CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (DPD)

LDF EXAMINATION

Matter 3 – Strategic allocations: General Matters

STATEMENT PREPARED BY:

WOOLF BOND PLANNING LLP

REPRESENTATION NUMBER: 507451

On behalf of:

Bodorgan Properties (Channel Islands) Ltd., Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd. & Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

AUGUST 2013

 Our joint clients own and have interests in the proposed mixed use extension at North Christchurch (CN1) and wish to ensure that the planning policy framework aimed at securing release of the land is sound in that it is Positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. To do so it must be sufficiently flexible. This statement refers to policies that affect Christchurch Borough only.

Question 1: Does the CS provide clearly defined boundaries for every strategic allocation?

- 2. The proposal map provides a clearly defined boundary for the Christchurch urban extension. However strictly we consider the blue line showing the allocated land should include the allotments
- 3. The site has very well defined physical boundaries comprising a railway to the north that lies on an embankment, the A35 to the south, and Salisbury Road and Hawthorn Road to the west. The site therefore benefits from clear and well defined boundaries for the built up area of the settlement in future years.

Question 2: Flood risk: has every strategic allocation been subjected to a sequential and, if appropriate, exceptions test?

- 4. Yes, in respect of the Christchurch urban extension CN1 This is covered by the SFRA prepared by the Council, and the background reports (ED 68 and 69) produced for the Council by Broadway Malyan.
 - Question 3: Flood Risk: is every site allocation supported, where necessary, by a site specific flood risk assessment to demonstrate that development will be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere? (Ref: NPPF para 102)
- 5. Site CN1 was studied comprehensively in a report prepared by Broadway Malyan for the Council. Section 6 of the Stage 1 Report addressed the limited issue of flooding on the site in relation to the central corridor formed by the River Mude. This includes an allowance for flood/ water attenuation measures including a water attenuation pond. The report assumes the upper end of the

required scale for the purposes of generating a land use budget which totals 0.9ha.

- To be compliant with paragraph 102 of the NPPF it is not consistent with wider sustainability objectives for development to be located in protected zones where there might be risk of flooding.
- 7. The defined flood risk area associated with the River Mude is established (ED 69 stage 2 masterplan Page 29) and can be appropriately mitigated in the masterplanning of a future development scheme on the Christchurch urban extension site.

Question 4: Protection of designated habitats: Are all site allocations for residential development which are required to provide mitigation capable of providing SANG or alternative acceptable mitigation?

8. Comments here relate to Site CN1 only which requires SANG to mitigate possible effects on the SPA as it is within 5km of the European site. The statement on Matter 4 deals with SANG for site CN1 and the statement of common ground with Natural England (see Annex A) supported by the relevant parties in this matter shows that there is detailed agreement about the nature and delivery of SANG for this site.

Question 5: Do all site allocations satisfactorily address biodiversity?

- 9. There are limited ecological interests associated with development at the Roeshot Hill site (need for SPA mitigation apart) and the matter can be satisfactorily addressed by way of further survey work and then a comprehensive masterplan at the application stage. In addition, an appropriate condition requiring the establishment of an Ecological Management Plan can be secured as part of any planning permission.
- 10. Ecological studies have been completed in relation to the development of SANG (Annex A).

Annex A