundaries will follow the edge of the new urban area, this is ambiguous as the Green Belt boundaries will need to be revised in order to allow the new urban area to be developed. The revisions to the policy would provide greater clarity if	Amend the proposed change as follows: The revised Green Belt boundaries will accommodate the allocated development sites by following the red line indicating the extent of the site as shown in the illustrative plans in the	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes in relation to land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley that forms the FWP4 allocation in the Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	Is it unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									they were re-worded to explain that the revised Green Belt boundaries follow the extent of the proposed development sites as indicated by the red line in the illustrative plans in the relevant site chapters, unless the site includes SANGS and strategic open space, which will be incorporated into the revised Green Belt. The additional criteria added to Policy KS2 to clarify the approach to the development of previously developed sites is welcomed.	relevant site chapters, unless the site includes SANGS or strategic open space provision, which will be included in the Green Belt.			
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS221</a>	27	KS2	No	No	Positively Prepared Effective Consistent with national policy	In order to provide for locally led and small scale development initiatives that will emerge through the Site Specific Allocation Document, Neighbourhood Plans or other later stages in the development plan process, policy KS2 needs to be amended to enable minor amendments to Green Belt boundaries to be made at those later stages in the planning process. Minor amendments to Green Belt boundaries may be required in order to facilitate smaller scale but sustainable forms of development. The amended KS2 wording does not enable such changes to be made at later stages of the development plan process, hence the policy is too rigid, and will procedurally preclude the Council's ability to agree to such changes at a later date. This will have the effect of precluding or stifling some locally beneficial and locally supported development initiatives from being properly considered. The Council has indicated that smaller scale developments are not strategic enough to warrant any consideration in the Core Strategy at this stage of the process, but unless there is an ability to make minor adjustments to Green Belt boundaries to facilitate such developments at a later stage in the process, they will have been totally precluded without the opportunity even to have been assessed and considered.	The following additional wording should be inserted after the amended wording to KS2 on page 13 of the Consultation Document: Minor amendments to Green Belt boundaries may be made at alter stages of the plan making process in order to facilitate small scale sustainable developments that emerge through Site Specific Allocations or Neighbourhood Plans, provided it can be demonstrated that such developments are sustainable, deliver local benefits and do not adversely affect the strategic role of the Green Belt.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	There is a fundamental failing in the process at present, as the Core Strategy will fix the Green Belt boundaries irrevocably at this strategic plan making stage. In doing so it will preclude the consideration of developments with the potential to bring forward important local benefits, supported by the community, delivering the Governments' objectives as set out in the NPPF and the localism agenda. Local communities, Parish Councils and other bodies will be precluded from initiating locally-led proposals in the manner advocated by Government planning advice if the Green Belt policy is fixed as currently proposed. This matter is important and needs to be fully debated at the examination.	
654618	Mr Peter Tanner	Tanner & Tilley Planning Consultants	<a href="#">PCCS474</a>	27	KS2	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Effective Consistent with national policy	The proposed change to Policy KS2 has failed to take the opportunity to review the Green Belt boundary to accommodate for the needs of development, including housing development, not just for that which will arise during the Plan Period but also beyond it. Paragraph 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework advocates that once established, Green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, it proposes that authorities "...should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period". Paragraph 5.42 of the 'Analysis of Responses Core Strategy Pre-Submission Consultation April – June 2012' (November 2012) acknowledges that "...The Councils have demonstrated evidence of need for additional dwellings within the Plan area, and have also demonstrated that there is insufficient capacity within the existing built-up areas to accommodate this need...".	To make Policy KS2 compliant and sound it is suggested that the last paragraph to the policy be changed to read:- "The existing boundaries will be reviewed and where necessary changed to enable some new housing and employment to meet local needs that may be required both within and beyond the Plan Period of the Core Strategy"	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									If it is the case that Green Belt boundaries need to be changed in terms of the Core Strategy proposals to accommodate projected housing and employments needs during the Plan period, it is likely that housing and employment needs beyond the Plan period will also need to rely on land currently in the Green Belt. For this reason we suggest that the opportunity of reviewing the Green belt Boundary should be taken now to allow for the accommodation of possible future development that may be needed beyond the Plan Period.				
654871	Mr Martin Miller	Technical Director Terence O'Rourke Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS148</a>	27	KS2	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>Whilst we welcome the council's intention to modify Policy KS2 to take account of the change of government policy in paragraph 89 of the NPPF, objection is raised to the requirement for an adopted development brief, travel plan and wildlife strategy to be agreed with the council as pre-requisites to any planning applications for development being determined. Whilst we accept that development briefs, travel plans and wildlife strategies can often be useful in establishing development parameters at sites:</p> <p>1) There is no national requirement for them to be produced on green belt or any other sites, and they may not always be necessary on every site to deliver an acceptable form of development. Productive pre-application discussions and a comprehensive planning application are potentially capable of delivering the same outcomes</p> <p>2) The inclusion of these requirements unnecessarily adds to the costs and delays that developers face in bringing sites forward. This is contrary to the government's desire to get the construction industry moving, as set out in Eric Pickles' speech entitled Housing and Growth on 6 September 2012</p> <p>3) Should the council choose not to adopt / agree a development brief, travel plan or wildlife strategy on a green belt site for any particular reason, the council would effectively have a planning policy that an applicant for planning permission has no prospect of complying with. This would either lead to development not coming forward or an unnecessary planning appeal, contrary to the government's objectives for a more streamlined planning system</p>	<p>In order for the policy to be justified, effective and in accordance with national policy, we consider that flexibility needs to be introduced such that each site is looked at on its individual merits. We therefore suggest the following amendments:</p> <p>"In accordance with the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, development proposals on sites considered as previously developed sites within the Green Belt shall be considered against sustainable development criteria. Depending on the characteristics of a particular site, potential prerequisites for development could include:</p> <p>1) approval of a development brief by the Council</p> <p>2) agreement of a comprehensive travel plan, and</p> <p>3) agreement of a wildlife strategy that ensures no harm to features of acknowledged biodiversity importance, as well as enhancing the biodiversity where possible through improving the condition of existing habitats or</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	We wish to have the opportunity to explain to the Inspector why we consider the policy amendments (although well intentioned) are unnecessarily onerous, and to be part of any debate about potential alternative wording.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										creation of new ones."			
717053	Mrs Janet Healy		<a href="#">PCCS82</a>	27	KS2	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	We support keeping all the SANGS within the Green Belt. We reluctantly support some revision of the Green Belt in order to increase the supply of much needed affordable homes. We cannot support all the potential revision of the Green Belt using the criteria proposed in the Core Strategy by the Christchurch and East Dorset Officers. Authors have omitted some of the most valuable purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF. All our arguments are set out in our response to the Core Strategy pre-submission Consultation under the names of Janet and Kevin Healy. More arguments were raised in the Issues and Options response submitted by Janet & Kevin Healy, Paul Timberlake.	We will support the inclusion of the purposes of the Green Belt that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</li> <li>to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment in addition to the remaining criteria.</li> </ul>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	We do appreciate the difficulty in finding suitable land for building in East Dorset as so much of our land is covered by international and national designations. We also recognise the urgent need to house our young who cannot afford the high market prices in our area. However, we believe that some proposed urban extensions would violate the original purposes of the Green Belt which remain even more valid now than when first introduced, and we wish to take our arguments against these proposed extensions as far as we can	
718911	Mr Joshua Lambert	Planning Assistant Pro Vision Planning and Design	<a href="#">PCCS467</a>	27	KS2	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	Policy KS2 Green Belt 2.1 To be sound, a Core Strategy must be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence (ie, justified, in accord with paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework NPPF). The revised Green Belt boundaries set out within the Proposed Changes to Policy KS2 should follow the edge of the previously developed area of Little Canford Depot. Little Canford Depot does not contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt set out within paragraph 80 of the NPPF, as the site is substantially developed and is largely surrounded by development. The site is to be redeveloped during the plan period. In light of the reasonable alternatives, including greenfield land release, the inclusion of Little Canford Depot within the Green Belt is not the most appropriate strategy for the delivery of essential housing and employment. The significant area of SANG provided as part of the redevelopment of Little Canford Depot could remain within the Green Belt, consistent with the Proposed Changes to Policy KS2. The redevelopment of the site would facilitate the beneficial use of this area of the Green Belt, in accord with paragraph 81 of the NPPF. The proposals for the SANG would improve access, provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation, protect the landscape character, improve visual amenity and enhance biodiversity. Including the previously developed area of Little Canford Depot within the Green Belt does not facilitate the beneficial use of the Green Belt. Therefore Policy KS2 is inconsistent with the NPPF. Paragraph 182 of the NPPF states that Core Strategies must be consistent with the NPPF to be sound. Little Canford Depot should be released from the Green Belt to ensure that Policy KS2 complies with the NPPF and the Core Strategy is sound. Wessex Water Services supports the further criteria set out within the Proposed Changes to Policy KS2 clarifying the Core Strategy's approach to Previously Developed Land		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1. Because of the high level of public interest in reducing greenfield land in East Dorset in favour of optimizing previously developed land. 2. To enable the Inspector to test the evidence demonstrating that the Core Strategy is unsound without the allocation of Little Canford Depot for mixed use residential and employment development.	<a href="#">2403289_0_1.pdf</a>

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									within the Green Belt. The criteria are consistent with paragraph 89 of the NPPF, which states that redevelopment of Previously Developed Land, whether redundant or in continuing use, which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development, is appropriate within the Green Belt.				
719394	Ms Jade Ellis	Assistant Planner Turley Associates	<a href="#">PCCS295</a>	27	KS2		No	Effective Consistent with national policy	The wording of the new paragraph and criterion regarding previously developed sites in the Green Belt is not consistent with paragraph 88 and 89 of NPPF. Reference to 'sustainable development criteria' is insufficiently precise and would require further definition if retained. The current wording is more positive towards development on such sites than is necessarily reflected in NPPF. The objective in our view should be to secure development in the most appropriate and sustainable locations, not maximise the use of previously developed land at all costs.	Revise to better reflect NPPF paragraphs 88 and 89.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I would like to confirm that we would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of clients' interests at Wimborne/Colehill.	
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS384</a>	28	4.17	Yes			Proposed Changes to paras 4.17 – 4.20 and Policy KS3 Housing Provision in Christchurch and East Dorset. Christchurch and East Dorset Councils are proposing revised housing figures based on updated evidence on population and household projections for Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset provided by the County Council. The revised figures indicate that household growth for the plan area could be lower than was indicated in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (2012). The Councils acknowledge in the AoR (para 5.62) that these figures are estimates and that changing data results in variation of outputs. For instance, revised Census based projections are expected in 2013 and these may indicate a different level of growth. Also, any strategy should be developed in recognition of the role that Christchurch and East Dorset play in the wider Strategic Housing Market and Local Enterprise areas. It is this overarching strategy that local councils should be developing through the duty to co-operate.	Dorset County Council considers that the plan should go further in clarifying the role that the housing strategy plays in the wider Housing Market and Local Enterprise areas	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset County Council wishes to partake in any oral hearing on this matter in order to fulfil its role under the duty to cooperate and ensure that its interests are considered in the emerging Core Strategy.	
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	Clerk West Parley Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS409</a>	28	4.17		No	Positively Prepared Justified	West Parley Parish Council's response to the original draft strategy was critical of the way in which the housing figures had been arrived at. The new evidence since produced - the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Population and Household Projection (2012) - does nothing to change this deficiency.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	West Parley Parish Council would like to present a final written statement to the Inspector, based on any questions raised by the Inspector and take part in the oral examination. We reserve the right to respond to any new evidence presented by the District Council and/or Third Parties.	
619967	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation (South West)	<a href="#">PCCS110</a>	28	4.17		No	Justified	(Please see attachment <619967 Christchurch East Dorset CS - proposed changes.pdf> for charts referred to in the text) The housing requirement is unsound as it is unjustified by an evidence base that is available for public scrutiny. We note the reference to the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Population and Household Projections (2012) prepared by Dorset County Council. This document,		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The HBF would like to appear at the examination to debate these matters further.	<a href="#">2392573_0_1.pdf</a>

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>however, was not available from the website for East Dorset when I checked on the 5 December 2012. The East Dorset Council confirmed that this was the case when I rang to ask it about the location of the document on 5 December. Following an inquiry, East Dorset Council subsequently made this information available to me on the 6 December. Planning Policy Manager, Richard Henshaw, for the Christchurch &amp; East Dorset Partnership, commented to me in an email to me on the 7 December, that he did not consider that the late presentation of this evidence represented a significant flaw in the consultation process. As he remarked:</p> <p>“I apologise that the DCC housing figures were not available on our website which was an administrative oversight. However, I do not believe that there is a need to extend the consultation beyond the seven weeks provided. At the time the data was published on the website there were still two weeks remaining in the consultation which should be sufficient bearing in mind it is a short piece of work. Additionally, we have only had two enquiries (both this week) for the data.”</p> <p>I am not so sure for the reasons I will set out below. Having considered the new evidence it takes the form of two documents:                      Christchurch Borough Council: 2011 Census Based Projection                      East Dorset Council: 2011 Census Based Projection                      It is unclear how the Councils have arrived at a combined figure for 7,500 dwellings as representing the objectively assessed level of need, since these two documents measure the household growth over a period of 2011 to 2031, not 2013 to 2028 which is the requirement of paragraph 159 of the Framework. The household growth over this period that both documents show is:                      Christchurch 4,300 dwellings                      East Dorset 5,300 dwellings                      How the Councils have arrived at a figure of 7,500 as the objective level of need has not been explained, and while I think I know the answer, this needs to be set out in the two papers more clearly (I think it is taking these totals, dividing them by 20 years, and then multiplying them by 15 years). It is also curious and a little troubling that the Council has produced a new evidence base for the objective assessment of the housing need so late in the plan making process. The does raise procedural questions relating to public consultation on identifying the objective need for housing and the second stage of the plan making process relating to establishing a housing requirement (which would reflect other policy considerations that are raised by the Framework) and the conduct of the Sustainability Appraisal. Although we note that the difference between the housing requirements in the pre-submission document and the proposed changes appears de minimis – it is some 70 dwellings shy of the pre-submission version (5,250 dwellings were originally earmarked for East Dorset and 3,020 in</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>Christchurch, totalling 8,270) the objective assessment in the proposed changes is for 7,500 dwellings, and the requirement only goes up to 8,200 once a 10% contingency has been added-on. Because a contingency has been factored in – a precautionary measure that we would support to enable the plan to be able to respond to potential changes in patterns of housing need – the difference between the pre-submission version and the proposed changes is some 770 dwellings. This is not an insignificant difference and we would need to see the underlying evidence that justifies this change to the core strategy and what impact this may have on the Sustainability Assessment.</p> <p>The HBF recommends that the Dorset County Council document is made available to the public and the consultation period is extended to enable people to have the time to consider the new evidence.</p> <p>We also note, that the figure of 7,500 homes (less the 10% allowance) compares unfavourably with the evidence from the SHMA 2012 which appears to indicate a need for 3,285 homes in Christchurch (219 x 15 years) and 5,040 homes in East Dorset (336 x 15 years) between 2013 and 2028. This would make a total of 8,325 homes. See figure 7.6 on page 108 of the SHMA 2012 which provides the updated assessment of household change over the period 2011 to 2031. Since the Framework expects the objective assessment of housing need to be conducted through the SHMA we would tend to attach greater weight to this document. If a 10% contingency is added to the SHMA figure of 8,325 then this would indicate the need for a housing requirement of about 9,157 dwellings (or rounded down to 9,150) over the life of the plan.</p> <p>The Framework requires that the objective assessment of housing need is conducted through the SHMA (paragraph 159). The Dorset County Council document does not satisfy the requirements of the Framework in this regard.</p> <p>The freely available How Many Homes website provides information on the household and population projections. This can be accessed by everyone for free at <a href="http://www.howmanyhomes.org/3.html">http://www.howmanyhomes.org/3.html</a>. The website has been sponsored jointly by the Local Government Association, the HBF, the Planning Advisory Service, the Planning Officers' Society and Shelter among others. Its purpose is to provide an independent and publicly available data on the household and population projections for every local authority in England and to present this in an easy to understand way. The aim is to present the basic evidence on the household and population projections to enable third parties to understand and scrutinise the evidence base for housing numbers. The data for East Dorset and Christchurch show that the main factors driving housing demand in both authorities is the effect of in-migration of households into the authorities from elsewhere in England.</p> <p>East Dorset Christchurch In view of the extent of in-migration into the authorities from</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									elsewhere in the England – an indicator of the attractiveness of the area – it is wise that contingency is factored in lest housing demand exceeds the baseline indicator provided by the SHMA 2012 document.				
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS434</a>	28	4.18	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The Proposed Change to Policy KS 3 introduces an overall strategic housing target in the Core Strategy area of 8,200 in the period 2013 – 2018. This represents a reduction from the target of 8,625 as set out in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy (PSCS) - 3,375 for Christchurch and 5,250 for East Dorset. A reduction of this nature is not justified, particularly given the text of Paragraph 4.16 of the PSCS, which states: "Christchurch and East Dorset face major pressure to provide more housing. There is a high level of housing that cannot be met in the private market. Additionally, it is predicted that there will continue to be changes in the size and nature of households which will increase the need for new homes." Given that Paragraph 4.16 is not proposed to be changed, the Core Strategy will continue to acknowledge the need to provide significant levels of new dwellings to meet housing need; yet now proposes to reduce the strategic target. This approach fails the tests of soundness set out in Section 5 of this Form of Representation.	Amend the text to revert to the PSCS targets to give a combined total for Christchurch and East Dorset of 8,625 dwellings.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine the components of housing need and supply in the Borough of Christchurch.	
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS425</a>	28	4.18	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective	The Proposed Change to Policy KS 3 introduces an overall strategic housing target in the Core Strategy area of 8,200 in the period 2013 – 2018. This represents a reduction from the target of 8,625 as set out in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy (PSCS) - 3,375 for Christchurch and 5,250 for East Dorset. A reduction of this nature is not justified, particularly given the text of Paragraph 4.16 of the PSCS, which states: "Christchurch and East Dorset face major pressure to provide more housing. There is a high level of housing that cannot be met in the private market. Additionally, it is predicted that there will continue to be changes in the size and nature of households which will increase the need for new homes." Given that Paragraph 4.16 is not proposed to be changed, the Core Strategy will continue to acknowledge the need to provide significant levels of new dwellings to meet housing need; yet now proposes to reduce the strategic target. This approach fails the tests of soundness set out in Section 5 of this Form of Representation.	Amend the text to revert to the PSCS targets to give a combined total for Christchurch and East Dorset of 8,625 dwellings.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine the components of housing need and supply in the Borough of Christchurch.	
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS420</a>	28	4.18	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The Proposed Change to Policy KS 3 introduces an overall strategic housing target in the Core Strategy area of 8,200 in the period 2013 – 2018. This represents a reduction from the target of 8,625 as set out in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy (PSCS) - 3,375 for Christchurch and 5,250 for East Dorset. A reduction of this nature is not justified, particularly given the text of Paragraph 4.16 of the PSCS, which states: "Christchurch and East Dorset face major pressure to provide more housing. There is a high level of housing that cannot be met in the private market. Additionally, it is predicted that there will continue to be changes in the size	Amend the text to revert to the PSCS targets to give a combined total for Christchurch and East Dorset of 8,625 dwellings.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine the components of housing need and supply in the borough of Christchurch.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									and nature of households which will increase the need for new homes.” Given that Paragraph 4.16 is not proposed to be changed, the Core Strategy will continue to acknowledge the need to provide significant levels of new dwellings to meet housing need; yet now proposes to reduce the strategic target. This approach fails the tests of soundness set out in Section 5 of this Form of Representation.				
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS385</a>	28	4.18	Yes			Proposed Changes to paras 4.17 – 4.20 and Policy KS3 Housing Provision in Christchurch and East Dorset. Christchurch and East Dorset Councils are proposing revised housing figures based on updated evidence on population and household projections for Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset provided by the County Council. The revised figures indicate that household growth for the plan area could be lower than was indicated in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (2012). The Councils acknowledge in the AoR (para 5.62) that these figures are estimates and that changing data results in variation of outputs. For instance, revised Census based projections are expected in 2013 and these may indicate a different level of growth. Also, any strategy should be developed in recognition of the role that Christchurch and East Dorset play in the wider Strategic Housing Market and Local Enterprise areas. It is this overarching strategy that local councils should be developing through the duty to co-operate.	Dorset County Council considers that the plan should go further in clarifying the role that the housing strategy plays in the wider Housing Market and Local Enterprise areas	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset County Council wishes to partake in any oral hearing on this matter in order to fulfil its role under the duty to cooperate and ensure that its interests are considered in the emerging Core Strategy.	
490815	Mrs Trish Jamieson	Clerk Burton Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS481</a>	28	4.18				Objects to statement of need for housing of this magnitude. BPC disputes the rationale for assessing housing need, as opposed to housing want, and strongly supports the model used in Bournemouth.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS198</a>	28	4.18		No	Justified Effective	The proposed change to paragraph 4.18 deletes the reference to the household projections included in the 2012 SHMA Update report, and instead replaces it with a figure taken from population projections prepared by Dorset County Council. The DCC paper is dated August 2012, however it has only very recently been made available as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy. The projections should be treated with a degree of caution as the 2011 ONS data has not been fully released and official mid-year estimates have not been included in the projection; instead housing completions between 2002 and 2010 have been used as a basis of levels of population growth between 2001 and 2011. The migration numbers included in the projections are described as ‘experimental’. This is a projection forward of past demographic trends, such forecasts can be vary significantly and should be considered alongside other indicators of housing need and demand such as affordability and economic growth targets. For example, the SHMA Update (2012) indicates at figure 6.16 a total net annual housing need of 426 homes (6,816 homes over the period 2013 to 2028) for East Dorset.	The reference in paragraph 4.18 to the household projections in the SHMA should be retained. Additional text should recognise that whilst there is some variance in household projections, identified housing needs remain substantially higher, and the NPPF guidance is that housing targets should cater for the scale of supply necessary to address the need for all types of housing as identified in the SHMA. The housing target in the revised paragraph 4.18 should be increased to at least 8,625 in line with the	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of the Canford Estate and Harry J Palmer Ltd in relation to their landholdings on the edge of Corfe Mullen that form part of the CM1 allocation in the Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>Allowance also needs to be made for vacancy rates and second homes, which would be circa 5-10% for East Dorset. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) highlights the role of the SHMA in providing the evidence base for the plan by identifying the scale and mix of housing needed over the plan period. The SHMA forms an important part of the evidence base for the plan and should form the basis of the housing target, taking full account of relevant market end economic signals.</p> <p>Moving away from the jointly prepared SHMA figures could also create difficulties in joint working between the planning authorities in the Bournemouth and Poole HMA as it will be difficult to provide the scrutiny and clarity of a shared evidence base, which is necessary to ensure the overall growth needs of the HMA, and any surplus requirements from adjoining HMAs, are fully met.</p>	combined SHMA household projections for Christchurch and East Dorset, thereby providing a degree of flexibility in order to take account of identified housing needs and allow for vacancy rates and second homes.			
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS188</a>	28	4.18		No	Justified Effective	<p>The proposed change to paragraph 4.18 deletes the reference to the household projections included in the 2012 SHMA Update report, and instead replaces it with a figure taken from population projections prepared by Dorset County Council using the popgroup model.</p> <p>The DCC paper is dated August 2012, however it has only very recently been made available as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy. The projections should be treated with a degree of caution as the 2011 ONS data has not been fully released and official mid-year estimates have not been included in the projection; instead housing completions between 2002 and 2010 have been used as a basis of levels of population growth between 2001 and 2011. The migration numbers included in the projections are described as 'experimental'.</p> <p>This is a projection forward of past demographic trends, such forecasts can be vary significantly and should be considered alongside other indicators of housing need and demand such as affordability and economic growth targets. For example, the SHMAA Update (2012) indicates at figure 6.16 a total net annual housing need of 426 homes (6,816 homes over the period 2013 to 2028) for East Dorset.</p> <p>Allowance also needs to be made for vacancy rates and second homes, which would be circa 5-10% for East Dorset. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) highlights the role of the SHMA in providing the evidence base for the plan by identifying the scale and mix of housing needed over the plan period. The SHMA forms an important part of the evidence base for the plan and should form the basis of the housing target, taking full account of relevant market end economic signals.</p> <p>Moving away from the jointly prepared SHMA figures could also create difficulties in joint working between the planning authorities in the Bournemouth and Poole HMA as it will be difficult to provide the scrutiny and clarity of a shared evidence base, which is necessary to ensure the overall growth needs of the HMA, and any surplus requirements from adjoining HMAs, are fully met.</p>	<p>The reference in paragraph 4.18 to the household projections in the SHMA should be retained. Additional text should recognise that whilst there is some variance in household projections, identified housing needs remain substantially higher, and the NPPF guidance is that housing targets should cater for the scale of supply necessary to address the need for all types of housing as identified in the SHMA.</p> <p>The housing target in the revised paragraph 4.18 should be increased to at least 8,625 in line with the combined SHMA household projections for Christchurch and East Dorset, thereby providing a degree of flexibility in order to take account of identified housing needs and allow for vacancy rates and second homes.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes in relation to land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley that forms the FWP4 allocation in the Pre-submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
654962	Mr Christopher Chope		<a href="#">PCCS377</a>	28	4.18	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>I object to the proposed amended text. My first concern is that it replaces separate assessment of need for market and affordable housing in Christchurch compared with East Dorset with a 'joint housing target'. Each elected Council has the right to have a distinct policy relating to housing land which balances need against what is sustainable. It is essential that the situation of each separate Council remains separate. Although Councils are always free to cooperate should they so wish, what is proposed will undermine the accountability of each District Council to its own residents for its own planning policy in relation to allocation of land for housing.</p> <p>It is also of particular concern that the implications of such a dramatic change may not have been brought to the attention of elected Councillors.</p> <p>I also object to the arbitrary introduction of a new joint target of 8,200 dwellings, 700 more than the total of 7,500 derived from the revised assessment of need.</p> <p>The amended text ignores the fact that the new 2011 Census data shows a reduced need for housing down from 8,625 to 7,500. If anything, the need for 7,500 homes over the Plan period is likely to be too high having regard to the reality of the ever extending forecast period of low or zero growth in the economy. It is, however, unnecessary and undesirable to introduce an arbitrary additional target of 700 houses beyond the 7,500 identified as being needed.</p> <p>I have been given information by the Chief Executive which shows that the number of dwellings with planning permission but not started or under construction in the Christchurch Borough Council area at 30th September 2012 was 475 net (gross 568). The number for that part of the East Dorset District Council area within the Christchurch constituency is 356 (gross 408). These figures suggest that approximately 1,000 of the 7,500 new homes 'needed' over the next 15 years across the full extent of both Council areas, already have planning permission. If one adds these to the 2,140 and 2,800 identified in paragraph 4.19 of the pre-submission document, it means that around 6,000 – or about 80% of the 7,500 homes can be provided in the existing urban areas within the fifteen year Plan period without the need for any alteration of existing Green Belt boundaries. The best way of ensuring that the developable land in the urban areas is used before any possible incursion into the existing Green Belt would be to defer any possible amendment to the Green Belt boundaries until ten years into the fifteen year plan period.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In my capacity as the Member of Parliament for the Christchurch Constituency which includes all of Christchurch Borough and a significant part of the East Dorset District Council area within its boundary.	
655010	Mrs S Moran		<a href="#">PCCS150</a>	28	4.18	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective	It is inappropriate to group together housing targets from 2 different planning authority areas. It creates a lack of clarity over housing targets for an area and could lead to one authority being pressured for development more than another. Councillors and their electorate should have a clear idea of the housing demands.	East Dorset should have a clearly defined housing target.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719394	Ms Jade	Assistant Planner	<a href="#">PCCS297</a>	28	4.18		No	Positively Prepared	In support of this modification, the joint authorities have	The evidence base	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral	I would like to confirm that we would wish to	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
	Ellis	Turley Associates						Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>produced additional population and housing formation evidence for the period to 2031 using the PopGroup model (August 2012). However, this additional evidence still fundamentally excludes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. An analysis of the additional homes required to sustain the economic growth proposed in the JCS (including evidence to confirm the proposed level of economic growth is sound).</li> <li>ii. An analysis of unmet housing requirements from adjoining authorities under the Duty to Cooperate;</li> </ul> <p>NPPF requires LPAs to objectively assess and meet the need for market and affordable housing in their area, as far as is consistent with NPPF, including any unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable and sustainable to do so (paragraph 14, 47 and 182, NPPF).</p> <p>For the plan to satisfy the tests of soundness, the Council must have first objectively assessed such needs and then tested alternative strategies to meet this need. Only once this process is complete can the Council claim their strategy satisfies the 'Positively Prepared' and 'Justified' tests of soundness.</p> <p>We contend the Council have not presented sufficient evidence in support of the proposed modification to meet the NPPF requirement to 'objectively assess' their housing need. Nor have the Council assessed and consulted on alternative ways of meeting themselves, or with the help of adjacent authorities (under the duty to cooperate defined in the Localism Act and NPPF) some or all of these objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>By way of illustration, the 2011 SHMA Update published by the Dorset authorities in January 2012 indicates that affordable need alone in East Dorset is 426 homes a year. The corresponding figure for Christchurch Borough is 332 affordable homes a year. We have reviewed the Council's evidence base and cannot find any evidence to suggest they have explored or consulted on options to meet this or a greater proportion of this identified need for affordable housing within the district themselves, or jointly with adjoining authorities. Particularly in the first five years of the plan period to boost significantly the supply of housing (NPPF para.47). The SHMA merely concludes it would be unrealistic to meet this need on grounds of past completions and potential significant impact on the private rented sector of the housing market. In doing so the Councils are effectively spreading their backlogs of unmet housing needs over the plan period, rather than making meaningful attempts to redress these backlogs. This same point was raised in examination of the Joint East Hampshire/South Downs National Park Core Strategy DPD in November 2012. The Inspector found this approach unacceptable. We would encourage the joint authorities to reconsider their approach in light of the Inspectors letter prior to formal submission of the plan. The evidence base to date supporting such modifications does not sufficiently justify why some or all of the areas housing needs cannot be met. We conclude the</p>	<p>informing the proposed modifications should be updated as indicated above. Further consultation should be undertaken on this and any material revisions to the plan that may arise from this.</p>	examination	participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of clients' interests at Wimborne/Colehill.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>Council will need to provide this evidence if they are to satisfy paragraph 14, 47 and 182 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The annual housing provision figure proposed in the Policy KS3 (as proposed to be amended) is essentially therefore a single trend based option derived from the PopGroup Model with a 10% contingency. The Council have not produced, tested or consulted on alternative strategies to meet the full objectively assessing housing needs of the area, which would include that required to sustain planned economic growth. The latter is fundamental in our view in districts with an ageing population and declining population of working age (paragraph 2.21-2.22 of the Pre-Submission Core Strategy DPD). This factor may suggest the need to test alternative levels of housing growth to redress a decline in an economically active population that has significant consequences for the district's future economic prosperity. In light of the above, we recommend the Council test alternative strategies to accommodate more of their objectively assessed housing need. This should factor in housing needs associated with the employment growth and any unmet housing needs from adjoining authorities, as required by paragraphs 14, 47 and 182 of the NPPF. Once growth options are deduced, they must then be tested to see if they can be sustainably accommodated from suitable and available sources of land supply. This evidence and process is notably absent from the JCS.</p> <p>In fact, up until the publication of the Pre-Submission Core Strategy DPD, East Dorset District Council had not consulted on a housing provision figure. The Council's evidence base suggests this was to be informed by the availability of land for housing, rather than objectively assessed housing needs. This is clearly contrary to paragraph 47 and 182 of NPPF. The housing provision proposed by the Councils is overly informed by existing environmental and policy constraints in our opinion and too little by economic and social considerations. The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development proposed by the NPPF is to secure an appropriate balance of the three. The Councils have simply not provided sufficient evidence in the form of alternative strategy testing to justify the environmental capacity led approach to housing provision implied by Policy KS3 (as proposed to be amended).</p> <p>Some parallels can be drawn in our view with the recently examined East Hampshire and South Downs National Park Authority Joint Core Strategy DPD. In November 2012, the Inspector examining that plan concluded it was unsound on very similar grounds to those we make in respect of these Proposed Modifications to the JCS. We would recommend the Joint authorities review the Inspectors letter and ensure additional evidence and consultation on alternative strategies is undertaken prior to the formal submission of the JCS.</p> <p>A robust SHLAA is needed to inform the above, which we contend that neither of the Joint Councils can claim at</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>present.</p> <p>On closer scrutiny of the SHLAAs for each authority area, it is apparent a large proportion of urban supply is yet to be confirmed as available and therefore achievable within the plan period. To accord with paragraph 47 of NPPF we recommend the Council obtain this evidence prior to submission of the plan to the Secretary of State. This evidence may well indicate the need for revisions to the Core Strategy DPD and further consultation prior to formal submission.</p> <p>In addition, a large proportion of housing land supply comprises possible opportunities for intensification within existing residential areas. This includes a significant proportion from the sub-division of detached units and building on residential gardens. The latter no longer affords the status of previously developed land and should not be included in land supply calculations under paragraph 48 of the NPPF. In the absence of evidence to confirm the availability of these sources of supply, such sites are neither deliverable, developable, nor broad locations for growth identified on the Key Diagram; and therefore fall into the definition of windfall. We would therefore question whether this satisfies the tests of soundness in NPPF, particularly the 'Effective' test given the inherent uncertainties surrounding delivery from such sources within the plan period.</p> <p>This places greater emphasis on the Council to produce compelling evidence that their housing trajectory has a reasonable prospect of delivery within the plan period, particularly within the first five years of adoption of the plan (paragraph 47 of the NPPF). At present the uncertainties over the availability and achievability of a significant proportion of supply bring this into question.</p> <p>Recent post NPPF appeal decisions concerning five year housing land supply (i.e. APP/C1625/A/11/2165865) indicate housing shortfalls should aim to be recovered in the next five years of the plan period. This and the NPPF (footnote 41) confirm that the RSS remains a material consideration until formally revoked by order. Given this context and looking at the latest SHLAA published by both Councils, there is unlikely to be a sufficient supply of land to meet housing requirements in the first five years of the plan period. Under paragraph 49 of NPPF the land supply policies of the plan would therefore be out of date at the point of adoption.</p> <p>To accord with paragraph 47 of NPPF, the Council should allocate further land to address such shortfalls and include a contingency strategy to address any future shortfalls in five year housing land supply. This could include the allocation of reserve sites to address shortfalls, and possibly criteria the Council will apply to planning applications on such sites.</p> <p>Contingency policies such as these provide the Council with a measure of control when land supply drops below five years. This is shown to be the case at present and therefore highlights the importance of allocating further land and including contingencies to accord with NPPF paragraph 47.</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS386</a>	28	4.19	Yes			Proposed Changes to paras 4.17 – 4.20 and Policy KS3 Housing Provision in Christchurch and East Dorset. Christchurch and East Dorset Councils are proposing revised housing figures based on updated evidence on population and household projections for Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset provided by the County Council. The revised figures indicate that household growth for the plan area could be lower than was indicated in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (2012). The Councils acknowledge in the AoR (para 5.62) that these figures are estimates and that changing data results in variation of outputs. For instance, revised Census based projections are expected in 2013 and these may indicate a different level of growth. Also, any strategy should be developed in recognition of the role that Christchurch and East Dorset play in the wider Strategic Housing Market and Local Enterprise areas. It is this overarching strategy that local councils should be developing through the duty to co-operate.	Dorset County Council considers that the plan should go further in clarifying the role that the housing strategy plays in the wider Housing Market and Local Enterprise areas	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset County Council wishes to partake in any oral hearing on this matter in order to fulfil its role under the duty to cooperate and ensure that its interests are considered in the emerging Core Strategy.	
653893	Mr Michael Bailey		<a href="#">PCCS368</a>	28	4.19				The amendments state that Christchurch has insufficient land suitable for housing due to the risk of flooding. I object to the proposal to build on the Burton Farm site as it represents a flood risk. Should the development proceed the water table will rise to even higher levels with displaced water and backed up water affecting many streets in the area. Martins Hill playing field is subject to flooding such that field sports can no longer be played. Martins Hill Lane is frequently flooded. Farm fields are sodden with water up to a foot deep in places. Marsh plants are visible together with marsh birds who are regular visitors. Properties in Gordon Way suffer flooding up to 6 inches at the present time. One property in the road required underpinning due to subsidence.				
655010	Mrs S Moran		<a href="#">PCCS151</a>	28	4.19	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective	It is inappropriate to group together housing targets from 2 different planning authority areas. It creates a lack of clarity over housing targets for an area and could lead to one authority being pressured for development more than another. Councillors and their electorate should have a clear idea of the housing demands.	Add a clearly defined housing target for East Dorset.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
657138	Mr Mike Hirsh	Intelligent Land	<a href="#">PCCS64</a>	28	4.19	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	The base figure for the capacity to build homes in the urban area is suspect. There are economic drivers that tend to suggest the delivery will not be at historic rates including the state of the economy and the introduction of CIL. Critically, however, the figures used by the Councils do not reflect the proper analysis required by paragraph 48 of the NPPF in so far as severance plots from residential gardens, which have always made up the vast majority of windfall sites in the area, appear to be still included.	A revised base figure is required for the urban capacity during the plan period and in consequence further housing will need to be allocated in new neighbourhoods. (See previous representation)	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Intelligent Land will be pleased to try to reconcile housing land supply figures with officers of the Councils but, to date, the baseline information and projections in accordance with the SHLAA best practice guidance and Section 6 of the NPPF have not been available. If the figures cannot be reconciled ahead of the Examination then the issue is significant enough to engender a focused discussion.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
718821	Mrs Alison Ramsey		<a href="#">PCCS158</a>	28	4.19	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Amendments include a deleted section regarding suitable sites for development due to flood risks. This land is constantly flooded, evidence has already been provided to the Council. The water will have to go somewhere	Remove Burton from the Core Strategy	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To get the villages perspective	
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS387</a>	29	4.2	Yes			Proposed Changes to paras 4.17 – 4.20 and Policy KS3 Housing Provision in Christchurch and East Dorset. Christchurch and East Dorset Councils are proposing revised housing figures based on updated evidence on population and household projections for Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset provided by the County Council. The revised figures indicate that household growth for the plan area could be lower than was indicated in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (2012). The Councils acknowledge in the AoR (para 5.62) that these figures are estimates and that changing data results in variation of outputs. For instance, revised Census based projections are expected in 2013 and these may indicate a different level of growth. Also, any strategy should be developed in recognition of the role that Christchurch and East Dorset play in the wider Strategic Housing Market and Local Enterprise areas. It is this overarching strategy that local councils should be developing through the duty to co-operate.	Dorset County Council considers that the plan should go further in clarifying the role that the housing strategy plays in the wider Housing Market and Local Enterprise areas	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset County Council wishes to partake in any oral hearing on this matter in order to fulfil its role under the duty to cooperate and ensure that its interests are considered in the emerging Core Strategy.	
719394	Ms Jade Ellis	Assistant Planner Turley Associates	<a href="#">PCCS298</a>	29	4.2				The proposed modification highlights the weaknesses in the evidence base informing the JCS. For brevity see comments in relation to 4.18 above.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I would like to confirm that we would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of clients' interests at Wimborne/Colehill.	
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS435</a>	30	KS3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	In accordance with our representations in respect of Paragraph 4.18, the housing target for the Core Strategy area should be increased from 8,200 to 8,625. Please see the separate Form of Representation, which sets out our reasoning. Given the limitations on the development of sites within existing urban areas, the increased number of dwellings should be provided on urban extension sites.	Replace 8,200 with 8,625. The number of dwellings to be provided at the new neighbourhoods should be increased from 3,400 to 4,025.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine the components of housing need and supply in the borough of Christchurch.	
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS419</a>	30	KS3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	In accordance with our representations in respect of Paragraph 4.18, the housing target for the Core Strategy area should be increased from 8,200 to 8,625. Please see the separate Form of Representation, which sets out our reasoning. Given the limitations on the development of sites within existing urban areas, the increased number of dwellings should be provided on urban extension sites.	Replace 8,200 with 8,625. The number of dwellings to be provided at the new neighbourhoods should be increased from 3,400 to 4,025.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine the components of housing need and supply in the Borough of Christchurch.	
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS427</a>	30	KS3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	In accordance with our representations in respect of Paragraph 4.18, the housing target for the Core Strategy area should be increased from 8,200 to 8,625. Please see the separate Form of Representation, which sets out our reasoning. Given the limitations on the development of sites within existing urban areas, the increased number of dwellings should be provided on urban extension sites.	Replace 8,200 with 8,625. The number of dwellings to be provided at the new neighbourhoods should be increased from 3,400 to 4,025.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine the components of housing need and supply in the Borough of Christchurch.	
