

# Core Strategy

## 11 Creating High Quality and Distinctive Environments Background Paper

Pre-Submission Consultation  
2<sup>nd</sup> April – 25<sup>th</sup> June 2012



Prepared by Christchurch Borough Council and  
East Dorset District Council

April 2012



<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2 Formation of Pre Submission Options .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3 Pre Submission Options .....</b>	<b>34</b>

## 1 Introduction

**1.1** This background paper is one of a number of papers produced as part of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Development Framework (LDF) to inform the Pre – Submission Core Strategy. This particular paper sets out the refinement of policy options for the Core Strategy Creating High Quality and Distinctive Environments chapter following consultation undertaken between October 2010 – Jan 2011 on the Core Strategy ‘Options for Consideration’ document. Specifically, the Creating High Quality and Distinctive Environments chapter sets out policy options associated with the quality and design of the built environment, the historic environment, the coast, landscape and design, open spaces, leisure facilities and green infrastructure.

**1.2** Preparation of the Pre - Submission Core Strategy Creating High Quality and Distinctive Environments chapter has involved consideration of the following:

- National and local policy;
- Core Strategy ‘Options for Consideration’ consultation and ongoing engagement;
- Sustainability Appraisal, Habitats Regulations Assessment, Health Impact Assessment and Equalities Impact Assessment;
- The Local Development Framework Evidence Base;
- Infrastructure delivery and viability.

**1.3** This background paper also identifies, where appropriate, strategic infrastructure requirements to support the policy options within the < xxxxxx> chapter which feeds into the wider Core Strategy infrastructure delivery plan and preparation of the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule.

**1.4** This paper should be read in conjunction with the following key issue papers prepared in refining Core Strategy options from the initial issues and options consultation undertaken in March 2008 to the ‘Options for Consideration’ consultation undertaken from October 2010 – January 2011.

- **Key Issue Paper:** Historic Built Environment
- **Key Issue Paper:** Design and Landscape
- **Key Issue Paper:** Improving Sports and Leisure Facilities

## 2 Formation of Pre Submission Options

**2.1** This section provides a critical assessment of the options put forward for consultation in the Creating High Quality and Distinctive Environments chapter of the 'Options for Consideration' Core Strategy, and provides recommendations for the policy approach to be adopted in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy. The assessment process examines the consultation responses received to the 'Options for Consideration' document and key issues arising from this engagement process. The formation of Pre-Submission policy options also considers any recent changes in national policy and updates to the evidence base which supplements the policy and evidence review undertaken within the key issue papers listed in the introduction. The assessment below also takes into account key conclusions of the sustainability appraisal, habitats regulations assessment, health impact assessment and equalities impact assessment undertaken for the 'Options for Consideration' Core Strategy. A summary of all the proposed Pre-Submission policy options for the Creating High Quality and Distinctive Environments chapter is set out at the end of this paper.

### **Issue and Options Identified in 'Options for Consideration' Core Strategy:**

**2.2** How can we protect historically and/or architecturally locally important unlisted buildings, sites, parks and gardens from demolition or inappropriate development?

#### **Preferred Option HE 1**

##### **Protection of buildings of local historic and architectural interest**

Locally listed buildings, along with monuments, sites or landscapes of historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest will form part of the heritage protection strategy. Local lists of heritage assets will identify key buildings and structures which, although not of sufficient quality to meet national listing criteria, have valuable architectural or historic merit and make a positive contribution to local character. Development proposals affecting such sites or buildings will be sympathetic to their character and will respect their key architectural or historic features. Demolition of a locally listed building will require planning consent, as will works which adversely affect any of the features recognised on the Local List.

Accordingly:

- a. In East Dorset, a Local List of Heritage Assets will be produced.
- b. In Christchurch the existing Local List of Heritage Assets will be updated.

### Consultation Response

Option	Support	Object	No Opinion	Total
<b>Preferred Option HE 1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>

Table 2.1

**2.3** There was strong support for this option from Wimborne Civic Society, a local councillor and 3 local residents, to protect locally listed buildings, monuments, sites or landscapes of historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest, to develop a Local List of Heritage Assets in East Dorset and to update the List of Heritage Assets in Christchurch. It was also strongly endorsed by English Heritage.

**2.4** The objection was raised by Cranborne Estates who questioned the criteria for listing such assets, and believed that local listing might be construed as gold-plating current legislation on the protection of heritage assets.

**2.5** Comments were also made on the following points:

- English Heritage - We are anxious to ensure you also appreciate the significance of the wider historic landscape rather than just the local impact on individual designated heritage assets. For example, what is the cumulative impact of the various developments and associated infrastructure on the historic landscape, its character and setting?
- English Heritage - In addition you will need to consider how the Core Strategy, and/or subsequent heritage SPD, responds to the challenge faced by the 52 scheduled monuments, a registered park and garden, and 3 listed buildings on the national 'at risk' register?
- Cranborne Estates on the type of consultation and criteria to be used for selection;
- The East Dorset Environment Theme Action Group (ETAG) commented that the policy wording should protect historic landscapes and townscapes as well as individual buildings.
- That current legislation was already sufficient;
- That consent to replace locally listed buildings would not normally be forthcoming; and
- Local roads and lanes in conservations areas should be protected.

## Response

**2.6** It is considered that locally listing buildings will be a positive move in recognising their contribution to the local area. It is anticipated that consultation on producing these lists will be carried out with the local community.

## Consideration of Evidence and Policy

**2.7** The policy approach in HE 1 remains consistent the Draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (July 2011), which states the Government's objectives for planning and the historic environment are to:

- Conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance; and
- Contribute to our knowledge and understanding of our past by capturing evidence from the historic environment and making this publicly available, particularly where a heritage asset is to be lost.

**2.8** The Draft NPPF recommends that local planning authorities should take into account:

- The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets
- The wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring; and
- The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

**2.9** The importance of the setting of a heritage asset is identified and this should be taken into account.

**2.10** The Draft NPPF continues, that when considering the impact of a proposed development on a designated heritage asset, considerable importance and weight should be given to its conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss.

**2.11** The policy approach remains consistent with PPS 5 supporting the desirability of protecting heritage assets, and recognising the qualities and local distinctiveness of the historic environment, and with the local development framework evidence base.

