

**Reference 359555**  
**Wimborne Minster Town Council**  
**(Represented by Cllr T F Wheeler)**

**CEDC Core Strategy Examination in Public.**  
**Matter 5/7**

Wimborne Minster Town Council (WMTC) does not consider the location and scale of the Cranborne Road New Neighbourhood (WMC5) to be justified and is excessive to the needs of Colehill & Wimborne. WMTC's standpoint is described in the document 'Wimborne Minster Town Council and Colehill Parish Council – A Statement of Common Ground.'

WMTC believes that WMC5 should be removed from the Core Strategy pending the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan by Colehill Parish Council under the Localism Act. This plan would consider all the sites within that parish, where developments would integrate with existing communities, rather than create a new neighbourhood which would have no link with either the Town or Colehill. We see this as a viable alternative, to the inclusion of WMC5 within the Core Strategy, which we believe is inappropriate for the following reasons:

By refusing to consult on alternative sites, EDDC has ignored its own 'Statement of Community Involvement Policy (SD25)' and as such the plan is not consistent with paragraph 17 of the NPPF, as it has removed the ability of local people to shape their surroundings. Colehill Parish Council and WMTC are stated as LDF Key Stakeholders within SD25 and yet neither were consulted with regard to any alternative sites. The District Council has ignored the many objections to this development on greenbelt land, despite acknowledging the strength of local opinion in the Leader of the District Council's letter to the then Secretary of State for Communities and Local government in June 2009 (appendix 1).

The development is disproportionate to the needs of Colehill and Wimborne. The Core Strategy identifies proposals for 2447 new homes for the area and yet the identified needs of the immediate area are only 720 dwellings (ED29 – table 7.4). The Core Strategy comments that Wimborne is an historic market town and key to the tourism of the district but its character will be damaged by this unsustainable development, which alone will account for 25% of the likely increase in population in Colehill/Wimborne

The plan is unsound because it will not deliver sustainable development. Almost all the major employment sites as identified in Policy PC1 are to the South and East of Wimborne and accessing them from WMC5 will require crossing a narrow bridge and

then driving through the town. The 2011 Dorset County Council Wimborne Transport Model (Final\_Wimborne\_SATURN\_report\_Jan\_2011.pdf) has identified that 16 junctions would have a Ratio of Flow to Capacity of over 75%. It concluded that general traffic would increase by 45% in and around the Town with a significantly higher increase in some areas, which would be on the routes taken by residents of WMC5 to the major employment sites. In the letter referred to in Appendix 1, the District Council said that these traffic issues may not be resolvable. Nothing has changed since that time, with the exception that the District Council has now increased the housing proposals over and above the figure it was objecting to in 2009. Despite the concerns expressed in Chapter 4 of the Core Strategy (4.44 – 4.49), the proposals for its largest development within the whole plan are not at the end of a prime transport corridor, but accessed through the town which it acknowledges already has transport issues. Furthermore the Core Strategy has identified that the nearest industrial estate (Stone Lane) should be demolished and replaced by another new neighbourhood (WMC4) and therefore does not prove positive preparedness as WMC5 conflicts with policy KS9 and NPPF para 37 as the higher density development planned here is neither in or around the town centre or a prime transport corridor (SD 28). SD16 Transport Baseline 5.100 – 5.104 itself identifies serious issues for transport and the sustainability assessment should therefore comprise an impact assessment for the Core Strategy as a whole

Part of the plan for WMC5 includes the replacement of Wimborne First School, which is currently situated in the centre of town. Moving this school to WMC5 on the Town's extremity would create longer journeys for existing pupils and as such is inconsistent with NPPF para 37. Indeed this will encourage parents to drive children to school exacerbating the traffic issues described above and does not engender sustainability. The nearest upper school is already at capacity and the district council does not envisage increased capacity coming on-stream in the short term of the plan. Similarly the plan does not widen choice as required under NPPF para 72.

The Bournemouth, Christchurch, East Dorset, North Dorset and Salisbury Strategic Flood Risk Assessment - Level 1 of February 2008 stated Policy WENV4:

“Development should be sited and designed to protect or enhance the visual and physical quality and natural history interest of rivers or their tributaries, and their landscape settings. This policy will apply to the Rivers Avon and Stour.” Despite this plans for WMC5 include high density developments adjacent to the SANG through which the Stour tributary, the River Allen runs. This SANG is subject to winter flooding. Whilst Natural England have apparently stated that this is acceptable, the site is within 5km of Dorset Heathland. The SANG's unsuitable topography cannot in times of flooding meet the requirements of Policy ME3 (Core Strategy Chapter 13). Given the scale of proposed development for WMC5 it would be inconsistent with sustainable development to proceed without a suitable SANG.

There is no evidence within the Core Strategy to suggest that the District Council has complied with paragraphs 100 of the NPPF, not only for the WMC5 site, but also in respect of the area immediately to the south of the River Allen, to ensure that this area, some of which lies within the R. Allen flood plain and is known to flood (as it did this year), would not be adversely affected by the development (NPPF 103). Given the

topography of the area it would make sense for Strategy to have included evidence of sequential and exception testing in order to meet Core Strategy ME6 (paragraph 13.5). Without completing these tests it is not possible to identify compliance with NPPF 101, in terms of steering development of identified strategic sites towards areas of lower risk of flooding. In this respect we contend that the plan is not positively prepared as the strategy has not been objectively assessed to meet infrastructure requirements and is also inconsistent with policies in the NPPF.