359277	Mr Jamie	Tetlow King	<a href="#">PCCS103</a>	30	KS3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared	The changes do not address our objections made to the Pre-		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
	Sullivan							Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Submission Core Strategy representations (Our Ref: M5/0103-07 or M4/50514-09) These comments should still be forwarded to the Inspector.		examination		
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	<a href="#">PCCS366</a>	30	KS3	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>Policy KS3</p> <p>We object to the proposal to merge the housing provision target in Christchurch and East Dorset. This does not represent a sound change, given the plan would not be sufficiently effective in ensuring the delivery of defined housing needs within each District in accordance with the proposed spatial strategy and objectives. By merging the requirement figures, there is a risk that delivery may come forward more within one District than the other, holding back development on defined allocations. This represents a material change at this late stage of the process, whereby the housing provision target would operate on a joint District basis. This has never been the intention throughout the process, where the Councils have sought to work together but ensure their housing delivery through individual District's policies.</p> <p>We further object to the revision to the policy that states the 'masterplan is to be applied'. This is not justified by evidence, as the level of detail within the masterplan has not been fully tested and does not allow for flexibility of delivery, especially in relation to the increased capacity of the site.</p> <p>We propose that the Council's urban extension Masterplan should be referred to as for 'illustrative purposes only' within Policy KS3 so to ensure the policy retains a sufficient level of flexibility at the later planning applications stage.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To provide expert evidence on relevant aspects of the policy.	
359547	Mrs V Bright	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	<a href="#">PCCS59</a>	30	KS3				Concern about whether the plan for Christchurch and East Dorset is going to be deliverable as the area is covered by two separate elected councils. Christchurch and East Dorset are administered as one Authority and we are concerned that the housing plan has been combined and that the housing allocation may cross borders.				
475144	Sophia Thorpe	Gleeson Strategic Land Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS173</a>	30	KS3	Yes	Yes		<p>These representations have been prepared by Gleeson Strategic Land as part of our continued promotion of the land to the south of Leigh Road, Wimborne through the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Development Framework.</p> <p>During the previous consultation events Gleeson has promoted the land to the south of Leigh Road for residential development with associated open space and Country Park. Gleeson supports the continued progress of the joint Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy, and the identification of Wimborne Minster as a settlement suitable for accommodating residential growth across the plan period. Accordingly we now support the submission of the Pre-Submission Core Strategy to the Secretary of State for consideration by an Independent Inspector at an Examination in Public.</p> <p>We have carefully considered the content of the proposed changes version of the Pre-Submission Core Strategy, and we think that the plan is sound and legally compliant. We</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>support the joint Councils in submitting the document to be examined followed by adoption of the plan to form an up to date development plan when read alongside the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), with some weight to be given the proposed modifications version of the South West Regional Spatial Strategy and the Dorset Structure Plan. Without the joint authorities progressing this plan to examination and adoption the joint authorities would be left to rely only on outdated plans that do not reflect the aspirations of the NPPF.</p> <p>Gleeson acknowledge that the Council have recognised that housing growth is required across the joint Districts to meet housing demand, however we think that there is greater housing need and demand than that projected for this plan period within the Pre-Submission document. Therefore although we are supportive of this document to be found Sound, we would also advocate that a degree of flexibility should be applied to the housing numbers, and particularly within the housing allocations to ensure that the release of the sites makes an efficient use of the delivery of the site, and any additional homes delivered in the strategic allocations should be added to the total housing number for the District to incentivize and maximize the delivery of housing on the allocated sites, whilst also not discouraging or reduce the quantum of sustainable developments outside of the allocations.</p> <p>Unlike many of the other larger settlements within the joint authority area, Wimborne does not fall with the Special Protection Area (SPA) however it is within 5km of the habitat designation. Therefore unlike development at many of the other settlements across the joint authority areas, development at Wimborne will not directly impact upon the heathlands habitat as mitigation land can be provided at the settlement. In addition to mitigating impacts associated with the development this facility could also reduce travel to the SPA for recreation by providing a resource closer to existing residents to reduce travel to the SPA heathlands. For this reason a degree of flexibility should be applied to delivery of homes within the allocations to deliver an increased quantum to ensure the efficient use of land. If each allocation is able to deliver with flexibility this could ensure that sites are viable and therefore delivered promptly following the adoption of the Core Strategy, and to ensure the objectives of Paragraph 173-177 of the NPPF are achieved, which state that competitive returns are received by developers and landowners following the release of land for development.</p>				
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS497</a>	30	KS3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	MEM Ltd do not support the change to policy KS3 and KS4 to create a combined housing target for EDDC and CBC as it is not effective and not justified. The housing needs in each district are different and serve different housing market areas. Indeed when considering housing land supply issues any judgment must be made against each authority's ability to demonstrate that they have met the need. They question	A partial solution to this problem would be to increase capacity at Burton (site CN2) as outlined in the earlier representations made on this policy. This is justified	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	MEM Ltd as the managing agent of both of the additional housing allocation sites within Christchurch has an interest in assisting the Council in meeting its housing need and has demonstrated how they could assist housing delivery in the early years of the plan	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>with this is most effective strategy to meet housing need. MEM believe the policy is not sound as it not positively prepared as it does not meet the objectively assessed housing need of each authority. The global figure for housing supply places an unrealistic expectation on delivery of housing in the combined urban area. The recycling of existing sites within the urban area is a flawed strategy for delivery as evidenced by recent production rates in both Councils Annual Monitoring Reports. For 2010/11 CBC produced no affordable units and EDDC produced only 14 affordable units. The recent Autumn Statement has (confirmed austerity measures will remain in place until 2018, which have now been in place since 2010. This would suggest that the current model / pattern of delivery based on a reliance on existing urban sites will continue to undersupply against the objective housing need and in particular affordable housing within CBC.</p> <p>There is no detailed assessment in evidence to demonstrate that the urban sites in both authority areas will deliver the housing requirement. This policy is therefore not sound as it does boost housing supply as required by NPPF paragraph 47 and is not a credible evidence base on which to plan the housing strategy.</p> <p>In particular the immediate need for affordable housing in Christchurch will not be met by the proposed change to the policy KS3 and removal of site CN3. There is no robust evidence to suggest that sites within the urban area will have sufficient viability to support development of any affordable housing units. Indeed the softening of the policy proposed for LN3 in relation to both thresholds and percentages of affordable housing to support the viable introduction of CIL payments from 2014 clearly indicates the Council has significant concerns over viability of the smaller urban sites The only viable site that will deliver affordable housing in the first years of the plan is at Burton, allocated under policy CN2, given the long lead in time for delivery at Roeshot due to the undergrounding of overhead high voltage electricity lines. However, as the Council have not altered the boundary and capacity of site CN2 as requested by the site's promoter to reflect more detailed technical work at Burton which takes into account site specific flood constraints, biodiversity, landscape, conservation and community views capacity of the allocated site is limited. In short with CN2 remaining at 45 units delivery of only about 10 affordable units is possible in the first three years of the plan. This is not an effective strategy to meet housing need in the early years of the plan to meet the needs of Christchurch.</p> <p>Even if supply in one authority was to exceed this expectation it would not meet the housing needs in the other authority, particularly the affordable market (which is less mobile). The policy includes a statement that a partial review of Core Strategy against non-delivery would be possible. MEM Ltd believe this is not a reflection of being positively prepared in line with the NPPF requirements and almost</p>	<p>by detailed technical evidence including community consultation. In addition each authority should have separate housing figures to assist with delivery and monitoring.</p>		<p>and wish to bring to the Inspector's attention an alternative solution for early housing delivery.</p>	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									accepts that non-delivery is inevitable. Both authorities have the ability to address the needs and get plan right now, rather than planning for failure. The policy also refers to the Council's masterplan at Roeshot to be applied. Representations on this element of the policy are made jointly with Taylor Wimpey and Sainsbury's Stores Ltd. 1) Legally compliant: Yes No (2) Sound*: Yes No Positively Prepared: Justified: Effective: Consistent with national policy:				
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS191</a>	30	KS3		No	Justified	As set out in our comments on paragraph 4.18, the evidence base suggests the need for new housing is potentially significantly higher than the level of housing provision set out in revised Policy KS3. The level of housing provision set out in SHMA household projection of 8,625 for Christchurch and East Dorset, on top of which consideration should be given to an additional allowance to provide the flexibility needed to take account of housing needs, vacancy rates and second homes.	The housing target in the revised paragraph 4.18 should be increased to at least 8,625 in line with the combined SHMA household projections for Christchurch and East Dorset, thereby providing a degree of flexibility in order to take account of identified housing needs and allow for vacancy rates and second homes.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes in relation to land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley that forms the FWP4 allocation in the Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.	
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS200</a>	30	KS3		No	Justified	As set out in our comments on paragraph 4.18, the evidence base suggests the need for new housing is potentially significantly higher than the level of housing provision set out in revised Policy KS3. The level of housing provision set out in SHMA household projection of 8,625 for Christchurch and East Dorset, on top of which consideration should be given to an additional allowance to provide the flexibility needed to take account of housing needs, vacancy rates and second homes.	The housing target in the revised paragraph 4.18 should be increased to at least 8,625 in line with the combined SHMA household projections for Christchurch and East Dorset, thereby providing a degree of flexibility in order to take account of identified housing needs and allow for vacancy rates and second homes	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of the Canford Estate and Harry J Palmer Ltd in relation to their landholdings on the edge of Corfe Mullen that form part of the CM1 allocation in the Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.	
619967	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation (South West)	<a href="#">PCCS111</a>	30	KS3		No	Effective	The expression of the housing target is unsound: it is unclear and therefore ineffective. As we commented in the pre-submission version back in May, the expression of the targets in policy KS3 is still imprecise and creates uncertainty. The policy refers to 'about 8,200 new homes' to be provided between the years 2013 to 2028. The expression of the housing target needs to be precise for the purposes of deriving the five year land supply and planning the housing trajectory. The use of the word 'about' should be deleted. The target should be treated as a minimum target, so that if other suitable sites become available during the plan period that have been assessed as being suitable (because they satisfy the provisions of the Framework and the core strategy) these will enable the Councils to exceed the targets.				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									The core strategy also remains deficient by not providing a housing trajectory which is required by paragraph 47 of the Framework.				
654618	Mr Peter Tanner	Tanner & Tilley Planning Consultants	<a href="#">PCCS473</a>	30	KS3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Effective Consistent with national policy	It would appear from the 2011 Christchurch SHLAA Report that the Local Authority are unable to deliver a 5 year supply of deliverable sites for housing, nor the 5% additional buffer required in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework. Furthermore, the 2011 SHLAA has been prepared on assumptions used in the preparation of the 2008 SHLAA, which presumably assumes that the majority of development will be at a minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare, which applied in 2008. The reliance on such a high percentage of windfall development also makes it questionable that the level of housing to provide for the identified need will be delivered. With no minimum density being set and with delivery relying on a large percentage of former garden land coming forward for development where densities of 30 dwellings per hectare or more is likely to be resisted, it is difficult to see how the Core Strategy will deliver the houses needed during the Plan period without the allocation of more greenfield sites or housing allocations both within the existing built up area and on land currently within the Green Belt.	We consider that the Local Authority needs to revisit the evidence base and to more realistically identify how it will provide for delivery of a five year housing supply together with an additional buffer of 5% to according with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
654962	Mr Christopher Chope		<a href="#">PCCS378</a>	30	KS3	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	I object to the revised wording. There is no documentation in support of either ' The advice from the Planning Inspectorate that we should set one housing target for the whole Plan area' or the reasons why the Councils have accepted that advice and the implications flowing therefrom.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In my capacity as the Member of Parliament for the Christchurch Constituency which includes all of Christchurch Borough and a significant part of the East Dorset District Council area within its boundary.	
657059	Mr and Mrs T R Beaumont		<a href="#">PCCS272</a>	30	KS3	No	No	Justified Effective	There is currently no identified suitable site for relocation to a larger "hub site" as initially proposed. The appointed independent Government Inspector should be made clearly aware of this.	Obtain specific approval from the Secretary of State or Remove Roeshot Hill allotment site from the Council's master plan.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
657138	Mr Mike Hirsh	Intelligent Land	<a href="#">PCCS65</a>	30	KS3	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	The base figure for the capacity to build homes in the urban area is suspect. There are economic drivers that tend to suggest the delivery will not be at historic rates including the state of the economy and the introduction of CIL. Critically, however, the figures used by the Councils do not reflect the proper analysis required by paragraph 48 of the NPPF in so far as severance plots from residential gardens, which have always made up the vast majority of windfall sites in the area, appear to be still included.	A revised base figure is required for the urban capacity during the plan period and in consequence further housing will need to be allocated in new neighbourhoods. (See previous representation)	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Intelligent Land will be pleased to try to reconcile housing land supply figures with officers of the Councils but, to date, the baseline information and projections in accordance with the SHLAA best practice guidance and Section 6 of the NPPF have not been available. If the figures cannot be reconciled ahead of the examination then the issue is significant enough to engender a focused discussion.	
714782	MR MALCOLM MAWBEY		<a href="#">PCCS13</a>	30	KS3	Yes	Yes		Line 18 and line 20: insert apostrophe after "Councils" Line 27: insert "of" after "review"		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718577	Mr Richard Terry		<a href="#">PCCS136</a>	30	KS3		No	Effective	It is unclear as the wording uses "about" and should be considered as a minimum making allowance for any other suitable sites to come forward.	The wording is one of restraint not encouraging greater housing provision	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										which is needed. Delete "approx", introduce wording to encourage greater provision.			
718911	Mr Joshua Lambert	Planning Assistant Pro Vision Planning and Design	<a href="#">PCCS468</a>	30	KS3	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	<p>Policy KS3 Housing Provision in Christchurch and East Dorset</p> <p>Wessex Water Services supports the delivery of a single housing target for Christchurch and East Dorset. East Dorset can deliver a greater proportion of the overall housing target on sustainable sites, such as Little Canford Depot, than allocated within the Pre Submission Core Strategy. The Core Strategy must be consistent with national policy to be sound, as stated in paragraph 182 of the NPPF. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out the core planning principle that the effective use of land should be encouraged through the reuse of previously developed sites. Policy KS3 is inconsistent with paragraph 17 of the NPPF, as reference to the delivery of housing through the release of previously developed sites in the Green Belt is omitted.</p> <p>The redevelopment of Little Canford Depot compares favourably in sustainability terms to the development of the some of the new neighbourhoods set out within the Proposed Changes to Policy KS3. The allocation of the new neighbourhoods does not represent the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the sustainable redevelopment of Little Canford Depot, which is a reasonable alternative.</p> <p>For example, Little Canford Depot is comparable to the Council Offices site at Furzehill in terms of size and the mix of existing uses. Little Canford Depot is closer to the main built up area than Furzehill and has better access to sustainable transport. The approach taken to the allocation of Furzehill is inconsistent with the omission of Little Canford Depot.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>1. Because of the high level of public interest in reducing greenfield land in East Dorset in favour of optimizing previously developed land.</p> <p>2. To enable the Inspector to test the evidence demonstrating that the Core Strategy is unsound without the allocation of Little Canford Depot for mixed use residential and employment development.</p>	<a href="#">2403289_0_1.pdf</a>
719394	Ms Jade Ellis	Assistant Planner Turley Associates	<a href="#">PCCS299</a>	30	KS3				<p>For brevity see comments in relation to Paragraph 4.18 above. We conclude this policy and the strategy that flows from it does not satisfy the 'Positively Prepared' or 'Justified' tests of soundness in NPPF. Further evidence should be produced to objectively assess housing needs. Alternative strategies to meet such needs within the area or with help from adjoining areas should be tested and consulted upon prior to formal submission of the JCS to the Secretary of State.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I would like to confirm that we would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of clients' interests at Wimborne/Colehill.	
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">PCCS104</a>	31	KS4	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The changes do not address our objections made to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy representations (Our Ref: M5/0103-07 or M4/50514-09). These comments should still be forwarded to the Inspector.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359547	Mrs V Bright	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	<a href="#">PCCS60</a>	31	KS4				Concern about whether the plan for Christchurch and East Dorset is going to be deliverable as the area is covered by two separate elected councils. Christchurch and East Dorset are administered as one Authority and we are concerned that the housing plan has been combined and that the				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									housing allocation may cross borders.				
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS192</a>	31	KS4		No	Justified	As set out in our comments on paragraph 4.18, the evidence base suggests the need for new housing is potentially significantly higher than the level of housing provision set out in revised Policy KS3. The level of housing provision set out in Policy KS3 should be based on the evidence provided in SHMA household projection of 8,625 for Christchurch and East Dorset, on top of which consideration should be given to an additional allowance to provide the flexibility needed to take account of housing needs, vacancy rates and second homes.	The housing target in the revised paragraph 4.18 should be increased to at least 8,625 in line with the combined SHMA household projections for Christchurch and East Dorset, thereby providing a degree of flexibility in order to take account of identified housing needs and allow for vacancy rates and second homes.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes in relation to land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley that forms the FWP4 allocation in the Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.	
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS201</a>	31	KS4		No	Justified	As set out in our comments on paragraph 4.18, the evidence base suggests the need for new housing is potentially significantly higher than the level of housing provision set out in revised Policy KS3. The level of housing provision set out in Policy KS3 should be based on the evidence provided in SHMA household projection of 8,625 for Christchurch and East Dorset, on top of which consideration should be given to an additional allowance to provide the flexibility needed to take account of housing needs, vacancy rates and second homes.	The housing target in the revised paragraph 4.18 should be increased to at least 8,625 in line with the combined SHMA household projections for Christchurch and East Dorset, thereby providing a degree of flexibility in order to take account of identified housing needs and allow for vacancy rates and second homes.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of the Canford Estate and Harry J Palmer Ltd in relation to their landholdings on the edge of Corfe Mullen that form part of the CM1 allocation in the Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.	
654962	Mr Christopher Chope		<a href="#">PCCS379</a>	31	KS4	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	I object to the revised wording. There is no documentation in support of either 'The advice from the Planning Inspectorate that we should set one housing target for the whole Plan area' or the reasons why the Councils have accepted that advice and the implications flowing therefrom.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In my capacity as the Member of Parliament for the Christchurch Constituency which includes all of Christchurch Borough and a significant part of the East Dorset District Council area within its boundary.	
657138	Mr Mike Hirsh	Intelligent Land	<a href="#">PCCS66</a>	31	KS4	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	The base figure for the capacity to build homes in the urban area is suspect. There are economic drivers that tend to suggest the delivery will not be at historic rates including the state of the economy and the introduction of CIL. Critically, however, the figures used by the Councils do not reflect the proper analysis required by paragraph 48 of the NPPF in so far as severance plots from residential gardens, which have always made up the vast majority of windfall sites in the area, appear to be still included.	A revised base figure is required for the urban capacity during the plan period and in consequence further housing will need to be allocated in new neighbourhoods. (See previous representation)	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Intelligent Land will be pleased to try to reconcile housing land supply figures with officers of the Councils but, to date, the baseline information and projections in accordance with the SHLAA best practice guidance and Section 6 of the NPPF have not been available. If the figures cannot be reconciled ahead of the examination then the issue is significant enough to engender a focused discussion.	
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS388</a>	31	4.26	Yes			Proposed Changes to paras 4.26 – 4.27 and Policy KS5 Provision of Employment Land. Dorset County Council notes the proposed changes to Paras 4.26- 4.27 and Policy KS5 in respect of the change to the area on which the employment land figures are based and has no objection to this change. However it is considered that these changes fail to address	The County Council reiterates its concern that background evidence should be updated to explain the linkages between the latest household and workforce	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset County Council wishes to partake in any oral hearing on this matter in order to fulfil its role under the duty to cooperate and ensure that its interests are considered in the emerging Core Strategy.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									the County Council's concern that the linkages between workforce projections and housing provision should be clarified to ensure there is an appropriate balance. The delivery of the proposed amount of employment land alone will place significant demands on local infrastructure – particularly transport. The County Council will wish to continue to work closely with Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to ensure infrastructure needs are properly planned for and the necessary delivery strategies, including the use of CIL, are clearly set out.	projections and policies derived from them, to clarify the relationship and ensure that there is an appropriate balance between them.			
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS389</a>	31	4.27	Yes			Proposed Changes to paras 4.26 – 4.27 and Policy KS5 Provision of Employment Land. Dorset County Council notes the proposed changes to Paras 4.26- 4.27 and Policy KS5 in respect of the change to the area on which the employment land figures are based and has no objection to this change. However it is considered that these changes fail to address the County Council's concern that the linkages between workforce projections and housing provision should be clarified to ensure there is an appropriate balance. The delivery of the proposed amount of employment land alone will place significant demands on local infrastructure – particularly transport. The County Council will wish to continue to work closely with Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to ensure infrastructure needs are properly planned for and the necessary delivery strategies, including the use of CIL, are clearly set out.	The County Council reiterates its concern that background evidence should be updated to explain the linkages between the latest household and workforce projections and policies derived from them, to clarify the relationship and ensure that there is an appropriate balance between them.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset County Council wishes to partake in any oral hearing on this matter in order to fulfil its role under the duty to cooperate and ensure that its interests are considered in the emerging Core Strategy.	
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS390</a>	32	KS5	Yes			Proposed Changes to paras 4.26 – 4.27 and Policy KS5 Provision of Employment Land. Dorset County Council notes the proposed changes to Paras 4.26- 4.27 and Policy KS5 in respect of the change to the area on which the employment land figures are based and has no objection to this change. However it is considered that these changes fail to address the County Council's concern that the linkages between workforce projections and housing provision should be clarified to ensure there is an appropriate balance. The delivery of the proposed amount of employment land alone will place significant demands on local infrastructure – particularly transport. The County Council will wish to continue to work closely with Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to ensure infrastructure needs are properly planned for and the necessary delivery strategies, including the use of CIL, are clearly set out.	The County Council reiterates its concern that background evidence should be updated to explain the linkages between the latest household and workforce projections and policies derived from them, to clarify the relationship and ensure that there is an appropriate balance between them.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset County Council wishes to partake in any oral hearing on this matter in order to fulfil its role under the duty to cooperate and ensure that its interests are considered in the emerging Core Strategy.	
499532	Bournemouth Borough Council	Bournemouth Borough Council	<a href="#">PCCS308</a>	32	KS5				Policy KS5: Provision of Employment Land Support		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To present evidence.	
715197	Mr Neil White	Architectural Designer Quantum Group	<a href="#">PCCS144</a>	34	KS6	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The amended text is contrary to the NPPF where it promotes sustainable development. The plan should be positively prepared and consistent with achieving sustainable development. Sustainable development is made up of three dimensions, economic, social and environmental as detailed with the NPPF. By redefining Barrack Road as a Local	The amended text should read as detailed in the previous consultation.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	We are a key land holder within the area of Barrack Road and this is material to the help achieve sustainable development. This proposed change looks to limit positive growth which therefore hinder making economic,	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>Centre the Core Strategy fails to acknowledge the objectively assessed potential for Barrack Road to be elevated up the retail policy hierarchy from its existing status. It therefore is not positively prepared especially when considering the Council's own commissioned evidence base. The Plan is un-justified in reverting back to the Local Centre status as the initial Core Strategy Pre-Submission acknowledged the findings within the Council commissioned Joint Retail Assessment 2008 that Barrack Road had potential to sustain a higher retail status (Table 8.3) and that it could be considered to perform the role of a District Centre (Para. 8.16). An updated Joint Assessment in September 2012 has been issued; this is to be read in conjunction with the original assessment (Para.1.5) and does not contradict the original findings. Contained within the currently adopted Local Plan it confirmed that Barrack Road (Para. 6.62) has the greatest concentration of shops in North Christchurch, this is emphasised by the large retail units located at Christchurch Retail Centre housing many national brands. These shops are not generally associated with Local Centres who generally include a range of small shops of a local nature serving a small catchment area (PPS4 Local Centre Definition).</p> <p>The amended text is not Effective as it has been assessed that Barrack Road has potential for a higher retail status. The October 2012 resolution to grant Planning Permission (LPA ref: 8/12/0044) for a 57,000ft2s supermarket highlights that Barrack Road can easily conform to the definition of a District Centre status making it highly deliverable over the plan period. Restricting Barrack Road to the existing status of Local Centre prevents the potential growth of Barrack Road over the period of the plan and how it is well positioned to improve locally accessible shopping for West Christchurch residents. This is recalcitrant with the NPPF as it goes against the core principles which are to provide sustainable development and encourage growth. The NPPF states "sustainable development is about positive growth – making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations.". Paragraph 23 talks about growth and setting policies over the plan period. The current status of the amended text ignores the assessed findings and limits the potential for acknowledge growth of the Barrack Road Centre. The Plan should be consistent in line with National Policy defining a network and hierarchy of centres that is resilient to anticipated future economic changes.</p>			environmental and social progress for this and future generations.	
715197	Mr Neil White	Architectural Designer Quantum Group	<a href="#">PCCS143</a>	34	4.35	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>The amended text is contrary to the NPPF where it promotes sustainable development. The plan should be positively prepared and consistent with achieving sustainable development. Sustainable development is made up of three dimensions, economic, social and environmental as detailed with the NPPF. By redefining Barrack Road as a Local Centre the Core Strategy fails to acknowledge the objectively assessed potential for Barrack Road to be elevated up the retail policy hierarchy from its existing status.</p>	The amended text should read as detailed in the previous consultation.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	We are a key land holder within the area of Barrack Road and this is material to the help achieve sustainable development. this proposed change looks to limit positive growth which therefore hinder making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>It therefore is not positively prepared especially when considering the Council's own commissioned evidence base. The Plan is un-justified in reverting back to the Local Centre status as the initial Core Strategy Pre-Submission acknowledged the findings within the Council commissioned Joint Retail Assessment 2008 that Barrack Road had potential to sustain a higher retail status (Table 8.3) and that it could be considered to perform the role of a District Centre (Para. 8.16). An updated Joint Assessment in September 2012 has been issued; this is to be read in conjunction with the original assessment (Para.1.5) and does not contradict the original findings. Contained within the currently adopted Local Plan it confirmed that Barrack Road (Para. 6.62) has the greatest concentration of shops in North Christchurch, this is emphasised by the large retail units located at Christchurch Retail Centre housing many national brands. These shops are not generally associated with Local Centres who generally include a range of small shops of a local nature serving a small catchment area (PPS4 Local Centre Definition).</p> <p>The amended text is not Effective as it has been assessed that Barrack Road has potential for a higher retail status. The October 2012 resolution to grant Planning Permission (LPA ref: 8/12/0044) for a 57,000ft2s supermarket highlights that Barrack Road can easily conform to the definition of a District Centre status making it highly deliverable over the plan period. Restricting Barrack Road to the existing status of Local Centre prevents the potential growth of Barrack Road over the period of the plan and how it is well positioned to improve locally accessible shopping for West Christchurch residents. This is recalcitrant with the NPPF as it goes against the core principles which are to provide sustainable development and encourage growth. The NPPF states "sustainable development is about positive growth – making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations.". Paragraph 23 talks about growth and setting policies over the plan period. The current status of the amended text ignores the assessed findings and limits the potential for acknowledge growth of the Barrack Road Centre. The Plan should be consistent in line with National Policy defining a network and hierarchy of centres that is resilient to anticipated future economic changes.</p>				
523627	David Lowin	WYG Planning & Design	<a href="#">PCCS503</a>	35	KS7				Further clarification is needed regarding the proposed lower threshold set for retail developments outside defined centres. The National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Authorities to set their own 'proportionate' thresholds. However, given the default threshold in the NPPF is 2,500 sq m and it is proposed to set the threshold significantly below this, the Council have not justified how or why the threshold has been set at 1000 sq m. The Joint Retail Study update (2012) does not provide any evidence or explanation as to how this threshold has been decided.				
642224	Mr T	Director Christchurch	<a href="#">PCCS73</a>	35	KS7		No	Positively Prepared	Whilst recognising the prohibition of further discussion on the		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral	To present the view that this strategy does not	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
	Atkinson	Chamber of Trade & Commerce						Justified Effective	<p>generality of the Core Strategy, we still do not consider the statements regarding the town centre to be based on up to date evidence or, in the case of the recent Retail Update, on reasonable predictions of future economic growth. Following these comments, we attach a brief critique of that report to explain our reasoning. This unrealistic approach to consultation will lead to poor planning decisions and will jeopardise the economic potential of the area.</p> <p>We are very concerned that the draft Core Strategy document does not seem to command significant public support – the summary of comments against many sections do not seem to conclude that it was positively prepared, justified, or effective.</p> <p>Detailed Comments Page 35, KS 7</p> <p>We object to the change from 2500 square metres to 1000 square metres - this was based on the recent Retail Update recommendation that was formed by opinion not evidence. This is a significant change from the universally accepted 2500 square metres threshold, based on a single unchallenged opinion of one group of consultants. We cannot see how this will encourage economic progress.</p> <p>Critique of Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners Christchurch Retail Update 2012 Document number 30929, dated the 24th September, 2012</p> <p>This document is intended to update the 2008 Joint Retail Assessment and was commissioned by the local authority essentially to update the evidence base for the emerging Core Strategy. In our opinion, having considered the document carefully, we do not believe it represents a realistic assessment of either the near or distant future. We are concerned that it has however been used as the basis for updating the Core Strategy without an independent review of its findings and proposals. In particular, we are extremely concerned with the rationale behind the anticipated expenditure growth.</p> <p>The figures used have been based on the 'Experian' model which has in recent times not proven to have any great reliability. For example, Experian were forecasting 2.3 per cent growth in 2012 when the outturn would appear to be more like minus 0.8 per cent. We do not consider there is any evidence of the need for further retail floor space certainly in the medium term, and as forecasting beyond five years is pure speculation we cannot see the purpose in planning for further growth in the longer term. The report also downplays the importance of the Internet and online shopping. It regards online shopping as 'insignificant' and assumes it to 'flat line' after 2018. This is contrary to most other predictions of online shopping, which currently holds 13% of the market share and is growing at 16% a year and accelerating. We do not believe that the number of 'computer literate adults reaching saturation point' is a prime driver of this phenomenon, what is more important is the new generation that has been brought up with the use of the computer and mobile phone,</p>		examination	have the support of the local business community and will lead to unnecessary planning conflict and cost and inhibit potential economic prosperity.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>and Internet shopping as a norm. The growth will only accelerate with companies such as Amazon entering the online food market, and more online suppliers offering same day, and even same hour delivery.</p> <p>The levels of growth assumed in the report have no basis in fact. We do not understand why major economic factors are not reflected in the assumptions. In particular the general annual growth of 3% for comparison goods cannot be justified - in the light of negative growth in 2012, most retailers anticipating even to negative growth in 2013 and a significant decline of in the years following 2015 as the need for more austerity cuts to maintain the UK's credit rating have to be employed.</p> <p>We also do not believe that the conditions will encourage the development of the levels of housing necessary to support the assumed increase in population in the Christchurch capture area. The report assumes a significant increase in the expenditure capacity per capita over the period, which does not reflect the demographic situation in Christchurch, where many of the retired population have seen a their incomes from investment drastically reduced over the past five years and this is certainly not expected to recover for the next decade.</p> <p>On the subject of convenience floor space, the report concludes that there will be a surplus of convenience expenditure in Christchurch of some £19M but neglects that planning permission has 4 already in effect been granted for three new convenience retailers with a capacity of around £45M.</p> <p>We will therefore have a surplus of convenience goods capacity rather than a shortfall and there is therefore no need to plan for further expansion. In terms of the balance of class A1 and A3 retail uses, the report comes to an illogical conclusion by stating clearly that even though the ratio is already at nearly 32% in Christchurch that to adopt a figure of 30% would not be 'overly restrictive'. This cannot be considered as objective planning.</p> <p>Accordingly, we do not consider that the findings of the Retail Update 2012 form a sound or objective platform as the basis of updating the emerging Core Strategy.</p>				
642224	Mr T Atkinson	Director Christchurch Chamber of Trade & Commerce	<a href="#">PCCS74</a>	36	KS8		No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective	<p>Whilst recognising the prohibition of further discussion on the generality of the Core Strategy, we still do not consider the statements regarding the town centre to be based on up to date evidence or, in the case of the recent Retail Update, on reasonable predictions of future economic growth.</p> <p>Following these comments, we attach a brief critique of that report to explain our reasoning. This unrealistic approach to consultation will lead to poor planning decisions and will jeopardise the economic potential of the area. We are very concerned that the draft Core Strategy document does not seem to command significant public support – the summary of comments against many sections do not seem to conclude that it was positively prepared, justified, or effective.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To present the view that this strategy does not have the support of the local business community and will lead to unnecessary planning conflict and cost and inhibit potential economic prosperity.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>We disagree with the change to the need for comparison and convenience goods floor space. This new recommendation was based on the 2012 Retails Study Update which has not been given public scrutiny and is not robust. There is no objective justification to plan for additional retail development in and around the town centre. Predictions of future growth have little validity in the current economic situation. The more objective position would be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise the extent of vacant Retail Property in the town centre</li> <li>• Recognise extant permissions for retail development in Wick Lane, Barrack Road, and Somerford.</li> <li>• Concentrate potential town centre retail activity around the Lanes</li> <li>• Plan for additional retail capacity at Lyndhurst Road (Sainsbury's) for new housing development</li> <li>• Recognise that a more sustainable infrastructure will be provided by incorporating retail facilities in close proximity to any new housing development.</li> </ul> <p>Critique of Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners Christchurch Retail Update 2012 Document number 30929, dated the 24th September, 2012</p> <p>This document is intended to update the 2008 Joint Retail Assessment and was commissioned by the local authority essentially to update the evidence base for the emerging Core Strategy. In our opinion, having considered the document carefully, we do not believe it represents a realistic assessment of either the near or distant future. We are concerned that it has however been used as the basis for updating the Core Strategy without an independent review of its findings and proposals. In particular, we are extremely concerned with the rationale behind the anticipated expenditure growth.</p> <p>The figures used have been based on the 'Experian' model which has in recent times not proven to have any great reliability. For example, Experian were forecasting 2.3 per cent growth in 2012 when the outturn would appear to be more like minus 0.8 per cent. We do not consider there is any evidence of the need for further retail floor space certainly in the medium term, and as forecasting beyond five years is pure speculation we cannot see the purpose in planning for further growth in the longer term. The report also downplays the importance of the Internet and online shopping. It regards online shopping as 'insignificant' and assumes it to 'flat line' after 2018. This is contrary to most other predictions of online shopping, which currently holds 13% of the market share and is growing at 16% a year and accelerating. We do not believe that the number of 'computer literate adults reaching saturation point' is a prime driver of this phenomenon, what is more important is the new generation that has been brought up with the use of the computer and mobile phone, and Internet shopping as a norm. The growth will only accelerate with companies such as Amazon entering the online food market, and more online suppliers offering same day, and even same hour delivery.</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>The levels of growth assumed in the report have no basis in fact. We do not understand why major economic factors are not reflected in the assumptions. In particular the general annual growth of 3% for comparison goods cannot be justified - in the light of negative growth in 2012, most retailers anticipating even to negative growth in 2013 and a significant decline of in the years following 2015 as the need for more austerity cuts to maintain the UK's credit rating have to be employed.</p> <p>We also do not believe that the conditions will encourage the development of the levels of housing necessary to support the assumed increase in population in the Christchurch capture area. The report assumes a significant increase in the expenditure capacity per capita over the period, which does not reflect the demographic situation in Christchurch, where many of the retired population have seen a their incomes from investment drastically reduced over the past five years and this is certainly not expected to recover for the next decade.</p> <p>On the subject of convenience floor space, the report concludes that there will be a surplus of convenience expenditure in Christchurch of some £19M but neglects that planning permission has 4 already in effect been granted for three new convenience retailers with a capacity of around £45M. We will therefore have a surplus of convenience goods capacity rather than a shortfall and there is therefore no need to plan for further expansion.</p> <p>In terms of the balance of class A1 and A3 retail uses, the report comes to an illogical conclusion by stating clearly that even though the ratio is already at nearly 32% in Christchurch that to adopt a figure of 30% would not be 'overly restrictive'. This cannot be considered as objective planning. Accordingly, we do not consider that the findings of the Retail Update 2012 form a sound or objective platform as the basis of updating the emerging Core Strategy.</p>				
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS391</a>	39	KS9	Yes	Yes		<p>The County Council notes the proposal to delete the A349 improvements from the policy since the majority of this route is in Poole so the Borough of Poole will deliver the improvements.</p> <p>Dorset County Council supports the proposed change.</p>				
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		<a href="#">PCCS16</a>	39	KS9	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Effective	<p>In my opinion leaving Poole Borough Council to make improvements to the very important A349, is lacking commitment to this route between Poole and Wimborne. This route is already used extensively by existing residents to go to work and will be used by the majority of the residents from the new suggested sites around Wimborne in the future. What assurances does our Council have that Poole will carry out the necessary improvements and what time scale has been agreed for completion of these works?</p>	<p>A signed agreement must be in place that the works to this important road will be carried out and completed by Poole Borough Council BEFORE the proposed new homes are occupied.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
474490	Mrs Sheila Bourton	Chairman Keep Wimborne Green	<a href="#">PCCS26</a>	39	KS9	Yes	No	Effective	<p>How can it be guaranteed that Poole Borough Council will make improvements to the A349 Poole through to Wimborne? What assurances does East Dorset District Council have and what timescale has been received to</p>	<p>Improvements to the A349 road, Poole through to Wimborne should take place before any new</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									improve this vitally important road which is used by residents of Wimborne/Colehill to go to work in Bournemouth and Poole? The population of Wimborne/Colehill will increase dramatically as a result of new homes being built and a high percentage of those will be travelling on the A349 to get to work.	housing development takes place and a guarantee should be given by Poole Borough Council that this will be the case.			
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS392</a>	40	KS10	Yes	Yes		The County Council notes the proposed changes to the timescales and way the schemes are listed. Dorset County Council supports the proposed changes.				
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		<a href="#">PCCS17</a>	40	KS10	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Effective	With regard to the busy and strategically important A31 road, the Highways Agency has not committed to a specified date when the dualling of that road will start and, more importantly, will finish. It may not be until 2028 and even then that date is questionable because of lack of finance . The existing residents of Wimborne and Colehill already have to contend with congestion at the "improved" Canford Bottom junction and this would only get worse when the population of Wimborne/Colehill increases as a result of building so many new homes. The A31 is one of the roads used by commuters to go to work from Wimborne/Colehill. How can our councils consider building hundreds of new homes in the Wimborne/Colehill area before essential works to the A31 have been completed?	No new homes should be occupied before improvements to the A31 have been completed, or at least only partial occupation should take place before completion of the works..	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
474490	Mrs Sheila Bourton	Chairman Keep Wimborne Green	<a href="#">PCCS27</a>	40	KS10	Yes	No	Effective		As funding for the dualling of the A31 has not been agreed neither has the timescale for these improvements, it is our view that no new housing development should take place around Wimborne until funding and timescale is agreed. It is clear that the so called improvements to Canford Bottom junction have not produced the result expected; there are still long queues to this junction on all the side roads at various times of the day, particularly at "going to work" and "returning from work" times.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS495</a>	40	KS10	Yes	No	Justified Effective	The proposed change to policy KS10 is not justified by evidence as Dorset County Council have not completed sufficient transport modelling to be so specific about where the improvements are needed If the policy is to include the schemes it needs to be effective and should include those schemes that are missing from the current list, these being Barrack Road/Stour Road, Stour	In order to make the plan sound it is suggested that the policy wording be revised to say: 'Improvements at junctions on the A35 in Christchurch could	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	MEM Ltd as the managing agent of both of the additional housing allocation sites within Christchurch and will be responsible for the infrastructure improvements associated with the development, and has an interest in assisting the Council in delivering	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									Road/Tuckton Road, Somerford Roundabout.	include but not limited to .....inserted before 'Stony Lane roundabout'. Please		the developments.	
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS11</a>	40	KS10				BBC, DCC and BoP officers are in the middle of working on how to spend the devolved transport funding from government for the 2015-2019 period. The A338 resurfacing still looks like the strongest candidate, but obviously we'll need member approval from all 3 transport authorities which make up the new Local Transport Body. As a result of this on-going work, I have now been advised by Andy Shaw and Mike Campkin that the widening element of the A338 works (from Blackwater - Cooper Dean) which we had identified for 2015-2019 in your CS and IDP, is unlikely to occur until 2020+ and will again be dependent on when funding becomes available for that period. The resurfacing and the widening can remain as 1 scheme in your text but we need to add this additional information in, perhaps best described as phase 1 and 2. The other change that BBC officers would like us to make is to be clearer that the DCC element of the resurfacing and widening just goes up to the county boundary. I had described it as going from Blackwater to Cooper Dean for completeness and to avoid confusion for the public as on the face of it a widening to 3 lanes over a stretch of only 1km wouldn't seem to make much sense! I know we can't change this now, but can we hold it in mind to add to the other changes that are likely to occur during the examination process please. Both KS10 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will need changing.				
654962	Mr Christopher Chope		<a href="#">PCCS380</a>	40	KS10	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Transport Infrastructure. I object to the deferral of the widening of the B3073 between Chapel Gate and Blackwater and to the deferral and removal of the linkage of improvements to the A35 Fountains roundabout, Stony Lane roundabout and Staple Cross junction to the proposed Christchurch urban extension.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In my capacity as the Member of Parliament for the Christchurch Constituency which includes all of Christchurch Borough and a significant part of the East Dorset District Council area within its boundary.	