## 'Options for Consideration' Sustainability Appraisal

Relevant Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Preferred Option HE 1
Objective 2: Make sustainable use of resources.	Positive Impact

Relevant Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Preferred Option HE 1
Objective 10: Protect and enhance historic buildings, archaeological sites and other culturally important features.	Positive Impact
Objective 11: Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness and create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look well.	Positive Impact
Objective 12: Facilitate a sustainable and growing economy for the District that creates economic and employment opportunity, as well as providing for vital and viable town centres.	Positive Impact

Table 2.2

**‘Options for Consideration’ Habitats Regulations Assessment**

**2.12** The HRA assessment for this option concluded that it is not likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of any European site in Christchurch or East Dorset. This option would seek to protect designated landscapes, so effects would be positive or neutral.

**‘Options for Consideration’ Health Impact Assessment**

**2.13** The HIA identifies a positive impact for the Built Environment, and no adverse impacts.

**‘Options for Consideration’ Equalities Impact Assessment**

**2.14** The EqIA identifies that this option is likely to have a neutral impact.

**Infrastructure Requirements**

**2.15** This policy option does not give rise to infrastructure requirements.

**Conclusions**

**2.16** The historic environment plays an important role in the economic wellbeing of the two districts, particularly in relation to tourism. This can place significant pressures on the historic environment. Pressures come from the demand to modernise historic buildings, change their uses, develop within conservation areas, and from the increased effects of traffic and highway improvements. Option HE1 is favourably supported by the consultation, local development framework evidence base and consistent with current and emerging national policy. The Option wording could be amended to reflect comments raised in the consultation regarding the importance of the landscape and setting as noted in the Draft NPPF.

**2.17** The SA, HRA, HIA and EqIA assessments do not identify any significant adverse impacts.

**2.18** How can we further prevent harmful changes to Conservation Areas and listed buildings?

### Option HE 2

#### Development within Conservation Areas

To consider the use of Article 4(2) Directions in appropriate cases to control small scale works to buildings in Conservation Areas and within the curtilage of listed buildings that would otherwise be authorised by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.

### Option HE 3

#### Development within Conservation Areas

To consider the use of of Article 4(1) Directions in appropriate cases (where the consent of the Secretary of State is required) to control small scale works to buildings in conservation areas and within the curtilage of listed buildings that would otherwise be authorised by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.

### Consultation Response

Option	Support	Object	No Opinion	Total
Option HE 2	1	0	0	1
Option HE 3	1	0	0	1

Table 2.3

**2.19** There was unanimous support for both of these options in the consultation, including particular support from English Heritage. The proposed historic environment policies and commitment to local lists and Article 4 directions are positive features of note according to English Heritage.

**2.20** English Heritage also suggested developing a specific Heritage section of the document to demonstrate a coherent heritage strategy and delivery framework. This can, in turn, demonstrate a joined up approach; provide the justification for, and show how it helps support delivery of the planned vision.

**2.21 Officer Response**

**2.22** These comments are welcomed in support of the options.

**Consideration of Evidence and Policy**

**2.23** The Draft NPPF recommends that local planning authorities should look for opportunities to enhance the significance of Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites. The policy approach in HE 2 and HE 3 remains consistent with PPS 5 to consider the desirability of controlling small scale works to buildings in Conservation Areas and within the curtilage of listed buildings, by the use of an Article 4(2) or an Article 4(1) Direction.

**2.24** The policy approach of HE 2 and HE 3 remains consistent with the local development framework evidence base.

**‘Options for Consideration’ Sustainability Appraisal**

Relevant Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Option HE 2	Option HE 3
Objective 10: Protect and enhance historic buildings, archaeological sites and other culturally important features.	Strongly Positive Impact	Strongly Positive Impact
Objective 11: Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness and create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look well.	Strongly Positive Impact	Strongly Positive Impact
Objective 12: Facilitate a sustainable and growing economy for the District that creates economic and employment opportunity, as well as providing for vital and viable town centres.	Positive Impact	Positive Impact

Table 2.4

### **‘Options for Consideration’ Habitats Regulations Assessment**

**2.25** The HRA assessment for this option concluded that it is not likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of any European site in Christchurch or East Dorset. This option would seek to protect designated landscapes, so effects would be positive or neutral.

### **‘Options for Consideration’ Health Impact Assessment**

**2.26** The HIA identifies a positive impact for the Built Environment, and no adverse impacts.

### **‘Options for Consideration’ Equalities Impact Assessment**

**2.27** The EqIA identifies that this option is likely to have a neutral impact.

### **Infrastructure Requirements**

**2.28** This policy option does not give rise to infrastructure requirements.

### **Conclusions**

**2.29** Options HE2 and HE 3 are supported by the consultation, local development framework evidence base and consistent with national policy. The impact on character of small scale development within conservation areas is a critical issue. Carefully designed schemes have the potential to improve historic areas, provided new development complements and enhances the special features of historic buildings and respects the scale, building materials and density of the surrounding form.

**2.30** A Heritage Strategy taking into account the protection of listed buildings, monuments, sites, gardens, landscapes and their settings will be developed with Option Option HE 1 above. Article 4 directions will be considered where there are threats to heritage assets. The SA, HRA, HIA and EqIA assessments identify a positive impact for the Built Environment, and do not identify any significant adverse impacts.

### 2.31 How can we ensure that development is of a high design standard which complements local character, environmental qualities and makes a positive contribution to local distinctiveness and cultural vitality?

#### **Preferred Option HE 4**

##### **Special Character Areas**

It is proposed that Special Character Areas should continue to form part of the design strategy in East Dorset. A review will be carried out regarding the appropriateness of the designations in the Plan period. When considering this, the local authority will take into account the character of the area by virtue of its function, i.e. the accessibility to transport corridors, the design details/style/appearance/layout of buildings and landscaping.

#### **Preferred Option HE 5**

Introduction of an Urban Design Guide in East Dorset

In East Dorset introduce urban design guides for the urban areas outside conservation areas and Special Character Areas.

