

CS Options

Events: Core Strategy Options for Consideration - Chapter 12 Managing the Natural Environment

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 725	12		General Comment	We welcome the introductory text to this chapter (paragraph 12.1) and the context to development set out in paragraph 12.7. We welcome the suite of biodiversity options in this chapter.			1113
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 183	12		General Comment	<p>ETAG recommends that the natural environment should be valued for its own sake and for the contribution it makes to people's health and wellbeing. This should be achieved through policies to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land owners and managers are supported in their work to protect natural resources and our distinctive local landscapes and to deliver the vision for the environment of East Dorset. • Green Infrastructure in towns, villages and the countryside is conserved, enhanced and extended to give people greater access to wildlife and the historic environment within easy reach of their homes. • There is more opportunity for people of all ages and abilities to access the countryside sustainably. • The tranquillity of our 'special areas' (eg the CC & WW AONB and the AGLVs) is secured through appropriate management and control of traffic and of potentially intrusive development and leisure pursuits. <p>ETAG recommends that the distinctive and varied natural habitats of East Dorset should be conserved and enhanced through extension, linkage, and positive management. Key opportunities for landscape scale habitat restoration should be identified and safeguarded for that purpose. Particular attention should be given to those habitats of principal importance listed under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural</p>			1113

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Communities Act 2006 (i.e. Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats). In this way, the vulnerability of natural ecosystems and biodiversity will be reduced and biodiversity enhancement targets for habitats and species will be achieved. Strategic areas of open habitat and native woodlands will be restored. There will be active management to control and remove invasive non-native species.</p> <p>Since the Core Strategy Options document was drafted, an independent review panel (comprising eminent natural scientists and chaired by Professor Lawton) has published for DEFRA an in depth analysis of the need for and mechanisms to ensure England's wildlife sites comprise a coherent and resilient ecological network. To deliver the vision of the English Biodiversity Strategy the report recommends that the overall aim for England's ecological network should be to deliver a natural environment where:</p> <p>Compared to the situation in 2000, biodiversity is enhanced and the diversity, functioning and resilience of ecosystems is re-established in a network of spaces for nature that can sustain these levels into the future, even given continuing environmental change and human pressures.</p> <p>The three objectives to underpin this aim are:</p> <p>(1) To restore species and habitats appropriate to England's physical and geographical context to levels that are sustainable in a changing climate, and enhanced in comparison with those in 2000.</p> <p>(2) To restore and secure the long-term sustainability of the ecological processes that underpin the way ecosystems work, thereby enhancing the capacity of our natural environment to provide ecosystem services such as clean water, climate regulation and crop pollination, as well as providing habitats for wildlife.</p> <p>(3) To provide accessible natural environments rich in wildlife for people to enjoy and experience.</p> <p>Lawton states, This is not a luxury. Establishing a coherent and resilient ecological network to help conserve the biodiversity that we still have will enhance</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>our options and improve our chances of achieving a prosperous and healthy future for ourselves and our children.</p> <p>The SSSI series, important as it is ...does not in itself comprise a coherent and resilient ecological network. They were not designated for this purpose. The approaches recommended include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improving the quality of habitat patches; • making existing sites bigger (which can include creating ecotones); • enhancing connectivity; • creating new sites; and • reducing pressures on sites by establishing buffer zones or enhancing the wider environment. <p>Particular emphasis is placed on the importance of Local Wildlife Sites and the fact that currently they do not receive sufficient protection. Lawton recommends three options which are not mutually exclusive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • find different, better ways of protecting Local Wildlife sites and other remaining areas of semi-natural habitat of high wildlife value (in particular BAP priority habitats) through the planning system; or • provide incentives for private owners to secure their future; or • designate more areas as SSSIs. <p>Or a combination of these approaches.</p>			
478222	Mrs Yvonne Kemsley		CSO44	12	Object		This document is too long for the older generation to read through and digest how about some thought for them - a simpler more streamlined version should be made available for the elderly anything less is discriminatory.			1113
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO543	12	Object		<p>This document has ignored valid brown field sites and opted to destroy cheap to develop areas of green field and green belt land.</p> <p>There are no commitments to provide anything in this document other than housing.</p> <p>Everything other than housing is unfunded.</p>		Emailed to ask for clarification JW 18/11/10	1113