718916	Mr Mike Campkin	Planning and Transport Bournemouth Borough Council	<a href="#">PCCS183</a>	40	KS10	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified	Following your consultation analysis we remain concerned at the proposed improvements at Parley Cross (cross referred at FWP5) without further assurances or detailed analysis confirming appropriate mitigation is provided to the implications on the dominant flows between Ferndown and Bournemouth. We acknowledge that subject to detailed information your proposed enhancement scheme may be a more appropriate solution to the immediate locale than a gyratory; however we would reserve our position subject to the detailed analysis confirming appropriate mitigation of the proposed flows between Ferndown and Bournemouth. I would stress that the peak period delays that lead into and out of Bournemouth along this corridor which would continue to and may increase the adverse impact on our network unless this enhancement scheme mitigates the proposed development impacts on this strategic junction.	Produce the supporting information that demonstrates the revised enhancement scheme for Parley Cross will not prejudice the flows between Ferndown and Bournemouth.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	As neighbouring Highway Authority the proposed transport scheme has a direct impact on our network due to the high volumes of traffic flowing in and out of the Borough along the A347 corridor.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>For completeness I have enclosed below our previous concerns with the policy and associated map:                      Policy KS10: Strategic Transport Improvements (and Map 4.6)                      Comment                      The junction improvements at Parley Cross referred to in Policy KS10 and Policy FWP5, the West Parley Village Centre enhancement scheme, differ from those recommended by the SEDMMTS, see paragraphs 8.61 and 8.62, which promotes the provision of a gyratory. The enhancement scheme may have a significant impact on the flows between Bournemouth and Ferndown. This scheme does not appear to have been referred to at the Preferred Options stage and there are concerns that it will not fully address the predicted traffic problems in the area although it may form part of a phased programme subject to detailed analysis.                      Currently long delays are evident during the peak periods leading into and out of Bournemouth along A347 New Road. Whilst the enhancement scheme will improve the situation for east-west movements and provide significant relief this should not be at the cost of the north-south movements between Ferndown and Bournemouth.</p>				
718916	Mr Mike Campkin	Planning and Transport Bournemouth Borough Council	<a href="#">PCCS184</a>	41	Map 4.6	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified	<p>Following your consultation analysis we remain concerned at the proposed improvements at Parley Cross (cross referred at FWP5) without further assurances or detailed analysis confirming appropriate mitigation is provided to the implications on the dominant flows between Ferndown and Bournemouth. We acknowledge that subject to detailed information your proposed enhancement scheme may be a more appropriate solution to the immediate locale than a gyratory; however we would reserve our position subject to the detailed analysis confirming appropriate mitigation of the proposed flows between Ferndown and Bournemouth.                      I would stress that the peak period delays that lead into and out of Bournemouth along this corridor which would continue to and may increase the adverse impact on our network unless this enhancement scheme mitigates the proposed development impacts on this strategic junction.                      For completeness I have enclosed below our previous concerns with the policy and associated map:                      Policy KS10: Strategic Transport Improvements (and Map 4.6)                      Comment                      The junction improvements at Parley Cross referred to in Policy KS10 and Policy FWP5, the West Parley Village Centre enhancement scheme, differ from those recommended by the SEDMMTS, see paragraphs 8.61 and 8.62, which promotes the provision of a gyratory. The enhancement scheme may have a significant impact on the flows between Bournemouth and Ferndown. This scheme does not appear to have been referred to at the Preferred Options stage and there are concerns that it will not fully address the predicted traffic problems in the area although it</p>	Produce the supporting information that demonstrates the revised enhancement scheme for Parley Cross will not prejudice the flows between Ferndown and Bournemouth.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	As neighbouring Highway Authority the proposed transport scheme has a direct impact on our network due to the high volumes of traffic flowing in and out of the Borough along the A347 corridor.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									may form part of a phased programme subject to detailed analysis. Currently long delays are evident during the peak periods leading into and out of Bournemouth along A347 New Road. Whilst the enhancement scheme will improve the situation for east-west movements and provide significant relief this should not be at the cost of the north-south movements between Ferndown and Bournemouth.				
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS393</a>	42	KS11	Yes	Yes		The County Council notes that the proposal to amended the policy to provide greater clarity for developers on financial contributions. Dorset County Council supports the proposed change				
642224	Mr T Atkinson	Director Christchurch Chamber of Trade & Commerce	<a href="#">PCCS75</a>	45	5.4		No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective	This section is headed 'facts', - the changes proposed are not based on fact.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To present the view that this strategy does not have the support of the local business community and will lead to unnecessary planning conflict and cost and inhibit potential economic prosperity.	
642224	Mr T Atkinson	Director Christchurch Chamber of Trade & Commerce	<a href="#">PCCS76</a>	47	5.10		No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective	The change is conjecture based on the unjustified growth presumptions.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To present the view that this strategy does not have the support of the local business community and will lead to unnecessary planning conflict and cost and inhibit potential economic prosperity.	
642224	Mr T Atkinson	Director Christchurch Chamber of Trade & Commerce	<a href="#">PCCS77</a>	48	CH1		No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective	The change is conjecture based on the unjustified growth presumptions.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To present the view that this strategy does not have the support of the local business community and will lead to unnecessary planning conflict and cost and inhibit potential economic prosperity.	
670146	Mr Peter Williams	Partner Amicitia Partnership	<a href="#">PCCS115</a>	48	CH1				Thank you for advising me of the consultation. I am happy for our previous submission re the draft Core Strategy to be used as an input in this round of consultation.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Also can you please note that I would like the opportunity to meet with the Secretary of State's representative May/June? next year to present my views on this subject.	
715197	Mr Neil White	Architectural Designer Quantum Group	<a href="#">PCCS145</a>	48	CH1	Yes	No	Justified	The amended text should refer to the future requirements to 2031 not 2028		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
642224	Mr T Atkinson	Director Christchurch Chamber of Trade & Commerce	<a href="#">PCCS78</a>	52	CH3		No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective	As detailed elsewhere we can see no objective justification for extending the primary shopping area to include the Magistrates Court site. To be designated as a primary shopping area, is to conclude that either the area already consists of essential primary and all secondary shopping frontages or that it will in future become an area of contiguous retail frontages. The plans for the Magistrates Court site do not entail such an extent of retail development, and the Council's Planning Committee meeting of the 23rd of October, 2012 concluded that the site was not suitable for extensive retail development. There can therefore be no evidence based		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To present the view that this strategy does not have the support of the local business community and will lead to unnecessary planning conflict and cost and inhibit potential economic prosperity.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									reason to extend the primary shopping area to include this site.				
715197	Mr Neil White	Architectural Designer Quantum Group	<a href="#">PCCS146</a>	52	CH3	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	<p>We note that the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) of Christchurch Town Centre is proposed to be extended from the Local Plan definition to include the 'Pit Site' Car Park and adjoining dwellings fronting the Barrack Road and the Fountains Roundabout (see Map 5.3). We object to this change on the following grounds:</p> <p>The NPPF Annex 2 Glossary states that a PSA is an area where retail development is concentrated. This generally comprises the primary and those secondary frontages which are adjoining or closely related to the primary shopping frontage. This definition and that of Primary and Secondary Frontages does not include car parks, residential dwellings and nor is retail development concentrated in this particular area.</p> <p>Whilst the Joint Retail Study seeks to provide justification for this change and recommends the boundary, any justification and the recommendation in this document are not sound as it does not accord with the NPPF definition. The PSA should only be extended once the scale and type of development on this site is known.</p> <p>Such a change is necessary as it will allow this part of the Core Strategy to achieve soundness by being consistent with the NPPF.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		<a href="#">2403957_0_1.jpg</a>
717253	Mr Graeme Warriner	Director Turley Associates	<a href="#">PCCS52</a>	52	CH3	Yes	Yes		DDP support the extension of the PSA to include the whole of the Magistrates Court site. Given the clear intention to redevelop this site for a comprehensive retail-led mixed-use scheme, the inclusion of the whole site will encourage a holistic development solution and allow for the proper planning of the whole area.				
654046	Mr David Pardy		<a href="#">PCCS142</a>	52	5.22 (Character of Highcliffe text)	Yes	Yes		<p>I strongly support the statement - " Highcliffe has seen considerable development over the past 30 years, which has included some larger blocks of flats and high density infill development which has detracted from the character of the area. Consideration will be given to developing policies and design guidance in future Development Plan Documents which protect the character of Highcliffe. " &amp; wish to reinforce the view that a social/demographic balance must be maintained to prevent the area from becoming a geriatric ghetto.</p> <p>In order to achieve this I believe that the plans for redevelopment of existing family houses should be resisted.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In order to achieve this I believe that the plans for redevelopment of existing family houses should be resisted.	
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS175</a>	52	Map 5.3	Yes	Yes		Whilst the Hospital of St. Mary Magdalen Trust does not object to the Proposed Change to Map 5.3, it wishes to maintain the flexibility for the Trust land and properties to be developed for an alternative range of uses as set out in policy CH 2; i.e. residential, employment, retail, leisure and entertainment, offices, arts, culture and tourism development.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
717253	Mr Graeme	Director Turley	<a href="#">PCCS53</a>	52	Map 5.3	Yes	Yes		DDP support the extension of the PSA to include the whole				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
	Warriner	Associates							of the Magistrates Court site. Given the clear intention to redevelop this site for a comprehensive retail-led mixed-use scheme, the inclusion of the whole site will encourage a holistic development solution and allow for the proper planning of the whole area.				
714782	MR MALCOLM MAWBEY		<a href="#">PCCS14</a>	53	5.22 (Key facts)	No	No		Line 2 specifies "non food comparison retail floorspace" Para 5.24 and CH4 do not specify "non food".	Leave out "non food" or insert it in the other two paragraphs as appropriate.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
714782	MR MALCOLM MAWBEY		<a href="#">PCCS15</a>	55	CH5	No	No		The revised map does not show "frontages". It outlines and shades in the primary and secondary shopping cores.	Redraw and show the shopping frontages.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
642224	Mr T Atkinson	Director Christchurch Chamber of Trade & Commerce	<a href="#">PCCS79</a>	56	5.31		No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective	The Retail Update does not form an objective opinion.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To present the view that this strategy does not have the support of the local business community and will lead to unnecessary planning conflict and cost and inhibit potential economic prosperity.	
715197	Mr Neil White	Architectural Designer Quantum Group	<a href="#">PCCS147</a>	57	CH7	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>The proposed map 5.5 does not show or provide an appropriate boundary for Barrack Road Centre. The Proposal Map seems to ignore the main shopping centre along Barrack Road. It also does not consider the Former QinetiQ Site which recently (23rd October 2012) gained a resolution to grant a planning permission for 57,000ft2 of retail for a new supermarket. Allocating both the existing Retail Park and Former QinetiQ site within the District Centre is sound for the following reasons:</p> <p>(i) There is a longstanding recognition that a District Centre consists of a group of shops which would include a Supermarket or Superstore and non-retail services and community facilities. Such a range of services is necessary in order to adequately serve a local residential area. This reflects the approach taken in the Joint Retail Study evidence base (based on then PPS6) and PPS4. Whilst the NPPF is silent on a definition for a District Centre, the principles remain unchanged in terms of the reasons for identifying a 'Centre'.</p> <p>(ii) The Centre fronting Barrack Road does not contain either a Supermarket or Superstore and is deficient in this form of retailing. Whilst it contains a range of commercial services and smaller scale top-up food retail (such as the One-Stop store), this aspect of its District Centre function is deficient when compared with the established definitions of a District Centre. The March 2012 Planning Permission for a mixed use scheme including a 371 sq.m retail store at 170-174 Barrack Road does not alter this position.</p> <p>(iii) To perform a District Centre role and ensure the needs of local residents in the Barrack Road / West Christchurch area are met, the Core Strategy should plan positively for the provision of a Supermarket or Superstore in the Barrack Road area. This will then provide a sustainable solution to address the identified outflow of convenience goods expenditure in our Retail Assessment. Such an outflow was</p>	The proposal should read in line that Barrack Road has been acknowledged to be a District Centre and the proposal map should represent this.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	We are a key land holder within the area of Barrack Road and this is material to the help achieve sustainable development. This proposed change looks to limit positive growth which therefore hinders making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>identified in the Core Strategy evidence base (see the household survey of the Joint Retail Study) upon which our Assessment was based. If this cannot be met on an identified existing site within the existing Centre boundary through improvements to existing facilities, following the principles of the sequential approach, the Core Strategy should identify a District Centre boundary that includes adequate provision to address the Centre's deficiency.</p> <p>(iv) From our assessment, the most suitable location to accommodate such growth is the Former QinetiQ Site. This was effectively acknowledged in the June &amp; October 2012 Committee resolutions to approve a planning application on this site for a Food Store (LPA Ref: 8/12/0044). This offers the only suitably sized site to accommodate a Food Store of sufficient scale to serve the District Centre / West Christchurch area and already benefits from pedestrian linkage with the Centre. Such linkage can be strengthened via physical improvements which will be delivered as part of the eventual scheme. The provision of a Food Store will then ensure the Centre fulfils its potential for growth reflecting one of the reasons for its identification (see PCSC paragraph 4.35).</p> <p>(v) The identification of the site within the District Centre boundary would still complement Christchurch's Town Centre status in the hierarchy as this Centre would still contain additional and wider comparison, convenience and service retail choices to serve the wider CBC area. It is however appropriate to plan for enhanced local convenience provision in a District Centre location in preference to a Town Centre as this will ensure the District Centre fulfils its particular policy role and function. This then allows the Town Centre to increase its role in other forms of retailing (e.g. comparison goods) to ensure it performs effectively in that particular form of retailing. This is particularly appropriate for Christchurch as it seeks to improve its competitiveness and attraction for local residents compared with Bournemouth, Castlepoint and other sub-regional alternatives.</p>				
653893	Mr Michael Bailey		<a href="#">PCCS369</a>	59	6.4 (Allotment Provision)				6.40 Page 64. The relocation of allotments to Burton has been removed. Alternative sites are being investigated. Does this mean that another site in Burton is being considered? I object to this section as being misleading. Residents of the village may be thinking that allotments are NOT to be relocated in the village.				
656619	Mrs Kay Power		<a href="#">PCCS332</a>	59	6.4 (Allotment Provision)				I feel that there are several reasons that the part of this document relating to the removal of the allotment site at Roeshot hill is unjustified. Roeshot Hill allotment site is Grade 2 agricultural land and the National Policy is to preserve both Green Belt and the best agricultural land. As Roeshot Hill is some of the best land in Dorset, the proposal to build on the land is not consistent with the National Policy. The site has been awarded a Green Flag, proving its excellence. The latest schedule no longer suggests that the allotments be re-sited at Burton, but makes no proposal as				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									to where they could be moved to, if they must be moved. This is a very worrying consideration for the plotters. Christchurch has very little space for the extra housing, East Dorset would surely have greater space. Neither do I feel that it is automatically right for the allotments to be sacrificed for housing. People in Britain are being encouraged to grow more food, sacrificing good agricultural land does not make sense.				
662780	Mr Anthony Page		<a href="#">PCCS408</a>	59	6.4 (Allotment Provision)	No	No	Justified Effective	The approved Christchurch Allotment Strategy 2012-2028 VISION for allotments states that :- 'Permanent Christchurch residents who wish to cultivate an allotment should have the opportunity to do so and within a reasonable distance of their home'. The proposed changes to part 6.40, in line with the stipulated lack of suitably arable land, where it states 'Alternative sites are being considered for the relocation of the Roeshot Hill Allotments and a such reference to a specific location has been removed' means that with no suitable sites to meet with the Christchurch Allotment Strategy 2012-2028 vision cannot be met to support the local Mudeford community, it also becomes unclear and uncertain to the community holders what the future holds and causes undue anxiety and disbelief.	To set out with clear plain English as to how the approved Christchurch Allotment Strategy 2012-2028 VISION for allotments :- 'Permanent Christchurch residents who wish to cultivate an allotment should have the opportunity to do so and within a reasonable distance of their home', will be met With the limited available land for reallocation., and to ensure that the local community is best served, the Roeshot Hill allotment provision should remain an support for the community at large.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
663614	Everett Jones		<a href="#">PCCS44</a>	59	6.4 (Allotment Provision)	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The document no longer states an alternative site for moving the Roeshot allotments, which should stay where they are anyway. There is no provision for expansion of the allotments as there is no alternative suitable site proposed. There must be a credible alternative to even object to it, how can you argue in thin air. There is no sensible reason to move the allotments as what we have at the moment are exactly what's required and fit for purpose.	This question is not applicable until a suitable alternative site is found which in my opinion is impossible.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To find out exactly what you are trying to do.	
663627	Hugh Jones		<a href="#">PCCS381</a>	59	6.4 (Allotment Provision)	No	No	Consistent with national policy	You have not identified an alternative site that complies with the 1922 Allotments Act. Until you do so and it is acceptable, you cannot develop the Roeshot Hill site.	You need to identify the 'Hub site' you mention, including its location, size and availability. Obviously the original site in Burton is no longer available.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718314	Dr D.M Cort		<a href="#">PCCS411</a>	59	6.4 (Allotment Provision)	No	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The intention to relocate Roeshot Hill Allotments 'to a suitable site' is not justified, not effective and not consistent with National Policy because:- a) the Council is unable to identify any alternative site for the allotments. b) the land is no longer required for housing now that Burton has been identified as suitable for development. c) the A35 is unable to cope with the ingress and exit of	All reference to the relocation of Roeshot Hill allotments should be deleted and replaced with words to the effect that the site will not be required for housing development at any time	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To advise the Inspector on the part that the allotments play in the social cohesion of Christchurch and on the adverse impacts of using Roeshot Hill for housing development.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									additional traffic associated with development. d) likewise social infrastructure, including schooling will not support housing development at Roeshot. e) the cost of undergrounding O/H power cables will make development at Roeshot economically unviable. f) relocation of ploholders will be socially disruptive and may result in economic and social disadvantage.	within the time frame of the plan.			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		<a href="#">PCCS18</a>	60	6.9	Yes	Yes			I support the increase to housing density from 20-45 dwellings per hectare to 26-46 dwellings per hectare because by building more dwellings it reduces the need to lose even more greenfield sites to development. This change was also agreed by independent consultants Broadway Malvan.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
474490	Mrs Sheila Bourton	Chairman Keep Wimborne Green	<a href="#">PCCS28</a>	60	6.9	Yes	Yes		We agree with increasing housing density because this will enable more houses to be built on the areas proposed by our Councils and will serve to reduce even more pressure to release more greenfield sites for development.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
656629	Mr John Campbell	Chairman Roeshot Hill Allotment Association	<a href="#">PCCS372</a>	60	6.9				Fail to see how the proposed increase in housing density (p 60 para 6.9) will be consistent with the Core Strategy vision of delivering housing 'of a character and type consistent with the local area.'		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1) The Association represents the majority of allotment tenants who will be adversely affected by the implementation of CN1. 2) The document raises serious doubt that the statutory duty in relation to removal of allotments and the provision of an allotment hub can be achieved. 3) There has been a persistent failure of the Council to consider a mixed use scheme consistent with the Core Strategy Vision and the vision contained in Christchurch Borough Council's Allotment Strategy 2012.	
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS418</a>	61	6.11	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	This Paragraph of the Core Strategy deals with the anticipated level of development on the proposed urban extension at Roeshot Hill. As set out in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy (PSCS), the potential range of dwellings was between 765 and 933; averaging at 850. This formed the basis of the estimate in Policy CN 1. The dwelling range in the Proposed Changes is now 765 – 950. This gives an average of 848. However, Paragraph 6.11 concludes that Policy CN 1 should now accommodate the maximum of 950. This is at the very top of the dwelling range. There is no certainty that this number of dwellings will be delivered. The reference to 950 dwellings is arbitrary; and lacks justification.	Amend the figure of 950 to 860.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
642224	Mr T Atkinson	Director Christchurch Chamber of Trade & Commerce	<a href="#">PCCS80</a>	62	6.18		No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective	The Joint Retail Assessment 2008 only considered quantitative not qualitative need therefore this conclusion is not valid.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To present the view that this strategy does not have the support of the local business community and will lead to unnecessary planning conflict and cost and inhibit potential economic prosperity.	
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS491</a>	63	6.27				In addition MEM are pleased that reference to a Country Park east of Burton has been omitted.				
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS417</a>	65	CN1	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	In accordance with our representations in respect of Paragraph 6.11, Policy CN 1 should be amended in order that the delivery target for new housing should be set at 860. This reflects the possibility that the development potential of the site may not meet its maximum target.	Amend the figure of 950 to 860.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	<a href="#">PCCS359</a>	65	CN1	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	We refer to the above consultation event and respond on behalf of Messrs Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Bodorgan Properties (CI) Ltd and Sainsburys PLC. Our clients have the controlling interest in the land north of Roeshot Hill and wish to ensure that the planning policy framework aimed at securing release of the land is both satisfactory and sufficiently flexible. CN1 - Christchurch Urban Extension We support the revision to the policy with regard to the percentage of affordable housing required to reflect development viability in recognition of the significant exceptional costs in Policy CN1 including the relocation of the existing allotments and the realignment and undergrounding of the existing overhead power cables. In addition there is a requirement for significant strategic infrastructure to be provided as part of the development including improvements to the wider transport network and the provision of a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). As regards the change from 850 to 950 dwellings proposed on the site this is supported. We would request that the Authority confirm that this has been subject to appropriate sustainability testing.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To provide expert evidence on relevant aspects of the policy.	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS320</a>	65	CN1	Yes	Yes		On site ecology Dorset Wildlife Trust support the inclusion of new wording 'Biodiversity enhancements will be provided within this buffer zone' as a positive approach to improving the environment to compensate for the river being put into a more urban setting.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS234</a>	65	CN1	Yes	Yes		We support the amendments to this policy including the addition of 'biodiversity enhancements.'		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS235</a>	65	CN2	Yes	Yes		We support the amendments made to this policy.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
361028	Ms Helen	Head of Policy and	<a href="#">PCCS108</a>	65	CN1				It is noted that an increase from 850 in the Pre-Submission				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
	Patton	Plans New Forest National Park Authority							Document to 950 dwellings is proposed in this document. The housing figure now represents nearly a third of the total housing requirement for Christchurch and highlights the importance of providing the necessary infrastructure to support it. Of particular importance, given the proximity of the site to the New Forest National Park, is the provision of a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). As you are aware, the National Park Authority as set out in its recent response to a request for comments on the Draft SANG Strategy by Jackson Planning, while supporting the general principle of providing attractive, useable greenspace to address the recreational needs of the urban extension, the Authority does have concerns however, over whether the proposed SANGs would achieve their objectives during the periods of large scale mineral extraction also proposed for the area.				
476036	Mr Colin Jamieson		<a href="#">PCCS163</a>	65	CN1	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	These amended numbers have not been agreed by Christchurch Councillors because they are predicated on housing needs that are out of date. The housing needs analysis has not been undertaken by Christchurch Borough Council despite many requests for this information to be brought forward. Local councillors were led to believe that any surplus housing required in Christchurch would be provided in East Dorset. Clearly that is not the case because there is still a call for 45 houses in Burton which would destroy the local village centred farm that is detailed in the recent Burton Conservation Area Management Plan adopted recently in 2007 following extensive local consultation. The land identified for development is on the very edge of the flood plain and its development would impact on the plain.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I am a ward councillor. I believe that the basis on which new developments is founded is unsound, untested and is not evidenced on need. I believe that the need to redefine the Green Belt has not been evidenced because the local housing need has not been agreed by the councillors. I believe that the building of 45 or more houses in the green belt will effect the adjacent flood plain.	
508456	Rev. Dudley Powell		<a href="#">PCCS276</a>	65	CN1	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	There is a statutory requirement to provide allotments (e.g. Roeshot Hill). There is no concrete proposal to re-locate to a specific alternative site - there is no reason to re-locate hundreds of well-established allotment plots. Houses could be built around the back of the allotments without the re-location and houses built adjacent would have the allotments as a positive selling point. The allotments are full of wildlife and have recently won a green space award.	Any proposals relating to the allotments should be a) concrete b) specific c) based on plans which are confirmed as implementable.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS492</a>	65	CN1				We have been unable to reach final agreement with Natural England on the SANG strategy at Roeshot in time for your consultation deadline. However, we met Nick Squirrell on 17 December and have made progress with the design parameters on the SANG for Roeshot.				
612430	Mr Nick Squirrell	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">PCCS252</a>	65	CN1	No	No	Positively Prepared	Natural England advice remains the same as at the time of the Core Strategy pre-submission.	Natural England is able to confirm that discussions are on-going with the landowner and planning authority to bring forward secure proposals for consideration at the EIP.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Natural England has provided extensive advice to the parties concerned with this policy and may be able to offer advice and reassurance to the Inspector about the reliance he may have on the effectiveness of the policy and any modification proposed.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										Natural England's view is that at that time a number of concerns relating to the proposal will be resolved through an agreed package of mitigation measures which are compliant with other policies in the Local Plan.			
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		<a href="#">PCCS424</a>	65	CN1	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	A level of 'up to' (so it could be 1%) 35% affordable housing is far too low for a Borough which this Strategy acknowledges has one of the country's lowest ratio of earnings to house prices, and therefore affordability.	Affordability criteria must have a legally binding restriction for occupancy by local people only.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
654046	Mr David Pardy		<a href="#">PCCS120</a>	65	CN1	No	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	The extra housing planned for Christchurch presents a safety risk because the additional traffic will lead to increased numbers of road accidents because the plans to upgrade the road system to cope with this are totally inadequate. The plan for Roeshot Hill Allotments is unjustified – (Christchurch has no more space, why should allotments be sacrificed for houses, no site to go to, East Dorset has more space for houses etc) and it is not consistent with National Policy (which is to preserve Green Belt land and the best agricultural land (we are Grade 2, the best in Dorset).	The proposal to develop the Roeshot Hill Allotments for housing will be abandoned	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
654303	Mr Stephen Godley		<a href="#">PCCS225</a>	65	CN1		No	Positively Prepared Effective Consistent with national policy	The changes to the proposals have removed information on the relocation site for the Roeshot Hill Allotments. The relocation of the Roeshot Allotment site is governed by the Allotment Act and without appropriate alternative land, the detail in the policy is not valid and the development cannot proceed in the proposed form.	The appropriate land, both in space and quality, needs to be identified and agreed before the policy can be approved.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
656629	Mr John Campbell	Chairman Roeshot Hill Allotment Association	<a href="#">PCCS373</a>	65	CN1				CN1 Allotments Change The Pre-Submission document identified land to the north of the railway line for the relocation of Roeshot allotments, which was supposed to act as a 'hub' for such recreational activity. We disagree with this aspect of the Christchurch Allotment Strategy and regard reference to a hub as a euphemistic expression for the sanitisation of the urban landscape. The one virtue of the original proposal was the certainty that came with the identification of a new site. This proposal is to be deleted, whilst being silent as to the reason. The Council nevertheless persists in its intention to remove the allotments from Roeshot Hill whilst having no credible proposal for relocation consistent with its statutory obligation. We do not think that the Council is justified in submitting a document while a large part of its housing strategy remains speculative. These changes bring into focus the Council's consistent failure to consult with this Association. There appears to be a blind determination to pursue a pre-set policy option and in the process destroy a Green Flag award-winning site, purely to maximise commercial gain. As a result we have little		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1) The Association represents the majority of allotment tenants who will be adversely affected by the implementation of CN1; 2) The document raises serious doubt that the statutory duty in relation to removal of allotments and the provision of an allotment hub can be achieved; 3) There has been a persistent failure of the Council to consider a mixed land use scheme consistent with the Core Strategy Vision and the vision contained in Christchurch Borough Allotment Strategy 2012.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									confidence in the Council being able to produce a sound principled CN1 policy. CN1 Housing Strategy We regard the Council's strategy to maximise the potential at Roeshot Hill as an over-reaction which comes at the expense of the green infrastructure (now deleted from CN1). We also fail to see how the proposed increase in housing density (p60 para 6.9) will be consistent with the Core Strategy vision of delivering housing 'of a character and type consistent with the local area.' We believe that a smaller scale mixed use development continues to be justified by the new facts, and would deliver more of the Council's objectives. In the jargon required by 1.8 of the Schedule, we do not consider the Council's proposed strategic changes to be a sound response to the new facts on any of the criteria.				
657059	Mr and Mrs T R Beaumont		<a href="#">PCCS273</a>	65	CN1	No	No	Justified Effective	There is no identified suitable "hubsite" where the Roeshot Hill allotments could be relocated to.	Obtain Secretary of State approval for the relocation of the Roeshot Hill statutory allotments or remove this land from CN1.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718095	Mr William. C King		<a href="#">PCCS128</a>	65	CN1		No	Positively Prepared Effective	The vagueness over the future and the relocation site for the Roeshot Hill Allotments appears to be unacceptable. The vast majority of plot holders have made considerable investments in their plots. I would have thought that the location of the site is an essential element within the Christchurch housing strategy and should be resolved before further decisions are taken.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719808	Mr Hugh Trayhorne Merrett		<a href="#">PCCS382</a>	65	CN1	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Interpreted as commenting on changes to Housing Strategy. Other than supermarkets, local facilities/services are not sufficient for 950 new homes. Christchurch's new housing quota appears high in proportion to the whole Core Strategy total. May I ask if you have approached other local Boroughs as to whether they can assist with any part of your allocation as Christchurch is restricted by the New Forest National Park and sea/river/harbour.	Roeshot Hill allotments should be retained and together with the adjacent derelict Council nursery (also Grade 2 land purchased as arable land) could provide the Christchurch Allotment 'hub site'.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1) As Christchurch Council has not included or obtained any Roeshot Hill community / allotments information prior to recommending their destruction. 2) The Core Strategy does not include any facts and figures about the land / produce / community involvement / health benefits etc about our Roeshot Hill allotments to support any democratic decisions. Even the Green Flag Judges were more thorough and our site has a Green Flag community award recognising that it is a quality green space. 3) In view of how Christchurch Council (now including East Dorset Council) are targeting Allotments on community land, I feel the Government Inspector (based on the process so far) will be kept 'in the dark' just to satisfy the Council officials not the community / residents for whom they represent.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
476036	Mr Colin Jamieson		<a href="#">PCCS164</a>	69	6.54	No	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The provision of allotments should be within reasonable distance of the residential dwellings. The removal of this statement removes the need to provide such a facility in an appropriate setting	Identify the geographical area for the provision and include a consultation on that provision	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718095	Mr William. C King		<a href="#">PCCS129</a>	69	6.54		No	Positively Prepared Effective	The vagueness over the future and the relocation site for the Roeshot Hill Allotments appears to be unacceptable. The vast majority of plot holders have made considerable investments in their plots. I would have thought that the location of the site is an essential element within the Christchurch housing strategy and should be resolved before further decisions are taken.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS422</a>	70	6.60 (Marsh Lane)	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The proposed deletion of the Marsh Lane site is not justified. Please refer to our principal representations in respect of Policy CN 3.	Retain the text of Paragraph 6.60, subject to a minor amendment to refer to the capacity of the site accommodating up to 90 dwellings.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine nature conservation issues and methods of mitigating adverse impacts.	
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS466</a>	70	6.60 (Marsh Lane)	Yes	Yes		We support the deletion of these paragraphs (6.60 and 6.61)		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS416</a>	70	6.61	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The proposed deletion of the Marsh Lane site is not justified. Please refer to our principal representations in respect of Policy CN3.	Retain the text of Paragraph 6.61	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine nature conservation issues and methods of mitigating adverse impacts.	
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS233</a>	70	6.61	Yes	Yes		We support the deletion of these paragraphs (6.60 and 6.61)		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
476036	Mr Colin Jamieson		<a href="#">PCCS165</a>	71	CN2	No	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>Whilst in the past, the parish council has promoted limited development as a Rural Exceptions policy to provide limited local housing for local people. This was rejected by the CBC Planning Policy Team.</p> <p>The current proposal will demolish the working local farm as identified in the Burton Conservation Appraisal and management Plan. This has not been agreed by Christchurch Councillors however the Leader of the Council led local councillors and the parish council to believe that there would be no need to build within Burton. The proposed site will be in the wider flood plain and will destroy the strategic gap that exists between Burton and Christchurch and adds character to the village. The proposal will not provide local housing for local people and could be accommodated elsewhere in Christchurch or East Dorset. There has been no local housing needs survey to identify a need to build on the edge of the flood plain, in the strategic gap on land that is currently farmed and that will not benefit the local community.</p>	Remove the proposal to build approximately 45 houses in Burton and retain the Green Belt with its existing boundaries.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I am a ward councillor. I believe that the basis on which new developments is founded is unsound, untested and is not evidenced on need. The Burton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan was adopted by Christchurch Borough Council in 2007 and has been ignored in the compilation of this strategy, and the need for 45 houses in Burton has not been evidenced. I believe that the need to redefine the Green Belt has not been evidenced because the local housing need has not been agreed by the councillors. I believe that the building of 45 or more houses in the green belt will effect the adjacent flood plain, and destroy the strategic gap between Burton and the wider conurbation.	
612430	Mr Nick	Natural England,	<a href="#">PCCS253</a>	71	CN2		Yes	Positively Prepared		Natural England supports	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
	Squirrel	Dorset and Somerset Team						Justified Effective Consistent with national policy		the policy text modification made.	examination		
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		<a href="#">PCCS431</a>	71	CN2	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The new wording the affordable housing will be 'up to' 50% is dreadful: it could be 1% and still comply.	The housing referred to should be at least 50% affordable.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
653893	Mr Michael Bailey		<a href="#">PCCS370</a>	71	CN2				CN2 - Page 71. This section states that "Up to 50%" of affordable houses within the 45 house development are intended to meet Burton's needs. I object to this development as there is no guarantee from the CBC that the houses will be earmarked for Burton residents. The 45 houses in question could be sited on the piece of land within the Burton boundary between the railway line and Ambury Lane.				
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS412</a>	72	Map 6.4	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	As a consequence of our representations in respect of Policy CN3, Sembcorp object to the Proposed Change by way of the deletion on Map 6.4.	Retain Map 6.4	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine issues of ecological impact and housing delivery.	
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS415</a>	73	CN3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The proposed deletion of the Marsh Lane site is not justified. The representations of Natural England on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy (PSCS) outline four areas of concern: 1. Adverse impact on the Town Common SSSI. 2. Adverse impact on the Avon Valley nature conservation designations. 3. The effect on the current grazing regime. 4. Lack of data relating to the biodiversity interest on the site. Subsequent discussions with Natural England have focused on the potential development of the site based on a smaller allocation and the provision of a larger and more suitable Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space. Attached as Appendix 1 to these representations is a response to the representations of Natural England, outlining how the site can be developed incorporating sufficient mitigation measures to protect nearby areas of ecological importance. These concepts are graphically illustrated in Appendix 2. Thereafter, Appendix 3 contains a Phase 1 Biodiversity Survey. This information is considered to address and overcome the objections of Natural England. It is suitable and appropriate to allow for the continued allocation of the site for residential development. It was made available to Natural England in October 2012, albeit their formal response is still outstanding. It is acknowledged that the reduced land take for residential development may result in a slightly smaller allocation. This reflects our earlier representations on the PSCS.	Retain Policy CN 3, subject to the wording of the policy allowing for the site to be developed for up to 90 dwellings.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine nature conservation issues and methods of mitigating adverse impacts.	<a href="#">2402368_0_1.pdf</a> <a href="#">2402369_0_1.pdf</a> <a href="#">2402370_0_1.pdf</a>
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS322</a>	73	CN3	Yes	Yes		We support the deletion of this allocation as we support Natural England's view that effective mitigation measures cannot be put in place to avoid/mitigate harm to the heathlands and other nearby designations in order to satisfy		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									the Habitats Regulations.				
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS241</a>	73	CN3	Yes	Yes		We support the deletion of this policy.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
612430	Mr Nick Squirrell	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">PCCS254</a>	73	CN3		Yes	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy		Natural England supports the modification proposed.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718911	Mr Joshua Lambert	Planning Assistant Pro Vision Planning and Design	<a href="#">PCCS469</a>	73	CN3	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	CN3 Land East of Marsh Lane, WMC7 Leigh Park Area of Potential Change, Wimborne, and VTSW5 North-East Verwood New Neighbourhood The allocation of Little Canford Depot for mixed use redevelopment in place of the unsustainable housing allocations at Marsh Lane, Leigh Park and North-East Verwood would ensure consistency with the NPPF.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1. Because of the high level of public interest in reducing greenfield land in East Dorset in favour of optimizing previously developed land. 2. To enable the Inspector to test the evidence demonstrating that the Core Strategy is unsound without the allocation of Little Canford Depot for mixed use residential and employment development.	<a href="#">2403289_0_1.pdf</a>
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS323</a>	79	BA1	Yes	Yes		We support the amended wording under Environmental Designations as this seeks positive improvements in the extent and quality of priority habitats and the populations of priority species and shall conserve ecological network connections. We also support the need for off site infrastructure to meet the requirements of ME1 (as revised in this alteration), seek to avoid fragmentation of priority habitats, priority species populations and ecological network connections and to provide mitigation or compensation for any harm where it is considered that the need for development outweighs policy protection of the natural environment.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS238</a>	79	BA1	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	We support the amendments made to the Vision for Bournemouth Airport made in favour of the New Forest. We object the revised text relating to the need for development outweighing policy protection of the natural environment. This infers that sole test is planning policy. There is, as the Council is aware, a national and international legislative framework for assessing proposals that are likely to harm designated wildlife sites. This is enshrined in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.	We suggest the text needs to be amended to highlight that in addition to plan policy considerations there is a legislative framework that applies. NE can advise further as necessary.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
361028	Ms Helen Patton	Head of Policy and Plans New Forest National Park Authority	<a href="#">PCCS109</a>	79	BA1				The Authority is pleased to note and supports the proposed strengthening of wording to this policy; 'Growth of the operational airport and business park will be achieved acknowledging and respecting the environmental constraints which exist around the airport and in consideration of possible impacts on the New Forest National Park and statutory park purposes. Development of the airport and business park will be integrated within the high quality natural and water environment'. The additional wording reflects the consideration of the National Park purposes within the policy and is in line with				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>the requirements of Section 62(2) of the Environment Act 1995, which places a general duty on all relevant authorities to have regard to the purposes of the National Park when carrying out their activities. This includes development which is outside the Park but which may have an impact within the National Park, emphasising that neighbouring local planning authorities have an important role to play in the delivery of the two statutory purposes.</p> <p>As highlighted in the Authority's response to the Pre-Submission Document (25 June 2012), at its nearest point the New Forest National Park lies less than 3 kilometres from the Airport and aircraft from Bournemouth Airport routinely cross the National Park at altitudes between 3000 – 7000 feet. It remains Government Aviation policy however, that where it is possible to avoid over-flights of National parks below 7000 feet it makes sense to do so. Planning authorities must therefore, be fully aware of their legal duty to have regard to impacts on the adjacent National Park. Whilst the strengthening of this policy is welcomed, the Authority is however disappointed to note that no amendments for the inclusion of reference to the statutory duty are proposed for the introductory chapters to the document as requested by the Authority in the comments submitted to the consultation on the Pre-Submission Document.</p>				
499532	Bournemouth Borough Council	Bournemouth Borough Council	<a href="#">PCCS304</a>	79	BA1		No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>The reference to enhanced accessibility to the airport, particularly cycle access, is welcomed however more certainty is sought in the policy wording. It is noted that LTP3 is referred to as identifying the other improvements necessary and we would hope that this secures the much needed airport cycle link to north Bournemouth including a bridge over the River Stour. Currently cyclists attempting to commute from Bournemouth to the airport are presented with a long detour on busy roads which have no quality provision for cyclists. Policies BA1 and BA2 are unclear on this matter, and the policy should be amended to make greater emphasis of accessing the airport by sustainable modes of travel from Bournemouth.</p>	<p>In paragraph entitled 'Highway Capacity/Sustainable Transport, amend second to read: These junction improvements and improvements in public transport and cycle access, INCLUDING ACCESSING THE AIRPORT BY SUSTAINABLE MODES OF TRAVEL FROM BOURNEMOUTH, are set out in .....</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To present evidence.	
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">PCCS250</a>	79	BA1	Yes	Yes	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy		Natural England support the policy modifications proposed in BA1 and BA3, regarding using Zones to protect the Moors River SSSI.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
559634	Mr Mark Luken	Director Luken Beck Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS439</a>	80	BA2		No	Positively Prepared Justified	<p>NATS objects to the phrase 'may' because the policy wording should be consistent throughout the policy, which earlier states that associated infrastructure will be developed. Also, the word 'may' creates uncertainty on what the plan aims to effectively deliver.</p>	<p>To replace the word 'may' with the word 'will'. Also include the words 'and B1 office development' as an appropriate use to Zone B</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The former Hurn Training Centre is a significant brownfield site which NATS, as owner of the site, no longer require for operational purposes. The site is now vacant and NATS must consider appropriate	<a href="#">2403055_0_1.jpg</a>

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										policy in order to reflect the character of the existing buildings on site.		redevelopment proposals for alternative uses. Also, this major site would be vital to the delivery of the proposed policies BA1, BA2 and BA3. Therefore, NATS should be part of any discussions regarding the future redevelopment of this site and Bournemouth Airport.	