#### **Preferred Option HE 6**

In Christchurch the Borough-wide Character Assessment will continue to guide decisions regarding protection of character and appropriate design control, and will be updated within the plan period.

#### **Non Preferred Option HE 7**

In Christchurch to introduce Special Character Areas, to preserve the special character of individual areas.

## Consultation Response

Option	Support	Object	Total
Preferred Option HE 4	6	1	7
Preferred Option HE 5	8	3	11
Preferred Option HE 6	0	1	1
Non Preferred Option HE 7	0	1	1

Table 2.5

**2.32** There was welcome support for these options from English Heritage, Dorset Wildlife Trust (DWT), ETAG and local estate managers. DWT suggested that 'In urban designs we would wish to see recommendations on enhancing biodiversity through landscaping schemes and inclusion of biodiversity features'. Those who objected believed:

- design guides would be too prescriptive and too traditional in approach, stifling modern design
- that mitigating the effects of climate change should be incorporated into any design guide to encourage biodiversity (Natural England)

### 2.33 Officer Response

**2.34** It is widely believed that design guides will positively encourage good design in new development. The aim is not to stifle creativity, but to support the use of quality materials, and landscaping to reflect the character of the area.

### Consideration of Evidence and Policy

**2.35** The Government continues to attach great importance to the design of the built environment in the Draft NPPF. It aims to achieve high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider development schemes. It states that policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area, and local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes.

**2.36** Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:

- Ensure that a place will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development

- Optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks
- Respond to local character and reflect the identity of local surroundings, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation
- Create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and
- Are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

**2.37** The policy approach in HE 4, HE 5, HE 6 and HE 7 remains consistent with PPS 5 to set out a positive, proactive strategy for conservation of the historic environment in the local area. This approach should consider the character of the environment and an area's sense of place. The policy approach should inspire a high quality of development, minimise waste and consider mixed and flexible patterns of land use that are sustainable, as outlined in PPS 5.

**2.38** The policy approach of HE 4, HE 5, HE 6 and HE 7 remains consistent with the local development framework evidence base.

### 'Options for Consideration' Sustainability Appraisal

Relevant Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Option HE 4	Option HE 5	Option HE 6	Option HE 7
<b>Objective 10: Protect and enhance historic buildings, archaeological sites and other culturally important features.</b>	<b>Strongly Positive Impact</b>	<b>Strongly Positive Impact</b>	<b>Strongly Positive Impact</b>	<b>Positive Impact</b>
<b>Objective 11: Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness and create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look well.</b>	<b>Strongly Positive Impact</b>	<b>Strongly Positive Impact</b>	<b>Strongly Positive Impact</b>	<b>Positive Impact</b>

Relevant Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Option HE 4	Option HE 5	Option HE 6	Option HE 7
<b>Objective 12: Facilitate a sustainable and growing economy for the District that creates economic and employment opportunity, as well as providing for vital and viable town centres.</b>	<b>Positive Impact</b>	<b>Positive Impact</b>	<b>Positive Impact</b>	<b>Positive Impact</b>

Table 2.6

#### **‘Options for Consideration’ Habitats Regulations Assessment**

**2.39** The HRA assessment for these options concluded that it is not likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of any European site in Christchurch or East Dorset. These options would seek to protect designated landscapes, so effects would be positive or neutral.

#### **‘Options for Consideration’ Health Impact Assessment**

**2.40** The HIA identifies a positive impact for the Built Environment, and no adverse impacts. The urban design guides could refer to townscape and street improvements which would encourage active travel.

#### **‘Options for Consideration’ Equalities Impact Assessment**

**2.41** The EqIA identifies that these options are likely to have a neutral impact.

#### **Infrastructure Requirements**

**2.42** This policy option does not give rise to infrastructure requirements.

**2.43** Additional comments made in relation to these options

**2.44** **New Design Guidance in Coastal Areas**

**2.45** Cllrs John Lofts and Myra Mawbey (Highcliffe Ward Councillors) suggest there should be an option for new design guidance in coastal areas. This covers the area to the south of Lymington Road and includes Rothesday Drive in Highcliffe. The Borough Character Assessment dismissed Rothesay Drive as being merely a close giving access to the Castle. The assessment should be reviewed before it forms the basis for the design assessment for new schemes.

### **2.46 Officer Comment**

**2.47** This refers to a site specific consideration, which will be reviewed later in the development plan process. The Borough-wide Character Assessment will continue to guide decisions regarding protection of character and appropriate design control, and will be updated within the plan period.

### **Conclusions**

**2.48** There is a majority of support for Options HE4 and HE 5 from the consultation. Taking into account the development pressures it is inevitable that the area will need to face and adapt to change. The aim of the emerging policies should be to preserve valued features in the towns, which give them their distinctive characters and sense of place. New development should reflect the prevailing characteristics of a local area and, where possible, enhance those neighbourhoods in need of improvement both within the existing urban areas and within the rural countryside. New development will be expected to be attractive, functional, sustainable and of the highest quality, optimising the site potential and respecting the scale of the locality. The East Dorset Special Character Areas and Rural Design Guide, and the use of the Christchurch Borough-wide Character Assessment will form key components of the policy.

**2.49** This approach remains consistent with the local development framework evidence base and national policy, and should be taken forward. The SA, HRA, HIA and EqIA assessments identify a positive impact for the Built Environment, and do not identify any significant adverse impacts.

### **2.50 What open space and leisure provision should we provide to best meet identified local needs?**

## Preferred Option HE 8

**Adoption of local open space standards on the basis of a Local Need Area approach. Existing open space sites will be protected and, where appropriate, new sites designated.**

The recommended open space standards and Local Need Area boundaries provided by the 2007 Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study will be adopted for the Plan area (amended as necessary to take account of recent open space developments and new areas being considered for housing in the Core Strategy). Contributions will be directed towards meeting the **quantity, quality** and **accessibility** shortfalls for each of the Local Need Areas. The option will aim to deliver a combination of new facilities and improvements to existing ones, depending on the unique needs of the Local Needs Areas and the availability of land.

This option will protect existing open spaces and leisure facilities identified in the Local Plans and will not permit their loss unless their whole or partial redevelopment would result in greater benefits to the community than retaining that facility. Protected sites will be identified through the forthcoming Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document. The proposed open space 'implementation and delivery plan' will identify opportunities to maximise the use of existing sites and potentially re-designate sites for alternative leisure uses, in line with local needs.