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	CSO2187	12	Object		The word "biodiversity is used so many times in this chapter, it should be defined at the outset relating to its use in the chapter, as it can mean different things to different people.	At the start of Chapter 12, define the word "biodiversity" as used in the chapter.		1113
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17879	12	Object		This section of the Core Strategy needs to better reflect best practice and contain a spatial expression of the policy intent. There is an opportunity to acknowledge the emerging Dorset Green Infrastructure Strategy and extend the principles across the Borough to identify new opportunities and recreate wildlife corridors, for example along the Mude Valley, and the Chewton Vision.			1113
359350	Mr Jim BIGGIN	Chairman West Christchurch Residents Assoc & J.R.A.	CSO1579	12.1		General Comment		Protection for it's own sake is questionable. The requirement is to balance the sometimes conflicting demands of human habitation and the SSSI. There is no better example than the slopes of St Catherine's Hill behind the houses in Hillside Drive etc. and the top plateau of the hill where the requirements of the local population are far more important than any other consideration.	Appears to be comments relating to para 12.1 rather than suggested amendments	1114
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17503	12.1	Object		12.1, 12.2 DWT wish to see the desire to protect our natural assets/habitats and species strengthened to protect and enhance these assets (as indicated under 12.5, and expressed in ME1). This could be achieved through better management of the current resource, re-creating and connecting habitats, and taking a			1114

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							landscape scale approach, with reference to the Strategic Nature Areas, whilst taking opportunity to make smaller enhancements to developments through planting schemes, provision of bat and bird boxes etc. We therefore seek an additional bullet point under 12.2 "to provide new benefits to biodiversity by enhancing or re-creating habitats".			
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18204	12.1		General Comment	Non-renewable resources are not just those we extract from our land (oil, aggregates etc). The ultimate non-renewable resource is the land itself – landscapes, soils, ecosystems and the ecosystem services that they provide. Historical assets are also recognised formally in planning policy as being non-renewable.			1114
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO440	12.1	Support					1114
478222	Mrs Yvonne Kemsley		CSO43	12.1	Object		What about the wildlife they have a right to their natural habitat who will speak out for them? Leave our green fields alone.			1114
533867	Ms Emma Woodhouse	SW Food & Farming Adviser NFU	CSO19217	12.1		General Comment	<p>Planning policy should not prohibit development in the countryside. The Taylor Review of Rural Economy and Affordable Housing considered in detail the sustainable development in rural areas.</p> <p>"Planning must not determine the future development of rural communities against a narrow tick-box approach to sustainable development, assessing communities as they are now and not what they could be. In too many places this approach writes off rural communities in a 'sustainability trap' where development can only occur in places already considered to be in narrow terms 'sustainable'."</p> <p>"The question planners must address is 'how will development add to or diminish the sustainability of this community?' taking a better balance of social, economic and environmental factors together to form a long term vision for all scales of communities. A mix of housing</p>			1114

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							and employment opportunities are essential for the sustainability of rural communities"			
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17504	12.2	Object		12.1, 12.2 DWT wish to see the desire to protect our natural assets/habitats and species strengthened to protect and enhance these assets (as indicated under 12.5, and expressed in ME1). This could be achieved through better management of the current resource, re-creating and connecting habitats, and taking a landscape scale approach, with reference to the Strategic Nature Areas, whilst taking opportunity to make smaller enhancements to developments through planting schemes, provision of bat and bird boxes etc. We therefore seek an additional bullet point under 12.2 "to provide new benefits to biodiversity by enhancing or re-creating habitats".			1115
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO441	12.2	Support					1115
498562	Mr Lovering		CSO3336	12.2	Support					1115
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO442	12.4	Support					1117
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18208	12.5		General Comment	We recommend that the Core Strategy and the supporting Key Issue Paper should include more detail from PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development). Examples of critical issues that appear to have been overlooked in the Options document and hence in consideration of the proposed development sites include a requirement for plans to recognise (para 19) the limits of the environment to accept further development without irreversible damage and take account (para 20) of environmental issues such as ...the protection of groundwater from contamination, ... light pollution, ... the conservation of			1118