557299	Mr Peter Weatherhead	DTZ Planning	<a href="#">PCCS55</a>	82	7.27	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>The Malmesbury Estate objects to the proposed changes to the text at paragraph 7.27 and to the reworded policy BA3 relating to the release of green belt land to facilitate the growth of airport facilities. This objection also applies to Map 7.2. The Estate contends that the designation of zoning of the green belt land proposed for release is unnecessary and contrary to national planning policy. In particular, the Estate strongly objects to the designation of its land opposite the main airport entrance and currently used for airport car parking as zone A where uses will be restricted “to uses that retain the predominantly open aspect of this area of land, such as car parking”.</p> <p>The reason given for the proposed changes relates to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its guidance on green belts. The Estate contends that the stated reason for the changes is unsubstantiated in any reference to the NPPF. National policy accepts that it is appropriate to alter green belt boundaries in exceptional circumstances through a review of the Local Plan. It does not provide any policy support for the restrictive zoning proposals. Indeed, as set out in these representations, the NPPF provides policy support for ensuring that growth and innovation can take place in sustainable locations</p> <p>The Estate believes that this proposed change is directly in conflict with policy advice to local authorities when defining green belt boundaries. Paragraph 85 of the NPPF advises that green belts should not include land that it is unnecessary to keep permanently open and yet the proposed change seems to be asserting that the proposed zone A should be restricted to retain its openness. The same paragraph advises that green belt boundaries should be consistent with the local plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development yet it is acknowledged that airport related development needs are to be met through the proposed green belt release. Local authorities are also advised to satisfy themselves that green belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period. The Estate contends that the proposed restriction should be removed now but in any event would need to be lifted at the end of the plan period because of the need to capitalise on the economic benefits of the airport.</p> <p>The unnecessary restriction of development on the Estate's land is in conflict with one of the NPPF's core planning principles which is to “proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes,</p>	<p>The removal of the proposed zoning amendments to policy will enable the Plan to be more consistent with national planning policy by not placing unnecessary and unjustified restrictions on potential employment and airport related development, including the proposed park and ride transport hub.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>The Malmesbury Estate is a major landowner in the vicinity of Bournemouth Airport and a member of the Airport Advisory Group. The Estate would want the opportunity to present its case directly and to contribute to the discussion on the land use implications of policy relating to the airport and the associated employment and transport hub.</p>	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs”.</p> <p>The proposed change conflicts with the NPPF’s advice on building a strong, competitive economy and to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. The advice in paragraph 19 states that “Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system”.</p> <p>Additionally the NPPF advises that investment in business should not be over-burdened by the requirements of planning policy expectations and that LPAs should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century. Paragraph 21 adds that policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not identified in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.</p> <p>The Malmesbury Estate has already supported the case that there are exceptional circumstances for amendment to the green belt boundary in the vicinity of Bournemouth Airport in order to capitalise on the location’s potential for employment and airport related development and as an economic driver for growth. The proposed imposition of restrictions through zoning is entirely contrary to achieving that potential and is in conflict with the broad thrust of advice in the NPPF.</p> <p>In any event, The Estate contends that the proposed restriction is misconceived because the land is already used for car parking and consists of extensive hardstandings and tall lighting columns that clearly suggest that it is developed brownfield land rather than open land of any merit. When viewed from the B3073 the land is screened only by a low hedge, is readily visible and has lost any qualities that merit protection to retain openness. Similar circumstances also apply to proposed zone B where airport related development is to be permitted, which suggests an inconsistency of approach.</p> <p>The NPPF offers further advice to LPAs concerning plan-making and suggests that they should plan positively for the development and infrastructure required and indicate broad locations for strategic development. They should also allocate sites to promote development and the flexible use of land. The proposed zonal restrictions run contrary to this advice, seeking to impose unjustified restrictions on the development potential of land in a highly sustainable location to cater for identified development needs.</p> <p>The Estate considers that the proposed changes seem to be driven not by an objective assessment of development needs but by land ownership considerations.</p> <p>Representations have already been submitted relating to the obvious potential of both the car park land and land owned by the Estate to the south between the car park and the B3073 to accommodate airport related and employment development as well as the park and ride hub promoted in the Local Transport Plan.</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
557299	Mr Peter Weatherhead	DTZ Planning	<a href="#">PCCS6</a>	82	7.27	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>The Malmesbury Estate objects to the proposed changes to the text at paragraph 7.27 and to the reworded policy BA3 relating to the release of green belt land to facilitate the growth of airport facilities. This objection also applies to Map 7.2. The Estate contends that the designation of zoning of the green belt land proposed for release is unnecessary and contrary to national planning policy. In particular, the Estate strongly objects to the designation of its land opposite the main airport entrance and currently used for airport car parking as zone A where uses will be restricted “to uses that retain the predominantly open aspect of this area of land, such as car parking”.</p> <p>The reason given for the proposed changes relates to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its guidance on green belts. The Estate contends that the stated reason for the changes is unsubstantiated in any reference to the NPPF. National policy accepts that it is appropriate to alter green belt boundaries in exceptional circumstances through a review of the Local Plan. It does not provide any policy support for the restrictive zoning proposals. Indeed, as set out in these representations, the NPPF provides policy support for ensuring that growth and innovation can take place in sustainable locations</p> <p>The Estate believes that this proposed change is directly in conflict with policy advice to local authorities when defining green belt boundaries. Paragraph 85 of the NPPF advises that green belts should not include land that it is unnecessary to keep permanently open and yet the proposed change seems to be asserting that the proposed zone A should be restricted to retain its openness. The same paragraph advises that green belt boundaries should be consistent with the local plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development yet it is acknowledged that airport related development needs are to be met through the proposed green belt release. Local authorities are also advised to satisfy themselves that green belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period. The Estate contends that the proposed restriction should be removed now but in any event would need to be lifted at the end of the plan period because of the need to capitalise on the economic benefits of the airport.</p> <p>The unnecessary restriction of development on the Estate’s land is in conflict with one of the NPPF’s core planning principles which is to “proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs”.</p> <p>The proposed change conflicts with the NPPF’s advice on building a strong, competitive economy and to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. The advice in paragraph 19 states that “Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support</p>	<p>The removal of the proposed zoning amendments to policy will enable the Plan to be more consistent with national planning policy by not placing unnecessary and unjustified restrictions on potential employment and airport related development, including the proposed park and ride transport hub.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>The Malmesbury Estate is a major landowner in the vicinity of Bournemouth Airport and a member of the Airport Advisory Group. The Estate would want the opportunity to present its case directly and to contribute to the discussion on the land use implications of policy relating to the airport and the associated employment and transport hub.</p>	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>economic growth through the planning system". Additionally the NPPF advises that investment in business should not be over-burdened by the requirements of planning policy expectations and that LPAs should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century. Paragraph 21 adds that policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not identified in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances. The Malmesbury Estate has already supported the case that there are exceptional circumstances for amendment to the green belt boundary in the vicinity of Bournemouth Airport in order to capitalise on the location's potential for employment and airport related development and as an economic driver for growth. The proposed imposition of restrictions through zoning is entirely contrary to achieving that potential and is in conflict with the broad thrust of advice in the NPPF. In any event, The Estate contends that the proposed restriction is misconceived because the land is already used for car parking and consists of extensive hardstandings and tall lighting columns that clearly suggest that it is developed brownfield land rather than open land of any merit. When viewed from the B3073 the land is screened only by a low hedge, is readily visible and has lost any qualities that merit protection to retain openness. Similar circumstances also apply to proposed zone B where airport related development is to be permitted, which suggests an inconsistency of approach. The NPPF offers further advice to LPAs concerning plan-making and suggests that they should plan positively for the development and infrastructure required and indicate broad locations for strategic development. They should also allocate sites to promote development and the flexible use of land. The proposed zonal restrictions run contrary to this advice, seeking to impose unjustified restrictions on the development potential of land in a highly sustainable location to cater for identified development needs. The Estate considers that the proposed changes seem to be driven not by an objective assessment of development needs but by land ownership considerations. Representations have already been submitted relating to the obvious potential of both the car park land and land owned by the Estate to the south between the car park and the B3073 to accommodate airport related and employment development as well as the park and ride hub promoted in the Local Transport Plan.</p>				
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS324</a>	83	BA3	Yes	Yes		Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the proposed zoning which includes a restriction to maintain a buffer zone between the Moors River and the airport runways and taxiways where development will not take place.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
557299	Mr Peter Weatherhead	DTZ Planning	<a href="#">PCCS54</a>	83	BA3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The Malmesbury Estate objects to the proposed changes to the text at paragraph 7.27 and to the reworded policy BA3 relating to the release of green belt land to facilitate the	The removal of the proposed zoning amendments to policy will	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The Malmesbury Estate is a major landowner in the vicinity of Bournemouth Airport and a member of the Airport Advisory Group.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>growth of airport facilities. This objection also applies to Map 7.2. The Estate contends that the designation of zoning of the green belt land proposed for release is unnecessary and contrary to national planning policy. In particular, the Estate strongly objects to the designation of its land opposite the main airport entrance and currently used for airport car parking as zone A where uses will be restricted “to uses that retain the predominantly open aspect of this area of land, such as car parking”.</p> <p>The reason given for the proposed changes relates to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its guidance on green belts. The Estate contends that the stated reason for the changes is unsubstantiated in any reference to the NPPF. National policy accepts that it is appropriate to alter green belt boundaries in exceptional circumstances through a review of the Local Plan. It does not provide any policy support for the restrictive zoning proposals. Indeed, as set out in these representations, the NPPF provides policy support for ensuring that growth and innovation can take place in sustainable locations</p> <p>The Estate believes that this proposed change is directly in conflict with policy advice to local authorities when defining green belt boundaries. Paragraph 85 of the NPPF advises that green belts should not include land that it is unnecessary to keep permanently open and yet the proposed change seems to be asserting that the proposed zone A should be restricted to retain its openness. The same paragraph advises that green belt boundaries should be consistent with the local plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development yet it is acknowledged that airport related development needs are to be met through the proposed green belt release. Local authorities are also advised to satisfy themselves that green belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period. The Estate contends that the proposed restriction should be removed now but in any event would need to be lifted at the end of the plan period because of the need to capitalise on the economic benefits of the airport.</p> <p>The unnecessary restriction of development on the Estate’s land is in conflict with one of the NPPF’s core planning principles which is to “proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs”.</p> <p>The proposed change conflicts with the NPPF’s advice on building a strong, competitive economy and to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. The advice in paragraph 19 states that “Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system”.</p> <p>Additionally the NPPF advises that investment in business should not be over-burdened by the requirements of</p>	<p>enable the Plan to be more consistent with national planning policy by not placing unnecessary and unjustified restrictions on potential employment and airport related development, including the proposed park and ride transport hub.</p>		<p>The Estate would want the opportunity to present its case directly and to contribute to the discussion on the land use implications of policy relating to the airport and the associated employment and transport hub.</p>	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>planning policy expectations and that LPAs should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century. Paragraph 21 adds that policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not identified in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances. The Malmesbury Estate has already supported the case that there are exceptional circumstances for amendment to the green belt boundary in the vicinity of Bournemouth Airport in order to capitalise on the location's potential for employment and airport related development and as an economic driver for growth. The proposed imposition of restrictions through zoning is entirely contrary to achieving that potential and is in conflict with the broad thrust of advice in the NPPF. In any event, The Estate contends that the proposed restriction is misconceived because the land is already used for car parking and consists of extensive hardstandings and tall lighting columns that clearly suggest that it is developed brownfield land rather than open land of any merit. When viewed from the B3073 the land is screened only by a low hedge, is readily visible and has lost any qualities that merit protection to retain openness. Similar circumstances also apply to proposed zone B where airport related development is to be permitted, which suggests an inconsistency of approach. The NPPF offers further advice to LPAs concerning plan-making and suggests that they should plan positively for the development and infrastructure required and indicate broad locations for strategic development. They should also allocate sites to promote development and the flexible use of land. The proposed zonal restrictions run contrary to this advice, seeking to impose unjustified restrictions on the development potential of land in a highly sustainable location to cater for identified development needs. The Estate considers that the proposed changes seem to be driven not by an objective assessment of development needs but by land ownership considerations. Representations have already been submitted relating to the obvious potential of both the car park land and land owned by the Estate to the south between the car park and the B3073 to accommodate airport related and employment development as well as the park and ride hub promoted in the Local Transport Plan.</p>				
559634	Mr Mark Luken	Director Luken Beck Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS437</a>	83	BA3		No	Positively Prepared Justified	NATS objects to the phrase 'restricted to' because the list of proposed uses in policy BA2 is not exclusive and so may include other airport related uses and services subject to other Core Strategy policies.	To replace the words 'be restricted to' with the word 'permit'.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The former Hurn Training Centre is a significant brownfield site which NATS, as owner of the site, no longer require for operational purposes. The site is now vacant and NATS must consider appropriate redevelopment proposals for alternative uses. Also, this major site would be vital to the delivery of the proposed Policies BA1, BA2 and BA3. Therefore, NATS should be part of any discussions regarding	<a href="#">2403055_0_1.jpg</a>

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
												the future redevelopment of this site and Bournemouth Airport.	
559634	Mr Mark Luken	Director Luken Beck Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS438</a>	83	BA3				<p>The NATS support the removal of the former Hurn Training Centre site from the Green Belt. In addition to the justification offered by the Local Planning Authority for the site to be included within the boundaries of the operational airport, the land should be excluded from the Green Belt because it does not fulfil the purposes listed in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and the Local Plan is the appropriate vehicle to redefine Green Belt boundaries considering the criteria in the NPPF.</p> <p>Also, the NATS support the inclusion of the Hurn Training Centre site within Zone B of the operational airport, subject to the policy enabling the appropriate and viable redevelopment of the site (see separate objection).</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The former Hurn Training Centre is a significant brownfield site which NATS, as owner of the site, no longer require for operational purposes. The site is now vacant and NATS must consider appropriate redevelopment proposals for alternative uses. Also, this major site would be vital to the delivery of the proposed Policies BA1, BA2 and BA3. Therefore, NATS should be part of any discussions regarding the future redevelopment of this site and Bournemouth Airport.	<a href="#">2403055_0_1.jpg</a>
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">PCCS251</a>	83	BA3	Yes	Yes	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Natural England support the policy modifications proposed in BA1 and BA3, regarding using Zones to protect the Moors River SSSI.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
557299	Mr Peter Weatherhead	DTZ Planning	<a href="#">PCCS56</a>	83	Map 7.2	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>The Malmesbury Estate objects to the proposed changes to the text at paragraph 7.27 and to the reworded policy BA3 relating to the release of green belt land to facilitate the growth of airport facilities. This objection also applies to Map 7.2. The Estate contends that the designation of zoning of the green belt land proposed for release is unnecessary and contrary to national planning policy. In particular, the Estate strongly objects to the designation of its land opposite the main airport entrance and currently used for airport car parking as zone A where uses will be restricted "to uses that retain the predominantly open aspect of this area of land, such as car parking".</p> <p>The reason given for the proposed changes relates to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its guidance on green belts. The Estate contends that the stated reason for the changes is unsubstantiated in any reference to the NPPF. National policy accepts that it is appropriate to alter green belt boundaries in exceptional circumstances through a review of the Local Plan. It does not provide any policy support for the restrictive zoning proposals. Indeed, as set out in these representations, the NPPF provides policy support for ensuring that growth and innovation can take place in sustainable locations</p> <p>The Estate believes that this proposed change is directly in conflict with policy advice to local authorities when defining green belt boundaries. Paragraph 85 of the NPPF advises that green belts should not include land that it is unnecessary to keep permanently open and yet the proposed change seems to be asserting that the proposed zone A should be restricted to retain its openness. The same paragraph advises that green belt boundaries should be consistent with the local plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development yet it is</p>	The removal of the proposed zoning amendments to policy will enable the Plan to be more consistent with national planning policy by not placing unnecessary and unjustified restrictions on potential employment and airport related development, including the proposed park and ride transport hub.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The Malmesbury Estate is a major landowner in the vicinity of Bournemouth Airport and a member of the Airport Advisory Group. The Estate would want the opportunity to present its case directly and to contribute to the discussion on the land use implications of policy relating to the airport and the associated employment and transport hub.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>acknowledged that airport related development needs are to be met through the proposed green belt release. Local authorities are also advised to satisfy themselves that green belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period. The Estate contends that the proposed restriction should be removed now but in any event would need to be lifted at the end of the plan period because of the need to capitalise on the economic benefits of the airport.</p> <p>The unnecessary restriction of development on the Estate's land is in conflict with one of the NPPF's core planning principles which is to "proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs".</p> <p>The proposed change conflicts with the NPPF's advice on building a strong, competitive economy and to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. The advice in paragraph 19 states that "Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system".</p> <p>Additionally the NPPF advises that investment in business should not be over-burdened by the requirements of planning policy expectations and that LPAs should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century. Paragraph 21 adds that policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not identified in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.</p> <p>The Malmesbury Estate has already supported the case that there are exceptional circumstances for amendment to the green belt boundary in the vicinity of Bournemouth Airport in order to capitalise on the location's potential for employment and airport related development and as an economic driver for growth. The proposed imposition of restrictions through zoning is entirely contrary to achieving that potential and is in conflict with the broad thrust of advice in the NPPF.</p> <p>In any event, The Estate contends that the proposed restriction is misconceived because the land is already used for car parking and consists of extensive hardstandings and tall lighting columns that clearly suggest that it is developed brownfield land rather than open land of any merit. When viewed from the B3073 the land is screened only by a low hedge, is readily visible and has lost any qualities that merit protection to retain openness. Similar circumstances also apply to proposed zone B where airport related development is to be permitted, which suggests an inconsistency of approach.</p> <p>The NPPF offers further advice to LPAs concerning plan-making and suggests that they should plan positively for the development and infrastructure required and indicate broad locations for strategic development. They should also allocate sites to promote development and the flexible use of</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									land. The proposed zonal restrictions run contrary to this advice, seeking to impose unjustified restrictions on the development potential of land in a highly sustainable location to cater for identified development needs. The Estate considers that the proposed changes seem to be driven not by an objective assessment of development needs but by land ownership considerations. Representations have already been submitted relating to the obvious potential of both the car park land and land owned by the Estate to the south between the car park and the B3073 to accommodate airport related and employment development as well as the park and ride hub promoted in the Local Transport Plan.				
559634	Mr Mark Luken	Director Luken Beck Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS436</a>	83	Map 7.2	No	No	Justified	The NATS former Hurn Training Centre site (see attached plan) is excluded from Map 7.2 notation of 'Brownfield Land'.	NATS considers that the former Hurn Training Centre site within proposed Area B should, in addition, be identified and notated as 'Brownfield Land'.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The former Hurn Training Centre is a significant brownfield site which NATS, as owner of the site, no longer require for operational purposes. The site is now vacant and NATS must consider appropriate redevelopment proposals for alternative uses. Also, this major site would be vital to the delivery of the proposed Policies BA1, BA2 and BA3. Therefore, NATS should be part of any discussions regarding the future redevelopment of this site and Bournemouth Airport.	<a href="#">2403055_0_1.jpg</a>
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS327</a>	85	Para 8.5	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the amended text as an improvement on the original but does not consider this gives clarity on habitats, which is the reason given for the proposed change. The amendment clarifies that the rivers are of ecological value by providing habitat for protected and priority species, which is welcome, but does not clarify that, in the case of the River Allen, the habitat itself is a UK priority habitat, being a chalk stream. The River Allen is important as a Strategic Nature Area and subject to biodiversity enhancement works with a number of partners and we feel that the significance of this river warrants inclusion in the text especially as proposed developments may impact upon this river.	DWT continue to suggest the following wording: These are not protected in themselves but are important ecological corridors and provide habitat for protected and priority species. The River Allen is a chalk stream which is a UK priority habitat.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS326</a>	85	Para 8.5	Yes	Yes		Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the expanded text as an improvement on the original text but please see second response.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS448</a>	85	Para 8.5		No	Positively Prepared Justified Consistent with national policy	Although the wording is an improvement on the original he has neglected to address the fact that as a chalk stream the River Allen is a priority habitat: it is also a Strategic Nature Area (NPPF117 and 118). This should be reflected in the text.	As previously advised we recommend that the DWT wording should have been adopted in full viz: Wimborne sits at the confluence of the Rivers Allen and Stour. These are not protected in	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										themselves but are important ecological corridors and provide habitat for protected and priority species. The River Allen is a chalk stream which is a UK priority habitat. The rivers also affect...area.			
360235	Mr Christopher Undery	Christopher D Undery	<a href="#">PCCS67</a>	87	WMC1	Yes	No	Effective	See previously submitted Response Form dated 15/06/2012. The imposition on the developer of cost burdens including high proportions of affordable housing, suitable alternative natural green spaces, heathland mitigation, community and transport infrastructure levies etc. will undermine viability, cause developers to reduce purchase offers to landowners to the extent that landowners will decide not to sell, or offers to purchase will fail to reach base price provisions in option agreements. In consequence development will not come forward, landowners will withhold allocated land and housing provision and other benefits will not be achieved.	Cost burden requirements on development land must be scaled back to ensure that development land is not sterilized in the plan period. This consequence previously came about with the imposition of development land tax which subsequently had to be abandoned.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Because the Government Inspector will be able to recommend revision of policy provisions to reflect the risk of development stagnation and consequent frustration of strategy objectives.	
360235	Mr Christopher Undery	Christopher D Undery	<a href="#">PCCS90</a>	87	WMC1	Yes	No	Effective	Strategy objectives seek to foster the commercial prosperity of Wimborne Town and pedestrian flow within the town centre. At the time of approval for the Waitrose development a bridge link was envisaged from Crown Mead to join the major space occupier in the town with the historic shopping centre. Waitrose earmarked funds to provide this bridge link but it was not made a planning condition and obligation and thus the important and beneficial link has not been established by negotiation. The link connection with Crown Mead should be incorporated into the Strategy & Policies with compulsory powers exercised as necessary to ensure its provision, recognizing that cost funding by Waitrose will underwrite the work.	Incorporation of a Policy obligation to ensure delivery of the Crown Mead link.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To clarify as necessary answers given to questions 7 and 8.	
718952	Chris Slocock	Chairman Wimborne BID Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS219</a>	87	WMC1	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In relation to the policies listed where several options have been put forward to increase the number of homes in and around Wimborne, the 'Infrastructure' sections of each policy make no mention of the current or future availability of parking in Wimborne Town Centre. The residents and traders of Wimborne already feel that the parking arrangements are inadequate and yet there appears to be no consideration of increasing the number of number of spaces in line with the corresponding increase in residents that would enter the town. There can only be a boost to the local economy if the new residents are able to access the town.</li> <li>The Local Authority has a responsibility to support the local economy (Government Directive) and the Mary Portas review also identified car parking as the 'number one' issue to a town economy.</li> <li>The only reference to accessibility in this way is in paragraph 2.93 (WMC4), where it mentions the new homes being close enough for cycling/walking to town. It must be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 'Best Management Review' of car parking in Wimborne should take place as part of any of the above policies being assessed. It is the view of the residents and traders in Wimborne that this is required now due to the pressure on the town currently, these plans for additional homes only makes this issue more urgent. It should certainly be taken into account the potential plans to redevelop Old Road Car Park.</li> <li>Car park stats produced</li> </ul>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The BID is here to represent the levy payers of Wimborne and where they have made their views very clear on the issues of parking, it is our responsibility to ensure these are heard.	<a href="#">2403953_0_1.pdf</a>

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									stressed that people seeking to 'shop' may well require their transport to take home their purchases.	by EDDC and provided to the BID show an overall increase in parking tickets issued in 2012 (when the BID started collating and comparing the figures). • There has been the loss of spaces for short stay shoppers in the town centre since the changes to the square. There has been negative feedback from shoppers and traders facing the square.			
359416	Mrs Tracy Paine	Clerk Colehill Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS125</a>	90	New Policy WMC8				The Parish Council has no comments to make on the boundary changes.				
359416	Mrs Tracy Paine	Clerk Colehill Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS126</a>	90	New Policy WMC9				The Parish Council has no comments to make on the boundary changes.				
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS396</a>	90	New Policy WMC8	Yes	Yes		It is proposed to insert new text to explain that St Michael's School and Beacroft Foundation School will need to expand to accommodate additional demand for middle school places. This will require expansion onto Green Belt land. A new policy, WMC8 will specify that the Green Belt boundary will be amended to meet the school requirements. Dorset County Council supports the proposed changes.				
655010	Mrs S Moran		<a href="#">PCCS153</a>	90	New Policy WMC8	Yes	Yes		Text should be amended to make it clear that adjustment of the Green Belt boundary is just for the school expansion and area will be returned to the green belt if the school size is not increased.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
655010	Mrs S Moran		<a href="#">PCCS154</a>	90	New Policy WMC9	Yes	Yes		Text should be amended to make it clear that adjustment of the Green Belt boundary is just for the school expansion and area will be returned to the green belt if the school size is not increased.	Text should be amended to make it clear that adjustment of the Green Belt boundary is just for the school expansion and area will be returned to the green belt if the school size is not increased.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
717797	Mr Stanley Jackson	Wimborne Civic Society	<a href="#">PCCS93</a>	90	New Policy WMC8				Assuming that the proposed amendment to the Green Belt is used for an expansion of the School, should this be required and for no other purpose, then we would have no objection to this change.	The site concerned should be identified as safeguarded land for an expansion to the School only, as is proposed for the new school under the terms of Policy CM1 (Lockyer's School and Land North of Corfe Mullen New Neighbourhood).			
717797	Mr	Wimborne	<a href="#">PCCS94</a>	90	New Policy				Assuming that the proposed amendment to the Green Belt is	The site concerned			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
	Stanley Jackson	Civic Society			WMC9				used for an expansion of the School, should this be required and for no other purpose, then we would have no objection to this change.	should be identified as safeguarded land for an expansion to the School only, as is proposed for the new school under the terms of Policy CM1 (Lockyer's School and Land North of Corfe Mullen New Neighbourhood).			
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS395</a>	90	New text before paragraph 8.33	Yes	Yes		It is proposed to insert new text to explain that St Michael's School and Beaucroft Foundation School will need to expand to accommodate additional demand for middle school places. This will require expansion onto Green Belt land. A new policy, WMC8 will specify that the Green Belt boundary will be amended to meet the school requirements. Dorset County Council supports the proposed changes.				
655010	Mrs S Moran		<a href="#">PCCS152</a>	90	New text before paragraph 8.33	Yes	Yes		Text should be amended to make it clear that adjustment of the Green Belt boundary is just for the school expansion and area will be returned to the green belt if the school size is not increased.	Text should be amended to make it clear that adjustment of the Green Belt boundary is just for the school expansion and area will be returned to the green belt if the school size is not increased.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
360235	Mr Christopher Undery	Christopher D Undery	<a href="#">PCCS68</a>	91	WMC3	Yes	No	Effective	See previously submitted Response Form dated 15/06/2012. The imposition on the developer of cost burdens including high proportions of affordable housing, suitable alternative natural green spaces, heathland mitigation, community and transport infrastructure levies etc. will undermine viability, cause developers to reduce purchase offers to landowners to the extent that landowners will decide not to sell, or offers to purchase will fail to reach base price provisions in option agreements. In consequence development will not come forward, landowners will withhold allocated land and housing provision and other benefits will not be achieved.	Cost burden requirements on development land must be scaled back to ensure that development land is not sterilized in the plan period. This consequence previously came about with the imposition of development land tax which subsequently had to be abandoned.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Because the Government Inspector will be able to recommend revision of policy provisions to reflect the risk of development stagnation and consequent frustration of strategy objectives.	
655010	Mrs S Moran		<a href="#">PCCS155</a>	91	WMC3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Housing density still too high without any justification.	Reduce density below 200.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
708107	Ms Tessa Valpy		<a href="#">PCCS5</a>	91	WMC3	No	No	Justified Effective	No consideration of being in flood plain; every year floods. Also road access Julians Road is busy with lorries and is dangerous.	The location is prone to flooding every year at least once severely. In theory the extension to the hospital is sound and valid but what are Dorset Healthcare's long term plans for the hospital? Also who will be funding these new builds given	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally complaint or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										the current austerity cuts; even if some will be privately owned homes, will there be enough of an incentive for the builders and private buyers? Also impact of other schemes - see if they are successful first i.e. the Flight Refuelling site with mixed housing before any decisions (the builders have not been prompt in starting building).			
718952	Chris Slocock	Chairman Wimborne BID Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS220</a>	91	WMC3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In relation to the policies listed where several options have been put forward to increase the number of homes in and around Wimborne, the 'Infrastructure' sections of each policy make no mention of the current or future availability of parking in Wimborne Town Centre. The residents and traders of Wimborne already feel that the parking arrangements are inadequate and yet there appears to be no consideration of increasing the number of number of spaces in line with the corresponding increase in residents that would enter the town. There can only be a boost to the local economy if the new residents are able to access the town.</li> <li>The Local Authority has a responsibility to support the local economy (Government Directive) and the Mary Portas review also identified car parking as the 'number one' issue to a town economy.</li> <li>The only reference to accessibility in this way is in paragraph 2.93 (WMC4), where it mentions the new homes being close enough for cycling/walking to town. It must be stressed that people seeking to 'shop' may well require their transport to take home their purchases.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 'Best Management Review' of car parking in Wimborne should take place as part of any of the above policies being assessed. It is the view of the residents and traders in Wimborne that this is required now due to the pressure on the town currently, these plans for additional homes only makes this issue more urgent. It should certainly be taken into account the potential plans to redevelop Old Road Car Park.</li> <li>Car park stats produced by EDDC and provided to the BID show an overall increase in parking tickets issued in 2012 (when the BID started collating and comparing the figures).</li> <li>There has been the loss of spaces for short stay shoppers in the town centre since the changes to The Square. There has been negative feedback from shoppers and traders facing The Square.</li> </ul>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The BID is here to represent the levy payers of Wimborne and where they have made their views very clear on the issues of parking, it is our responsibility to ensure these are heard.	<a href="#">2403953_0_1.pdf</a>
360235	Mr Christopher Undery	Christopher D Undery	<a href="#">PCCS69</a>	102	WMC7	Yes	No	Effective	See previously submitted Response Form dated 15/06/2012. The imposition on the developer of cost burdens including high proportions of affordable housing, suitable alternative natural green spaces, heathland mitigation, community and transport infrastructure levies etc. will undermine viability,	Cost burden requirements on development land must be scaled back to ensure that development land is not sterilized in the	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Because the Government Inspector will be able to recommend revision of policy provisions to reflect the risk of development stagnation and consequent frustration of strategy	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									cause developers to reduce purchase offers to landowners to the extent that landowners will decide not to sell, or offers to purchase will fail to reach base price provisions in option agreements. In consequence development will not come forward, landowners will withhold allocated land and housing provision and other benefits will not be achieved.	plan period. This consequence previously came about with the imposition of development land tax which subsequently had to be abandoned.		objectives.	
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		<a href="#">PCCS19</a>	102	WMC7	Yes	No	Justified Effective	I consider that deleting reference to any possible housing development at Leigh Park to be regrettable. This is because any new affordable housing in this area would be close to Wimborne town centre and would have benefitted the residents of Leigh Park and those with a connection to that area.	The clause "housing to provide for the needs of residents with connection to Leigh Park " should be re-instated.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
474490	Mrs Sheila Bourton	Chairman Keep Wimborne Green	<a href="#">PCCS29</a>	102	WMC7	Yes	No	Justified Effective	We consider that deleting any reference to possible housing development at Leigh Park is regrettable because by building even some affordable housing in this area, close to Wimborne town centre would have benefitted the residents of Leigh Park and would have added to the affordable housing total overall.	There should be an option to build some affordable housing at Leigh Park in the future provided that some open space is retained for the benefit of the residents living there.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
717053	Mrs Janet Healy		<a href="#">PCCS83</a>	102	WMC7	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	We cannot possibly support the decision to use the entire area to the benefit of the recreational aspirations of the Leigh Park Community. This is not a good decision as some members of the community with children are living in flats/unsuitable accommodation, they could have benefited if just a few family homes were built so they could be re-housed in their own community.	The changes should be reversed so that at least some affordable homes are provided in this community as well as improvements to the recreational facilities. All will then benefit.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Local Town Councillors have denied the local community some much needed local affordable homes by signing this land away to the National Playing Fields Association. We wish to stand up for the local community in sharing this land between recreational use and housing.	
717797	Mr Stanley Jackson	Wimborne Civic Society	<a href="#">PCCS95</a>	102	WMC7				We continue to support the view that, if Wimborne Rugby Club were to move from Leigh Park, the area released should be developed as a mix of open space, youth club facilities and housing. We therefore do not agree with the decision taken by Wimborne Town Council on 6 November to seek to have Leigh Park declared a Queen Elizabeth II Playing Field in Trust. We consequently are opposed to the deletion of Policy WMC7 (3).				
718911	Mr Joshua Lambert	Planning Assistant Pro Vision Planning and Design	<a href="#">PCCS470</a>	102	WMC7	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	CN3 Land East of Marsh Lane, WMC7 Leigh Park Area of Potential Change, Wimborne, and VTSW5 North-East Verwood New Neighbourhood The allocation of Little Canford Depot for mixed use redevelopment in place of the unsustainable housing allocations at Marsh Lane, Leigh Park and North-East Verwood would ensure consistency with the NPPF.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1. Because of the high level of public interest in reducing greenfield land in East Dorset in favour of optimizing previously developed land. 2. To enable the Inspector to test the evidence demonstrating that the Core Strategy is unsound without the allocation of Little Canford Depot for mixed use residential and employment development.	<a href="#">2403289_0_1.pdf</a>
719394	Ms Jade Ellis	Assistant Planner Turley Associates	<a href="#">PCCS300</a>	102	WMC7		No	Positively Prepared Justified	The Schedule of Proposed Changes suggests an amendment to delete the reference to possible housing development at Leigh Park to reflect the Town Council's Views as landowner. However, the JCS does not provide an	An alternative site or sites for the delivery of housing should be identified in order to deliver more of	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I would like to confirm that we would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of client's	<a href="#">2399624_0_1.pdf</a> <a href="#">2399625_0_1.pdf</a> <a href="#">2399626_0_1.pdf</a> <a href="#">2399627_0_1.pdf</a>

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>alternative option to compensate for this loss. We contend that not only should an alternative site be found to compensate for this loss, but that the housing provision proposed at Wimborne/Colehill should deliver more of the objectively assessed housing needs at these settlements. The SHMA Summary (2011) for this area concluded at paragraph 7.4 and Figure 7.3 that the greatest annual need for affordable housing in East Dorset District lay at Verwood &amp; Alderholt (108 affordable homes per annum), closely followed by Wimborne Minster &amp; Colehill (104 affordable homes per annum). This is more than double that being provided for in the JCS for Wimborne Minster &amp; Colehill, as evidenced by the SHLAA, yet there is no evidence to justify why more could not be accommodated. In our view there are additional suitable, available and achievable sites for housing that could make a meaningful contribution to meeting some of these needs. An example in our view being the delivery of housing at land north of Leigh Road, Colehill either as an allocation for early release or as a reserve site.</p> <p>The North of Leigh Road Site</p> <p>The Background Paper for the Wimborne/Colehill Pre Submission Housing Options for Wimborne Minster and Colehill confirms that 'Land north of Leigh Road' was rejected on the basis of master planning work undertaken by Broadway Malyan. The conclusion of the report was that the land north of Leigh Road, which had been identified as a 'strategic gap' and a 'key edge' in the Dorset Green Belt Review was inappropriate as "development in this area would erode that gap and result in coalescence of Wimborne and Colehill".</p> <p>It is clear from this evidence base however that our clients' land has only been considered as part of a larger tract of land north of Leigh Road. Detailed work has not been undertaken by the Council which demonstrates that the development of our clients' site or other individual SHLAA sites would not result in urban coalescence.</p> <p>Our clients produced and have previously submitted to East Dorset District Council a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, and Housing Feasibility Report in support of this lands residential use (copies appended for reference). These submissions demonstrate that our clients' site would not harm the visual and functional separation between Wimborne to the east and Colehill to the west. The site lies outside the area required to maintain separation, and would be contained within defensible and logical boundaries. A sensitively conceived housing development would not have a material impact on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Moreover, when added with the need to provide additional urban extensions to meet the strategic housing requirement (our contention under Policy KS3 as proposed to be amended), our clients' land offers a sustainable and appropriate urban extension for Wimborne/Colehill.</p> <p>The land north of Leigh Road offers significant benefits as a housing allocation in terms of the potential for the delivery of</p>	<p>the areas objectively assessed housing needs can be met. As a minimum, an alternative site to accommodate housing lost from the proposed modification to this policy should be identified.</p> <p>We contend land north of Leigh Road should be included in this, being a sustainable extension to Colehill, with the potential to deliver much needed affordable housing and open space.</p>		interests at Wimborne/Colehill.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									affordable housing to meet local need, as well as delivering much needed open space. The PPG17 Open Space Study (May 2007) indicates there are significant open space deficiencies within Wimborne, most notably active sports space, multifunctional space and play facilities. In this respect, the promotion site offers significant benefits in terms of the potential to deliver much needed affordable housing, as well as open space including play facilities. Furthermore, the Broadway Malyan Housing Options Masterplanning report (November 2010) concluded that the Sub Areas Assessment carried out for Wimborne Minster East revealed that the two Refined Areas of Search, namely the Northern Sub-Area and the Southern Sub-Area compared similarly. The Masterplanning report did not assess individual sites within the area of search. It is considered that the smaller area of land within the Northern Sub-Area represents a sustainable and logical extension to the settlement of Colehill.				
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS394</a>	107	Policy CM1	Yes	Yes		The Pre-Submission plan identified the current Lockyers School and land to the north as a site that offers the opportunity to deliver some new housing. It is proposed to include a statement within Policy CM1 to safeguard land in the Green Belt for the expansion of the school only, if this is found to be needed. Dorset County Council supports the proposed change.				
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS38</a>	107	Policy CM1				We support only the CHANGE to CM1 ref safeguarding the land – though not CM1 itself.				
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS199</a>	107	Policy CM1		No	Effective	The proposed change to CM1 is welcomed as it clarifies the status of the proposed new school site in Green Belt terms. However the changes do not address our concerns regarding the timing and delivery of the school relocation, and the need for the policy to include a clear approach to phasing to provide for the early delivery of the land to the north of Wimborne Road.	As per previous representations.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of the Canford Estate and Harry J Palmer Ltd in relation to their landholdings on the edge of Corfe Mullen that form part of the CM1 allocation in the Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.	
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Clerk Ferndown Town Council	<a href="#">PCCS168</a>	110	FWP1	Yes	No	Positively Prepared	The Town Council are of the opinion that the proposals are not backed up with specific details as to why the amended text etc is required. More detail is required to show what is planned for the Town Centre, as at present it is based on generalities. The issues with regard to increased traffic and HGVs using roads near to the centre of the town as 'through routes' has not been properly addressed. More specific intentions are required. The issues concerning the increase in the number of dementia homes within the town has not been addressed by the policy. For the size of the town there are an excess.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS189</a>	116	FWP4		No	Effective	The proposed changes to FWP4 to clarify that on-site SANG provision is not required are welcomed. This approach provides consistency with Policies ME2 and ME3, and the	Amend the first sentence of Policy FWP4 as follows '...to provide about 45	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes in relation to land to the north of Christchurch	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2012-2014. A consequence of this change is that the capacity of the site referred to in Policy FWP4 and the indicative masterplan shown in Map 10.5 are no longer justified or effective. The capacity of the site should be revised to 'about 45 homes', the status of Map 10.5 should be clarified, and the area shown for residential development should be amended in line with the proposed layout for the site set out in the Land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley – development concept document submitted alongside our previous consultation response, which is consistent with the indicative masterplan shown in the 2010 Core Strategy Options consultation document, which was drawn up before on-site SANG provision was proposed.</p> <p>A further consequence of the change is that the second and third sentences of the supporting text at paragraph 10.29 are no longer relevant and should be deleted.</p>	<p>homes.'</p> <p>Amend the area shown for residential development in Map10.5 in lane with the indicative layout provided in the Land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley – development concept document and the diagram provided for Policy WHP4 of the 2010 Core Strategy Options document.</p> <p>Delete the second and third sentences paragraph 10.29 and provide additional text to explain that the plans provided in the map are indicative, as follows:                      10.29 This small site offers the opportunity to provide much needed housing within reasonably close proximity to facilities, services and employment opportunities. Map 10.5 provides an illustration of how the site could be delivered, and is included for information but does not form part of Policy FWP4</p>		Road, West Parley that forms the FWP4 allocation in the Pre-submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.	