Recommended Open Space Standards from the 2007 Open Space, Sport & Recreation Study:

Open space type	Recommended accessibility standard (straight line distance).	Recommended quantity standard (hectares per 1000 population)	Recommended quantity standard (square metres per person)	Total recommended provision

<b>Recreation Grounds &amp; Public Gardens (includes parks)</b>	450m	0.5 ha	5.0 sq m	<b>3.75 ha per 1000 population / 37.5 sq m per person</b>
<b>Amenity Green Space</b>	450m	0.5 ha	5.0 sq m	
<b>Natural &amp; Semi-natural Green Space</b>	600m	1.0 ha	10.0 sq m	
<b>Active (outdoor) Sports Space</b>	600m	1.25 ha	12.5 sq m	
<b>Children &amp; Young People’s Space</b>	450m	0.25 ha	2.5 sq m	
<b>Allotments</b>	600m	0.25ha	2.5 sq m	

Table 2.7

**Consultation Response**

Option	Support	Object	Total
<b>Preferred Option HE 8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>

Table 2.8

**2.51** Support for this option was received by the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Steering Group, Verwood Allotment Association, local residents and developers. Comments made included those raised by the Woodland Trust and Natural England:

- to ensure that the location of open space should be integral to designing resilience and adaptation into the urban environment;
- to use the Woodland Access Standard - WAST - as a delivery tool (Woodland Trust);
- to make clear the linkages with woodland and active health;
- to clarify if heaths are deemed to be open space, and the need to protect all areas of open space, whether in the rural area and including green belt land.

**2.52** Verwood residents who responded to the Verwood Town Plan consultation supported more leisure facilities, pitches and a better leisure centre as a priority in Verwood. In addition, more open space, playgrounds and allotments were supported, as was a swimming pool in the town.

**2.53** Synergy residents commented that they would like to see better maintenance of public space.

**2.54** Students from Queen Elizabeth's UpperSchool in Wimborne also supported better leisure facilities and a new swimming pool. Students at CorfeHillsSchool supported improvements to skate parks in Corfe Mullen and Wimborne, and more gyms in the district.

**2.55** Children from St Mark's Primary School in Christchurch wanted to see more allotments, play areas, sports facilities, a nature zone and community garden associated with new development in Christchurch. Children from across East Dorset first, middle and upper schools at the East Dorset Pupil Voice Conference, supported a bowling alley and an ice rink in East Dorset, a skate park in Colehill, and better sports facilities in Verwood, including an astro turf pitch, new swimming pool and more facilities for young people generally.

**2.56** Ferndown Jujitsu Club also supported the provision of more sports facilities and pitches in Ferndown, as well as teenage facilities such as a skate park, bowling alley or scrambling track.

### **Response**

**2.57** The support and interest in open space is welcomed from a wide range of residents across many age groups. The important of bio-diverse linkages has been highlighted in creating a network of open space in our towns and settlements. The range of facilities desired and the need for good maintenance of open space is acknowledged.

### **Consideration of Evidence and Policy**

**2.58** The policy approach in HE 8 remains consistent with PPG 17 and the PPS Consultation Paper: Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment. The emerging Draft NPPF strengthens policies to guard against the loss of community facilities, and recommends communities designate land as Local Green Space, that will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and planned so that they are capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas of open space. The designation should only be used:

- where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to a centre of population or urban area
- where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance because of its beauty, historic importance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of wildlife
- where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land; and
- if the designation does not overlap with Green Belt

**2.59** The Dorset Play Strategy (2011 - 2015) aims to firmly embed play as a cross cutting policy issue and ensure local communities are active partners in identifying and meeting local play needs. This strategy and the policy approach of HE 8 remains consistent with the local development framework evidence base.

**‘Options for Consideration’ Sustainability Appraisal**

Relevant Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Option HE 8
Objective 5: Provide access to meet people's needs.	Positive Impact
Objective 7: Create conditions to improve health, promoting healthy lifestyles, especially routine daily exercise and reducing health inequalities.	Positive Impact

Table 2.9

**Options for Consideration’ Habitats Regulations Assessment**

**2.60** The HRA assessment for this option concluded that it is not likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of any European site in Christchurch or East Dorset. This option would seek to protect designated landscapes, by providing alternative areas of open space for recreation, so effects would be positive or neutral.

**‘Options for Consideration’ Health Impact Assessment**

**2.61** The HIA identifies a positive impact for Recreation and the Natural Environment, and no adverse impacts.

**‘Options for Consideration’ Equalities Impact Assessment**

**2.62** The EqIA identifies that this option is likely to have a positive impact for the elderly and the young, those with disabilities, those who are rurally isolated or those in areas of deprivation.

**Infrastructure Requirements**

Additional Infrastructure Requirement	Timing	Funding	Responsibility Provision
The provision of more allotments in East Dorset and Christchurch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the lifetime of the Core Strategy</li> </ul>	Unknown	Allotment Associations, District & Borough Councils, landowners and developers
New astro turf pitch in East Dorset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the lifetime of the Core Strategy</li> </ul>	Unknown	District Council, landowners and developers

Additional Infrastructure Requirement	Timing	Funding	Responsibility Provision
The provision of improved skate parks in East Dorset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the lifetime of the Core Strategy</li> </ul>	Unknown	District Town and Parish Councils, landowners and developers
New Sports Centre at Emmanuel School in Verwood and sports facilities in The Hub	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Short Term</li> </ul>	Unknown	Morrisons Supermarket, EDDC, DCC & Verwood Community Association
Wimborne Rugby Club - new pitches and clubhouse on land south of Leigh Road.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In conjunction with the development on land at WMC 5.</li> </ul>	Unknown	Wimborne Rugby Club and the developer of this site
Wimborne Town Football Club - new pitch and clubhouse on land south of Leigh Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In conjunction with the development of land at WMC 5.</li> </ul>	Unknown	Wimborne Town Football Club and the developer of this site

Table 2.10

## Conclusions

**2.63** There is a majority of support for this option, and comments are to a greater extent already covered by the policy option, notably reinforcing the links of exercise, good health and well being. The approach remains consistent with the local development framework evidence base and national policy in the Draft NPPF, which seeks to protect community facilities and identify Local Green Space. The SA, HRA, HIA and EqlA assessments identify a positive impact for Recreation and the Natural Environment, and do not identify any significant adverse impacts. This Option should be taken forward in the Pre-Submission document, as a general open space policy supporting the the delivery of new and enhanced provision, and the provision of green infrastructure.