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							soil quality. Soils are an important component of SEA and EIA. We recommend adopting guidance in DEFRA (2009) Safeguarding our Soils – A Strategy for England and DEFRA Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable use of Soils on Construction Sites. The risk of contamination of groundwater and surface water is discussed under options for employment land within the Moors River catchment.			
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 586	12.5	Object		Regulations and Advice, page 250 - 258 Paragraph 12.5 - We recommend other national planning policy should also be included: i) Achieve sustainable waste management (PPS10 waste management) ii) Protect the water environment, including groundwater (PPS23 Planning and Pollution Control).			1118
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 505	12.6	Object		12.6 DWT wish to see inclusion of the importance of protecting and enhancing SNCIs, as sites of county biodiversity importance, and principles of Strategic Nature Areas included within these bullets.			1119
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 209	12.6		General Comment	Although picked up in the preferred options, it might be helpful to expand bullet point 5 to reflect the SNA approach. It's not just size that matters but connectivity between the sites that increases the resilience of our BAP habitats. The data presented in the table demonstrate very clearly the contribution made by SNCIs to the biodiversity of the District. These sites have made and continue to make a huge contribution to the integrity of our SSSIs.			1119
360379	Mr Andrew MURRAY	Planning Advisor Manchester Airport	CSO18 448	12.6	Object		Would refer to paragraph 89 of the English National Parks and the Broads UK vision and Circular 2010, in particular "it would be impractical to prevent widespread over-flying of the parks without affecting reasonable levels of access to airports" given that it is difficult to understand what the sentence in 12.6 seeks to achieve.	Remove sentence "reduce the impact of noise on the new forest national park from the airport."		1119

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361028	Helen Patton	Head of Policy and Plans New Forest National Park Authority	CSO18949	12.6		General Comment		As a minor point, the New Forest National Park Management Plan 2010 – 2015, which is referred to on page 251, was formally adopted in December 2009 and is therefore not a 'revised draft' as stated.		1119
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO443	12.6	Support					1119
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO180	12.6	Object		Avoid building on the Greenbelt and look more thoroughly into Vacant brownfield sites, regeneration and knocking down and rebuilding, building up and not out. See CPRE website, urban sprawl.			1119
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO544	12.6	Object		Where is the strategy to develop brown field sites in preference to green field and green belt land? This document proposes the destruction of green field and green belt land to allow cheap development proposals. Brown field sites should be investigated first, as per current government development policy.			1119
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	CSO2186	12.6	Object		Paragraph 12.6 is headed 'Local' and has 9 bullet points. This heading provides an ideal opportunity to include local communities, however there is no mention whatsoever of any Parish Plan or acknowledgement of community views on their local natural environment, which may be contained therein. The Hurn Parish Plan notes that Hurn residents have strong views about the natural environment surrounding where they live, and they want those views to be heard and considered. There is mention of a 'Christchurch Community Plan' at bullet point 3, on which Hurn Parish Council was not consulted and had no input. This section should give	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet Point 1 says - "Seek the restoration of Dorset's biodiversity to meet government targets for condition of Sites of Special Scientific Interest, farmland birds, priority species and birds". We would like an addition to this point as follows - "Any proposed 		1119

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>more weight to consultation with local people affected by any proposals, taking account of the emerging Localism Bill and the Government policy of the Big Society. A further comment (as mentioned as a general objection to Chapter 12), is that as the word 'biodiversity' is used so many times in this paragraph and indeed in Chapter 12 as a whole, there should be a definition of it included at the outset, as this word can be interpreted in many ways.</p>	<p>restoration should not be to the detriment of other natural species; the loss of productive forestry operations; or contrary to government objectives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions relating to climate change.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet point 2 says – “Support the protection of the most fragile environments and encourage greater access to more robust areas”. We would like an addition to this point as follows – “The status of such robust areas should be acknowledged as a very important part of the protection of fragile habitats, and they should be identified in each local community/Parish by local people, and protected as 'robust areas' for recreational use. A map should be produced, based on the areas identified, outlining the location of these very important robust areas.” • Bullet Point 3 mentions the Christchurch 		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								<p>Community Plan. This Point should also acknowledge the existence of Parish Plans and ensure that they are referred to where relevant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet point 5 says - "Create additional areas of specific types of habitat (Dorset Structure Plan and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership)". We would like an addition to this point as follows - "Creation or restoration of certain habitats to be subject to consultation with local communities who may be affected by such proposals, in line with the emerging Localism Bill and government policy of the Big Society". • Include an additional bullet point – "Statutorily Registered Common Land to remain with unrestricted access and not to be fenced when it compromises recreational use or access to all types of user." 		
498562	Mr		CSO33	12.6	Support		Support, because once change has been instigated it			1119