359261	Mr Doug Cramond	DC Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS274</a>	120	FWP6				<p>In response to the above Proposed Change re the foodstore 'reducing' from about 3,000 sq m to 800 - 900 sq m, we would be grateful if you would consider the enclosed report by Drivers Jonas Deloitte.</p> <p>The Deloitte report, taking the relevant economic and sustainability factors into account, reaches the conclusion that a store of about 1,500 sq m net would bring positive benefits and not undermine the future vitality and viability of Ferndown centre.</p> <p>In the circumstances we trust that you will revise the FWP6 Policy wording re the foodstore to state 'about 1,500 sq metres'.</p> <p>On this basis we would not pursue the matter through the Examination which would obviously save time and costs to all parties.</p> <p>Should things remain as presently drafted we would, of course, wish to appear at the Examination to fully explore this matter.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<a href="#">2398830_0_1.pdf</a>	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS449</a>	120	FWP6		No	Effective	Rather than using our response to this Policy, in reaching a decision the Analysis of Responses has cited part of ETAG's response to FWP3. Although we have been advised that a correction will be made to that document there is no evidence that our views have been taken into consideration in the revision of the Policy.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
496575	Mrs Gillian Sewell		<a href="#">PCCS45</a>	120	FWP6				I find the Core Strategy for West Parley to be unsound. Significant new proposals are included which were not included in the strategy document. Local democracy should be of utmost importance. We do not need a new village store - we already are more than adequately served by a large Tesco express and diverse shops including the Post Office and pharmacy. We are glad that English Heritage is investigating changes near Dudsbury ancient hill fort. The flood plains of great importance locally and further down the River. Too much housing is being proposed and will destroy our "village				
500570	Mr J.D Head		<a href="#">PCCS279</a>	120	FWP6	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The reason given for the change in the size of the foodstore was that a mistake was made. As all the drawings etc at the roadshow indicated a large supermarket was to be built this brings into question as to how reliable any of the numbers quoted in the document can be considered to be and is this large increase in housing justified.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
717053	Mrs Janet Healy		<a href="#">PCCS84</a>	120	FWP6	Yes	Yes		We support the reduction in size of the comparison retail space as West Parley is vulnerable to 'out of town' stores taking over from local convenience stores. However, this only goes a very small way in reducing our objections to this site for housing. Please see the Core Strategy pre-submission responses by Janet & Kevin Healy, and the Issues and Options response by Janet & Kevin Healy, Paul Timberlake.	We do not consider that these changes are sufficient. They only satisfy one small part of our objections.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	We would like to take our argument for a reduction in housing on this arable site to its logical conclusion.	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS329</a>	122	FWP7	Yes	No	Consistent with national policy	We note that a "Statement of Common Ground " is being prepared with Natural England to address the need for a greater understanding of the biodiversity issues and that Natural England have advised on the use of SANGs and the impacts of flooding. However, with reference to the proposed alteration we seek a further amendment to incorporate our view that parkland may not be the most appropriate use of the land between the hillfort and residential development, given that we do not know the current biodiversity value of this site. We consider the requirement for parkland is too restrictive and an appropriate open space use should be decided once all the necessary information is available, taking into account both the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument and the biodiversity of the area. DWT support the need for a Heritage Strategy that includes an access strategy.	DWT seek amended wording to the paragraph 'the land between the hillfort and the residential development is to be set out as parkland' to remove the requirement for parkland and replace this with a need for appropriate open space use for this area to be determined through further studies/within a strategy that can take into account both the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument and existing biodiversity interest and connectivity with surrounding habitats.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
359478	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	West Territory Planner English Heritage	<a href="#">PCCS286</a>	122	FWP7				<p>Unsound</p> <p>Policy FWP7 West of New Road, West Parley</p> <p>The proposed new neighbourhood lies immediately east of Dudsbury Camp, a prehistoric hillfort and designated Scheduled Monument (reference 1003583).</p> <p>The hillfort clearly contributes to the area's identity, its local distinctiveness and is an important part of the area's cultural heritage – its history. As a nationally significant heritage asset, the hillfort and its setting are protected by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 (NPPF). The PPS5 Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide, March 2010 (still extant) and The Setting of Heritage Assets, English Heritage October 2011 are also particularly relevant in relation to this case.</p> <p>The more important the asset, the greater the weight that should be attached to its conservation. Scheduled monuments are considered to be of the highest significance along with World Heritage Sites and similar.</p> <p>There is no specific evidence to demonstrate that an understanding of the significance of the Iron Age hillfort has informed the principal of development in this location, and the Core Strategy and evidence base only make fleeting reference to it.</p> <p>The particular characteristics that contribute to the monument's significance must be defined. This understanding must in turn be used to assess whether the significance will be conserved. I refer to NPPF paragraph 169, 129 and 132 for example.</p> <p>This expectation was clearly set out in formal English Heritage correspondence to you in May 2008, 26 January 2011, 1 June 2012, and 25 June 2012.</p> <p>E.g. "To ensure the national significance of Dudsbury camp is conserved (protected and enhanced), its values must first be fully appreciated. The immediate and wider significance of the historic landscape must also be understood. Specific detailed evidence must therefore be gathered to inform consideration of the areas suitability, the proximity and the form of any future potential development" 26 January 2011.</p> <p>It is our expert opinion that this proposal (as shown on map10.10 of the Plan) lies too close to the Scheduled Monument of Dudsbury Camp and that if implemented it will have a negative impact on its setting. The north-western part</p>	<p>Unfortunately the revisions now proposed do not satisfy the above concerns. To do so I recommend the Plan is adjusted as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The indicative housing layout for the site on Map 10.10 is omitted or revised.</li> <li>2. The Plan reads, "The quantity and location of future development on the site will be determined by a historic environment assessment to ensure that the significance of the Dudsbury Camp Scheduled Ancient Monument and its setting is preserved and enhanced".</li> <li>3. "A heritage strategy for Dudsbury Camp will be prepared and submitted with any future planning application and future development will be expected to financially support its implementation".</li> </ol> <p>Or alternatively, further progress on the Plan is deferred until a suitable assessment is produced to inform the principle, location and quantum of development. The LPA should also be reminded that significant archaeological remains may survive beyond the boundary of the Scheduled Monument and that these will need to be properly assessed. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states 'Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered</p>			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									of the development is of particular concern although the western edge is also likely to have an impact and consideration should be given to pulling this back. This accords with paragraph 129 of the NPPF. To deliver sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF there is an expectation that such irreplaceable heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed by future generations. At present it is unclear this will be the case and as a consequence the Plan is therefore neither JUSTIFIED, because it is not founded on robust and credible evidence, nor CONSISTENT with national policy for the reasons described above; the Plan as a whole is therefore UNSOUND.	subject to the policies for designated heritage assets."			
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	Clerk West Parley Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS410</a>	122	FWP7		No	Positively Prepared Effective	The Heritage Access Strategy demanded by English Heritage has not yet been discussed with EH or the Parish Council. Many houses have been planned very close to the large area of the monument, which could be used as a children's adventure playground and cannot practicably be closed off. A successful conclusion to this difficult problem cannot be taken for granted. This planned development should not have reached this stage without any formal discussions with EH having been held.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	West Parley Parish Council would like to present a final written statement to the Inspector based on any questions raised by the Inspector and take part in the oral examination. We reserve the right to respond to any new evidence presented by the District Council and/or Third Parties.	
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS450</a>	122	FWP7		No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Rather than using our detailed and considered response to this Policy, in reaching a decision the Analysis of Responses has cited part of ETAG's response to FWP3. Although we have been advised that a correction will be made to that document there is no evidence that our views have been taken into consideration in the revision of the Policy Changes have not reflected ETAG response to CS regarding layout and design of land between hillfort and development.	We retain our objection and recommendations.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	As part of the East Dorset Community Partnership, ETAG's remit on biological sciences and sustainability is wider than that of Natural England or Dorset Wildlife Trust. Membership includes highly qualified natural scientists and town & parish representatives.	
496575	Mrs Gillian Sewell		<a href="#">PCCS57</a>	122	FWP7				I find the Core Strategy for West Parley to be unsound. Significant new proposals are included which were not included in the strategy document. Local democracy should be of utmost importance. We do not need a new village store - we already are more than adequately served by large Tesco Express and diverse shops including the Post Office and pharmacy. We are glad that English Heritage is investigating changes near Dudsbury ancient hill fort. The flood plains of great importance locally and further down the River. Too much housing is being proposed and will destroy our "village".				
717053	Mrs Janet Healy		<a href="#">PCCS85</a>	122	FWP7	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Very disappointing that the area between the hill fort and the proposed residential area has not been enlarged by reducing the proposed number of houses and scrapping the through road. Just creating a parkland will serve little purpose. Part of this land proposed as the western relief route for Parley	We are not reassured by this proposed parkland. It would be more suitable to encourage the natural grassland as it would be	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	We would argue for a more suitable setting for the hill fort.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									Cross, was under water several times in November 2012 following heavy rains.	more likely that our Ancient British brothers would not have surrounded their secure enclave with parkland. Grazing cattle would be more likely so perhaps unimproved grassland and wildflower meadows would be more suitable.			
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		<a href="#">PCCS258</a>	128	After Para 11.21, before Policy VTSW1	Yes	Yes		Excellent change.				
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS429</a>	135	VTSW5	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Seaward Properties support the proposed deletion of the North East Verwood New Neighbourhood. However, this heightens the concern that the strategic housing target will not be met unless there is a replacement allocation elsewhere. As such it is considered that the land owned and controlled by Seaward Properties at Manor Road should be re-allocated for residential development; as set out in the Core Strategy Options for Consideration – and as set out in our representations in respect of Policy VTSW 4 of the Core Strategy Pre-Submission document.	Re-instate land at Manor Road, Verwood, for the residential development of approximately 165 dwellings.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine issues of viability and deliverability.	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS330</a>	135	VTSW5	Yes	Yes		Dorset Wildlife Trust support the deletion of this policy from the Core Strategy as the proposed residential development would be likely to cause harm to Ebblake Bog, which forms part of the internationally protected Dorset heaths.				
359547	Mrs V Bright	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	<a href="#">PCCS61</a>	135	VTSW5				Support the withdrawal of this site for the reasons stated for the change.				
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS240</a>	135	VTSW5	Yes	Yes		We support the deletion of this policy.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS451</a>	135	VTSW5	Yes	Yes		We support the view of NE that the proposal should be withdrawn as it cannot be demonstrated that there would be no harm to Ebblake Bog as a result of development,				
524338	Mr Kenneth Brooks		<a href="#">PCCS99</a>	135	VTSW6		No	Justified	The amended text merely crosses out '9.7 hectares to be removed from the Green Belt' and replaces with '13.1 hectares' without explanation or justification. This would virtually double the size of Woolsbridge Ind Estate, which adjoins the floodplains close to the Moors River, rendering the risk of flooding even more difficult to overcome, even using sustainable drainage systems. Even Dorset County Council Highways are admitting 'Highway Improvements are necessary to access the site'. When this Industrial site was approved 30 years ago the plans included an entry / exit road directly to the Azalea roundabout on the A31, but was never constructed. Horton Road is too narrow for large HGV's and wideloads and a direct link to the Azalea roundabout on the A31 should be a pre-requisite for such a	Woolsbridge Industrial Estate covers 15 hectares and the original proposal to remove a further 9.7 hectares of Green Belt land represents a 65% increase in area. Taking into account the adjacent flood plains create a serious risk of flooding, the potential harm to the Moors Valley SSSI and the admitted poor access, this is the maximum	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									substantial development.	justifiable increase in size. Map ref 11.7 'proposed change' shows the amended 13.1 hectare increase in the area of the site envisages taking the boundary close to the existing Horton Road (shown as Ringwood Road on the map), which would preclude future widening. Clearly, a direct road into Woolsbridge Industrial Estate from the A31 Azalea roundabout, which is clearly designed for this purpose, should be a pre-requisite for such a substantial development.			
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		<a href="#">PCCS259</a>	135	VTW5	Yes	Yes		Excellent change.				
718911	Mr Joshua Lambert	Planning Assistant Pro Vision Planning and Design	<a href="#">PCCS471</a>	135	VTW5	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	CN3 Land East of Marsh Lane, WMC7 Leigh Park Area of Potential Change, Wimborne, and VTW5 North-East Verwood New Neighbourhood The allocation of Little Canford Depot for mixed use redevelopment in place of the unsustainable housing allocations at Marsh Lane, Leigh Park and North-East Verwood would ensure consistency with the NPPF.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1. Because of the high level of public interest in reducing greenfield land in East Dorset in favour of optimizing previously developed land. 2. To enable the Inspector to test the evidence demonstrating that the Core Strategy is unsound without the allocation of Little Canford Depot for mixed use residential and employment development.	<a href="#">2403289_0_1.pdf</a>
719231	Mr Mike Newton	Boyer Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS278</a>	135	VTW5	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective	Our client is a major national housebuilder and developer with important land interests in the Core Strategy area. Our response therefore focuses on this site and sets out our concern with the removal of the allocation via the schedule of proposed changes. The removal of the site is unsound and contrary to the development plan process and evidence base that led to the identification and allocation of the site in the Pre-Submission draft of the Plan. Please see the accompanying statement.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The representation relates to a key policy in the Core Strategy. Our client is controls the land comprising the North Eastern Verwood New Neighbourhood and therefore has an important role to play in delivering this part of the Strategy.	<a href="#">2399052_0_1.pdf</a>
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS331</a>	137	VTW6	Yes	Yes		Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the proposed changes to this policy which give increased protection to the nature conservation features adjacent to the site.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS237</a>	137	VTW6	Yes	Yes		We support the amendments made to this policy.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East	<a href="#">PCCS452</a>	137	VTW6		Yes		We support the revision of this policy provided that it can be assured that the wording and subsequent ME policies				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
		Dorset)							encompass all our concerns about water pollution and light pollution (please see response to previous consultation).				
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		<a href="#">PCCS261</a>	137	VTSW6	Yes	Yes		Excellent.				
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">PCCS264</a>	137	VTSW6	Yes	Yes	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy		Natural England support the policy modifications.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
657138	Mr Mike Hirsh	Intelligent Land	<a href="#">PCCS100</a>	137	VTSW6	Yes	Yes		Ankers and Rawlins have been involved for many years with the development of this estate. Over the past year and a half there has been a continuing negotiation to bring forward more land for development and this is at a well-developed stage with Council officers and includes a submitted planning application. It is important to support the local economy and to provide employment land and this proposal meets these requirements and is available. The land's allocation is, therefore, supported.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718911	Mr Joshua Lambert	Planning Assistant Pro Vision Planning and Design	<a href="#">PCCS472</a>	137	VTSW6	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	The Proposed Changes to Policy VTSW6, include the release of 13.1 hectares of land adjacent to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate from the Green Belt. This site is some distance from the closest residential area. It is an unsustainable and unjustified proposal. The approach is inconsistent with the allocation of employment land adjacent to the large village of Sturminster Marshall, which is sustainable and justified. A reasonable alternative to the release of Green Belt land adjacent to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is the retention of the existing employment site at Furzehill. The redevelopment of Little Canford Depot for a mix of housing, employment and green infrastructure, in place of the Furzehill housing allocation, would be more sustainable than the redevelopment of Little Canford Depot solely for employment. Little Canford Depot is a more sustainable location than Furzehill in terms of the site's proximity to the main built up area and access to sustainable transport. The Core Strategy must accord with national policy to be sound. The release of 13.1 hectares of land from the Green Belt adjacent to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate to provide employment is inconsistent with paragraph 17 of the NPPF, as the approach does not favour the reuse of land which has been previously developed. The retention of the existing employment site at Furzehill and the redevelopment of Little Canford Depot for housing, employment and green infrastructure would reduce greenfield land take in accord with the NPPF.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1. Because of the high level of public interest in reducing greenfield land in East Dorset in favour of optimizing previously developed land. 2. To enable the Inspector to test the evidence demonstrating that the Core Strategy is unsound without the allocation of Little Canford Depot for mixed use residential and employment development.	<a href="#">2403289_0_1.pdf</a>
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS336</a>	140	VTSW7	No	No	Positively Prepared Effective Consistent with national policy	Dorset Wildlife Trust strongly welcomes the need for a wildlife strategy to be agreed with the Council that ensures that no harm to the Moors River SSSI, the SNCI on the site and the adjacent internationally protected heathland will derive from the development. We also support the need for Sustainable Drainage Systems. However, we consider that the amended text does not	We consider rewording is required regarding 1. Provision of SANG, with need for a recreational amenity strategy. 2. Avoidance of harm to	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>ensure avoidance of harm to protected and priority species, including populations of SPA bird species which are likely to be present both on-site and in the surrounding area, including forestry blocks. There is also no requirement for SANG provision should residential development come forward of a scale and type which, without mitigation, could have an adverse impact on the Dorset Heaths SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. This is detailed in Natural England's response to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy. Additionally, having been through the planning process several times with regard to this site, Dorset Wildlife Trust do not consider that development is deliverable without some harm to the SNCI priority habitats and species, as the most important habitats (including rare U1 Festuca ovina-Agrostis capillaris-Rumex acetosella grassland) lie close to or within the currently developed area. The site supports 23 Dorset Notable Species within the acid grassland and heath areas. Previous negotiations led to a planning obligation attached to a care village proposal for nature conservation mitigation, to include translocation of some areas of the SNCI grassland, management of the SNCI areas within the care village and management of the wider SNCI surrounding the site through scrub and tree removal and heathland restoration. Thus we consider that development would be possible with a mitigation package that would minimise harm to the SNCI and seek biodiversity gains (in line with NPPF 109). We consider this needs to be reflected in the text.</p>	<p>SPA bird species, whether or not within the designated Dorset Heathlands SPA, and other protected and priority species. 3. Requirement for development to avoid harm to the SNCI priority habitats and species but where the need for development outweighs policy protection of the natural environment, provide measures to mitigate or compensate any harm and seek positive biodiversity gains. DWT would be pleased to discuss this further with regard to the SNCI.</p>		<p>are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership. We consider that the changes proposed do not give sufficient clarity, protection or gain for the environment and would wish to contribute to an oral examination in support of this view given our previous history of involvement with this site.</p>	
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS246</a>	140	VTW7	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>We generally support the amendments made to this policy. However, whilst we are not familiar with the site, we understand from conservation colleagues that the site itself supports populations of specially protected birds (SPA cited species). These species are not currently adequately protected by the proposed policy.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>The Plan raises issues of nature conservation importance, matters which the RSPB is familiar and has considerable expertise. We are active in the Plan area as advocates for sustainable development and biodiversity conservation. We wish to reserve the opportunity to appear at an examination of nature conservation issues. We consider that we are in well positioned to advise an Inspector on these matters.</p>	
359979	Mr Les Flay		<a href="#">PCCS7</a>	140	VTW7				<p>Thank you for the opportunity of expressing my views on future policies. Several points are involved, in future planning, and a firm commitment, and a bold response, should only be future housing. Many other bodies will seek your conclusions, and if strong enough will applaud and follow your lead. The suggestions of CPO of school playing grounds, should be abolished. There is enough land particularly in East Dorset, to encompass the physical needs for the period suggested. Land for example at St Leonards hospital, agreed for development, without any considerations to road infrastructure. The only way forward in retrospect, is to allow</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally complaint or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>the Grange Estate (EDDC) to return to it proposed development by the County, but to a lesser density, and firmer boundaries strictly adhered to. By this move outgoing traffic from the hospital site, moved into Boundary Lane, through a small roundabout, onto a flyover across the A31 with filters going both east and west, all paid for by the release of the Grange Estate, to encompass the extra traffic emanating from the new Grange development, also through the Grange distributory road to the A338, coupled with intersections to Hurn airport.</p> <p>All services are 'in situ' so the necessity of even considering schools, cancels itself out.</p> <p>Roads                      Bold action is needed though the A31 layouts. The traffic emanating from London via Picket Post, will inevitably get heavier. Turning traffic right, across open country, again with outlets to West Moors, and Ferndown, then connecting up with the existing A31, west of the Worlds End public house, straight to the dual carriage, onto the excellent new road to the West Country.</p> <p>It is a bold decision, but looking to 2028 it must be considered.</p> <p>Schools                      It appears at the moment the existing scenario is adequate, but with a new housing programme, these can be accommodated within the proposed new housing by the developers.</p> <p>Business.                      Small trading units to encourage those living on the new estates, will keep in favour with the environmental policies and road user agreements.</p> <p>Shops.                      New shops can be defined within existing layouts, thus inviting larger shops to be available, as we already had shown with LDV Sainsbury etc.</p> <p>Hospitals.                      St Leonards hospital development should never have been approved. The hospital has an excellent name, and ought to be encouraged to enlarge into a local cottage hospital, dealing with Ferndown, Ringwood, West Moors and surrounding rural areas, thereby relieving both road congestions, and pressure of Bournemouth and Poole hospitals. (read in conjunction with (para 6).</p> <p>Agriculture.                      Generally speaking the soil composition in this area is poor 4/5 on a Defra scale of 5 almost all common land, but some consideration should be set aside for small growers, to local populate, under glass etc.</p> <p>Power, water, sewage, electricity, are all in place, in the case of sewage already upgraded.</p> <p>The idea of a catchment lake on the Grange is, (see para 6)</p> <p>A. To control the surface water, before releasing into the Moors River.</p> <p>B. To enhance to whole futuristic estate, with beauty</p> <p>Thank you for reading my points for EDDC area.</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS453</a>	140	VTSW7		No	Justified Effective	The changes, as far as they have gone, are welcome but have still not achieved what is necessary. The policy should be more explicit in what is required as prerequisites for development and, as with other development sites within the Core Strategy, should make specific reference to the need for a SANG to be provided. Although reference is made to the adjacent internationally protected heathland, there should be recognition of the risk to SPA qualifying bird species whose territories clearly will not be confined to the SPA. As the long term use of the site has yet to be established, considerations similar to those of Policy VTSW6 should apply with respect to buffers, habitat connectivity and protection of the Moors River SSSI.	The policy should be more explicit in what is required as prerequisites for development including a wildlife and recreational amenity strategy that mitigates impacts on designated habitats (including the SNCI) and SPA qualifying bird species.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		<a href="#">PCCS260</a>	140	VTSW7	Yes	Yes		Great.				
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">PCCS265</a>	140	VTSW7	No	No	Positively Prepared	Natural England advice at the Pre-Submission stage remains our advice at this time.	The policy wording has improved but it is now no longer consistent with Policies ME1 and 3. The Policy needs additional text to set out the requirements for development more comprehensively for applicants. A wildlife strategy to be agreed with the Council that ensures that no harm to the Moors River SSSI, the Site of Nature Conservation Interest on the site and the adjacent internationally protected heathland will derive from the development. THE APPLICANT WILL NEED TO SHOW THAT THEY HAVE AVOIDED HARM TO PRIORITY HABITATS AND SPECIES. THE LAYOUT OF THE SITE IS LIKELY TO REQUIRE COMPENSATORY MEASURES WHICH MAY INCLUDE SANG PROVISION WHERE RECREATIONAL PRESSURE IS GENERATED. Particular regard to the water environment will be needed and in this respect the use of	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The objective is critical to the delivery of biodiversity at a national and European level and Natural England would wish to be available to advise the Inspector accordingly.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										Sustainable Drainage Systems to mitigate any potential impacts will be expected to form part of this strategy.			
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS338</a>	142	VTW8	Yes	Yes		Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of land to the south of Blackfield Farm within the Green Belt as it provides a Green Belt function of providing access and opportunities for recreation.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS454</a>	142	VTW8		Yes		We support inclusion in the Greenbelt of land to the South of Blackfield Farm for reasons detailed in our previous response.				
485066	Mr David Brenchley		<a href="#">PCCS280</a>	142	VTW8	No	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The fact that the land to the south of Blackfield Farm is now being proposed as Green Belt increases, rather than decreases the need for the whole of the area to be Green Belt. The impact upon the local area if Blackfield Farm is allowed to be classified as Urban is completely unjustifiable and would change the nature of the local area and the village for the worse and forever. (This response was part of a longer response to the consultation. This is the only duly made part of the Response.)		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	For all of the reasons above and to ensure that even at this late stage the local residents of West Moors are given a voice by an independent local person.	
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	<a href="#">PCCS40</a>	142	VTW8	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	It is considered that the inclusion of the land south of Blackfield Farm within the Green Belt is not justified or consistent with national policy. This land is not considered to meet any of the five purposes that the Green Belt is supposed to serve, as set out in paragraph 80 of the NPPF, i.e. 1. It does not serve to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, as it lies between 2 areas of existing built-up land and a further area (Blackfield Farm) is to be included in the urban area. 2. It will not prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another as it does not bring the urban area of West Moors any closer to another settlement 3. Its close proximity to and relationship with the existing/proposed urban area of West Moors means that it is not required in order to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. 4. It does not preserve the setting and special character of a historic town, and 5. It will not assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and urban land in West Moors. Therefore, this land should be included within the urban area of West Moors along with the land at Blackfield Farm, as contained in the previous iteration of the Core Strategy Pre-Submission document.	Inclusion of the land south of Blackfield Farm within the urban area.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS340</a>	142	Map 11.9	Yes	Yes		Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the amendment to Map 11.9 for the reasons given.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS342</a>	152	13.10	Yes	Yes		Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the additional text which clarifies the role of Strategic Nature Areas.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS456</a>	152	13.10		Yes		We welcome the changes made.				
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS341</a>	152	13.8	Yes	Yes		Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the additional text for the reason given.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS455</a>	152	13.8		Yes		We welcome the inclusion of the paragraph clarifying the definition of priority habitats and species.				
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS345</a>	153	ME1	No	No	Consistent with national policy	<p>Whilst supporting most of the amendments to ME1, Dorset Wildlife Trust does not consider that the following paragraph reflects guidance in NPPF (118).                      "Where harm is identified as likely to result, provision of measures to adequately avoid or adequately mitigate that harm should be set out. Development may be refused if adequate mitigation or, as a last resort compensation cannot be provided."                      NPPF (118) states                      • If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.                      We consider that the there is no need for the word 'adequately' in front of 'avoid' as either harm will be avoided, or it won't. Also a comma is required after 'resort'.                      We also strongly consider that development 'may' be refused here weakens ME1, is vague and does not reflect the 'should' be refused in NPPF 118. It does not give us confidence that this policy will be applied.</p>	<p>We propose the following wording                      Where harm is identified as likely to result, provision of measures to adequately avoid or adequately mitigate that harm should be set out. Development may be refused if adequate mitigation or, as a last resort, compensation cannot be provided."</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county, are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership. We consider that the changes proposed do not give sufficient clarity or protection for the environment and would wish to contribute to an oral examination in support of this view.</p>	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS343</a>	153	ME1	Yes	Yes		<p>Dorset Wildlife Trust strongly supports all the amendments to this policy except the following paragraph which is commented upon in a second response:                      "Where harm is identified as likely to result, provision of measures to adequately avoid or adequately mitigate that harm should be set out. Development may be refused if adequate mitigation or, as a last resort compensation cannot be provided."                      We consider the supported amendments more accurately reflect the types of nature conservation sites, habitats and species which the Core Strategy aims to protect, maintain and enhance within their ecological networks. We also support the changes to the first two amended criteria that should be addressed when development is proposed as these increase clarity and seek biodiversity gains in line with NPPF.                      We welcome the additional text on Strategic Nature Areas and the additional paragraph relating to the level of</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									protection afforded to sites of different status and the assessment of impacts relative to a features' nature conservation value. We consider this brings this policy in line with NPPF.				
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS244</a>	153	ME1	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	We generally support the amendments made to this policy. However, the amendments in our view are not consistent with paragraph 118 of the NPPF.	The policy should be amended to reflect the requirements of the NPPF.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The Plan raises issues of nature conservation importance, matters which the RSPB is familiar and has considerable expertise. We are active in the Plan area as advocates for sustainable development and biodiversity conservation. We wish to reserve the opportunity to appear at an examination of nature conservation issues. We consider that we are in well positioned to advise an Inspector on these matters.	
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS457</a>	153	ME1		Yes		While welcoming and supporting most of the changes that have been made to this policy there are several issues that have still not been addressed/understood making it unsound as it stands. These exceptions to our support are detailed on the next response form.				
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS458</a>	153	ME1		No	Effective	While welcoming and supporting most of the changes that have been made to this policy there are several issues that have still not been addressed/understood making it unsound as it stands. These exceptions to our support are as follows: i) Under the heading of "criteria to be addressed when development is proposed" • Bullet Point 3. The text shows an incorrect change from "adequately avoid or mitigate" to "adequately avoid or adequately mitigate" – the first "adequately" should be deleted for this to make sense. Previous responses by ETAG and DWT made it clear what was needed. • Bullet Point 3. There is a world of difference between "Development may be refused" and "Development will be refused". Unless this change is changed to "will be refused" (as previously advised), the rest of the policy is meaningless as it results in a total failure to give clear guidance on the consequences of not meeting the listed objectives. To ensure certainty we advise the change to "will be refused" is essential. ii) There is no reference in the text to map 13.5 or any date. It is essential to make clear that the map is a snapshot in time (with date) and that local nature conservation, geological and geomorphological designations are likely to be updated and change during lifetime of Local Plan. We suggest that a reference to the map is inserted after the reference to the Dorset Nature Map on p92 of the Schedule of Proposed Changes.	(p92) Amend para 5 Bullet point 2 to include reference to map 13.5 (p92) Amend para 5 Bullet Point 3 to read Where harm is identified as likely to result, provision of measures to avoid or adequately mitigate that harm should be set out.. Development will be refused if adequate mitigation or, as a last resort, compensation cannot be provided.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	As part of the East Dorset Community Partnership, ETAG's remit on biological sciences and sustainability is wider than that of Natural England or Dorset Wildlife Trust. Membership includes highly qualified natural scientists and town & parish representatives.	
549174	Mr Justin Milward	Regional & Local Government Officer Woodland Trust	<a href="#">PCCS130</a>	153	ME1			Consistent with national policy	ME1 – Safeguarding biodiversity and geodiversity (p.153) We are objecting to the proposed new bullet point text under the paragraph heading 'The following criteria should be	We would therefore like to see Policy ME1 amended to reflect the precise	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>addressed when adequately avoid or mitigate that harm development is proposed': '...net gains in biodiversity, where possible...' (2nd bullet point).</p> <p>'Net biodiversity gain' is not applicable to ancient woodland. It is not possible to minimise the impact of new development on irreplaceable semi natural habitats like ancient woodland or ancient trees. In terms of compensatory measures, it is impossible to replace ancient woodland in Christchurch and East Dorset as this habitat has evolved over centuries and it is not possible to replicate hundreds of years of ecological evolution by planting a new site or attempting to translocation. This does not conform to current national policy.</p> <p>Ancient woodland, together with ancient/veteran trees, represents an irreplaceable semi natural habitat that still does not benefit from full statutory protection: for instance 86% of ancient woodland in the South West has no statutory protection. With 4.76% of East Dorset (0.07% in Christchurch) comprised of ancient woodland compared to an average for Great Britain of 2.40%, it is vital that the joint Councils do all they can to protect this above average resource. Whilst the Dorset Biodiversity Strategy seeks to 'conserve' ancient woodland, this is not as strong as promoting absolute protection.</p> <p>East Dorset also contains a number of ancient trees, of which many may not yet be formally recorded, and the Woodland Trust and Ancient Tree Forum are running a national project – the Ancient Tree Hunt - to identify and map ancient trees (<a href="http://www.ancienttreehunt.org.uk/">http://www.ancienttreehunt.org.uk/</a>) so they can be protected and enhanced for the benefit of all. This has already revealed a number of ancient trees, such as, for instance, the ancient oak at White Sheet Plantation near Broom Hill..</p> <p>Government policy is increasingly supportive of absolute protection of ancient woodland and ancient trees. The new National Policy Planning Framework clearly states: "...planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss " (DCLG, March 2012, para 118).</p> <p>This NPPF wording should be considered in conjunction with other national policy on ancient woodland -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Government's policy document 'Keepers of Time – A statement of Policy for England's Ancient &amp; Native Woodland' (Defra/Forestry Commission, 2005, p.10) states: 'The existing area of ancient woodland should be maintained and there should be a net increase in the area of native woodland'.</li> <li>- The Government's Independent Panel on Forestry states: 'Government should reconfirm the policy approach set out in the Open Habitats Policy and Ancient Woodland Policy (Keepers of Time – A statement of policy for England's ancient and native woodland).....Reflect the value of ancient</li> </ul>	<p>wording of NPPF para 118 with a new separate paragraph specifically for ancient woodland and ancient trees: 'The Council will not permit any development proposal which would result in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss'.</p>			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>woodlands, trees of special interest, for example veteran trees, and other priority habitats in Local Plans, and refuse planning permission for developments that would have an adverse impact on them.' (Defra, Final Report, July 2012).</p> <p>- The Government's Natural Environment White Paper – The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature (HM Government, July 2011, para 2.56) states that: 'The Government is committed to providing appropriate protection to ancient woodlands....'.</p> <p>- The new Biodiversity Strategy for England (Biodiversity 2020: A Strategy for England's Wildlife &amp; Ecosystem Services, Defra 2011, see 'Forestry' para 2.16) states that – 'We are committed to providing appropriate protection to ancient woodlands and to more restoration of plantations on ancient woodland site'.</p> <p>- The SW Forestry Framework (Forestry Commission, 2005) contains a key objective to 'Protect, improve and manage Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland...".</p> <p>An example of good Local Authority policy is provided by North Somerset Council Core Strategy Adopted April 2012 - 'Policy CS4: Nature conservation</p> <p>North Somerset contains outstanding wildlife habitats and species. These include limestone grasslands, traditional orchards, wetlands, rhynes, commons, hedgerows, ancient woodlands and the Severn Estuary. Key species include rare horseshoe bats, otters, wildfowl and wading birds, slow-worms and water voles.</p> <p>The biodiversity of North Somerset will be maintained and enhanced by:...</p> <p>3) seeking to protect, connect and enhance important habitats, particularly designated sites, ancient woodlands and veteran trees'.</p> <p>The West Dorset DC and Weymouth/Portland DC Local Plan (submission draft: June 2012) states that - 'Policy ENV 2. WILDLIFE AND HABITATS</p> <p>iv) Elsewhere, development that would adversely affect nature conservation interests, including Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, Local Nature Reserves, ancient woodlands, veteran trees and hedgerows, and key wildlife corridors will be resisted'.</p>				
612430	Mr Nick Squirrell	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">PCCS266</a>	153	ME1	Yes	Yes	Positively Prepared	The policy wording is not compliant with the NPPF as set out below.	Natural England supports the modification made to this policy. A minor modification is proposed to one bullet point relating to the assessment criteria: ...Where harm is identified as likely to result, provision of measures to adequately avoid or adequately	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										mitigate the harm should be set out. Development WILL be refused if adequate mitigation or, as a last resort compensation cannot be provided. This approach is consistent with the NPPF which seeks to move from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains. Natural England supports modifications proposed by Dorset Wildlife Trust.			
654817	Mr Alan Spencer		<a href="#">PCCS135</a>	153	ME1		No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective	There is a danger on private land that the ecological, environmental and bio diverse elements of a proposed development area will not be apparent to / or perhaps not disclosed by a landowner. The proposed advisers to the Council (Natural England, Dorset Wildlife Trust and Dorset District Council) have no current access to private land and will therefore only be able to offer advice against reports received from a developer's contractor. This will not safeguard biodiversity and geodiversity unless the developer's contractors are completely impartial. Even before development proposals were considered for this Core Strategy the council should have requested ecological, environmental and bio diverse surveys to be undertaken, made them public and had them examined by its advisors, so that any issues could have been highlighted, and alternative sites been offered in the this phase of the process.	The Council should immediately commission impartial ecological, environmental and biodiversity reports on all of the proposed development areas in the Core Strategy to determine if they really are viable to avoid wasting further public money. The Inspector will then only need to consider those sites which remain viable.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
717053	Mrs Janet Healy		<a href="#">PCCS87</a>	153	ME1	Yes	No	Effective	The wording is fine and the intention to protect both biodiversity and geodiversity is implicit in the text. However, the failing is in the final stages when planning permission is applied for. It is the developer who submits the ecological survey. This of course presents a conflict of interest as the ecologist is paid by the developer. All too often surveys are carried out only once and at the wrong time of year so a true picture is not presented.	At an early point in the development of the Core Strategy, an independent ecologist should take a look at the proposed sites for development to make sure they are not ecologically unique or sensitive. There is an abundance of local expertise and it is not too late to call on it.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	This is a very serious ecological failure in the Core Strategy that requires remedying and we need to argue the point. Our local ecological groups have no evidence to support/object to proposed sites. The councillors are guided by the planning application ecological survey, regardless of its soundness.	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS348</a>	153	New Map 13.5	Yes	No	Effective	Dorset Wildlife Trust have the following comments on this map: The purple shaded sites are 'Local Nature Reserves' (not Areas). We suggest to avoid later confusion that the title is changed to state the date the map was produced and clarify that it is updated annually by Dorset Environmental Records Centre so that as new sites are identified or existing sites deleted this is the information against which planning applications	DWT propose the following changes: 1. Change of text to 'Local Nature Reserves' within key. 2. In addition to text currently proposed, title change to state 'Map as at (date)' ..... 'Updated	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									are assessed. Reference to the map is required within Policy ME1	annually by Dorset Environmental Records Centre'. 3. Reference to Map 13.5 within Policy ME1.			
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS347</a>	153	New Map 13.5	Yes	Yes		The inclusion of a map of local nature conservation sites is supported and welcomed. Please see second response for suggested amendments.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS349</a>	154	Map 13.2	Yes	Yes		Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the amendment to Map 13.2 which reflects our comments made on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	<a href="#">PCCS362</a>	156	ME2	Yes	No	Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>We refer to the above consultation event and respond on behalf of Messrs Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Bodorgan Properties (CI) Ltd and Sainsburys PLC. Our clients have the controlling interest in the land north of Roeshot Hill and wish to ensure that the planning policy framework aimed at securing release of the land is both satisfactory and sufficiently flexible.</p> <p>Policy ME2 The revisions proposed to policy ME2 suggest heathland mitigation will be delivered either through SANG or through CIL in the majority of cases. There is a risk of double counting in CIL is charged for heathland mitigation for those sites that provide mitigation in the form of SANG.</p> <p>With the above exceptional costs and strategic infrastructure requirements in mind and the potential for double counting, it is considered that the requirement for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payments on this site would not be necessary, practicable or appropriate, in effectively delivering the required infrastructure. Further the inevitable confusion and concerns as to double counting that would arise would serve to delay the delivery of the urban extension.</p> <p>The point is highlighted in CLG CIL Guidance (published December 2012) that states: 'In proposing a levy rate(s) charging authorities should show that the proposed rate (or rates) would not threaten delivery of the relevant Plan as a whole. They should also take into account other development costs arising from existing regulatory requirements, including taking account of any policies on planning obligations in the relevant Plan (in particular those for affordable housing and major strategic sites)'. (Paragraph 29, CLG CIL Guidance December 2012) Accordingly it is advanced that CIL in this instance should properly be set at a level of £0 per square metre and the urban extension dealt with under the usual section 106 procedure of appropriate contributions and or capital works obligations so as to provide for the various requirements with Policy CN1 and avoid any risk of double charging. This approach would be objective, transparent and help to ensure the early delivery of the urban extension with associated</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To provide expert evidence on relevant aspects of the policy.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	Is it unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									infrastructure and that the development remains a viable prospect for the developer.				
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS350</a>	156	ME2		No	Effective Consistent with national policy	Dorset Wildlife Trust support ME2 but consider that the following points require greater accuracy: 1. Paragraph two states that any residential development within 400m and 5km of these areas will provide mitigation.....We feel this is ambiguous as the first paragraph also states 'within 400m'. The Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2012-14 Supplementary Planning Document uses the phrasing "in the area between 400m and 5km" (para3.5) and we feel this gives greater clarity. 2. We have not yet seen evidence that the combination of the 400m exclusion zone and heathland mitigation measures function together as an effective package avoiding harmful effects of additional residential development on the European and internationally designated heathlands. Although this is the aspiration, we cannot be certain of 100% effectiveness without monitoring results. We therefore suggest amendment to reflect this.	We suggest the following amendments to the text: 1. Paragraph 2: Any residential development in the area between 400m and 5km of these areas..... 2. The combination of the 400m exclusion zone and heathland mitigation measures set out above are designed to function together as an effective package.....	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS351</a>	156	ME2		No		Dorset Wildlife Trust supports ME2 in principle but has made two suggestions for amendments in our second response.				
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS239</a>	156	ME2	Yes	Yes		We support the amendments to this policy.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
360235	Mr Christopher Undery	Christopher D Undery	<a href="#">PCCS71</a>	156	ME2	Yes	No	Effective	See previously submitted Response Form dated 15/06/2012. The imposition on the developer of cost burdens including high proportions of affordable housing, suitable alternative natural green spaces, heathland mitigation, community and transport infrastructure levies etc. will undermine viability, cause developers to reduce purchase offers to landowners to the extent that landowners will decide not to sell, or offers to purchase will fail to reach base price provisions in option agreements. In consequence development will not come forward, landowners will withhold allocated land and housing provision and other benefits will not be achieved.	Cost burden requirements on development land must be scaled back to ensure that development land is not sterilized in the plan period. This consequence previously came about with the imposition of development land tax which subsequently had to be abandoned.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Because the Government Inspector will be able to recommend revision of policy provisions to reflect the risk of development stagnation and consequent frustration of strategy objectives.	
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS459</a>	156	ME2		No	Effective Consistent with national policy	While totally supporting measures to protect the Dorset Heathlands further changes to the wording of the policy are necessary. i) Para 2 indicates that development will take place within 400m of heathland. The confusion can be removed by amending the wording to follow that in the IPF to in the area between 400m and 5km ii) There should be clarity on the circumstances under which heathland mitigation measures will not be secured by CIL (para 3). iii) The effectiveness of the package (referred to at the end of para 5) is, as yet, unproven. The wording is pre-empting the findings of current research. Our agreement to the	Amend as indicated as above.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									wording of this will depend on the strength of the evidence and recommendations of the current work by Footprint Ecology. ETAG retains an objection because of lack of evidence at this stage. We advise that it would be better to delete the sentence The combination of .... heathlands.				