## 2.64 How should a developer contributions policy apply to new development?

## Preferred Option HE 9

**Developer contributions for the provision of open space will be applied to residential units of 1 unit net gain or greater.**

The Core Strategy will include a developer contributions policy which seeks to deliver new open space and enhancements to existing facilities in step with new residential development. Funding acquired through developer contributions will be complimented by other sources of funding where it can be secured.

Where appropriate in terms of location and the nature of the development, and where a local need for small scale facilities has been identified, an on-site contribution will be preferable. It may be appropriate for earlier developments to provide the land upon which later developments pay for structures or equipment. The policy will aim to deliver a combination of new facilities and improvements to existing ones, depending on the unique needs of the Local Need Areas (LNA) and the availability of land.

### ***Contributions commensurate with demand***

Population increase will be used to determine the relative demand created by different developments. For residential development, contributions will be on a per-dwelling basis and the level of contribution will be higher for larger housing than for small houses or flats; this will be determined by the average occupancy rates (where the average occupancy acts as a multiplier reflecting population increase):

<b>Dwelling type and size</b>	<b>Average occupancy (persons per dwelling)</b>
1 bedroom flat	1.1
1 or 2 bedroom house / 2 bedroom flat	1.5
3 or 4 bedroom house or flat	2.3
5+ bedroom house or flat	2.8

Table 2.11

(Average dwelling occupancy rates, *source: Office of National Statistics 2006 household projections*)

### ***Delivering new and enhanced provision***

To provide an evidence base upon which to base the contributions policy the Councils will produce an 'implementation and delivery plan' which will include a list of the priority needs and objectives for each LNA and specific opportunities for new or enhanced provision. The plan will provide costs for establishing and maintaining a range of formal and informal leisure facilities, which will then be factored into the calculation of per-dwelling (residential) and per-hectare (commercial) developer contributions. The plan will also provide developers with clarity about which form of contribution they will be required to make. Applicants should consider how their development can meet the identified priorities, either through on-site provision within the development, or through a financial contribution.

### ***Location of new provision***

When considering sites for new open space and leisure provision, priority will be given to sites which are easily accessible by a range of transport modes and which can be integrated into a network of green infrastructure. Transport options being proposed through the Key Strategy, aim to reduce people's need to travel by car and to guide new development towards accessible locations (such as town centres) and major transport corridors. Issue: How should policy deliver a network of green infrastructure? in this chapter provides options for integrating open space policy with green infrastructure and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace. Sites for new open space provision will be identified through an implementation and delivery plan and considered for allocation through the forthcoming Site-Specific Allocations Development Plan Document.

### **Alternative Preferred Option HE 10**

**As Option HE 9 and developer contributions will also be applied to commercial developments of over 1,000sqm gross internal floor space for B1, B2 and B8 uses and hotels.**

A discounting rate of 90% will be applied to commercial development (compared with residential) to recognise that employees create less demand than residents. The contribution will then be charged at a per - sqm rate.

### **Preferred Option HE 11**

Use a standard contribution across both districts and spend contributions anywhere in the districts.

### **Non Preferred Option HE 12**

Use a standard contribution across both districts and contributions spent within the local need area of the contributing development.

## Consultation Response

Option	Support	Object	Total
Preferred Option HE 9	5	0	5
Alternative Preferred Option HE 10	3	0	3
Preferred Option HE 11	3	2	5
Non Preferred Option HE 12	1	0	1

Table 2.12

**2.65** There was strong support for both Options HE 9 and HE10. The RSPB, Colehill Parish Council, ETAG and a housing developer all supported the provision of open space contributions or on site provision for housing developments of one unit net gain or more. Similarly, the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Steering Group supports commercial contributions to open space provision as suggested in Option HE 10, as does Corfe Mullen Parish Council although with some reservations.

**2.66** The responses showed mixed views for using a standard contribution across both districts and how it should be spent. Option HE 11 proposed spending contributions collected anywhere in either district, but concern was expressed about this by developers and a local estate manager who preferred to see contributions spent in the vicinity of the development. Local nature conservation interests however supported this option. Comments relating to Option HE 12 in relation to the collection of contributions and spending them only within the local need area, suggested that the approach should be updated with regard to the current position of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding arrangements.

### **2.67 GI and Natural Environment Focus Group 24.11.10**

**2.68** There was discussion about developer contributions and the Interim Heathland Framework mitigation fund. There was support for collecting and spending contributions in the Local Needs Area (Option HE 12), rather than throughout the plan area as proposed in Option HE 11.

## Response

**2.69** The ways in which contributions will be collected, with the possible merger of the Joint Heathland IPF and developer contributions for the provision of general open space will need to be decided upon. It is interesting to see that contributions from commercial developments of over 1000 sqm are supported, but how to spend the contributions whether in the LNA or across both authority areas split views.

**Consideration of Evidence and Policy**

2.70 The policy approach in HE 9 and HE 10 remains consistent with PPG 17 and the PPS Consultation Paper: Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment and the Draft NPPF. The collection of contributions will be addressed in the CIL document being developed in line with Government guidance as part of the Core Strategy. The policy approach of HE 9 and HE 10 remains consistent with the local development framework evidence base.

**‘Options for Consideration’ Sustainability Appraisal**

Relevant Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Preferred Option HE 9	Alternative Preferred Option HE 10	Preferred Option HE 11	Non Preferred Option HE 12
Objective 5: Provide access to meet people's needs.	Positive Impact	Positive Impact	Positive Impact	Positive Impact
Objective 7: Create conditions to improve health, promoting healthy lifestyles, especially routine daily exercise and reducing health inequalities.	Positive Impact	Positive Impact	Positive Impact	Positive Impact

Table 2.13

**Options for Consideration’ Habitats Regulations Assessment**

2.71 The HRA assessment for these options concluded that they are unlikely to have a significant effect on the integrity of any European site in Christchurch or East Dorset. These options would seek to protect designated landscapes, by providing alternative areas of open space for recreation, so effects would be positive or neutral.