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lovering		38				will never be reversed			
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17588	12.6	Object		Paragraph 12.6 - We recommend that an additional bullet point is added within section 12.6: 'Incorporate the recommendations contained in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 (Christchurch and East Dorset) (2008) and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 (Christchurch only) (2009) including using the future flood risk areas derived by the SFRA's for the application of the Sequential test.'			1119
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17506	12.7	Support		12.7 We support the comments made at Issues and Options. The provision of alternatives to heaths for recreation must realise the need for people to be in contact with nature/natural sites for their health and wellbeing – thus new public open space must be able to provide these benefits and a comparable experience.			1122
361028	Helen Patton	Head of Policy and Plans New Forest National Park Authority	CSO18950	12.7	Support		One of the key attributes of the plan areas is the quality of its natural environment. The proximity of the New Forest National Park to the east of the plan area also benefits residents of Christchurch and East Dorset. The Authority supports the inclusion of wording relating to the Section 62 duty on page 252 and the reference to impacts on the National Park in Preferred Option ME2.			1122
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO444	12.7	Support					1122
359350	Mr Jim BIGGIN	Chairman West Christchurch Residents Assoc & J.R.A.	CSO1580	12.9		General Comment		So long as you see East Dorset as a separate entity you won't succeed. Once you view the population centres as suburbs of Bournemouth-Poole it all becomes much easier.	Comment relating to para 12.9?	1124

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO181	12.9		General Comment	Simple leave it alone and build up and regenerate the brownbelt, but we can't afford that so what's the point in asking you to. Thousands of Bees live in the heathland we need bees, farmers need bees, the greenbelt is just as an important part of our land and animal ethos, and should not be built on just because the money is not available to sort out the brownbelt.			1124
359350	Mr Jim BIGGIN	Chairman West Christchurch Residents Assoc & J.R.A.	CSO1581	Preferred Option ME 1	Object			The main thing with all of these options is to consult local residents about any proposed changes and listen to what they have to say. In that context I can't find any reference to the Hurn Parish Plan drawn up by the local Council - strange!	Comments relating to objecting to lack of reference to HPP in PE ME 1	1126
359362	Mr Justin MILWARD	Regional Policy Officer Woodland Trust	CSO3184	Preferred Option ME 1	Object		Preferred Option ME 1 - Criteria-based development assessment for Biodiversity and Geodiversity We are pleased to see that this Option seeks to 'protect, maintain and enhance' biodiversity, but it is important that semi natural habitats like native woodland are specifically promoted for positive new expansion as well. Deforestation of wooded heathland sites in particular offers the opportunity to promote compensatory woodland creation elsewhere in East Dorset. • The UK is one of the least wooded areas of Europe, with just 11.8% woodland cover compared to around 44% for Europe as a whole. The Woodland Trust is therefore working to achieve its ambitious aim of doubling native woodland cover by 2050. • Woodland creation is a key delivery component of Government policy: Caroline Spelman, Environment Minister has set this out: "Now let me turn to our environment and, specifically, to our trees. Because if ever organisms demonstrated their ability to	We would like to see the biodiversity need for, and the benefits from, native woodland creation reflected in Option ME 1, and incorporated into a formal Trees, Woods and Forests Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).		1126