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		<a href="#">PCCS20</a>	156	ME2	Yes	No	Effective	I am encouraged to read that mitigation measures are to be delivered in ADVANCE of the developments being occupied and that the mitigation measures would be there in perpetuity, however I am concerned that SANGS have yet to be tested as to their ability to attract the public away from internationally protected Heathland.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
474490	Mrs Sheila Bourton	Chairman Keep Wimborne Green	<a href="#">PCCS30</a>	156	ME2	Yes	No	Effective	We are encouraged that the protection of Dorset Heathlands by way of avoidance or mitigation measures are to be delivered in advance of the occupation of new housing development, however, we are concerned that SANGS have yet to be tested as to their ability to attract the public to them and away from internationally protected heathland.	SANGS should be tested as to their effectiveness before full residency of new developments.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
474490	Mrs Sheila Bourton	Chairman Keep Wimborne Green	<a href="#">PCCS31</a>	156	ME2	Yes	No	Effective	We are encouraged that the protection of Dorset Heathlands by way of avoidance or mitigation measures are to be delivered in advance of the occupation of new housing development, however, we are concerned that SANGS have yet to be tested as to their ability to attract the public to them and away from internationally protected heathland.	SANGS should be tested as to their effectiveness before full residency of new developments.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS493</a>	156	ME2	Yes	No	Justified Effective	MEM Ltd object to the addition of the phrase that 'SANG will be secured by way of a legal agreement between the developer and the relevant council.' This addition to the policy is not sound as it is not effective as it does not allow for SANG ownership/ provision being made by third parties who would be signatory to a legal agreement as part of any planning permission granted where SANG was required to mitigate potential harm from the development. This addition is not sound as it is justified as it is not the only solution available for delivery. (1) Legally compliant: Yes No (2) Sound*: Yes No Positively Prepared: Justified: Effective: Consistent with national policy: MEM Ltd objects to the revision to the policy, which states that Heathland mitigation measures will be secured through CIL in the majority of cases. Infrastructure projects which are not "area wide" but instead are more "site-specific" may still be funded through section 106 contributions rather than CIL. As the SE Dorset authorities under the Heathland DPD and SPD propose to fund heathland mitigation projects via CIL, a local authority cannot seek a section 106 contribution/ or capital works towards the same item of infrastructure. Otherwise this would be "double counting". Where SANG is provided as part of the mitigation measures for a development it would be inappropriate to charge the heathland element of CIL. The policy is therefore	The policy should be revised to say: 'SANG will be secured by way of a legal agreement between the SANG provider and the relevant council and secured against the delivery of the development.' The issue of potential double counting of CIL/ physical SANG mitigation needs to be resolved to make the plan sound. The policy needs to be revised to allow for temporary/ mobile SANG solutions to ensure the policy can be flexibly applied to assist with development delivery. The policy needs to be revised to include a direct cross reference to policy DH2 of the Dorset Heathlands DPD.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	MEM Ltd will act as SANG provider for site CN1 and CN2 and wish to ensure the Inspector understands the possible delivery mechanism and the ability to mitigate the potential harm from residential development. MEM Ltd wish the principle of 'double counting' to be explored as part of the examination into the Core Strategy. MEM Ltd is keen to examine the potential for mobile SANG as a solution at Roeshot, given their ability to deliver alternative solutions.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally complaint or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									inconsistent with National Guidance on CIL. MEM object to the insertion of the phrase “mitigation in perpetuity” as this suggested degree of permanence does not allow for a flexible approach to a ‘mobile SANG’ which may be used at Roeshot where the temporary use the land for minerals extraction may require alterations to SANG arrangements over time. The policy needs to make more specific reference to the need to satisfy the Habitats Directive to allow residential development to proceed within the area between 400m and 5km from the European sites.				
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS488</a>	156	ME2	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>Policy ME2 has been revised to include a statement with regard to the effectiveness of heathland mitigation measures as a package. This is in part made up from SANGs and in part by the range of other projects funded through the Heathland tariff. The spatial expression of this policy is not shown on the proposals map for the core strategy but is shown on the Draft Heathlands’ DPD proposals map. Although the policy cross-refers to the Heathlands DPD this is not sufficient to set the spatial framework for the development of the Borough and it therefore fails to meet the national guidance in NPPF paragraph 154 that requires Local Plans to address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change.</p> <p>Bodorgan Environmental Management (BEM) has serious concerns that the package of measures and potential SANGS that locally will mitigate the urban effects on the European Heathland sites are not part of the spatial solution of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Policy ME2 in the Core Strategy is a development management policy and does not consider the strategic and spatial role of SANGs in relation to the impacts of built development within the Borough. This is inconsistent with national policy and does not meet the requirements of paragraph 114 of the NPPF. The Core Strategy is not positively prepared in this respect. The range of measures to support heathland mitigation and mitigate or avoid urban effects on heath are to be secured through a ‘heathland tariff’ through CIL. The revised policy suggests this will be in the ‘majority of cases’. BEM Ltd have serious concerns over the effectiveness of the projects in the SPD and notes that the projects will not be scrutinised at this plan’s examination or the Heathland DPD examination. It is noted that revised policy ME2 appears to expect the draft heathlands DPD to set out a range of measures to provide mitigation. The recently released Heathland DPD draft does not specify the ‘range of measures’.</p> <p>BEM believe the projects should not circumvent examination by being relegated to an SPD and believe that either this plan or the heathland DPD should examine the projects in detail to ensure they provide the appropriate package of measures to mitigate potential harm from the development and consider the tests of the Habitats Directive.</p> <p>European wildlife sites are protected by the EU Birds and Habitats Directives (‘the Habitats Directive’) and, in</p>	<p>BEM wish to see a spatial expression of this policy on the Core Strategy proposals map to show The SANGs, their links, the coast and the potential for landscape scale biodiversity improvements indicated in the Draft Heathland DPD should be repeated in the Core Strategy proposals map to secure this spatial arrangement of heathland mitigation and protect these areas from inappropriate development that may affect the delivery of heathland mitigation. In addition BEM believe all heathland projects that will be funded by CIL should be identified in the Core Strategy to demonstrate that development and mitigation are delivered in tandem and that there is a spatial strategy for project delivery that mirrors the mitigation required to overcome the urban effects on the protected heathland.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>BEM Ltd has raised objections on the nature of the proposed CIL funded heathland projects in relation to consultation on the Heathland SPD. In addition BEM Ltd intends to object to the forthcoming Heathland DPD as not meeting the tests of EU Birds and Habitats Directives Article 6.</p> <p>As a potential provider of a major SANG within the plan BEM Ltd have an interest to ensure that the SANG provision is supported by appropriate CIL funded heathland projects that together will mitigate potential harm and allow development to go ahead without fear of third party challenge.</p> <p>Bodorgan Environmental Management Ltd have in depth experience of local conditions, SANG criteria and SANG design following development of the SANG strategy for Roeshot Hill with Natural England and have based the strategy on evidence from the research work by Footprint Ecology.</p>	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>particular, Article 6. The specific provisions of the Habitats Directive have been transposed into UK law by the Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. The UK Regulations place particular responsibilities on the decision makers namely Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council in relation to such sites. As competent authorities, the Local Authorities must have regard to these requirements, as advised in Circular 06/20053, which provides the procedure that should be followed in deciding whether to approve a proposal (a plan or project) that will potentially affect a European wildlife site.</p> <p>Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset are the authorities responsible for ensuring that the Local Plan mitigates the potential adverse effect from the new population who may use the nearby areas of protected heath for recreation. If the supporting projects to be funded by CIL from April 2014 through the proposed heathland DPD and SPD are not examined in any detail other than by self-appointed representatives of the local authority, without any independent scrutiny, it cannot be adequately demonstrated that no adverse effects are likely.</p> <p>There is very good evidence base from the work of Footprint Ecology in 2008 in relation to use of Green Space across Dorset. This evidence has not been used to inform how SANG can create links with landscape scale biodiversity as there is a lack of spatial direction with regard to heathland mitigation and biodiversity, and this means the plan is not effective. The plan shown on the draft Heathlands DPD proposals map should be repeated in the Core Strategy. The role of the coast as highlighted by Footprint Ecology is not recognised in the Core Strategy as a potential diverter of heathland trips. This is inconsistent with national policy, in particular paragraph 114 of the NPPF which seeks to improve public access and enjoyment of the coast.</p>				
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS196</a>	156	ME2	No	Effective		<p>The amendments to Policy ME2 to confirm that developments of approximately 50 dwellings can provide mitigation by means of financial contribution is supported. The policy would benefit from greater flexibility to allow phased provision of mitigation measures alongside development is considered more appropriate.</p>	<p>Add the following text to the third paragraph of Policy ME2: 'The avoidance or mitigation measures should be phased in line with development.'</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>Savills are acting on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes in relation to land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley that forms the FWP4 allocation in the Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.</p>	
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS204</a>	156	ME2	No	Effective		<p>The revised text states that SANGs will be secured by way of a legal agreement, and that heathland mitigation measures will be secured through CIL in the majority of cases. As currently worded, there is a risk that the larger sites of about 50 or more dwellings which are expected to provide SANGs though a legal agreement would also be required to fund wider heathland mitigation measures through CIL. This would place an unreasonable burden on such sites. The policy wording should therefore be amended to clarify that sites that provide SANGs through legal</p>	<p>Add the following text to Policy to ME2 or as clarification in the supporting text: CIL payments for heathland mitigation will not be sought on those sites where SANGs are delivered by legal agreement; a differential</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>Savills are acting on behalf of the Canford Estate and Harry J Palmer Ltd in relation to their landholdings on the edge of Corfe Mullen that form part of the CM1 allocation in the Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.</p>	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									agreements will not be required to contribute heathland mitigation through CIL.	CIL rate or exemption will be considered for these sites through the emerging CIL charging schedule.			
523893	Miss Lindsay Thompson	Senior Planner Terence O'Rourke Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS212</a>	156	ME2		No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>The new wording of policy ME2 currently requires SANGs to be in place prior to the occupation of development. On larger schemes in Christchurch and East Dorset, where SANGs will be provided on site, it would be more appropriate and provide greater flexibility to allow SANGs to be phased on the delivery of the new homes. For instance, the Cranborne Road new neighbourhood will deliver several areas of SANG as part of the scheme and these areas can be clearly linked to phases. In the instance of Cranborne Road new neighbourhood however some of these areas of SANGs may not be accessible/serviced by roads/footpaths until later phases of the development are brought forward. Therefore it would be inappropriate and potentially a significant burden on the development to deliver all the SANG prior to the occupation of the first dwelling. As it stands the current additional wording requires mitigation measures to be in place prior to occupation. This approach is not sound because it is ineffective in that it could unnecessarily restrict the delivery of development, is therefore not in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>The policy wording should be amended to provide flexibility and allow a pragmatic approach to be adopted on a site-by-site basis, to enable phasing of the areas of SANGs to be agreed with Natural England and the Council as part of the Section 106 negotiations.</p> <p>In respect of direct SANGs provision made in associated with strategic sites this provision needs to be taken into account in any CIL payment due, assuming that SANGs will be covered by the CIL charging schedule. For absolute clarity, it would be double counting if the strategic sites had to provide SANGs on-site as well as paying for provision elsewhere within the district. The policy wording ought to acknowledge this position.</p>	<p>Extract from policy ME2 text to be amended as follows:                      "The avoidance or mitigation measures are to be delivered in advance of the development being occupied and must provide for mitigation in perpetuity. Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs) will be secured by way of a legal agreement between the developer and the relevant council, THIS WILL ENABLE A PHASED APPROACH TO BE NEGOTIATED IF APPROPRIATE. Heathland mitigation measures will be secured through CIL in the majority of cases. IT IS ACKNOWLEDGED THAT CIL CONTRIBUTIONS WILL NOT BE REQUIRED WHERE SANGS PROVISION IS MADE ON SITE, FOR INSTANCE IN RESPECT OF STRATEGIC SITES. The authority will ensure that mitigation measures to avoid harm are given priority as required by this policy.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Our Client has a significant interest in land a North Wimborne (Cranborne Road new neighbourhood) and we therefore consider it to be important that we are able to participate orally at the examination to expand on the comment we have made within this document.	
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">PCCS267</a>	156	ME2	Yes	Yes	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy		Natural England support the policy modifications	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
654618	Mr Peter Tanner	Tanner & Tilley Planning Consultants	<a href="#">PCCS475</a>	156	ME2	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The proposed alteration to the wording of the Policy to require "... The avoidance or mitigation measures ... to be delivered in advance of the development being occupied and must be provided for mitigation in perpetuity...", requires further clarification. As contributions under CIL will be pooled it would be reasonable for development to be allowed to	That the wording of Policy ME2 be further amended as follows, "...The delivery of any planning obligation and or CIL Charge required to	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									proceed once the requirements of the CIL Charging Schedule have been met, including allowing for any phased payment that may be included in the CIL Charging Schedule. It would be unreasonable if it is intended that development should not proceed until the mitigation measures have actually been carried out by the Local Authority or Natural England, as this could be some time after the CIL charge has been paid by the developer to the Local Authority. Furthermore, the implementation of mitigation works is likely to be out of the control of the developer. Delay in allowing development to proceed once the CIL Charge has been paid would not be in accordance with the key principles of the NPPF to promote growth and provide for new homes.	provide for the avoidance or mitigation measures, are to be delivered in advance of the developments being occupied or in accordance with any phased payment or provision as may be provided for in the CIL Charging Schedule or as may otherwise be agreed by the LPA. ( delete following words in brackets) ( and must provide for mitigation in perpetuity.) Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs) will be secured by way of a legal agreement between the developer and the relevant Council where appropriate. Heathland mitigation measures will be secured through CIL in the majority of cases. The authority will ensure that mitigation measures to avoid harm are given priority as required by this policy....”			
717053	Mrs Janet Healy		<a href="#">PCCS88</a>	156	ME2	Yes	Yes		We fully support this policy. We do, however, have some reservations because we are still waiting for evidence to prove the policy is working. Currently it is just assumed to be working.	Any evidence that is available should be attached to the policy.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	Although we would like to appear at the EIP to cover other policies, this we feel is quite well covered.	
718577	Mr Richard Terry		<a href="#">PCCS137</a>	156	ME2	Yes	No	Justified Effective	There is limited land proposed for residential development, increasing burdens on developers will also increase the likelihood that land will not come forward for development. The value of development will be reduced to take into account all the costs this will mean some land will not be sold affecting supply and the viability of the plan.	Reduce the burden on developers throughout the plan.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	<a href="#">PCCS367</a>	157	ME3	Yes	Yes		Policy ME3 The proposed change to a more flexible policy focusing more on the quality rather than the quantity is supported. As elsewhere the SANG requirement should be varied dependent upon the radius of influence to the SPA.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To provide expert evidence on relevant aspects of the policy.	
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS397</a>	157	ME3	Yes	Yes		It is noted in the AoR (para 14.21) that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils consider that, based on the outcome of the recent Purbeck Core Strategy Examination in Public and the comments received in this consultation, Policy ME3				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									should be deleted and replaced by Appendix 5 which sets out the guidelines for SANGs linked to amended policy ME2. This will ensure it is aligned with the other South East Dorset local authorities that contain National and European protected heathland. Dorset County Council supports the proposed change.				
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS355</a>	157	ME3		No	Effective	Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the guidelines presented and their inclusion in Appendix 5. However, following discussions with members of the Environment Theme Action Group (ETAG) would like to support the views presented by ETAG in their response to ME3 that the policy should provide guidance on where SANGs should be in relation to the heathland/s they are designed to protect and that land adjacent to or in close proximity to existing heathland may be appropriate as Heathland Support Areas (HSAs). We also suggest that it seems less appropriate to aim to provide heathland on SANGs under guideline 12 than more robust habitats, especially where the preceding text identifies that SANGs do not have to contain heathland or heathy vegetation. With this habitat so vulnerable to disturbance it seems less suitable to encourage it on SANGs that are designed to encourage public access.	Dorset Wildlife Trust support suggested amendments to para 6 and Guideline 12 submitted by ETAG.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS354</a>	157	ME3	Yes	Yes		Dorset Wildlife Trust support deletion of ME3 and its inclusion as Appendix 5 as a reproduction of Appendix E of the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2012-14 Supplementary Planning Document. DWT have made further suggestions in a second response.				
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS236</a>	157	ME3	Yes	Yes		We support the amendments made to this policy.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
360235	Mr Christopher Undery	Christopher D Undery	<a href="#">PCCS72</a>	157	ME3	Yes	No	Effective	See previously submitted Response Form dated 15/06/2012. The imposition on the developer of cost burdens including high proportions of affordable housing, suitable alternative natural green spaces, heathland mitigation, community and transport infrastructure levies etc. will undermine viability, cause developers to reduce purchase offers to landowners to the extent that landowners will decide not to sell, or offers to purchase will fail to reach base price provisions in option agreements. In consequence development will not come forward, landowners will withhold allocated land and housing provision and other benefits will not be achieved.	Cost burden requirements on development land must be scaled back to ensure that development land is not sterilized in the plan period. This consequence previously came about with the imposition of development land tax which subsequently had to be abandoned.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Because the Government Inspector will be able to recommend revision of policy provisions to reflect the risk of development stagnation and consequent frustration of strategy objectives.	
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS460</a>	157	ME3		Yes		Supported subject to changes detailed in next response form				
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS461</a>	157	ME3		No	Effective	While supporting the principle of SANGs, subject to the strength of the evidence yet to be presented by Footprint Ecology, we retain our position that the policy is unsound and ask that the points listed below are read together with our previous comments (response to Core Strategy	Insert before para 6 (The identification of SANGs...) Land designated for SANG should avoid sites	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	As part of the East Dorset Community Partnership, ETAG's remit on biological sciences and sustainability is wider than that of Natural England or Dorset Wildlife Trust.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>consultation 2012).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The guidance should be generic and apply to whole of Dorset. The sites and pressures they have to withstand vary from one heathland area and its urban population to another. Some sites will need far more detailed consideration than others. As previously noted, design should be bespoke but policy should focus primarily on diverting large numbers of people AWAY from the heaths.</li> <li>The policy provides no guidance on where SANGs should be in relation to the heathland or heathlands they are designed to protect. This is a critical oversight. Creating a SANG adjacent to, or in close proximity to, an existing heathland is counterproductive in that it will inevitably increase visitor pressure on that heath. Also land adjacent to heathland in many cases is likely to be highly suitable for heathland restoration: in such cases the expansion of the heathland area should be considered as a means of both providing further protection for the designated area and meeting biodiversity restoration targets: it must not be destined for SANG function.</li> <li>However, land adjacent to or in close proximity to existing heathland may be appropriate as Heathland Support Areas (HSAs). These HSAs should be additional to and clearly distinct from SANG, and have the entirely different purpose of encouraging redirection of EXISTING visitor pressure away from the relevant heathland.</li> </ul> <p>Guidelines for the quality of SANGs                      We strongly object to the inclusion of wording that SANGs are to be designed principally for dogs and offer accessible water bodies for dogs to swim.                      The commitment to dogs using water bodies on site is a serious health and safety issue as dogs can easily get into difficulties in natural water bodies which inevitably support aquatic vegetation: every year there are tragedies of owners drowning trying to retrieve dogs that get into trouble. It is also extremely damaging to biodiversity. Dogs jumping into ponds will beach tadpoles, and knock off and destroy exuviae of dragonflies. Similarly they can cause enormous damage to riverbanks.                      The provision of SANG must recognise the needs of the whole community, which includes non dog walkers and children, and the necessity of managing sustainably for example by grazing (as supported below).                      P100-102 Guidelines1-3 (and supporting paragraphs) It is essential that new car parking is specifically for SANG use and its provision is not used to restrict the land available for informal recreation. It must not be allowed to become cheap/free out of town parking or serve as an informal shared car or park and ride facility. Car parks should not increase urbanisation of the area so defeating the object of SANGs being tranquil natural open greenspace. Those SANGs designed specifically for New Neighbourhoods should encourage access by walking and cycling and comply with Core Strategy Objective 6.                      Guideline 12. We question the wisdom of specifically</p>	<p>adjacent to or in close proximity to existing heathland.                      Insert after para 6                      Land adjacent to, or in close proximity to heathland may be used as Heathland Support Areas (HSAs), with the purpose of reducing existing visitor pressure on the relevant heathland through access management and, where appropriate, additional heathland recreation.                      Under Guidelines for the quality of SANGs                      Delete all reference to water bodies on site.                      P100-102 Guidelines1-3 (and supporting paragraphs)                      Insert at end of section on "Accessibility – reaching the SANGs"                      New car parking must be specifically for SANG use and its provision will not be used to restrict the land available for informal recreation. It will not be allowed to become cheap/free out of town parking or serve as an informal shared car or park and ride facility. Car parks will not increase urbanisation of the area so defeating the object of SANGs being tranquil natural open greenspace. Those SANGs designed specifically for New Neighbourhoods will encourage access by walking and cycling.                      Insert at end of Guideline 1: Car parking will be restricted to SANG users.                      Guideline 12 Omit reference to heathland                      Guideline 14 Change to:                      The attractiveness of a SANG must not be</p>		<p>Membership includes highly qualified natural scientists and town &amp; parish representatives</p>	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									including "heathland" in the variety of habitats. SANGs must aim to develop the natural characteristics of the area. Guideline 14 The wording "free from" is too stringent. For example, there are relatively few areas that are free from traffic noise though clearly tranquillity is a key attribute: similarly a derelict farm building would not necessarily render a site unsuitable as a SANG. We recommend that the guidance should be more positive encouraging design that makes SANGs attractive to mitigate effects on heathland. This again underlines the importance of potential sites being judged on their merits. Landscape and vegetation para 2. We welcome recognition of the need for grazing management.	seriously compromised by ...			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		<a href="#">PCCS21</a>	157	ME3	Yes	No	Effective	With regard to the SANGS an increase in vehicular traffic to and from these areas should be taken into account. Extra traffic to these areas could add to congestion from increased traffic from new developments around town and villages. With regard to Wimborne, the SANG at "By the Way" is situated on the busy B3073 road between Canford Bottom junction and Wimborne town. This road is set to become even busier with traffic from the proposed new housing development south of Leigh Road, the re-location of both Rugby and Football clubs, a possible new allotment and possible new school!	I would suggest that a clause should be added regarding SANGS in that they will be monitored closely as to their effectiveness, how many people visit and by what means (car or walking from nearby housing developments)., This monitoring should take place at various times of the day and week. I would also suggest that groundworks when constructing a SANG must not effect neighbouring existing properties in any way (i.e. increasing the risk of flooding)	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS494</a>	157	ME3	No	No	Justified Effective	Bodorgan Environmental Management (BEM) has serious concerns about the package of measures that locally will mitigate the urban effects on the European Heathland sites and therefore believes the Core Strategy may not be legally compliant. This point is addressed in detail below. BEM has concerns that there is not a policy that deals with SANG and mitigation in a strategic and spatial dimension. Policy ME2 in the Core Strategy is a development management policy and does not consider the strategic and spatial role of SANG in relation to the impacts of built development within the Borough. This is inconsistent with national policy and does not meet the requirements of paragraph 114 of the NPPF. The Core Strategy is not positively prepared in this respect. There is very good evidence base from the work of Footprint Ecology in 2008 relation to use of Green Space across Dorset. This evidence has not been used to inform how SANG can create links with landscape scale biodiversity as	BEM Ltd believe that in order to make the plan legally compliant it is necessary to consider both the proposed SANG mitigation and all other proposed CIL funded projects in combination as part of this Local Plan, especially as there is such a strong reliance on small sites that will generate CIL within both boroughs to meet the majority of the housing need over the plan period. BEM believes that the CIL funded heathland	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	BEM Ltd have raised objections on the nature of the proposed CIL funded heathland projects in relation to consultation on the Heathland SPD. In addition MEM Ltd intend to object to the forthcoming Heathland DPD as not meeting the tests of EU Birds and Habitats Directives Article 6. As a potential provider of a major SANG within the plan BEM Ltd have an interest to ensure that the SANG provision is supported by appropriate CIL funded heathland projects that together will mitigate potential harm and allow development to go ahead without fear of third party challenge. Bodorgan Environmental Management Ltd have	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>there is a lack of spatial direction with regard to heathland mitigation and biodiversity, and this means the plan is not effective. The role of the coast as highlighted by Footprint Ecology is not recognised in the Core Strategy as a potential diverter of heathland trips. This is inconsistent with national policy, in particular paragraph 114 of the NPPF which seeks to improve public access and enjoyment of the coast. BEM generally supports the substance of change from ME3 to Appendix 5 with the introduction of a quality-based assessment, rather than a quantitative assessment. They believe is a more effective way to secure quality SANG that meets the needs of new residents, and mitigates any likely harm. However, BEM Object to the wording "These must be such that the SANGs is more attractive to visitors than the Dorset Heathlands." This statement is not justified as the evidence to prove superior attractiveness is potentially subjective and would not be proportionate to the requirements of SANG. This is also inconsistent with the consultations in response to the draft Heathlands DPD which has a lower bar to success. The consultation suggested the DPD should describe SANG as having a similar experience to heathland. It is accepted by Natural England that SANG as a means of mitigation is experimental and untested and confirmed as such in the draft DPD that the long term efficacy of SANG is not yet established. Many of the new SANG in the Thames Basin Heath would not meet this onerous and disproportionate test.</p> <p>In addition this statement: "These must be such that the SANGs is more attractive to visitors than the Dorset Heathlands" is inconsistent with the earlier part of the policy that suggests that SANGs are intended to provide mitigation. The draft Heathland DPD acknowledges as part of the evidence base that there are no major SANGs in South East Dorset; it is not possible to establish how effective they are for mitigation. BEM believe the policy needs to be more effective to be found sound and needs to consider the distance/ journey time to the protected heathland and the availability of other existing alternative greenspace as a means of establishing the required efficacy of the SANG. Distance to the protected heathland sites should form part of the consideration of SANG. The policy only refers to the need to be attractive to visitors on foot where large populations are close. BEM believes the efficacy of SANG will be its relationship to other green spaces and other projects to mitigate potential harms to heathland. SANG does not sit alone, this is recognised by the draft DPD. The proposed SANG at Roeshot will link to the River Mude improvements and link south to the Coast and potentially could create links to Chewton Common. In the earlier consultation document of the DPD the importance of the wider green infrastructure network was recognised. The range of measures to support heathland mitigation and mitigate or avoid urban effects on heath are to be secured through a 'heathland tariff' through CIL. MEM Ltd has serious concerns over the effectiveness of the projects in the</p>	<p>projects must be subject to independent scrutiny by the Inspector and must therefore form part of this strategy. The impact and pressures of the Dorset Urban Heathlands are to be addressed in the forthcoming Heathland DPD, however this does not include a spatial plan, it must be for the Core Strategy to properly reflect this thinking in terms of SANGS, making use of less pressured green assets (the coast) and acknowledgment of current patterns of use and proposed use through planned built development. Both the coast and the New Forest have significant influence on the urban population of Christchurch and the Core Strategy must acknowledge this and plan for this spatially. The policy must also address cross boundary issues in relation to mitigation for potential impact on the New Forest.</p>		<p>in-depth experience of local conditions, SANG criteria and SANG design following development of the SANG strategy for Roeshot Hill with Natural England and have based the strategy on evidence from the research work by Footprint Ecology.</p>	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>SPD and notes that the projects will not be scrutinised at this plan's examination or the Heathland DPD examination. It is noted that policy ME2 appears to expect the draft heathlands DPD to set out a range of measures to provide mitigation. The recently released draft does not specify the 'range of measures'. BEM believe the projects should not circumvent examination by being relegated to an SPD and believe that either this plan or the heathland DPD should examine the projects in detail to ensure they provide the appropriate package of measures to mitigate potential harm from the development and consider that this document may not be legally compliant as it may not meet the tests of the Habitats Directive.</p> <p>European wildlife sites are protected by the EU Birds and Habitats Directives ('the Habitats Directive') and, in particular, Article 6. The specific provisions of the Habitats Directive have been transposed into UK law by the Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. The UK Regulations place particular responsibilities on the decision makers namely Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council in relation to such sites. As competent authorities, the Local Authorities must have regard to these requirements, as advised in Circular 06/20053, which provides the procedure that should be followed in deciding whether to approve a proposal (a plan or project) that will potentially affect a European wildlife site.</p> <p>Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset are the authorities responsible for ensuring that Local Plan mitigates the potential adverse effect from the new population who may use the nearby areas of protected heath for recreation. If the supporting projects to be funded by CIL from April 2014 through the proposed heathland DPD and SPD are not examined in any detail other than by self-appointed representatives of the local authority, without any independent scrutiny, it cannot be adequately demonstrated that no adverse effects are likely.</p> <p>Natural England is the statutory consultee on biodiversity, and can advise on the effects of any planning application or plan in relation to the requirements of the Habitats Regulations. Planning authorities have an obligation to inform Natural England of their proposed decisions and the conditions attached prior to the issue of planning consent. Equally Natural England must satisfy themselves that the proposed mitigation in the form of SANGs alongside the supporting projects proposed for each authority together can provide the appropriate mitigation for potential harm. It is not clear that this test has been met given the down grading of mitigation projects to an SPD.</p>				
523893	Miss Lindsay Thompson	Senior Planner Terence O'Rourke Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS214</a>	157	ME3	No		Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>Bloor Homes has concern with some of the content of Appendix 5. The main issues identified are as follows:                      - By their nature the guidelines should be flexible and this is particularly important when providing design guidelines that need to deal with a range of different circumstances. The wording of the quality guidelines appears inflexible in places,</p>	For practical purposes it is suggested that the wording of qualitative guidelines for SANG provision involve the removal of 'must provide'	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Our Client has a significant interest in land at North Wimborne (Cranborne Road New Neighbourhood) and we therefore consider it to be important that we are able to participate orally at the examination to expand	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>through the use of the word 'must'. By definition, a guideline should not be mandatory. Substitution of the word 'must' with 'should ideally' throughout the appendix would reflect the practicalities of provision and provide the flexibility required by developers and decision makers to ensure an appropriate response is made on a site by site basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In respect of any proposed specification there would need to be some flexibility to consider the merits of provision in any particular and individual case.</li> <li>- The appendix mentions visitor surveys from the Dorset Heathlands and the Thames Basin. These surveys should form part of the evidence base to the local plan/core strategy and should be available for consideration. It is not clear how much the guidelines have relied on evidence from the Thames Basin Heaths and how this evidence particularly relates to the Dorset Heathlands.</li> <li>- SANG design guidance needs to ensure flexibility to ensure SANG to be provided to accommodate different development needs across the district. Flexibility in the wording of the policy would also ensure that SANG provided as development mitigation measures comply with the requirements of NPPF paragraph 204 that the planning obligations should be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.' If a SANG is intrinsically being designed to mitigate the impact of visitors to the Dorset Heathlands from across the County and beyond, there needs to be an appropriate mechanism in place to either allow flexibility or draw funding from across the County to deliver the SANG.</li> <li>-</li> </ul> <p>The issue of the requirements need to be tested and should be debated in a basis of a conurbation wide strategy in accordance with the duty to co-operate.</p>	and its replacement with 'should ideally provide' for flexibility and effective delivery.		on the comment we have made within this document.	
549174	Mr Justin Milward	Regional & Local Government Officer Woodland Trust	<a href="#">PCCS131</a>	157	ME3			Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>ME3 – Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (p.157) Under the 'Landscape &amp; Vegetation' heading, we are pleased to see the new reference to native woodland creation, but would like to see it further supported by a 'two for one' tree replacement policy in respect of trees lost as part of heathland restoration (Policy ME2). The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports the need for more habitat creation by stating that: 'Local planning authorities should: set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure', (DCLG, March 2012, para 114). Also para 117 states that: 'To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, planning policies should:....promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan'. The new England Biodiversity Strategy which makes it clear that expansion of priority habitats like native woodland</p>	In order for Policy ME2 on SANGs to be effective and justified, and to conform with national policy, we would like to see this support for native woodland creation linked to Policy ME2 – Protection of Dorset Heathlands. Where trees are removed as part of heathland restoration, we would like to see each tree replaced on a 'two for one' basis under the provision of SANGs.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>remains a key aim – ‘Priority action: Bring a greater proportion of our existing woodlands into sustainable management and expand the area of woodland in England’, (Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England’s wildlife and ecosystems services, DEFRA 2011, p.26).                      A reading of these new policies in the National Planning Policy Framework together with the England Biodiversity Strategy indicates that habitat expansion, like native woodland creation, should form a high priority for this Local Plan.                      Woodland creation also forms a significant element in the conclusions of the Government’s Independent Panel on Forestry, which states: ‘Ensure woodland creation, tree planting and maintenance is part of the green space plan for new commercial and housing development’ (Defra, Final Report, July 2012). It also recommends: ‘Government to commit to an ambition to sustainably increase England’s woodland cover from 10% to 15% by 2060, working with other landowners to create a more wooded landscape’.                      The South West Forestry Framework Implementation Plan 2009-2012 (Forestry Commission, 2009, Action 2.3) highlights the need to “Encourage tree planting and woodland establishment”, and this is repeated in Action 3.6 - “Develop spatial framework for targeting tree planting and woodland creation”. Woodland creation is also supported in the Dorset Biodiversity Strategy.</p>				
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">PCCS268</a>	157	ME3	Yes	Yes		<p>Natural England supports the modifications made to this policy. One wording error is detailed below:</p>	<p>There is one wording error:                      ‘Any residential development IN THE AREA BETWEEN (delete within) 400m and 5km of these areas will provided mitigation through a range of measures as set out in the Dorset Heathlands Joint Development Plan Document.’                      This is consistent with wording in the Dorset Heathlands SPD.                      In accordance with recent progress on the Dorset Heathlands DPD the following minor rewording is proposed:                      ‘The Dorset Heathlands (delete Joint) Development Plan Document AND SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT will set out the type of</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Natural England may be able to offer advice and reassurance to the Inspector about the reliance he may have on the effectiveness of the policy and any modification proposed.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										development circumstances, a list of projects which will be funded by developer contributions and the calculated contribution amounts as they apply to different types of development. Projects delivered though the Development Plan Document will include Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), heathland access and visitor management, wardening, education, habitat re-creation and other appropriate avoidance measures. THESE MITIGATION MEASURES WILL BE REVIEWED AND REVISED WHERE NECESSARY AND MODIFICATIONS BROUGHT FORWARD FOR CONSULTATION THROUGH THE SPD REFRESH IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE AVAILABLE EVIDENCE.'			
654618	Mr Peter Tanner	Tanner & Tilley Planning Consultants	<a href="#">PCCS476</a>	157	ME3	Yes	No	Justified	Whilst we support the deletion of Policy ME3 and the proposal to provide guidance on SANG's in relation to Policy ME2 in Appendix 5, we object to the inclusion in the fourth paragraph to reference to "...the means to provide mitigation for development of a residential nature within or close to 5km of the Dorset Heathlands...". The requirements of Policy ME2 and this guidance should apply to development within 5km of the Dorset Heathlands and there is no justification to apply the requirements to developments beyond this distance.	Amend wording of fourth paragraph of proposed Appendix 5 to Policy ME2 as follows, "...the means to provide mitigation for development of a residential nature within (delete following words in brackets) (or close to) 5km of the Dorset Heathlands...".	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
654817	Mr Alan Spencer		<a href="#">PCCS134</a>	157	ME3		No	Positively Prepared Effective	Accessibility - reaching the SANGS The policy has been worded as a catch all for people arriving at SANGs either by Car or on Foot, and as a consequence creates an ambiguity as to the facilities one can expect in a SANG. It also leaves an option for the Developer or Council to provide more car parking spaces in New Neighbourhoods which are situated close to dwellings rather than their aim of providing alternative green space.	Since the two modes of transport walking and motoring do not sit comfortably alongside each other, I ask that 2 policies are created for SANGs, those being with car parks and those	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									Although the policy does differentiate between SANGs close to Heath land and close to Neighbourhoods, in its present form it contradicts Objective 6 of the Core Strategy which sets out the ideal of encouraging the public to walk or cycle to SANGs rather than use the car. It should be obvious that any car parks provided in New Neighbourhood SANGs will become free car parks for visitors to Town Centres and / or be utilised as overflow parking for residential streets, as is the current practice.	without. In addition I contend that SANGs within walking distance of New Neighbourhoods should not contain car parks and I therefore expect the Core Strategy to identify such a policy in support of Objective 6.			
717053	Mrs Janet Healy		<a href="#">PCCS89</a>	157	ME3	Yes	No	Effective	We support much of appendix 5. It is a tremendous improvement over the policy in the pre-submission document. We still need evidence though to show whether this policy is working and the heathlands are not being degraded. Our main objections/comments are as follows: SANGS within walking distance of new neighbourhoods should not have parking spaces, access should be by foot only. Otherwise there is a danger that these spaces will be used by visitors to the neighbourhood, or by people visiting the town, they would not benefit those wanting to use the SANG. Although it is appreciated that dogs can do much damage on heathlands and therefore it is important to encourage dog walkers away from heathland, SANGS must not be designed purely for dogs. However, if the proportion of dog walkers is likely to be high, then possibly water facilities should be provided in order to protect any natural water features where dogs may inadvertently harm the wildlife. We agree that SANGS should never be next to playing fields, they have had such awful problems in Ferndown with dog walkers and playing fields. Proximity should be avoided at all costs. SANGS close to/next to heathlands should also be avoided in case the dogs stray into the heaths.	Modify the recommendations for car parking. Assume the SANG will have more general uses other than dog walking, but make any natural features 'dog proof'. Avoid SANGS next to heathland, and never allow them next to playing fields in order to protect the young sports people. Each SANG needs to be suited to its locality and local requirements. One size does not fit all.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	Other ecological groups will be able to argue these points to better effect.	