**‘Options for Consideration’ Health Impact Assessment**

2.72 The HIA identifies a positive impact for Recreation and the Natural Environment, and no adverse impacts.

### **‘Options for Consideration’ Equalities Impact Assessment**

**2.73** The EqIA identifies that these options are likely to have a positive impact for people of all ages, those with disabilities, those who are rurally isolated or those in areas of deprivation.

### **Infrastructure Requirements**

**2.74** This policy option does not give rise to infrastructure requirements.

### **Conclusions**

**2.75** There is a clear majority of support for the collection of developer contributions towards the provision of open space, and a slight majority in favour of district wide collection and spending across the plan area, rather than in the locality where the development has taken place. This approach remains consistent with the local development framework evidence base and national policy. The SA, HRA, HIA and EqIA assessments identify a positive impact on Recreation and the Natural Environment and do not identify any significant adverse impacts. These options will form part of a single open space policy, and contributions will be made through CIL.

**2.76** **How should policy deliver a network of green infrastructure?**

#### **Preferred Option HE 13**

##### **Creation of a Green Infrastructure network using a shared open space/recreation and heathlands mitigation contributions policy.**

Where appropriate, developer contributions acquired through local open space policies and the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework/Development Plan Document will be used to develop a strategic green infrastructure network. Developments will be expected to incorporate elements of green infrastructure into their design such as ‘permeability’, with green foot and cycle paths running through the development, connecting with existing routes wherever possible. A new separate charge for green infrastructure will not be levied through Section 106 or through a tariff based approach. Instead, contributions acquired through open space policy and heathland mitigation and supported by local authority budgets will provide the necessary funding.

This approach will recognise the unique situation in Dorset where large open spaces are already being funded through an existing developer contributions policy aimed at diverting recreational pressures away from the sensitive Dorset Heaths. The focus of the Joint Heathland Interim Planning Framework/Development Plan Document upon mitigating recreational pressures will be preserved. The mitigation benefits of sites funded through the Interim Planning Framework/Development Plan Document will be enhanced by Green Infrastructure policy through improved connectivity with other open spaces, thereby promoting informal recreation (such as cycling and dog walking) and facilitating access by alternative forms of transport to the car. Green infrastructure will also be designed to protect and enhance sites of biodiversity value.

**Non Preferred Option HE 14**

Establish a separate contributions policy for Green Infrastructure.

This option would implement a new separate charge for green infrastructure through Section 106 or through a tariff based approach on the basis that local open space policies, local authority budgets and the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework will be insufficient to deliver the required level of green infrastructure. Examples of infrastructure that might not be fundable through existing mechanisms include connecting routes which do not fall under either ‘open space’ or ‘heathland mitigation’. Proposals for green infrastructure would be costed up and used to inform a per-dwelling or per-hectare charge to new development.

**Consultation Response**

Option	Support	Object	Total
Preferred Option HE 13	8	4	12
Non Preferred Option HE 14	4	1	5

Table 2.14

**2.77** There was a majority support for Option HE 13 from respondents who included Dorset Wildlife Trust, a housing developer, ETAG, and the Dorset Countryside Ranger Service. Comments made included rewording the Option to include the benefits of native woodlands as a GI asset, emphasising the role of linkages between different areas of green space, proposals for links in existing routes and supporting watercourses and wetlands. Several residents responded in support of new cycleways. Concern was however raised on the following points:

- the proposed linkages could undermine the Heathland IPF (RSPB and others)
- lack of spatial guidance - a key diagram is required with wider links to the the coast, the New Forest and the Stour and Avon Valleys

**2.78** There was overwhelming support for a separate Green Infrastructure Charge (Non Preferred Option HE 14) from both Dorset Wildlife Trust and ETAG. Other comments considered that the most important fact was to ensure that GI was supported and not double counted, and that a single charging schedule through a CIL levy might be the most appropriate and straightforward way to achieve this. Support also came from developers and the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Steering Group.

**2.79 Natural Environment and GI Focus Group 24.11.10**

**2.80** At the Green Infrastructure and Natural Environment Focus Group, there was strong support for the provision of a strategic green infrastructure network, with particular support for bio-diverse areas and linkages. There was a mixed reaction to the merger of the IPF fund to be used towards this network. Some organisations saw it was essential to join them in order to deliver Green Infrastructure, whereas others considered it was necessary to retain independence because of the unique mitigation features which the IPF provides. There was unanimous agreement that CIL should also be used for funding GI to deliver strategic schemes.

### **Response**

**2.81** The joint charging structure seems to be the most appropriate method to deliver GI. As the Joint Heathland IPF is under review, this would be an opportune time to consider the joint approach with GI delivery.

### **Consideration of Evidence and Policy**

**2.82** The Draft NPPF refers to the Government's objective to deliver more and greater coherence of strategic networks of GI. The benefits with regard to sustainability, managed networks of biodiversity, green space for local community use, and preserving green space for future generations was given. A strategic approach should be undertaken to understand the existing provision and achieve better decisions about the protection and management of GI.

**2.83** The Policy approach in Option HE 13 remains in line with government advice contained in the PPS Consultation Paper: Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment. Since the Issues and Options Consultation, the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Strategy has been prepared and will be endorsed by partner authorities. This Option remains in line with the South East Dorset GI Strategy, the onus being to create a GI network through Option HE 13, using developer contributions and other funding opportunities.