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>multi-task, it's trees. They capture carbon and hold soils together, prevent flooding and help control our climate". (Speech at Angela Marmont Centre for Biodiversity, 20 May 2010).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Woodland Trust believes that woodland creation is especially important because of the unique ability of woodland to deliver across a wide range of benefits – see our publication Woodland Creation – why it matters (http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/en/about-us/publications/Pages/ours.aspx). These include for both landscape and biodiversity (helping habitats become more robust to adapt to climate change, buffering and extending fragmented ancient woodland), for quality of life and climate change (amenity & recreation, public health, flood amelioration, urban cooling) and for the local economy (timber and woodfuel markets). • The UK Biodiversity Action Plan (http://www.ukbap.org.uk/default.aspx) makes it clear that expansion of priority habitats like native woodland is a key aim. Under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, all public authorities now have a statutory duty to conserve biodiversity under the definition of 'Conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat'. It therefore follows that public bodies such as Local Authorities should support the creation of more native woodland. • In a letter to all Local Authorities calling for support for the Government's National Tree Planting Campaign ('The Big Tree Plant'), the Environment Minister Caroline Spelman has extolled the many virtues of trees: 'Trees offer so many benefits to our citizens. They capture carbon and hold soils together, prevent flooding and help control our climate. They also add immeasurably to our quality of life by making areas more attractive and healthier places to live. In recent years the number of trees being planted annually across the country has declined, and could decrease further, 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>unless action is taken to reverse this trend' (letter to all Local Authorities, 12th November 2010).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Minister of State for Agriculture & Food Jim Paice stated in an appearance before the Lords EU Agriculture and Environment Committee on 24th November 2010 that: 'I want to see a significant extension of forestry and woodland planting in this country. I certainly see the Forestry Commission as taking a greater enabling role in that'. • 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". • The Dorset Trees, Woods & Forests Strategy (Dorset AONB, 2005) supports: 'New Plantings for - Biodiversity, connectivity & de-fragmentation. Identify priority areas for biodiversity gain and habitat linkages. Use a landscape scale approach and take account of other land uses and public benefits'. • Support for woodland creation is becoming widely embodied in the Local Development Plans process across the country. The Sedgemoor District Council LDF Core Strategy (Proposed submission, September 2010) states in Policy D14 on the Natural Environment that: 'Development will be supported where:... It makes positive provision for wildlife through appropriate urban and rural habitat creation/restoration, including tree and hedgerow planting, and subsequent management'. 			
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 507	Preferred Option ME 1	Support		<p>Whilst DWT welcome the reference to Dorset Biodiversity Principles, we are unclear as to the source of these. We assume this refers to the Key Biodiversity Principles set out in the Dorset Biodiversity Strategy (Manage, Avoid, Restore, Monitor); if so this is supported but it would be useful to state "Key Biodiversity Principles as set out in Dorset Biodiversity Strategy".</p> <p>We support the need to demonstrate that proposed</p>	We suggest a re-wording of 'Where harm is likely to result, developments will be expected to provide measures to adequately avoid or mitigate that harm. If adequate mitigation		1126

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>development will not result in adverse impacts on any internationally, nationally or locally designated site. We consider this should also include 'and other features of nature conservation importance'. We wish to see 'local designations' included under 'Why is it preferred?'. It is important to recognise the value of all local habitats, not just heathlands (which have measures set out in the Interim Planning Framework), and work towards their protection and enhancement. PPS9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) in paragraph 11 requires Local Authorities, through policies in plans, to conserve habitats and species of principal importance. These are listed by the Secretary of State under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (which supersedes Section 74 of the CROW Act referred to in PPS9). Paragraph 10 of PPS9 refers to ancient woodland and veteran trees and the need to identify and protect these.</p> <p>We support the need to assess if any existing habitats, species and/or features of nature conservation interest are likely to be affected by development, and to carry out a survey to document the results. We recommend following the Dorset Biodiversity Protocol and Bat/Barn Owl Protocol being developed by Natural England and Dorset County Council Natural Environment Team. To inform the whole process, we suggest survey work should include parts of the site for development, any areas proposed as SANGs or potential landscape areas and any neighbouring areas likely to be affected by the proposed change in land use.</p> <p>When retaining existing habitats and features of interest, we recommend these should not become too isolated and fragmented within the development, but retain some linkages and buffering.</p> <p>We welcome reference to the Dorset Biodiversity Strategy and South West Nature Map, but suggest the latter is referred to as the Dorset Nature Map. The South West Nature Map includes all the county Nature Maps in the region and was produced through a wide partnership and used for many purposes, one of which</p>	<p>cannot be provided, development may be refused' to 'Where harm is likely to result, developments will be expected to provide adequate measures to avoid or mitigate that harm. If adequate mitigation cannot be provided, development will be refused'</p> <p>How will appropriate management and monitoring be enforced? Our experience is that this is very difficult to achieve unless handed over to a suitable organisation and funded.</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>was to feed in to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). Though the RSS has been abolished, the evidence base such as the Nature Map remains valid; however, going forward, local evidence for Dorset is more relevant than regional.</p> <p>We suggest a re-wording of 'Where harm is likely to result, developments will be expected to provide measures to adequately avoid or mitigate that harm. If adequate mitigation cannot be provided, development may be refused' to 'Where harm is likely to result, developments will be expected to provide adequate measures to avoid or mitigate that harm. If adequate mitigation cannot be provided, development will be refused'</p> <p>How will appropriate management and monitoring be enforced? Our experience is that this is very difficult to achieve unless handed over to a suitable organisation and funded.</p>			
359482	Ms Helen POWELL	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18772	Preferred Option ME 1	Object		<p>The evidence presented in this chapter shows that a high percentage of the SSSI area and indeed also the SNCI area are not in favourable condition. On a number of SSSIs recovery to favourable condition is hampered or even precluded by circumstances relating to development e.g. neglect connected with development aspirations, drainage and poor water quality from existing development, and recreational pressures. A development framework exists to address recreational pressures on the heathland SSSIs, but in other situations there is no clear policy framework to inform potential developers of expectations in relation to SSSI and SNCI conditions. We suggest the policy measures should be expanded such that new development and re-development will be expected to provide for the recovery of SSSI and SNCI land to favourable condition where the context is appropriate, either as part of the development package or through contributions to off-site measures.</p> <p>The measures under this option should include compensation such as habitat re-creation in</p>			1126