718577	Mr Richard Terry		<a href="#">PCCS138</a>	157	ME3	Yes	No	Justified Effective	With limited residential development land identified the burden on developers is too great - the provision of increasing costs - heathland mitigation, transport and many other items. This will lead to reduced offers for land and potentially reducing the supply of land as owners will not sell.	Reduce the burden on developers throughout the plan.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719394	Ms Jade Ellis	Assistant Planner Turley Associates	<a href="#">PCCS302</a>	157	ME3		No	Effective	Reference to specific circular walk distance necessary within SANGs (page 103) is not sufficiently flexible to satisfy the Effective test of soundness in our view. Nor is there evidence presented to suggest the overall net contribution of a varied supply of SANGS, to meet the varied recreational needs of the population, would not be effective.	The text should be revised to be less prescriptive and more positive in support of: 1. A proportional approach that reflects an individual developments impact on the SPA (where on site SANG provision is proven necessary); 2. Positively encourage varied SANG provisions off-site that mitigate the	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I would like to confirm that we would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of client's interests at Wimborne/Colehill.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										level of housing proposed in the JCS.			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS231</a>	160	ME5	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	We object to this amendment. We are unclear as to the justification of the reduction to 10%.	We would welcome some clarification of the basis for this significant amendment.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS462</a>	160	ME5		No	Consistent with national policy	As advised in our response to Objective 3, we do not support the reduction of aspirational targets for renewable energy provision. Arguments about viability cannot be sustained when the technology that might be applicable to any site over the Plan period is unknown as is the level of Government incentives. We should be striving to achieve the maximum that is technically possible as required in NPPF 97.	Revert to original aspiration of at least 15%.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS478</a>	160	ME5	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>The basis of the reduction of the renewable energy target from 15% to 10% is not sound. It is inconsistent with National Energy Policy and the Government's target in National Energy Policy EN-1. It is also inconsistent with NPPF paragraph 93 that emphasises the role planning plays to secure radical reductions in greenhouse emissions and supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon infrastructure. Paragraph 95 – third bullet point- requires LPAs to set standards for sustainability consistent with the Government's policy.</p> <p>A reduction of Renewable Energy provision reduction to 10% within the policy is not justified on viability grounds. The very fact that larger proportions of total energy used must be from renewable sources will assist in driving down unit prices.</p> <p>(1) Legally compliant: Yes No                      (2) Sound*: Yes No</p> <p>Positively Prepared:                      Justified:                      Effective:                      Consistent with national policy:</p> <p>The plan is for the period to 2026 and the aspirations of the Council should reflect the Government's increasing reliance on renewables when zero carbon solutions are sought by 2016 and show some future ambition. The renewables industry is changing rapidly and prices are becoming increasingly competitive. This is a cost to development in the way that building standards are a cost and should be borne as a normal cost rather than seen as an abnormal that affects viability.</p> <p>This position is supported by evidence in the recent Dorset wide renewable strategy where renewable resources have been mapped. The consultants preparing the report concluded exact type, size and location of technologies installed on the ground will be determined by decisions on individual planning applications. It is too early to be specific about the mix of technologies that are likely to be the most efficient and cost effective at the time of the development due to the rapidly changing market.</p> <p>The Dorset Strategy recognised that no one technology on</p>	The policy needs to altered to say: " Total renewable energy use within these types of development will be consistent with national government standards"	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	New Forest Energy is a local renewable provider and believe they have a legitimate concern based on experience of the local market that the proposed policy change is unsound for the reasons set out at 6.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>its own, even at maximum deployment, can be relied upon to reach the targets for low carbon and renewable production. It concluded that in reality, the exact type, size and location of technologies installed on the ground will be determined by the individual planning applications and projects that are brought forward by developers, individuals or communities. It is quite wrong therefore to dismiss the government's target based on general evidence of viability on an unknown solution on each site This policy change is not effective and not necessary as a caveat on viability remains in the policy text.</p> <p>The policy aspiration should remain with the Government target and each proposal should be considered on a site by site basis against this policy with relevant information coming forward at the time of determination. There are many opportunities for sites to achieve a higher proportion of renewable energy use with no negative effect on viability, and those opportunities will increase over time as renewable energy market matures. In addition Green Deal, FIT and RHI incentives will change over time and may make renewable provision more cost effective than carbon intensive energy use.</p>				
654817	Mr Alan Spencer		<a href="#">PCCS133</a>	160	ME5		No	Justified	<p>The policy, by reducing its target from 15% to 10%, is ignoring that future innovation can have an impact in reducing the effects of Climate Change. It also gives a message to developers and the public that climate change is not a serious issue.</p> <p>10% is a soft target; it is quite easily achievable with modern materials and processes.</p>	Revert the objective back to 15%. Identify that this is a target and will be revised as future development and innovation impacts materials and processes in future years.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
717890	Angela Pooley	Co-ordinator East Dorset Friends of the Earth	<a href="#">PCCS117</a>	160	ME5	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	<p>Reducing the target for renewables from 15% to 10% is contrary to the UK's binding target of achieving a minimum of 15% of all energy coming from renewables. It also contrary to the policies in the Bournemouth, Dorset &amp; Poole Renewable Energy Strategy to 2020.</p>	Reinstate the 15% target as a minimum to reach by 2020	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719947	Mrs Susan Phyllis Christine Chapman		<a href="#">PCCS400</a>	160	ME5	No	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	<p>Target has been altered to 10% rather than 15%. This is not in line with "presumption in favour of sustainable development". Rt Hon Greg Clarke, Minister for Planning in National Planning Policy Framework. "Development that is sustainable should go ahead without delay... we respond to the changes that new technology is offering us.... living within the planet's environmental limits... not refuse permission for... infrastructure which... promotes sustainability. Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area... i.e. encourage the use of renewable resources.</p>	<p>The original wording should be retained: "The expectation will be that 15% of the total energy used... will be from such energy sources." It would be preferable of course if this percentage could be increased to 25%. Germany currently produces 25% of its electricity from renewables. We should decarbonise as soon as possible, given the current state of atmospheric carbon.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Christchurch Council need to understand why swift action on carbon is critical.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally complaint or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Urban & East Dorset Living Landscapes Manager Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">PCCS356</a>	161	New Policy ME8		No	Consistent with national policy	Dorset Wildlife Trust consider that ME8 could conflict with ME1 with the paragraph permitting development where " It would not have an adverse ecological impact upon the integrity of protected habitats and species unless there is no alternative solution and there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest". We consider that there should also be reference to priority habitats and species and continue to be a requirement to mitigate or compensate for any harm to the natural environment where such schemes are approved.	1. DWT suggests additional wording to include priority habitats and species. 2. DWT suggests wording that where there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest, measures will be provided to mitigate or compensate any harm.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS242</a>	161	New Policy ME8	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	We generally support the aims of this new policy. However, we consider that there are some environmental risks as the policy is currently drafted.	Renewable schemes are not necessarily benign for the environment. We suggest the addition of text which highlights the need for schemes to be comprehensively assessed and to avoid or mitigate for potential harm, in accordance with policy ME1.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The Plan raises issues of nature conservation importance, matters with which the RSPB is familiar and has considerable expertise. We are active in the Plan area as advocates for sustainable development and biodiversity conservation. We wish to reserve the opportunity to appear at an examination of nature conservation issues. We consider that we are in well positioned to advise an Inspector on these matters.	
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS464</a>	161	New Policy ME8		No	Effective	While accepting that policies throughout the Core Strategy are mutually dependent there could be risk of this policy conflicting with biodiversity policy, ME1.	We advise greater clarity to avoid problems.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		<a href="#">PCCS499</a>	161	New Policy ME8	Yes	No	Effective	With regard to renewable energy apparatus, how does the Council measure "it will not cause significant harm to a neighbouring amenity by reason of... ."? What is meant by "significant"? There must surely be a demonstrative formula to measure perceived harm.	A clause should be added stating what formula will be used to measure any harm which might come to a community.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
474490	Mrs Sheila Bourton	Chairman Keep Wimborne Green	<a href="#">PCCS500</a>	161	New Policy ME8	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Effective	How does the Council measure "significant harm to a neighbouring amenity...."? What is meant by "significant"?	There must be a demonstrative formula to measure perceived harm	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS490</a>	161	New Policy ME8				Please note that with the new policy additions KS13 and ME8 the previous objections about these omissions have now been overcome.				
654456	Mr Elliot Marx		<a href="#">PCCS224</a>	161	New Policy ME8	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	"The Councils encourage the sustainable use and generation of energy from renewable and low carbon sources where adverse social, environmental and visual impacts have been minimised to an acceptable level." "The judgment of at what point impacts have been minimized to 'acceptable' levels is open to challenge as the New Policy ME8 proposed here will not result in the needed amount of renewable energy being generated. Privileging visual amenity over physical safety as a planning strategy is a dangerous and misguided and will seriously erode our chance of increasing the proportion of renewable energy we generate. Our physical safety will be at risk with resultant weather instability and global warming. Geothermal is pie in	Loss of visual amenity should not be a deciding factor in granting permission for installation of wind turbines or any other renewable energy installation. The need for new renewable energy generation is too urgent to compromise development in this way. If visual amenity were given its proportionate	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>the sky—wind is realistic and here now. Global warming and the consequences of climate change far outweigh the importance of preserving a view. There will be life and death matters to worry about if we don't urgently address climate change—stop burning fossil fuels, use wind and other sources suited to our geography and weather, reduce our energy needs, and conserve energy (a strategy dubbed 'Negawatts')</p> <p>The UK needs to do everything it can to prevent a catastrophic 2 degree temperature change—government wants increase in renewable energy—UK is the most favourably situated region for generation of electricity by wind.</p> <p>This part of the Core Strategy needs to be rewritten or the whole region will end up as a no-go area for wind renewables. This will have disastrous consequences for meeting national targets for renewable energy, and accelerate the climate change we are already witnessing. Planners, take heed!</p> <p>Letter from retired Engineer Dan Fish, a New Forest resident nearby who is a living example of sustainable living and guest speaker for Transition Town Christchurch :</p> <p>Hello,</p> <p>I am extremely disappointed to hear that it is being agreed across the region that wind turbines should be opposed on appearance grounds (I think both on shore and off shore installations) This is a seriously wrong decision. While it cannot be disputed that some oppose wind farms as unnecessary and visibly undesirable nor can it be disputed that that the climate worldwide is getting warmer and that far the major proportion of climate scientists say that this is due to CO2 and other gases released over the last 150 years by industrial development (burning fossil fuels, oil coal and gas). As a result the scientists are quite clear that we must not merely reduce the amount of 'greenhouse' gas released but to avoid run away global over heating we must substantially stop burning fossil fuels virtually completely by about 2050. Of course this is a massive task and of course our irresponsible and short term politicians prevaricate because of the short term (only) hard ship that this will cause but it can be done by developing every practical source of genuinely clean renewable source of energy and also by reducing the amount of energy we use. By enthusiastically taking up the challenge and giving the world a lead we can win this but we have got to really try and not merely drum up the same false objections as excuses for inaction.</p> <p>Of course we know that the wind doesn't blow all the time (any more than the sun shines or the tide flows or the waves heave) but it does blow a lot of the time and is usually blowing somewhere thus making it one of our most valuable sources of totally clean electricity. When we rely entirely on intermittent sources such as wind we will have to develop and install energy storage facilities. This can be done (there are several proven and reliable methods but with relatively little wind energy being produced at the moment there is not</p>	importance as a consideration of minor gravity, this Core Strategy would be in line with National targets. A strategy on renewable energy generation is required by NPPF—but not this one.			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									yet need. What else do the objectors propose as a source of energy? Natural gas is a source of greenhouse gas so must not be developed and any way will run out eventually even with the delights of 'Fracking'. Hydropower is excellent but there is little more to be developed in Britain. Tidal power is also excellent but expensive to develop and limited in quantity. No one has yet produced a wave energy device which produces power reliably or anything like as cheaply a wind power. Nuclear is a possible but there are far too many questions to be answered. Do we really want hundreds more nuclear power plants in the world? (Or even worse coal.) Wind is totally clean. It produces no pollution. Wind pays back the energy used to install it in months rather than years. When a wind generator is removed it leaves almost no footprint. It uses hardly any land space. You can farm underneath it and around it or fish round it, it improves the fishing, sail past it easily and safely. In spite of its detractors it produces hardly any noise (There is quite a large wind generator in the middle of Penzance town!) It is currently one of the least expensive sources of electricity and unlike other sources the price keeps falling and most important we have plenty of wind."				
717890	Angela Pooley	Co-ordinator East Dorset Friends of the Earth	<a href="#">PCCS118</a>	161	New Policy ME8	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The wording for this policy is unjustifiably negative and suggests a lack of commitment to renewable technology, in particular, wind.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718911	Mr Joshua Lambert	Planning Assistant Pro Vision Planning and Design	<a href="#">PCCS176</a>	161	New Policy ME8	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	The Estate supports policy ME8 as the policy is consistent with Paragraph 97 of the NPPF, which states the following: "To help increase the use and supply of renewable energy, local planning authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable sources. They should: • have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources; and • design their policies to maximise renewable and low carbon energy development."		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS399</a>	162	ME6	Yes	Yes		As the Lead Local Flood Authority, Dorset County Council has responsibility to develop a strategy to tackle local flood risks and to ensure that other plans and policies accord with it. It was noted at the Pre-Submission stage that a number of references in the Core Strategy needed updating and new ones included to ensure that it reflected the County Council's responsibilities in respect of flood risk management. Changes have been proposed to para 13.33 and Policy ME6 and a number of minor changes have been proposed in the AoR (paras 6.47, 7.205, 8.61) to address these concerns. Dorset County Council supports these proposed changes				
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS463</a>	162	ME6		No	Justified	The revised wording needs slight correction so that it makes sense. Where exceptionally any development ... Remove the word "all"	The revised wording needs slight correction so that it makes sense. Where exceptionally any	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										development ... Remove the word "all"			
490815	Mrs Trish Jamieson	Clerk Burton Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS482</a>	162	ME6				Supports the strengthening of the restrictions on building in areas likely to flood. Notes that this policy as strengthened will protect Burton Village from development in unsatisfactory areas.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS398</a>	162	13.33	Yes	Yes		As the Lead Local Flood Authority, Dorset County Council has responsibility to develop a strategy to tackle local flood risks and to ensure that other plans and policies accord with it. It was noted at the Pre-Submission stage that a number of references in the Core Strategy needed updating and new ones included to ensure that it reflected the County Council's responsibilities in respect of flood risk management. Changes have been proposed to para 13.33 and Policy ME6 and a number of minor changes have been proposed in the AoR (paras 6.47, 7.205, 8.61) to address these concerns. Dorset County Council supports these proposed changes				
359478	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	West Territory Planner English Heritage	<a href="#">PCCS289</a>	166	HE1		No		Policy HE1 - Protection of local historic and architectural interest, page 166 The Schedule of Proposed Changes relating to Policy HE1 indicates a Policy that is unclear, repetitive, incomplete and inconsistent with the NPPF. The title, as previously mentioned, is misleading. The first paragraph only refers to the protection of heritage assets rather than its conservation which includes its protection and enhancement. It also appears to be superfluous as it repeats the second paragraph. The third paragraph is grammatically confusing and again repeats the first and second sentences in part. The fourth paragraph makes a welcome reference to Local Lists, the use of Article 4 Directions and the updating of conservation area appraisals. It then goes on to state 'Development proposals affecting such sites or buildings will be sympathetic to their character and will respect their key architectural or historic features'. Again this does not read well e.g. which "sites or buildings", nor does it appear to be consistent with the language of the NPPF. The Policy is also silent in a few areas that could be expected to have been included. As a consequence to accord with the NPPF, I would recommend that the policy is redrafted. As you intend to prepare a separate Development Management DPD, a Strategic Core Policy for the Historic Environment need not go into how applications should be considered. A possible version could however include the following: You could go on here to refer to key historic elements of both area(s) to be given particular conservation emphasis e.g. the distinctive market towns such as Wimborne; Christchurch Quay; Highcliffe and Christchurch castles; 11th century Christchurch Priory Church and Saxon Mill; site of a civil war siege in 1645; the setting of Wimborne Minster; significant Neolithic, iron age, bronze age, and roman archaeological landscape; prominent estates such as Cranborne and Wimborne St Giles etc.				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
490815	Mrs Trish Jamieson	Clerk Burton Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS483</a>	166	HE1				Supports the new wording. Points out that Burton is a conservation area and that Burton Farm was identified as an irreplaceable resource.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
501560	Mr Christopher Clarke		<a href="#">PCCS47</a>	166	HE1	Yes	No	Effective	The proposed changes to Policy HE1 are very much better than the original. However, there is still a discrepancy between the description of the heritage assets to be protected in para 1 of the amended text, and the fourth para (starting "Article 4.."). The first para is more all-embracing than the fourth para, which refers only to key buildings and structures.	The fourth paragraphs should ideally read - "Article 4 directions... Local lists of heritage assets will identify those buildings, sites and other assets set out in para XX above (i.e. the first para of the changed text) which, although not..." By doing this, there is consistency, and text becomes sound.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
653893	Mr Michael Bailey		<a href="#">PCCS371</a>	166	HE1				HE1 - Page 166. This section includes a statement "Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and will be conserved and where appropriate enhanced for their historic significance and importance locally to the wider social, cultural and economic environment." Burton Farm clearly has heritage importance. Such a statement can be interpreted in many ways and appears to be so designed as to leave open the possibility of redeveloping the old barns and possibly the farm itself. The tenant farmers are not able to continue running the dairy farm if this development proceeds. Meyrick Estates have stated in their document "Land South of Burton - Support Statement" that the farm will close if the development is approved. The Burton farm operation is of heritage importance, it has "valuable architectural and historic merit and makes a positive contribution to the local character of the village." Burton is a farming community whose existence goes back many centuries. Who are we to destroy such a heritage. I object to the proposed development on the grounds that it fails to conserve Burton's heritage in any way. Councillor Nottage has stated in an email that the Conservation Area Appraisal would not be amended. However in HE1 has been added "Conservation Area and special Character Area Appraisal will be updated." What is it to be? It appears that the Council are altering the Conservation Area Appraisal to meet the changes made by this development rather than the other way round. I object to this bending of the rules. Christchurch Council's cavalier attitude towards the residents of Burton are against all the principles of a democratic society. There would appear to be no arguments that will alter the decisions which have been made to proceed with the development. It is overwhelmingly believed that these decisions are already made and that any objections will be ignored.				
656832	Mr		<a href="#">PCCS285</a>	166	HE1				The following statement has been added to this section -				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
	Paul Ramsey								'Conservation Area and Special Character Appraisal will be updated.' Why is this? Why are the Council attempting to change the Conservation Area Appraisal, just to accommodate this development? I object to this.				
657138	Mr Mike Hirsh	Intelligent Land	<a href="#">PCCS63</a>	166	HE1	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The Policy omits the reference to criteria for the use of Heritage Assets for residential purposes and fails to describe the context of viability as being 'optimal', there is also no reference to enabling development. It therefore fails to meet the position set out at paragraph 55 bullet point 2 of the NPPF, which places it in conflict with 'saved' policy CSIDE2 of the EDLP.	There is the option of expanding the wording by adding 'optimal' before viable re-use in the second paragraph. Then adding a further sentence which advises: Whilst generally isolated rural dwellings are to be avoided, the use of heritage assets for a dwelling(s) may be an exception where the proposal is the most constructive use of the heritage asset. In addition enabling development may also be considered to secure the future of such assets provided such proposals do not undermine the integrity of the asset or its setting.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
662364	Mr Peter Fenning		<a href="#">PCCS363</a>	166	HE1	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Effective	Christchurch has a rich archaeological heritage which is virtually ignored throughout the Core Strategy and proposed changes to it. Current Local Plan and Structure Policies - LP BE14, LP BE20, SP EPQ and SP EPS are combined into a bland universal Policy HE1. The proposed changes to HE1 (page 112 of Proposed Changes document) are still inadequate.	Proposed changes to HE1 are inadequate and do not afford protection to ancient monuments.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
663076	Mrs Sheila Richards		<a href="#">PCCS124</a>	166	HE1				An additional statement in this section states that 'Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and will be conserved and where appropriate enhanced for their historic significance and importance locally to the wider social, cultural and economic environment'. I would imagine that Burton Farm would come under the category of Heritage.				
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS401</a>	167	HE2	Yes			At the Pre-submission stage the County Council requested that cultural needs should be given more prominence in the Plan that reference should be made to the Dorset Cultural Strategy 2009-14 and more emphasis should be given to the importance of good design and means of ensuring this is achieved Christchurch and East Dorset Councils' response (in the AoR para 3.12) that the Cultural Strategy is relevant and the text at para 1.26 - 27 will be amended to reference the Dorset Cultural Strategy 2009-14, is noted. Design guidance is discussed in Chapter 14 - Creating High Quality and Distinctive Environments. A change is proposed				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									to Policy HE2 to make reference to the Council's intention to prepare an "East Dorset Urban Design Guide" to complement the Countryside Design Summary and set out some basic requirements for good design in the urban areas. Dorset County Council supports these proposed changes to para 1.26-1.27 and Policy HE2.				
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	<a href="#">PCCS465</a>	167	HE2		No	Positively Prepared	Analysis para 9.58 commits to including light pollution but has not done so. It is not covered by "amenity". The changes have not addressed ETAG concerns.	We retain our objection and recommendations	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		<a href="#">PCCS23</a>	167	HE2	Yes	No	Effective	Although I agree that it is very important to minimize general disturbance to existing properties, I am concerned as to how this will be measured and policed? What level of disturbance is acceptable?	A clause should be added to state just how disturbance would be measured and what redress existing households will have regarding any adverse disturbance.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
474490	Mrs Sheila Bourton	Chairman Keep Wimborne Green	<a href="#">PCCS35</a>	167	HE2	Yes	No	Effective	With regard to minimising general disturbance to nearby properties, we agree that this is very important but how will this be policed?. Who decides what level of disturbance is acceptable?	There should be more detail given to this and it should be specified what department is responsible for ensuring that disturbance to existing properties is kept to a minimum and there should be a recognised means of measuring "acceptable" disturbance	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS432</a>	176	LN3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Whilst the Proposed Change to Policy LN 3 is welcomed, it still maintains an approach to the provision of affordable housing that will threaten the delivery of housing, including the expected level of development on greenfield sites. In particular, the policy still seeks to obtain up to 50% provision on the urban extension sites, although evidence that is being used to inform the future Community Infrastructure Levy already concludes that provision in excess of 30 – 35% will render sites non-viable. The Proposed Change also fails to adequately address the difference between viability and deliverability. The latter is critical, as insufficient returns for either the landowner or the developer will act as a constraint to the achievement of the housing element of the Core Strategy. Paragraph 173 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear on this point; development must "... provide competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable." Therefore, the scale of obligations should not be as great as to act as a burden to the development process. In particular, Policy LN 3 states a preference for the tenure split of affordable housing to include 70% as affordable rented or social rented. Unless supported by substantial grant aid, the latter has the impact of producing negative land values.	Amend the policy to refer to greenfield development providing up to 35% affordable housing. Delete the reference to tenure split.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine issues of viability and deliverability.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>Positive returns from the non-affordable housing can be insufficient to redress the balance and make a site financially attractive for development.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Core Strategy seeks to plan for development over a long term period. Market conditions will therefore change. However, increasing house prices will not necessarily result in greater finance being available for additional or increased planning policy obligations.</p> <p>Development costs will continue to increase, particularly in response to increasing environmental standards.</p>				
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS414</a>	176	LN3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>Whilst the Proposed Change to Policy LN 3 is welcomed, it still maintains an approach to the provision of affordable housing that will threaten the delivery of housing, including the expected level of development on greenfield sites. In particular, the policy still seeks to obtain up to 50% provision on the urban extension sites, although evidence that is being used to inform the future Community Infrastructure Levy already concludes that provision in excess of 30 – 35% will render sites non-viable.</p> <p>The Proposed Change also fails to adequately address the difference between viability and deliverability. The latter is critical, as insufficient returns for either the landowner or the developer will act as a constraint to the achievement of the housing element of the Core Strategy. Paragraph 173 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear on this point; development must "... provide competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable."</p> <p>Therefore, the scale of obligations should not be as great as to act as a burden to the development process. In particular, Policy LN 3 states a preference for the tenure split of affordable housing to include 70% as affordable rented or social rented. Unless supported by substantial grant aid, the latter has the impact of producing negative land values.</p> <p>Positive returns from the non-affordable housing can be insufficient to redress the balance and make a site financially attractive for development.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Core Strategy seeks to plan for development over a long term period. Market conditions will therefore change. However, increasing house prices will not necessarily result in greater finance being available for additional or increased planning policy obligations.</p> <p>Development costs will continue to increase, particularly in response to increasing environmental standards.</p> <p>(1) Legally compliant: Yes X (2) Sound*: No X Positively Prepared: No Justified: No X Effective: No X Consistent with national policy: NO X</p>	<p>Amend the policy to refer to greenfield development providing up to 35% affordable housing.</p> <p>Delete the reference to tenure split.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine issues of viability and deliverability.	
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby's Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS428</a>	176	LN3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>Whilst the Proposed Change to Policy LN 3 is welcomed, it still maintains an approach to the provision of affordable housing that will threaten the delivery of housing, including</p>	<p>Amend the policy to refer to greenfield development providing up to 35%</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine issues of viability and deliverability.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>the expected level of development on greenfield sites. In particular, the policy still seeks to obtain up to 50% provision on the urban extension sites, although evidence that is being used to inform the future Community Infrastructure Levy already concludes that provision in excess of 30 – 35% will render sites non-viable.</p> <p>The Proposed Change also fails to adequately address the difference between viability and deliverability. The latter is critical, as insufficient returns for either the landowner or the developer will act as a constraint to the achievement of the housing element of the Core Strategy. Paragraph 173 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear on this point; development must "... provide competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable."</p> <p>Therefore, the scale of obligations should not be as great as to act as a burden to the development process. In particular, Policy LN 3 states a preference for the tenure split of affordable housing to include 70% as affordable rented or social rented. Unless supported by substantial grant aid, the latter has the impact of producing negative land values. Positive returns from the non-affordable housing can be insufficient to redress the balance and make a site financially attractive for development.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Core Strategy seeks to plan for development over a long term period. Market conditions will therefore change. However, increasing house prices will not necessarily result in greater finance being available for additional or increased planning policy obligations. Development costs will continue to increase, particularly in response to increasing environmental standards.</p>	affordable housing. Delete the reference to tenure split.			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">PCCS105</a>	176	LN3	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	The amended policy wording only addresses our concerns over the use of the housing target as a starting point for negotiation. All other comments in relation to this policy made in previous representations (Our Ref: M5/0103-07 or M4/0514-09) still stand.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359284	Miss Lynne Evans	Consultant Southern Planning Practice	<a href="#">PCCS247</a>	176	LN3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>The proposed changes to the policy are noted but they are not considered to meet the concerns submitted at the Submission stage. Objection is therefore continued for the same reasons as before, and as set out again below.</p> <p>Hall &amp; Woodhouse support the objective to bring forward affordable housing in response to the identified need for affordable housing. However, objection is raised to the requirement for affordable housing on proposals involving any net increase in residential provision and therefore including development proposals as small as those promoting even 1 net new dwelling.</p> <p>The concern is that rather than assisting in bringing forward affordable housing, the policy trigger sought will hinder housing development coming forward and frustrate the realisation of the fundamental policy objectives of the Core Strategy. The policy is therefore ineffective and unsound. The whole aim of the NPPF is to secure sustainable</p>	Reconsideration needs to be given to the minimum scale of development, before an affordable housing requirement is triggered.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The representations submitted raise important and complex policy issues which require oral examination and round table discussion in order that the Inspector can be properly informed in reaching a decision on the soundness of the Plan	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>development and to help secure much needed development across the country. Whilst the importance of affordable housing provision is supported in the NPPF, this particular policy, in setting such a low threshold is likely to stymie development and therefore is inconsistent with national planning policy objectives to help bring forward much needed development.</p> <p>The trigger for requiring affordable housing to be provided on site, off site or through a financial contribution requires rethinking to enable smaller developments to continue to come forward and contribute to the vitality and prosperity of the local community. The Council's own Meeting Local Needs Background Paper recognises that the requirements for affordable housing must not inhibit the strategic objectives for housing and economic growth. However, it is contended that in promoting this policy it has not heeded its own concerns.</p> <p>The NPPF also emphasises that policies need to be flexible to respond to changing market circumstances and there is no indication in the policy that there is scope for flexibility.</p>				
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS406</a>	176	LN3	Yes	Yes		<p>The County Council notes the comments in the AoR (Paras 16.125 and 16.126) in response to its concern that the plan failed to adequately address the needs of older and vulnerable people. In follow up discussions between District and County Council officers it was agreed that the Core Strategy should ensure that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New development proposals for extra-care housing and care homes (market or affordable) should take into account the impacts on health and social care services and be supported by robust evidence of local need;</li> <li>• Development proposals should fit within the wider strategic framework for the Dorset County Council area and the East Dorset and Christchurch Housing Strategy;</li> <li>• Proposals for extra-care accommodation to be sold or let on the open market should be required to make an affordable housing contribution in accordance with Policy LN3;</li> <li>• The Councils should support and encourage Lifetime Homes;</li> <li>• A proportion of affordable homes on larger scale housing developments should be provided for those with special or supported housing need.</li> </ul> <p>To address these matters, new text and Policy LN7 are proposed as well as amendments to Policy LN3 on the Provision of Affordable Housing (in particular the last two paragraphs).</p> <p>Dorset County Council supports the new Policy LN7 and supporting text as well as the proposed changes to LN3 (last two paragraphs).</p>				
359555	Mr L Hewitt	Town Clerk Wimborne Minster Town Council	<a href="#">PCCS58</a>	176	LN3				<p>Although there is no provision on the response form to register support for a particular policy, please note that on pages 116-121 - Policy LN3 - the Town Council strongly supports the proposals for affordable housing in the hope</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									that there can be early provision of such accommodation for the benefit of local young people who badly need homes.				
475144	Sophia Thorpe	Gleeson Strategic Land Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS174</a>	176	LN3	Yes	Yes		Gleeson also supports the amendments to Policy LN3 in relation to the provision of affordable housing. We had made comments in relation to this policy in previous consultations to the Core Strategy and we are pleased to see that the policy has been amended to reduce the affordable housing provision required for the housing allocations.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS484</a>	176	LN3				MEM Ltd welcomes revision to the level of affordable housing expectation based on the CIL viability testing.				
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS195</a>	176	LN3		No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The increased affordable housing provision of up to 50% in revised policy is not justified by the evidence base on grounds of viability. Furthermore, we are concerned that the evidence base has not taken the full range of likely development costs and the likely impact on the overall viability of the plan into account.	The affordable housing provision should be set at a target level which reflects viability considerations for the overall plan and emerging CIL. Greater flexibility on tenure mix should be incorporated into the policy to allow for a higher proportion of intermediate housing.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes in relation to land to the north of Christchurch Road, West Parley that forms the FWP4 allocation in the Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.	
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	<a href="#">PCCS203</a>	176	LN3		No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The affordable housing provision of up to 50% sought in revised policy is not justified by the evidence base on grounds of viability. Furthermore, we are concerned that the evidence base has not taken the full range of likely development costs and the likely impact on the overall viability of the plan into account.	The affordable housing provision should be set at a target level which reflects viability considerations for the overall plan and emerging CIL. Greater flexibility on tenure mix should be incorporated into the policy to allow for a higher proportion of intermediate housing.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Savills are acting on behalf of the Canford Estate and Harry J Palmer Ltd in relation to their landholdings on the edge of Corfe Mullen that form part of the CM1 allocation in the Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy. We are seeking participation at the oral part of the examination in order to help ensure that the plan is sound and deliverable.	
523893	Miss Lindsay Thompson	Senior Planner Terence O'Rourke Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS208</a>	176	LN3		No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The policy wording should provide greater clarification from the outset that affordable housing provision will be subject to viability. The policy wording acknowledges that the mix of affordable housing units will be subject to negotiation but then it states that this mix "must reflect local housing needs". The later form of wording will restrict the ability of the Council and the developer to negotiate an appropriate solution on a site-by-site basis. We suggest adding flexibility to the policy by changing the wording from "must" to "should ideally". This enables both parties to enter negotiations on mix.	Amend the first paragraph to read: "To maximise affordable housing provision, whilst ensuring flexibility and sufficient margins to facilitate housing delivery, the Councils will require all residential developments to meet the following affordable housing requirements WHERE VIABILITY TESTING DEMONSTRATES IT CAN BE ACHIEVED:" Amended the paragraph	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Our Client has a significant interest in land a North Wimborne (Cranborne Road New Neighbourhood) and we therefore consider it to be important that we are able to participate orally at the examination to expand on the comment we have made within this document.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally complaint or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										following the title Affordable Housing Requirements to read: "The mix of affordable housing units will be subject to negotiations and agreement with the Council but in any event SHOULD IDEALLY reflect local housing needs identified in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment,"			
619967	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation (South West)	<a href="#">PCCS112</a>	176	LN3	No		Justified Consistent with national policy	<p>The policy is unsound as it is unjustified and contrary to national policy.</p> <p>I refer to my earlier representations. The observations that I made in my earlier representations still stand: the Councils have not demonstrated how these target rates for affordable housing are viable. Nor have the Councils included in their viability assessments the costs associated with meeting many other policies that they propose to introduce in the new Core Strategy even though these policies will impact upon the viability of residential schemes. These costs include those associated with meeting the following proposed policy requirements as set out in the Core Strategy:</p> <p>HE4: Open Space provision                      Policy ME2: Protection of the Dorset Heathlands                      Policy ME3: Alternative Natural Greenspace                      Policy LN1: the size and type of new dwellings                      Housing and accommodation proposals for vulnerable people (Lifetime Homes)</p> <p>These are very serious omissions which will add significantly to the cost of development. The Council has not reflected all the costs that the core strategy intends to impose on development to assess what impact this will have on development viability while still ensuring that competitive returns are provided for landowners and developers (paragraphs 173-177 of the Framework). This is necessary to ensure that the core strategy is deliverable. As such we recommend that the Core Strategy is withdrawn and the Councils reconsider the costs associated with these policies by carrying out a more through viability assessment of the core strategy.</p> <p>Assessing viability on an application-by-application basis is no longer an acceptable remedy for what is otherwise an undeliverable plan. The burden of proof is on the LPA to ensure that its policies are deliverable in the majority of instances, especially the first five years, not for developers to have to enter into protracted and costly negotiations in order to secure a viable and implementable permission.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The HBF would like to appear at the examination to debate these matters further.	
654618	Mr Peter Tanner	Tanner & Tilley Planning Consultants	<a href="#">PCCS498</a>	176	LN3	Yes		Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Pennyfarthing supports the provision of 50% affordable housing on allocated greenfield housing sites. However, we question the evidence base that seeks to justify the viability	We suggest that the evidence base in support of this proposed policy be	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>of the proposal to provide 40% of affordable housing on all other residential development sites. The Affordable Housing Viability Assessment for East Dorset District, carried out by consultants Three Dragons (Final Report 2010) was based on density policy assumptions as at 2008 when national planning policy was advocating minimum densities of 30dph and was prior to the Coalition Government guidance that garden land should not be regarded as brownfield sites. The case studies carried out in that report suggested that it would be viable to provide 40% affordable housing in high value areas. However it showed that lower value areas may only be able to viably support lower percentages of affordable housing. It also assumed that within the higher value areas minimum densities of 30dph or more could be achieved. However, in most high value areas in East Dorset District and in the Borough of Christchurch the existing character tends to be of low density housing where it is likely that higher density development would be resisted. Therefore it is questionable whether the density of development that would be allowed in the high value areas would be sufficiently viable to deliver affordable housing. It also suggests that the percentage of affordable housing to be provided by new development should vary according to the different market value areas rather than applying a blanket requirement of 40% affordable housing across the whole of the Plan area. We consider that the requirement of the provision of 40% affordable housing on all other housing development sites is likely to result in all of those planning applications being accompanied by viability assessments seeking to reduce the affordable housing requirement.</p>	<p>reviewed taking into account the removal of minimum density requirements from national planning policy guidance together with the removal of gardens from the definition of brownfield land and the likelihood that the majority of development sites within the Plan area are unlikely to achieve a minimum density of 30dph but may be considerably lower. It is also suggested that the LPA consider setting the percentage of affordable housing that will be sought having regard to the different market value areas across the Plan area rather than 40% being applied throughout the whole area.</p>			
655010	Mrs S Moran		<a href="#">PCCS157</a>	176	LN3	Yes	Yes		<p>Paragraph 2 should be adjusted to prevent developers who are working on existing sites not providing affordable housing on the basis they are reducing the number of units rather than increasing them. See Churchill Retirement Living Ltd and Shamrock Court Wimborne.</p>	<p>All greenfield residential development which results in a net increase of housing is to provide up to 50% of the residential units as affordable housing in accordance with the Policy Delivery Requirements and Affordable Housing Requirements unless otherwise stated in strategic allocation policies. All other residential development which results in a net increase of housing or development is on a site with historical affordable units is to provide up to 40% of the residential units as affordable housing in accordance</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										with the Policy Delivery Requirements and Affordable Housing Requirements.			
717797	Mr Stanley Jackson	Wimborne Civic Society	<a href="#">PCCS96</a>	176	LN3				We find it regrettable that the proposed Core Strategy should now include provision for a financial contribution, in lieu of on-site affordable housing, for sites resulting in a net increase of 15 or more dwellings.				
719231	Mr Mike Newton	Boyer Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS504</a>	176	LN3	Yes	No	Justified Effective	<p>Policy LN3 seeks to maximise the delivery of affordable housing across the two authorities. The Councils are continuing to apply a target of 50% affordable housing on all greenfield sites:</p> <p>"All greenfield residential development which results in a net increase of housing is to provide up to 50% of the residential units as affordable housing in accordance with the Policy Delivery Requirements and Affordable Housing Requirements unless otherwise stated in strategic allocation policies. All other residential development which results in a net increase of housing is to provide up to 40% of the residential units as affordable housing in accordance with the Policy Delivery Requirements and Affordable Housing Requirements".</p> <p>2.2 Our views with regards to this target in the context of Verwood have previously been discussed in our representations made during the consultation on the Core Strategy Pre-Submission in June this year. In light of the revised wording of Policy LN2, our argument in principle remains the same; however our key points have been reiterated below and updated where necessary for ease of reference.</p> <p>2.3 It is considered that this requirement of the policy is not effective in the context of East Dorset District. It is acknowledged that the District has a high level of affordable housing need, calculated at 440 dwellings per annum (CLG) or 243dpa (BHM) respectively (EDDC Affordable Housing Provision &amp; Developer Contributions in Dorset, January 2010). In addition the District has experienced low annual completions of affordable housing in recent years, with no completions in 2006/07 and 2007/08.</p> <p>2.4 The level of need in Christchurch is calculated at 243 dwellings per annum (CLG) or 163dpa (BHM) respectively (Christchurch Borough Council Affordable Housing Provision and Developer Contributions in Dorset, January 2010).</p> <p>2.5 Policy KS3 of the Core Strategy has been removed and the housing target for East Dorset combined with the target for Christchurch within Policy KS3. It is therefore not possible to calculate an annual target for East Dorset District only. Using the proposed combined target, Policy KS3 sets an overall housing target equivalent to approximately 546 dwellings per annum across both Authorities.</p> <p>2.6 This housing target will be comprised of both market and affordable housing. As such, although the housing target will go some way towards meeting the demand for affordable</p>	It is submitted again that the evidence base provided by the Three Dragons assessment should be used in considering which greenfield strategic allocations should have their target lowered from 50%. As such, to ensure soundness, sites in Verwood should have a target of 35% affordable housing to take account of its location in the Low Value East Dorset market value area.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The representation relates to a key policy in the Core Strategy.	<a href="#">2405043_0_1.pdf</a>

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>housing, it will not meet the entire identified need, even using the more conservative BHM calculations. As highlighted above, East Dorset District in particular has a recent history of under provision of affordable housing. To help meet the need for both affordable and market housing in the District it will be important to facilitate developments coming forward to provide the much needed completions.</p> <p>2.7 Policy LN3 includes a caveat which states that: "any Planning Application which on financial viability grounds proposes a lower level of affordable housing than is required by the Policy Percentage Requirements must be accompanied by clear and robust evidence that will be subject to verification".</p> <p>In January 2010 East Dorset District Council published the Affordable Housing Provision and Developer Contributions in East Dorset final report, produced by Three Dragons. The report divided the District into the following market value areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High Value Rural East Dorset;</li> <li>• East Dorset Rural;</li> <li>• Wimborne Minster &amp; St Leonards;</li> <li>• Southern Settlements;</li> <li>• Low Value East Dorset (including Verwood).</li> </ul> <p>2.9 In testing the residual values across these areas the report concluded that there was a "significant variance in residual values by market value area, reflecting the different housing prices found in each of them" (Para. 3.10). The report concluded by providing three possible policy options regarding affordable housing provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "A single percentage target across the whole district and which is realistic in the lower value market areas. We consider that a target of 40% would be a reasonable percentage and would be a continuation of current policy;</li> <li>• A split target which achieves 40% generally across the district and 50% in High Value Rural;</li> <li>• A more refined split target which achieves 50% in High Value Rural, 40% in East Dorset Rural and Wimborne Minster and 35% in Southern Settlements and Low Value East Dorset."</li> </ul> <p>2.10 The Councils have chosen to proceed with an overall affordable housing target of 40%, but this is increased on greenfield sites to 50% unless otherwise stated in strategic allocation policies. As highlighted above, Verwood falls within the Low Value East Dorset market value area. The Three Dragons report recommended that such areas should have an affordable housing target of 35-40%. Neither of the two proposed greenfield strategic allocations in the Core Strategy Pre-Submission in Verwood had their affordable housing target reduced below 50%, and it has not subsequently been reduced for the one remaining allocation for Verwood in the Schedule of Proposed Changes either.</p>				
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">PCCS106</a>	177	LN4	Yes	No	Effective	We strongly welcome the changes on allowing an element of open market cross-subsidy on rural exception schemes and allowing sites that do not adjoin the settlement boundary to		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									be considered for this policy. This is broadly in line with our representations, however we consider that more guidance over the level of open market dwellings that are acceptable is required within the supporting text.				
359547	Mrs V Bright	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	<a href="#">PCCS62</a>	177	LN4				Concern that the percentage of affordable housing is not specified in this policy for exception sites.				
359854	Mr T Graham		<a href="#">PCCS270</a>	177	LN4		No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The amendment to the text to include Corfe Mullen in the list of affordable housing exception sites will mean that housing would take place in areas of Corfe Mullen which the Core Strategy has already ruled out for a number of different reasons. So to include Corfe Mullen is unsound. The addition of Corfe Mullen has been prompted by fiercely prejudicial interests of parties on Corfe Mullen Parish Council which is well known about and not by adherence to sound policy.	Withdraw Corfe Mullen from amended text LN4 i.e. do not include Corfe Mullen on the list of affordable housing exception sites.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359860	Mrs P A Dent		<a href="#">PCCS209</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		There are many young families living in Colehill and many more who would like to because of the 3 good schools here and the accessibility of other facilities. Sadly, there is insufficient adequate housing to cope with the changing needs of growing families. Affordable housing that does come on the market is usually bought by local builders for extension and refurbishment and sold for twice the price paid. New housing in Colehill is essential.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359912	Mrs Barbara Huggins		<a href="#">PCCS48</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		I am delighted that Colehill has been included for exception sites. It will mean that affordable houses will be built and that local people who have grown up in Colehill will be able to be part of the community. It will strengthen community ties. Children should be able to live within walking distance of the schools and all in all - a most definite improvement for the area.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		<a href="#">PCCS24</a>	177	LN4	Yes	No	Justified	Why has Colehill been added to the list of Affordable Housing Exception sites? Colehill has already been identified for huge development sites and housing expansion. Where else in Colehill is the Council considering building even more houses?	Any reference to Colehill as being an Affordable Housing Exception site should be deleted.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
474490	Mrs Sheila Bourton	Chairman Keep Wimborne Green	<a href="#">PCCS34</a>	177	LN4	Yes	No	Justified	Why has Colehill been added to the list of "Affordable Housing Exception sites"? As areas in Colehill have already been identified for hundreds of new houses, what additional site does the Council propose for an Exception site?	Any proposal for an Affordable Exception site in Colehill should be deleted.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
485699	Mrs Janet Seal		<a href="#">PCCS187</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		More affordable housing is needed in Colehill to encourage the next generation to live locally. The children will go to the same school that the parents used and keep Colehill the vibrant village which it is today.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS485</a>	177	LN4				Rural Exceptions. MEM Ltd welcomes revision to the policy to allow affordable housing 'very close' to the defined settlements. However, this policy may need further explanation to be effective to define the term 'very close'.				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
619967	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation (South West)	<a href="#">PCCS113</a>	177	LN4		No	Effective Consistent with national policy	The policy is unsound as it is ineffective and contrary to national policy. As I commented in my earlier representations, the viability of providing 100% affordable housing has not been assessed. The Framework encourages LPAs to consider the merits of allowing for some market housing to ensure that the affordable housing supply is viable.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The HBF would like to appear at the examination to debate these matters further.	