**2.84** The policy approach of HE 13 remains consistent with the local development framework evidence base.

**2.85** The South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Strategy (2011) sets out a series of objectives and principles for the variety of functions it can provide for in south east Dorset. The strategy has three key roles:

- To promote the multi-functional approach of green infrastructure across a wide range of agendas
- To set an overarching strategy to deliver, manage and maintain current and future green infrastructure assets
- To guide a joint approach towards strategic green infrastructure for councils preparing local development framework documents

**2.86** The strategy also proposes 14 key strategic projects. Those sites located specifically in Christchurch and East Dorset are:

- Lower Stour Valley project
- Moors Valley extension
- Avon Heath enhancement
- Castleman Trailway

2.87 The following strategic projects encompass the broader sub region including Christchurch and East Dorset:

- Cycleways
- Enjoy Water
- Greenways, Coast and Chines
- Heath Restoration
- Historic Environment Liaison
- Local Food/Community Garden Initiative
- Local Open Spaces
- Street Trees
- Upton Country Park
- Woodland Restoration

**'Options for Consideration' Sustainability Appraisal**

Relevant Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Preferred Option HE 13	Non Preferred Option HE 14
Objective 5: Provide access to meet people's needs.	Positive Impact	Positive Impact
Objective 7: Create conditions to improve health, promoting healthy lifestyles, especially routine daily exercise and reducing health inequalities.	Positive Impact	Positive Impact

Table 2.15

**Options for Consideration' Habitats Regulations Assessment**

2.88 The HRA assessment for these Options concluded that they are not likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of any European site in Christchurch or East Dorset. These Options would seek to protect designated landscapes, by providing alternative areas of open space for recreation, so effects would be positive or neutral.

**Options for Consideration' Health Impact Assessment**

2.89 The HIA identifies a positive impact for Recreation and the Natural Environment, and no adverse impacts.

## Options for Consideration' Equalities Impact Assessment

**2.90** The EqIA identifies that these options are likely to have a positive impact for people of all ages and those with disabilities.

### Infrastructure Requirements

Additional Infrastructure Requirement	Timing	Funding	Responsibility Provision
The provision of a joined up Green Infrastructure network in Christchurch and East Dorset	During the lifetime of the Core Strategy	Unknown	DCC, District & Borough Councils, landowners and developers

Table 2.16

### Conclusions

**2.91** There is strong support to create a Green Infrastructure network in East Dorset linked into the wider sub region. There is some dissent about how contributions should be collected and spent across the two authorities, and the impact on biodiversity and the heathlands. This will need to be resolved as the Core Strategy is prepared. Areas of woodlands, wetlands and linkages need to be reinforced as key components in the Green Infrastructure network.

**2.92** This approach remains consistent with the Draft NPPF, the emerging South East Dorset GI Strategy, and the local development framework evidence base. In particular, the NPPF specifically refers to the strategic delivery of GI by local councils. The SA, HRA, HIA and EqIA assessments identify a positive impact for Recreation and the Natural Environment and do not identify any significant adverse impacts.

**2.93** These options will be supported in a single open space policy, incorporating the delivery of new and enhanced open space provision and the the delivery of green infrastructure.

**2.94** How far should landscape quality and character be protected in the rural area?

### Preferred Option HE 15

Review the existing Areas of Great Landscape Value in East Dorset, and consider the designation of further Areas of Special Landscape Character across East Dorset and Christchurch, based on Landscape Characterisation work.

**Preferred Option HE 16**

Rural design policies should be introduced to ensure that alterations and extensions to the housing stock, as well as all new development, sensitively respects and enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the area in which it is situated, particularly in areas with strong traditions and high heritage value.

**Non Preferred Option HE 17**

Use national policy to provide general rural landscape policies.

**Consultation Response**

Option	Support	Object	Total
Preferred Option HE 15	4	1	5
Preferred Option HE 16	7	1	8
Non Preferred Option HE 17	1	1	2

Table 2.17

**2.95** There was widespread support for the protection of the rural area of East Dorset, including further landscape designations and the introduction of rural design policies to guard against inappropriate alterations and new development. Support for either Option HE 15 and Option 16 was received from ETAG, The Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Wimborne Civic Society, and various local residents. Comments raised included:

- no further landscape designations as they will be too restrictive
- extension of the existing AONB to cover the whole width of the river valley in Stour Ward and selective protection of the traditional rural areas of the Green Belt - such as the landscape to the north of Wimborne
- reference to other landscape documentation to support this work (Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB)

**2.96** There was a very small response to Option HE 17 as a Non Preferred Option, and clearly most respondents prefer Options HE15 and HE16 in favour to reliance on national policies.

### Response

**2.97** On balance there is greater support for the protection of areas of landscape value, and consideration will be given to reviewing the existing boundaries and designations.

### Consideration of Evidence and Policy

**2.98** The Policy approach of Options HE 15 and HE 16 remain in line with government advice contained in PPS7 and in the PPS Consultation Paper: Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment. There is further local evidence emerging for the AONB on Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) and Historic Environment Action Plans (HEAPs) and this will help to shape the policies as they are developed.

**2.99** The policy approach of HE 15 and HE 16 remain consistent with the local development framework evidence base.

### Options for Consideration' Sustainability Appraisal

Relevant Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Preferred Option HE 15	Preferred Option HE 16	Non Preferred Option HE 17
<b>Objective 5: Provide access to meet people's needs.</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Positive</b>
<b>Objective 7: Create conditions to improve health, promoting healthy lifestyles, especially routine daily exercise and reducing health inequalities.</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Positive</b>

Table 2.18

### Options for Consideration' Habitats Regulations Assessment

**2.100** The HRA assessment for these Options concluded that they are not likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of any European site in Christchurch or East Dorset. These Options would seek to protect designated landscapes, by providing alternative areas of open space for recreation, so effects would be positive or neutral.