654618	Mr Peter Tanner	Tanner & Tilley Planning Consultants	<a href="#">PCCS502</a>	177	LN4	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Effective Consistent with national policy	We consider that the policy should include for provision of a small amount of open market housing within the mix of affordable housing on these exception sites. The inclusion of a mix of, say 70% affordable housing and 30% open market housing on these sites would be more likely to encourage these sites to come forward; would result in a better mix of housing that would provide for an inclusive mixed community; and would be more likely to promote the delivery of affordable housing than might otherwise be the case. Paragraph 54 of the NPPF suggests that LPA's should consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs. We also consider that this policy should apply to land adjoining all defined rural and urban settlements where there is an identified local housing need and not just those currently listed in the proposed policy.	We suggest that the policy be replaced with the following:- " Affordable housing exception sites Exceptionally land adjoining or very close to the defined rural and urban settlements which would otherwise be considered inappropriate for development may be developed in order to provide affordable housing, in perpetuity, provided that: - The housing comprises a minimum of 70% affordable housing (the balance could be made up by open market housing); and - Secure arrangements are included for the affordable housing to ensure that its benefits will be enjoyed by successive as well as initial occupiers. - The proposed development would provide a mix of housing size and type which meets demonstrated local housing needs as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. - The development is small scale and reflects the setting, form and character of the settlement and the surrounding landscape. This policy will apply to land adjoining or close to all settlements, subject to	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										the above provisos."			
657152	Miss Suzannah Bath		<a href="#">PCCS179</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		I'm glad that you have changed the policy to include Colehill for exception sites, this will help local people afford to stay living close to their families, thank you for listening to my previous comments.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
657154	Miss Katherine Bath		<a href="#">PCCS180</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		I'm pleased to see that Colehill is now included for exception sites as I believe there is a need for affordable housing in Colehill to allow local people to be able to stay in their neighbourhoods, close to family. This will help the above happen.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
657160	Mr Richard Bath		<a href="#">PCCS177</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		Thank you for changing the policy to include Colehill for exception sites. A positive change.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
657163	Ms Wendy Grace		<a href="#">PCCS182</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		Glad that my comments have been taken notice of as that Colehill is now included for exception sites.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718915	Mr Darren James Goodwin		<a href="#">PCCS186</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		I'm pleased that Colehill has been included for exception site proposals, and that affordable houses will be available to local people.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718923	Mr Harold Seal		<a href="#">PCCS194</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		Pleased to note that Colehill is included in the areas where affordable housing can be built. The average cost of houses in Colehill is above the first time buyer's budget. Local people want to stay here and should be able to buy property here.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718926	Mr and Mrs Thomas and Janet Martin		<a href="#">PCCS197</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		We are delighted that Colehill has been included for exception sites and that it will mean that affordable houses will be built. Our children were raised in Colehill and it would give them the opportunity to return.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718927	Mr Alan Philip Rowett		<a href="#">PCCS206</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		There is a local need for affordable housing, and I am pleased to see Colehill has now been included for affordable housing exception. It was due to the lack of affordable housing I had to move from the area to be able to find what I could afford. It is important that local people are able to stay in the area to live and work.				
718929	Mrs Suzanne Jane Rowett		<a href="#">PCCS207</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		We need more affordable homes for our growing children, Colehill seems like a perfect place to create such homes. Good news for the area! and for our children's futures!				
718931	Mrs Lesley Glynis Goodwin		<a href="#">PCCS210</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		I am delighted that Colehill has been included for exception sites because it will mean more affordable housing for local people to stay in the area.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718933	Mr Stephen George Goodwin		<a href="#">PCCS211</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		I am delighted to learn that Colehill has been included for "exception sites", since it will mean that the ever-increasing number of young singles and newly-weds living in the area who are desperate to find their own accommodation will now be able to. This will ease problems of overcrowding and the bad tempers that often result, making life quieter and less stressful. With all these people taking the first step on the property ladder, this will jump start the local housing market, and boost the local economy. These people will also remain		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									in their local area, so links to friends and family will be retained.				
718934	Mr Mark James Huggins		<a href="#">PCCS213</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		I am delighted that Colehill has been included for exception sites. This will mean that the much needed affordable housing crisis will be addressed in Dorset and local people will be able to afford their own home - which currently many cannot do.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718935	Mr Robert Holly		<a href="#">PCCS215</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		Colehill is in urgent need of affordable homes for first time buyers and for new family homes. I have two children wanting to buy homes in this area and I also have a grandson at a local school.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
718936	Mrs Jennifer Holly		<a href="#">PCCS216</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		Colehill is a great area to bring up a family but there is a great shortage of both affordable homes and family houses. My son is looking to start a business in the area and needs a first time house buyer property which is in short supply.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719083	Mr Philip Michael Strong		<a href="#">PCCS255</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		I am pleased to see that provision is being made for more affordable housing for young people and those on a more modest income in the Wimborne area and praise the council for their consideration of this.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719085	Mrs Valerie Spence		<a href="#">PCCS257</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		As I recently moved into my present property, and having spent many months searching for accommodation in the Colehill / Wimborne area, it became apparent that there is a shortage of affordable, smaller properties in the area. This is a lovely location, but the lack of accommodation would deter would-be buyers. Its easy access to both town and countryside (via good bus routes) makes an attractive proposition. I hope therefore that this proposal is allowed to go ahead. I feel it will benefit the whole area, with little disruption.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719189	Ms Susan Barbara Huggins		<a href="#">PCCS275</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		I whole heartedly support the soundness of this revised document. I am absolutely delighted that having sought consultation you have fully taken on board that there is a justified necessity for more affordable housing in Colehill. It is vital for us to maintain communities by providing the young people in our society the potential for living and creating their own families where they grew up and where their supporting family network surrounds them.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719550	Mrs Jean Loader		<a href="#">PCCS333</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		Affordable housing is urgently needed locally and I am pleased that Colehill has now been included under the affordable housing exception sites. With the cost of local housing being so expensive and anything reasonable, usually being bought by developers and then done up / extended and then resold at a higher price putting it beyond local young people. It is important that local young people are able to purchase affordable houses, so they can stay in the area to live and work, contributing to the local economy.				
719556	Mr Peter Dennis George Loader		<a href="#">PCCS334</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		I am glad to see that Colehill is to be included in the area for affordable housing exceptional sites. This is very necessary				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									to enable young local and elderly people to stay in the area they grew up in. Housing is very important and not enough land is available to meet requirements for affordable homes.				
719570	Mrs Amanda Jane Oakley		<a href="#">PCCS344</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes	Justified	Colehill should be considered for new housing because there is a lack of affordable housing in the area, which means families like ourselves, have to look further afield. Colehill is an excellent area with good roads and local amenities. It is also well linked to other towns and motorways making it attractive for working families like ourselves.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
719604	Mrs W M James		<a href="#">PCCS358</a>	177	LN4	Yes	Yes		I have been looking for somewhere to live at Colehill for 2 years. It will be good to have more homes or mobile homes as you have shops around a post office and it's only a stone's throw to Wimborne to banks and more shops which is what we need and schools, police station, fire station, ambulances. It would be ideal and near to the library all things one needs and to be in a good community with churches.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS403</a>	178	LN5	Yes	Yes		At the Pre-Submission stage the County Council sought corrections to the Key Facts under Para 15.19 and suggested amendments should be made to Policy LN5 to reflect changes in government policy introduced in "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites". Christchurch and East Dorset have proposed changes to meet these concerns. Dorset County Council supports these proposed changes.				
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS402</a>	178	15.2	Yes	Yes		At the Pre-Submission stage the County Council sought corrections to the Key Facts under Para 15.19 and suggested amendments should be made to Policy LN5 to reflect changes in government policy introduced in "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites". Christchurch and East Dorset have proposed changes to meet these concerns. Dorset County Council supports these proposed changes.				
657462	Ms Carla Fulgoni	Planning Assistant The Planning Bureau Limited	<a href="#">PCCS335</a>	179	New text on Housing and accommodation proposals for older and vulnerable people	Yes	Yes	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	My client welcomes the inclusion of text included to take into account the housing and accommodation needs of older and vulnerable people.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359284	Miss Lynne Evans	Consultant Southern Planning Practice	<a href="#">PCCS248</a>	180	LN6	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The proposed changes to the policy are noted but they are not considered to meet the concerns submitted at the Submission stage. Objection is therefore continued for the same reasons as before, and as set out again below. 1. The policy is ambiguous in terms of the community facilities and services that it seeks to address, as they are not defined, and in particular in the light of another policy, Policy PC4 which also addresses similar issues. The policy is therefore unsound as it is not positively prepared and effective. It is not clear whether this policy relates to privately run facilities such as pubs and local shops or more	The policy needs to be reconsidered alongside Policy PC4 to ensure that there is no duplication or ambiguity between the two policies. The policy in so far as it seeks to resist the loss of facilities unless it can be shown that the facility is no longer needed is	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The representations submitted raise important and complex policy issues which require oral examination and round table discussion in order that the Inspector can be properly informed in reaching a decision on the soundness of the Plan	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally complaint or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>specifically to facilities that are generally publicly funded. The Policy wording, supporting text and Infrastructure Delivery Plan suggests that the policy is directed to facilities that are generally publicly funded but this is not clear.</p> <p>2. The policy in so far as it seeks to resist the loss of facilities unless it can be shown that the facility is no longer needed is unsound because there is no clear advice as to how the policy requirement will be measured – it has not therefore been positively prepared; it is not justified, effective or consistent with national policy.</p> <p>3. The part of the policy which indicates that ‘where appropriate, financial contributions towards the provision of facilities and services will be sought’ is considered too vague to be justified or effective. The circumstances in which such contributions will be sought and the basis for the contributions need to be detailed.</p> <p>The proposed addition of the requirement to show that ‘ the loss would not result in a substantial decline in the range and quality of facilities and services for local people’ is not defined as to how this will be measured. Furthermore, the two parts of the policy may conflict – it may be the situation that a facility or service is no longer viable because it is not supported by the local community, but that its ‘loss’ would appear to remove the only facility of its kind from the local community.</p> <p>The policy, if required in the light of PC4, should focus on ensuring that a facility or service has been adequately marketed to prove whether it remains viable. In this regard please see the comments in respect of Policy PC4.</p>	<p>unsound and clear measures need to be set out as to how the policy requirement will be measured. This should be in terms of a requirement to market the premises for a minimum period of time to prove whether it is viable.</p>			
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS404</a>	180	LN6	Yes	No		<p>At the Pre-submission stage the County Council noted its concern that, despite frequent references to CIL and contributions policy, there is not a specific policy in the Core Strategy which requires development to meet its infrastructure needs or to mitigate adverse impacts, including the potential use of CIL to contribute towards the full range of community benefits required over the next 15 years. In response, Christchurch and East Dorset Councils state in the AoR (Para 18.68) that “Policies now contain references to CIL.”</p> <p>It is noted that new wording is proposed in Policy LN6. This states: “Planning obligations may be sought in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 to obtain financial contributions towards the provision of facilities and services.”</p> <p>It is considered that this wording is confusing since it does not clearly set out the difference between planning obligations and CIL and how the two relate to each other. It implies that planning obligations may be sought under CIL regulations, which is incorrect. As such the County Council considers that its original suggestion that the Core Strategy should include a new policy and supporting text in the Key Strategy should still apply</p>	<p>That the proposed wording change to Policy LN6 relating to planning obligations and CIL be deleted and a new policy and text in section 4 Key Strategy be inserted as follows:</p> <p>It is important that new development makes provision, where necessary for infrastructure needed to serve it, or to mitigate potential impacts it is likely to cause.</p> <p>Planning obligations, also known as section 106 agreements, have played an important role in providing the infrastructure necessary to support new development.</p> <p>The Government has</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>Dorset County Council wishes to partake in any oral hearing on this matter in order to fulfil its role under the duty to cooperate and ensure that its interests are considered in the emerging Core Strategy.</p>	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										<p>introduced provisions for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The overall purpose of the CIL is to ensure that development contributes fairly to infrastructure it creates a need for and thus can be delivered in a sustainable way. Meeting infrastructure needs will also require other vehicles and joint working with a range of partners to ensure that common areas and priorities are coordinated. The establishment of the CIL will however transform the current method of collecting and distributing developer contributions, as from April 2014 there will be a limit on the pooling and use of section 106 contributions.</p> <p>Policy KS xx Infrastructure Delivery "Development proposals will be required to provide, or meet the reasonable costs of providing, the on-site and off-site infrastructure, facilities and/or mitigation necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms, including the mitigation of the effect of cumulative developments.</p> <p>Delivery and monitoring The council will implement the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy and seek to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is secured to support development by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working with stakeholders and partner organisations through a variety of fora and other</li> </ul>			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										arrangements, including the LEP; • preparing regeneration area and other supplementary planning documents as required, and supplementing the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD with development briefs, master plans and best practice guidance if this is necessary; • undertaking pre-application discussions with developers and involving partner organisations where appropriate, and through development management powers, including negotiating S106 obligations; • allocating council funding to projects and bidding for other monies to support core strategy initiatives; • developing a charging schedule in response to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations or successor levy regimes that support the implementation of infrastructure projects necessary to deliver the Core Strategy; and • preparing annual monitoring reports to review the effectiveness of policies and identify alterations where necessary."			
654046	Mr David Pardy		<a href="#">PCCS140</a>	180	LN6	Yes	No	Justified	The statement that "The loss of existing community facilities and services will be resisted unless it is clearly demonstrated there is insufficient demand and it is not feasible and viable to support their continued existence and the loss would not result in a substantial decline in the range and quality of facilities and services for local people" is contrary to the policy pursued by Christchurch Council in their plans to demolish Drutt Hall		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">PCCS107</a>	181	New Policy LN7	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>We welcome the inclusion of this policy and the clarity it provides on how the two local authorities will seek affordable housing contributions on this scheme. However, we still consider that a robust enabling policy presuming the positive determination of these types of schemes is required. Furthermore, given the ageing demographic of the population as acknowledged by the Council, the SHMA has to assess the housing needs of this group, as required by paragraph 159 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Guidance on effectively meeting the requirements of the NPPF in relation to older person's housing can be found in the Housing in Later Life: Planning Ahead for Specialist Housing for Older People toolkit hosted on the HousingLIN website  <a href="http://www.housinglin.org.uk/Topics/type/resource/?cid=8654">http://www.housinglin.org.uk/Topics/type/resource/?cid=8654</a>  . We strongly urge the Council to review this document prior to proceeding to the examination.</p> <p>Our comments on a recommended policy wording made in our previous representations (Our Ref: M5/0103-07 or M4/0514-09) still stand.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS405</a>	181	New Policy LN7	Yes	Yes		<p>The County Council notes the comments in the AoR (Paras 16.125 and 16.126) in response to its concern that the plan failed to adequately address the needs of older and vulnerable people. In follow up discussions between District and County Council officers it was agreed that the Core Strategy should ensure that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New development proposals for extra-care housing and care homes (market or affordable) should take into account the impacts on health and social care services and be supported by robust evidence of local need;</li> <li>• Development proposals should fit within the wider strategic framework for the Dorset County Council area and the East Dorset and Christchurch Housing Strategy;</li> <li>• Proposals for extra-care accommodation to be sold or let on the open market should be required to make an affordable housing contribution in accordance with Policy LN3;</li> <li>• The Councils should support and encourage Lifetime Homes;</li> <li>• A proportion of affordable homes on larger scale housing developments should be provided for those with special or supported housing need.</li> </ul> <p>To address these matters, new text and Policy LN7 are proposed as well as amendments to Policy LN3 on the Provision of Affordable Housing (in particular the last two paragraphs).</p> <p>Dorset County Council supports the new Policy LN7 and supporting text as well as the proposed changes to LN3 (last two paragraphs).</p>				
619967	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation (South West)	<a href="#">PCCS114</a>	181	New Policy LN7		No	Justified Consistent with national policy	<p>The policy is unsound as it is unjustified and contrary to national policy</p> <p>The policy attempts to introduce Lifetime Homes standards for larger scale development and neighbourhood schemes</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The HBF would like to appear at the examination to debate these matters further.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									(although the definition of both is unclear) under the rubric of "General principles for all residential development proposals". The cost of Lifetimes Homes has not been reflected in the viability assessments by the two Councils. Either the reference to Lifetime Homes is deleted, or the Council should state clearly that this is a requirement of the core strategy. If this is a policy requirement then it should have been reflected in the viability assessment in accordance with the requirements of the Framework. This will add additional costs to development of the order of £3K per dwelling. Failing to account for this cost means that the plan is unsound. The DCLG in its report Assessing the Cost of Lifetime Homes Standards, DCLG, July 2012, page 22, assesses the cost of Lifetime Homes as follows (figures rounded): 2 bed terrace £1,394 3 bed terrace (example 1) £2,966 3 bed terrace (example 2) £ 586 4 bed semi £1,153 The average cost is £1,525 per dwelling. This cost will need to be factored into an updated viability assessment of the core strategy.				
657462	Ms Carla Fulgoni	Planning Assistant The Planning Bureau Limited	<a href="#">PCCS337</a>	181	New Policy LN7	Yes	Yes	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	My client welcomes the inclusion of Policy LN7 which has been included to take into account the housing and accommodation needs of older and vulnerable people.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		<a href="#">PCCS25</a>	186	PC6	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Effective	Electronics Communications Network The Advisory Group on Non-ionising Radiation (AGNIR), published a report in 2012 on the health effects from radio frequency electromagnetic fields. This group stated that there was "no convincing evidence that RF field exposures below guideline levels caused health effects in adults or children" BUT The Health Protection Agency's response to this AGNIR report was "it will be important to carry forward research recommendations made by AGNIR especially to gain understanding of longer term effects" Bearing this in mind, it would seem that great caution should be taken when siting electronic equipment close to any housing development or schools.	A clause should be added that Electronic Communications equipment should NOT be sited close to housing developments or schools.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		
474490	Mrs Sheila Bourton	Chairman Keep Wimborne Green	<a href="#">PCCS36</a>	186	PC6	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Effective	With regard to Electronic Communication Networks, the advisory Group on Non Ionising Radiation (AGNIR) published a report in 2012 on the health effects from radio frequency electromagnetic fields. This group stated that there was "no convincing evidence that RF field exposures below guideline levels caused health effects in adults or children" BUT The Health Protection Agency's response to this AGNIR report was "it will be important to carry forward research recommendations made by AGNIR especially to gain understanding of longer term effects"	Bearing this in mind, any electronic equipment should be sited as far away as possible from residential development and schools. It should be stated just exactly what is meant by "measures to mitigate significant impacts" on proposed housing developments and how	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										those mitigation measures will be assessed and by whom.			
710840	Ms Jacquelyn Fee	Planner Mono Consultants Limited	<a href="#">PCCS8</a>	186	PC6				<p>Thank you for your recent consultation on the above and taking the time to seek our views on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. We welcome the opportunity to have input into the process.</p> <p>Paragraph 42 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) confirms that; 'advanced, high quality communications infrastructure is essential for sustainable economic growth and play a vital role in enhancing the provision of local community facilities and services.'</p> <p>Paragraph 43 confirms that 'in preparing local plans, to keep the number of radio communications masts and sites for such installations to a minimum consistent with the efficient operation of the network. Existing masts, buildings and other structures should be used, unless the need for a new site has been justified.'</p> <p>While we support the inclusion of a telecommunications policy within the emerging Core Strategy, we have the following concerns about the draft wording of Policy PC6: Electronic Communications Networks.</p> <p>Criteria 4 of Policy PC6</p> <p>Criteria 4 of Policy PC6 states that the Planning Authority will need to be satisfied that: 'applicants have considered the need to include additional structural capacity to take account of the growing demands of network development, including that of other operators'. Unfortunately, it is not possible for any operator to give a clear indication of what their infrastructure requirements are likely to be in 5,10,15 or 20 years' time. The technology is continually evolving and ways of improving quality of coverage and/or network capacity may change in the future. We therefore request that the above wording be removed from Policy PC6.</p>	<p>The formulation of policy does not exist in isolation and there are numerous documents which will affect the formulation of any telecommunications policy, the most important of these being the NPPF. On this basis we would suggest that within the Local Development Framework (Local Plan) there should be a concise and flexible telecommunications policy contained within one of the statutory documents. Such a policy should give all stakeholders a clear indication of the issues which development will be assessed against. We would suggest a policy which reads;</p> <p>'Proposals for telecommunications development will be permitted provided that the following criteria are met;-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area;</li> <li>(ii) if on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and designed in order to seek to minimise impact to the external appearance of the host building;</li> <li>(iii) if proposing a new mast, it should be demonstrated that the</li> </ul>			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										<p>applicant has explored the possibility of erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other structures. Such evidence should accompany any application made to the (local) planning authority.</p> <p>(iii) If proposing development in a sensitive area, the development should not have an unacceptable effect on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest.</p> <p>When considering applications for telecommunications development, the (local) planning authority will have regard to the operational requirements of telecommunications networks and the technical limitations of the technology.'</p> <p>We would consider it appropriate to introduce the policy and we would suggest the following:</p> <p>'Modern telecommunications systems have grown rapidly in recent years with more than two thirds of the population now owning a mobile phone. Mobile communications are now considered an integral part of the success of most business operations and individual lifestyles. With new services such as the advanced third generation (3G) services, demand for new telecommunications infrastructure is continuing to grow. The authority is keen to</p>			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
										facilitate this expansion whilst at the same time minimising any environmental impacts. It is our policy to reduce the proliferation of new masts by encouraging mast sharing and siting equipment on existing tall structures and buildings. Further information on telecommunications can be found in Local Development Document ....'			
359284	Miss Lynne Evans	Consultant Southern Planning Practice	<a href="#">PCCS249</a>	187	PC3	Yes	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	The proposed changes to the policy are noted but they are not considered to meet the concerns submitted at the Submission stage. Objection is therefore continued for the same reasons as before, and as set out again below. Objection is raised to this policy as the policy is silent on residential development and it is not clear whether this should be interpreted as an indication that residential would not be supported or that it is dealt with elsewhere (and if so where?). It is also not clear as to the extent of the district to be covered by this policy – there is reference to the open countryside but also to some of the smaller settlements. It would appear that the policy is primarily directed to the countryside (outside of settlements) but this needs clarification in order that the policy can be properly effective. Whilst it is recognised that this policy relates primarily to the promotion of economic activities in the rural area, the Council's approach to the potential re-use of non-residential properties for residential purposes is unclear. Residential re-use is not listed but does not appear to be referenced elsewhere. Paragraph 55 of the NPPF lists examples where residential use of individual properties in the countryside may be appropriate but this does not appear to be addressed by this Policy or elsewhere in the Plan. As currently drafted, the policy is therefore unsound as it appears to be inconsistent with national policy, is not effective and not justified	The policy needs to be reviewed to clarify: a) The parts of the district it covers – the open countryside or in addition, the smaller settlements; b) Whether it should address in this policy residential use to comply with guidance in the NPPF or whether that will be addressed elsewhere.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The representations submitted raise important and complex policy issues which require oral examination and round table discussion in order that the Inspector can be properly informed in reaching a decision on the soundness of the Plan	
359529	Mrs Lisa Goodwin	Clerk to the Council Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS172</a>	187	PC3				There continues to be considerable concern about the highly restrictive approach to business development and diversification where it is clearly implied that this will only be permitted at the major villages. For example, when applied to the major rural industry – agriculture – only one of the twenty odd farms and small holdings in this parish which is adjacent to the major village could benefit and to apply such a restriction is quite unacceptable. The Core Strategy should not incorporate a policy that effectively caps rural development.	PC3 Recommend Amended Text be changed (in red) to read: The Rural Economy - "Although economic development ..... Sixpenny Handley and Sturminster Marshall, and other locations where the development will aid rural sustainability."			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
718911	Mr Joshua Lambert	Planning Assistant Pro Vision Planning and Design	<a href="#">PCCS178</a>	187	PC3	Yes	No	Justified Consistent with national policy	<p>The Charborough Estate supports paragraph 16.16 (page 186) regarding the important role played by major country landowners and large rural estates in shaping, maintaining and promoting rural housing, enterprise, tourism and landscape quality.</p> <p>Emerging Policy PC3 (page 187) is inconsistent with paragraph 16.6. Policy PC3 promotes economic growth in rural areas through the conversion and re-use of existing appropriately located and suitably constructed buildings in the countryside. However, Policy PC3 does not consider the conversion and re-use of these buildings to provide rural housing, where appropriate. The emerging policy is inconsistent with the NPPF (paragraph 55) which identifies the following circumstances in which housing development in the countryside would be appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “where such development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets; or</li> <li>• where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement in the immediate setting”.</li> </ul> <p>PC3 does not provide for the residential re-use of redundant or disused buildings in the countryside where these would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset, would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of a heritage asset or would lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting.</p> <p>PRO VISION</p> <p>Christchurch and East Dorset’s approach to residential development in the countryside is inconsistent with Policy CO of the adopted Purbeck Local Plan Part 1, which is permissive of the conversion or reuse of rural buildings for housing. The policy is currently in conflict with Paragraph 182 of the NPPF, which states that, to be sound, policy should be based on effective joint working on cross-boundary priorities.</p> <p>The Charborough Estate objects to Policy PC3 in its current form.</p>	<p>The following text should be added to the Policy: “conversion to housing may also be appropriate, provided it would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset, would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of a heritage asset or would lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting.”</p> <p>Whilst the existing reference to promoting the re-use of appropriate buildings in the countryside is supported, the proposed changes to the wording of the policy do not address residential conversion.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
523893	Miss Lindsay Thompson	Senior Planner Terence O'Rourke Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS205</a>	191	Appendix 1		No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	<p>The appendix offers no flexibility on terms of the payment of capital sums towards layout and provision of play facilities and to fund the on-going care and maintenance. To ensure the plan can be found sound the text should provide an element of flexibility. There should be a recognition that this is the Council's preferred approach but flexibility to allow developers to bring forward other approaches to provision and maintenance should a different approach be more appropriate in a particular case. For instance, on larger sites where the provision of SANG is required it may be more appropriate to establish a management company responsible for the play space and the management of the SANG.</p>	<p>"2. On sites of 150 dwellings or more a site for open space should be provided. The Council's preferred approach is as follows."</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Our Client has a significant interest in land at North Wimborne (Cranborne Road New Neighbourhood) and we therefore consider it to be important that we are able to participate orally at the examination to expand on the comment we have made within this document.	
719394	Ms Jade	Assistant Planner	<a href="#">PCCS303</a>	191	Appendix 1		No	Effective	Specific reference to sums of money for the provision, layout	Remove specific sums	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral	I would like to confirm that we would wish to	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
	Ellis	Turley Associates							and maintenance of open space is insufficiently flexible to be effective on a site by site basis. The level and specific nature of open space required / proposed on a site will vary according to existing capacity and facilities in an area, with in some cases greater formal facilities preferred over informal and vice versa. The sums involved will vary accordingly and should not therefore be expressed as fixed, indexed linked requirements. There may also be instances where a developer proposes to deliver and maintain such facilities for future residents under a management company. This highlights the inflexibility of this Proposed Modification.	and if needed add a footnote reference to an SPD that will elaborate on such matters.	examination	participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of client's interests at Wimborne/Colehill.	
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Affordable Housing Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS407</a>	222	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan				<p>Flood Management, mitigation and Defence.                      Para 2.23 has been updated to reflect Dorset County Council's role. However the County Council is not yet the SUDS approving body, therefore a further minor change is recommended.                      Further change proposed                      Amend last sentence of para 2.23 to read: "Dorset County Council now has a role in this issue as the Lead Local Authority and once schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act is implemented, as the SUDS approving body authority"                      Education requirements                      In addition to the items already identified in the IDP, additional requirements have been identified arising through increasing pressure from birth rates and the need to accommodate population outside the specific allocated sites.                      Christchurch                      Para 2.44 and Schedule of Projects for Christchurch                      Due to increasing pressure from birth rates Dorset County Council wish to propose a further change to para 2.44 of the IDP to add Burton Primary School to the list of schools in Christchurch that will need to be expanded.                      Further change proposed                      Add Burton Primary School to the list of schools in Christchurch that will need to be expanded in Para 2.44.                      Add to the Schedule under Christchurch Education                      CBC Burton Primary School expansion to 2FE; Est Cost £1.5 million; Delivery agency – DCC/Developer contributions.                      East Dorset.                      Wimborne                      Para 2.46 and Schedule of Projects for East Dorset                      In order to accommodate the unallocated 2,800 housing units, provision should be made for an additional 210 places in the Wimborne area delivered as an extension to one of the schools and funded through developer contributions and DCC.                      Further change proposed                      Add to para 2.46                      "In addition to the specific site allocations, an additional 210 places in the Wimborne area should be delivered as an extension to one of the schools, funded through developer contributions and DCC."</p>				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>Add to the Schedule under East Dorset Education EDDC - Wimborne area – additional 210 places delivered as an extension to one of the schools; Est cost £1.8million; Delivery agency Developer Contributions and DCC.</p> <p>Ferndown Para 2.47 and Schedule of Projects for East Dorset In addition to the provision at Parley First School, additional accommodation will be required to meet the needs arising due to growth in the Ferndown area. Ferndown First School could rise to 90 in the existing buildings with a small allocation to refurbish and bring these spaces on line. Further change proposed Add to para 2.47 “In addition to the provision at Parley First School, additional accommodation will be required to meet the needs arising due to growth in the Ferndown area. Ferndown First School could rise to 90 in the existing buildings with a small allocation to refurbish and bring these spaces on line.” Add to the Schedule under East Dorset Education EDDC - Ferndown area, refurbishment of Ferndown First School; Est cost £200,000; Delivery agency – Developer contributions.</p> <p>Verwood Para 2.48 and Schedule of Projects for East Dorset In addition to the allocated sites, an additional 934 units will require just over 1FE within the Verwood area. Further change proposed Add to para 2.48. “In addition to the allocated sites, an additional 934 units will require just over 1FE within the Verwood area.” Add to the Schedule under East Dorset Education EDDC - Verwood area – an additional 1FE; Est cost £1.8 million; Delivery agency - Developer Contributions and DCC.</p> <p>Libraries The change requested at the Pre-submission stage has not been correctly made. The work on Christchurch library extension is already underway. Further Proposed Change Para 2.52 – Delete: “work on the extension will begin in the spring of 2013”. Replace with: “The extension of the library in Christchurch is underway with a completion date of Spring 2013</p>				
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	Clerk West Parley Parish Council	<a href="#">PCCS413</a>	222	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan	No	Justified		<p>The plan adds, without any discussion at all in the Core Strategy itself: 2.56 Dorset Fire and Rescue may require a fire and rescue station to be built at West Parley - A New Waste Plant to serve Christchurch and East Dorset. These major constructions, all with traffic impacts on an already overloaded road network, would have a considerable planning impact on West Parley yet none of them are mentioned in the Core Strategy. They have appeared in the Infrastructure Development Plan at the last minute with no justification provided and no discussion with the local Parish Council.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	West Parley Parish Council would like to present a final written statement to the Inspector, based on any questions raised by the Inspector and take part in the oral examination. We reserve the right to respond to any new evidence presented by the District Council and/or Third Parties.	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS228</a>	222	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Paragraph 2.89 We object to this paragraph. This is a minor drafting point. We consider that the current drafting of this paragraph does not make clear that the Council gives absolute priority call on CIL funds to qualifying mitigation for designated heathlands. It is inferred but is not unambiguous.	The paragraph should be amended to state that the Council recognises the requirements for funding mitigation for heathlands and that it is an absolute priority for 'top slicing' CIL receipts.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS230</a>	222	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Yes	No	Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	We object to this paragraph (2.88). These are drafting points. 1. In this paragraph we would suggest that for 'large scale' developments bespoke mitigation packages including the delivery of SANGs are likely (not 'may be') necessary. 2. We would suggest that 'avoidance' should come before mitigation and compensation within the hierarchy of addressing potential effects on designated sites.	We suggest that minor amendments are made to the paragraph to capture the above points.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS227</a>	222	Updated Habitats Regulations Assessment Report	Yes	Yes		We support the comments made in paragraph 3.24. These relate to uncertainties over the effects of policies KS9 and KS10.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">PCCS229</a>	222	Updated Habitats Regulations Assessment Report	Yes	Yes		We support the comments made in paragraph 3.25. These relate to the aspirations of Christchurch Borough Council for a by-pass (as mentioned on the Vision). We would add that any such proposal is likely to need project level assessment including a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). This will include a consideration of alternatives and considerations of over-riding public interest, as is briefly described in paragraph 3.19.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
500570	Mr J.D Head		<a href="#">PCCS269</a>	222	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan	No	No	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	In the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the follow items regarding West Parley have suddenly appeared, new school, possibly on a new site, possible new fire and rescue station and a new waste transfer depot are all mentioned. No information has been given to the Parish Council on these matters and no further information appears to be available. As these have not been included in the Core Strategy and fully explained residents have been denied a chance to comment on a complete strategy. This makes the strategy unsound.	Listen to the views of West Parley Parish Council and take into account the local parish plan that allows for an increase in house numbers without the large estates that are being proposed, and will maintain the green belt. Fully discuss all plans with the Parish Council which the District Council should be doing and is not.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
521383	Mr Graham Paisley	Network Development Planner Scottish and Southern Energy	<a href="#">PCCS4</a>	222	Additional Responses				I provide below some information on where potential development sites are crossed by existing infrastructure in the form of overhead lines. Where overhead lines cross development sites, these will, with the exception of 400kV tower lines, normally be owned and operated by Southern Electric Power Distribution. In order to minimise costs, wherever possible, existing				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									<p>overhead lines can remain in place with uses such as open space, parking, garages or public highways generally being permitted in proximity to the overhead lines. Where this is not practicable, or where developers choose to lay out their proposals otherwise, then agreement will be needed as to how these will be dealt with, including agreeing costs and identifying suitable alternative routing for the circuits. The existing customer base should not be burdened by any costs arising from new development proposals.</p> <p>To ensure certainty of delivery of a development site, any anticipated relocation of existing overhead lines should be formally agreed with Southern Electric Power Distribution prior to submission of a planning application.</p> <p>I also wish to draw your attention to recent correspondence which was submitted from Southern Electric Power Distribution to all Planning Authorities regarding existing infrastructure usually in the form of overhead lines. "Such overhead lines generally afford supplies to other locations beyond the development, even whole towns or parts of cities in some instances are carries on either steel towers or wood poles. These structures and the overhead conductors they support have been placed in accordance with planning permission in the form of a Section 37 (Electricity Act 1989) consent granted by the Secretary of State. This consent can only be granted following initial consultation with the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>As such Southern Electric Power Distribution believes that in these circumstances, the Planning Authority should impose a condition prohibiting development until such time as the developer has reached agreement with the Distribution Network Operator (DNO)</p> <p>a) how the development can be laid out such that the lines can be retained in their current position or;</p> <p>b) such that contractual arrangements have been agreed to modify the overhead lines"</p> <p>Where existing infrastructure is inadequate to support the increased demands from the new development, the costs of any necessary upstream reinforcement required would normally be apportioned between developer and DNO ( Distribution Network Operator) in accordance with the current Statement of Charging Methodology agreed with the industry regulator (OFGEM). Maximum timescales in these instances would not normally exceed around 2 years and should not therefore impede delivery of any proposed housing development.</p> <p>I trust this is helpful to you at this current stage and can be included in your Neighbourhood Plan Area Consultation and any Core Strategy Documentation.</p> <p>I should be grateful if you would confirm receipt of this communication and trust this letter provides adequate and appropriate information at this stage.</p>				
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Managing Director Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">PCCS486</a>	222	Sustainability Report				Sustainability Appraisal (SA) We are grateful that you have updated the Sustainability				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
									Appraisal to cover the alternative site/solution at Burton, as we believe this is a viable alternative, this will assist the Inspector considering the scheme at examination.				
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS10</a>	222	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan				<p>BBC, DCC and BoP officers are in the middle of working on how to spend the devolved transport funding from government for the 2015-2019 period. The A338 resurfacing still looks like the strongest candidate, but obviously we'll need member approval from all 3 transport authorities which make up the new Local Transport Body. As a result of this on-going work, I have now been advised by Andy Shaw and Mike Campkin that the widening element of the A338 works (from Blackwater - Cooper Dean) which we had identified for 2015-2019 in your CS and IDP, is unlikely to occur until 2020+ and will again be dependent on when funding becomes available for that period. The resurfacing and the widening can remain as 1 scheme in your text but we need to add this additional information in, perhaps best described as phase 1 and 2.</p> <p>The other change that BBC officers would like us to make is to be clearer that the DCC element of the resurfacing and widening just goes up to the county boundary. I had described it as going from Blackwater to Cooper Dean for completeness and to avoid confusion for the public as on the face of it a widening to 3 lanes over a stretch of only 1km wouldn't seem to make much sense!</p> <p>I know we can't change this now, but can we hold it in mind to add to the other changes that are likely to occur during the examination process please. Both KS10 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will need changing.</p>				
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">PCCS271</a>	222	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Yes	Yes	Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with national policy	Paragraphs 2.87, 2.88, 2.89 and 2.94	Natural England support the paragraphs 2.87, 2.88, 2.89 and the hierarchy set out in 2.94. These set out an approach to the mitigation/avoidance of adverse effects on European and Internationally protected sites which is consistent with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations 2012 and government policy set out in the NPPF with regard to the protection of these sites.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		
656499	Mr R J Leaper		<a href="#">PCCS49</a>	222	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan				Another fire station is a waste, we are also surrounded by fire stations already, and I was under the impression we had a perfectly good waste disposal system already, if I am to believe all the praise the local council heaps on itself for the success of the new waste collection service. (Paragraph 2.38 of the IDP)				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Comment ID	Page Number	Reference	Is the document Legally compliant?	Is the document Sound?	It is unsound because it is not	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Comments also supporting legal compliance or soundness	Changes considered necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound	Participation in the oral part of the examination	Reasons why you wish to participate	Attachments to Response
656499	Mr R J Leaper		<a href="#">PCCS50</a>	222	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan				Another fire station is a waste, we are also surrounded by fire stations already, and I was under the impression we had a perfectly good waste disposal system already, if I am to believe all the praise the local council heaps on itself for the success of the new waste collection service. (Paragraph 2.56 of the IDP)				
656684	Mr Ed Denham	Capital Project Co-ordinator Dorset County Council	<a href="#">PCCS12</a>	222	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan				I have had a chance to look through these numbers (2011 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) and based on the 2,800 what I call unallocated units of housing I have put together need based on that. I realise that the current consultation on the Core Strategy is only to do with the changes that have been made in the first round on consultations. As you will see from the attached document - there are three potential projects based on fairly general assumptions about the housing location and numbers - it basically says that 3 schools, one in each urban area, might have to be extended if this level does materialise in these areas. Fairly long drawn out assumptions. Ideally we would look to have a line in the IDP for each of these projects, Verwood, Wimborne and Ferndown. Again I am concerned the procedure and protocol of the consultation may hamper this?			<a href="#">2376856_0_1.pdf</a>	
657385	Mr W.P Rees		<a href="#">PCCS501</a>	222	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan		No		The single most outrageous flaw is the underhand manipulation and obfuscation of major new proposals which particularly affect West Parley. These new proposals have been quietly detailed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) but have not been properly described in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy and most certainly have not been subject to proper public scrutiny. The contemptuous attitude of EDDC to the wishes of the local population, coupled with the underhand major changes quietly detailed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan render the Pre-Submission Core Strategy wholly unsound.				
717053	Mrs Janet Healy		<a href="#">PCCS86</a>	222	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Yes	Yes		Point 2.45 of Draft IDP The replacement school at the Cranborne Road proposed extension (WMC5). This we support as it goes part way in providing a solution to one of our objections, that of creating a schism between the existing and new community. We understood in previous plans that both schools would exist side by side, the old First School and the new one. It is much better if just one school takes all the children. However, all our other objections remain. Please see the response to the Core Strategy pre-submission submitted by Janet & Kevin Healy and also the Issues and Options submission by Janet & Kevin Healy, Paul Timberlake.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	We wish to continue our efforts to have these proposed sites deleted from the Local Plan, or at the very least, greatly reduced in size.	
717399	Mr Gavin Dick	Policy Officer National Landlords Association	<a href="#">PCCS51</a>	222	Additional Responses	Yes	Yes		The National Landlord Association do not wish to comment on the consultation of Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy. We are happy with the Core Strategy.				