### Options for Consideration' Health Impact Assessment

**2.101** The HIA identifies that this option is likely to have a neutral impact.

### Options for Consideration' Equalities Impact Assessment

**2.102** The EqIA identifies that these options are likely to have a neutral impact.

### Infrastructure Requirements

Site	Infrastructure	Timing	Funding	Responsibility
Urban Extension and New Neighbourhood GI requirements for SANGs	Provision of SANGs /linkages, circular walks and trails	Phased ready for use ahead of new developments being occupied	s106	Developer and Countryside Rangers at Christchurch and East Dorset
Lower Stour Valley Project	Provision of linkages, circular walks and trails	Lifetime of Plan	CIL developer contributions	DCC, EDDC and CBC, GI Steering Group and landowners
Castleman Trailway Project	Improvements to the trail, provision of linkages and circular walks	Lifetime of Plan	DCC, CIL developer contributions	DCC, EDDC and CBC, GI Steering Group and landowners
Moors Valley Extension	Extension and Improvements to the park, provision of linkages and circular walks to the other nearby GI	Lifetime of Plan	CIL developer contributions, EDDC	DCC, EDDC, GI Steering Group and landowners

Site	Infrastructure	Timing	Funding	Responsibility
Avon Heath Extension	Improvements to the park, provision of linkages and circular walks to the other GI	Lifetime of Plan	DCC	DCC, EDDC and GI Steering Group

Table 2.19

### Conclusions

**2.103** There was widespread support for Preferred Options HE 15 and HE 16 to support landscape quality and to seek to protect and enhance the landscape character of the area. Reviews of existing designations will be supported subject to funding. Regard will be made to the Areas of Outstanding Beauty's Management Plan for development proposals affecting that area. This approach remains consistent with the local development framework evidence base and national policy. The SA, HRA, HIA and EqIA assessments do not identify any significant adverse impacts.

### 3 Pre Submission Options

#### 3.1 Protection of local historic and architectural interest

##### Policy HE1

##### **Protection of local historic and architectural interest**

The protection of national and local listed buildings, along with monuments, sites, gardens, landscapes and their settings of historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest will form part of the heritage protection strategy. Article 4 directions will be considered where there are threats to heritage assets. Local lists of heritage assets will identify key buildings and structures which, although not of sufficient quality to meet national listing criteria, have valuable architectural or historic merit and make a positive contribution to local character. Development proposals affecting such sites or buildings will be sympathetic to their character and will respect their key architectural or historic features.

#### 3.2 Design

## Policy HE2

### Design of New Development

Within Christchurch and East Dorset the design of development must be of a high quality, reflecting and enhancing areas of recognised local distinctiveness. To achieve this, development will be permitted if it is compatible with or improves its surroundings in:

- Layout
- Site coverage
- Architectural style
- Scale
- Bulk
- Height
- Materials
- Landscaping
- Visual impact
- Relationship to nearby properties
- Relationship to mature trees

This is within the context of the Christchurch Borough Wide Character Assessment. In the East Dorset rural area, design should accord with the Rural Design Summary. In Special Character Areas development must respect the identified features and characteristics. Careful design to reduce the risk of crime will be required.

### 3.3 Landscape Quality

### Policy HE3

#### Landscape Quality

Development will need to protect and seek to enhance the landscape character of the area.

Proposals will need to demonstrate that the following factors have been taken into account:

1. The character of settlements and their landscape settings.
2. Natural features such as trees, hedgerows, woodland, field boundaries, water features and wildlife corridors.
3. Features of cultural, historical and heritage value.
4. Important views and visual amenity.
5. Tranquillity and the need to protect against intrusion from light pollution, noise and motion.

Development proposals within or affecting the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will need to have regard to the relevant Management Plan.

Within the Areas of Great Landscape Value development will be permitted where its siting, design, materials, scale and landscaping are sympathetic with the particular landscape quality and character of the Areas of Great Landscape Value.

#### 3.4 Open Space, Leisure and Green Infrastructure

**Policy HE4**

**Open Space Provision**

The open space standards and Local Need Area boundaries provided by the 2007 Open Space, Sport and Recreation Studies will be applied throughout the Plan area (amended as necessary to take account of recent open space developments and new areas allocated for housing in the Core Strategy). Contributions will be directed towards meeting the quantity, quality and accessibility shortfalls for each of the Local Need Areas. The aim is to deliver a combination of new facilities and improvements to existing ones, depending on the unique needs of the Local Needs Areas and the availability of land.

Existing open spaces and leisure facilities identified on the Proposals Map will be protected and their loss will not be permitted unless their whole or partial redevelopment would result in greater benefits to the community than retaining that facility. On such occasions the replacement must be provided in close proximity, unless it can be shown that the open space, sport or recreational facility was not required.

**Recommended Open Space Standards from the 2007 Open Space, Sport & Recreation Study:**

Open Space Type	Recommended accessibility standard (straight line distance).	Recommended quantity standard (hectares per 1000 population)	Recommended quantity standard (square metres per person)	Total recommended provision
Recreation Grounds & Public Gardens (includes parks)	450m	0.5 ha	5.0 sq m	3.75 ha per 1000 population / 37.5 sq m per person
Amenity Green Space	450m	0.5 ha	5.0 sq m	
Natural & Semi-natural Green Space	600m	1.0 ha	10.0 sq m	
Active (outdoor) Sports Space	600m	1.25 ha	12.5 sq m	
Children & Young People’s Space	450m	0.25 ha	2.5 sq m	
Allotments	600m	0.25ha	2.5 sq m	

Table 3.1

Children's play provision, which forms part of the children and young people's space category, must be provided on the basis of the standards set out in Appendix 1.

Where appropriate in terms of location and the nature of the development, and where a local need for small scale facilities has been identified, on site provision will be preferable. It may be appropriate for earlier developments to provide the land upon which later developments pay for structures or equipment. Financial contributions towards off site provision of open space may be acceptable where it is impractical for provision to be on site. In this instance contributions should be in line with the standards set out in this policy.

The policy will aim to deliver a combination of new facilities and improvements to existing ones, depending on the unique needs of the 'Local Need Areas' and the availability of land.

### ***Delivering new and enhanced provision***

The Councils will produce an 'implementation and delivery plan' which will include a list of the priority needs and objectives for each local Needs Area and specific opportunities for new or enhanced provision. It will identify opportunities to maximise the use of existing sites and potentially re-designate sites for alternative leisure uses, in line with local needs.

### ***Location of new provision***

When considering sites for new open space and leisure provision, priority will be given to sites which are easily accessible by a range of transport modes and which can be integrated into a network of green infrastructure. Sites for new open space provision will be identified through an implementation and delivery plan and considered for allocation through the forthcoming Site-Specific Allocations Development Plan Document.

### ***Green Infrastructure***

Where appropriate, the Community Infrastructure Levy will be used to ensure that elements of green infrastructure will be incorporated into their design such as 'permeability', with green foot and cycle paths running through the development, connecting with existing routes wherever possible.