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>circumstance where harm cannot be fully mitigated and considerations for the development outweigh those for the site designation.</p> <p>Furthermore, we consider that the Core Strategy should contain a positive policy for habitat creation/re-creation.</p>			
359529	Mrs Gill Martin	Clerk to the Council Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council	CSO17 970	Preferred Option ME 1		General Comment	<p>Section 12 on Managing the Natural Environment focuses almost entirely on the potential and planned development of the urban fringe of Bournemouth and Poole and its impact on the fragile coastal and heathland habitats. This is indeed most important, not least because the environmental status of these vital areas but it should not be at the expense of the possible neglect and degradation of the wider rural area in the north of the district.</p>			1126
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 729	Preferred Option ME 1	Support					1126
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 210	Preferred Option ME 1	Support		<p>ETAG supports this option but requests that the following conditions are included in further development of the Core Strategy</p> <p>It is essential that any survey work should not be a simple one or two day snapshot at an inappropriate time of year but are carried out over a 12 month period to take account of what is apparent or present in all seasons. Independent surveys which adequately target relevant habitats and species over sufficient time and area must be conducted.</p> <p>Where sites include habitats or features of interest, the buffer zones should be of sufficient size to allow for gradual change from the development to the natural/semi-natural habitats and for partial habitats that are essential for many of our pollinators. (Westrich, 1996)</p> <p>We strongly support the need for on-going appropriate</p>			1126

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>management. This must be undertaken by people fully qualified to do the work and who are able to interpret their findings and adapt management as necessary, particularly in response to climate change. Continuity of personnel is so important in understanding the land and its ecosystems. It is ETAG's view that EDCMS would be best placed to undertake this work in East Dorset. Adequate funding and staffing would be essential. Grammatical correction. Amend penultimate bullet point to read Where harm is likely to result, developments will be expected to provide measures either to avoid or to mitigate that harm adequately.</p> <p>We support the proposal to refuse development consent where adequate mitigation cannot be provided. As discussed above this is essential if we are to make progress in establishing a coherent and resilient ecological network.</p>			
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO23 47	Preferred Option ME 1	Support					1126
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO44 5	Preferred Option ME 1		General Comment	<p>Although I appreciate that these various assessments and surveys would be part of any proposed development site I am concerned that not enough thought has been given to light pollution which could seriously affect wild life.</p> <p>Although the plan is to monitor species and habitats for a period of time after any development takes place, I fail to understand how "corrective measures " could be put in place. Isn't this "shutting the stable door after the horse has bolted?"</p> <p>Even the use of SANGS (Suitable Alternative Greenspace) is untested.</p> <p>This Option ME1, in my opinion, does not ensure that any development will not have any adverse impact on national and international importance for nature conservation.</p>			1126

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	CSO2951	Preferred Option ME 1	Object		The 3rd bullet point from the bottom is incomplete.	The 3rd bullet point from the bottom of this Option mentions enhancing existing habitats or creating new ones etc..... We would like an addition to this point as follows - "Such new habitats not to be created from robust areas identified by local communities for recreational use." This refers to our comments relating to paragraph 12.6 where we have asked that robust areas be acknowledged as very important to the protection of fragile habitats, and that they are identified on a map.		1126
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17591	Preferred Option ME 1	Support		We support Preferred Options ME1, ME2, ME3, ME4, ME5, ME6, ME7, ME10, ME11, ME12 and ME13. In particular we are pleased that these include recognition of undesignated sites and the potential creation of a new Stour Valley country park. Preferred Option ME1, page 253 Biodiversity Within this option or supporting text otters should be considered. It is important that all new road schemes and improvements to existing roads take the needs of otters into account in their design and construction, which should help reduce the number of otter road casualties. A number of otters have been killed on roads within East Dorset and Christchurch (the Highway Agency has			1126

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>carried out mitigation at a number of sites to try and reduce the number of casualties). We recommend that the Core Strategy promotes measures to reduce the number of otters killed on existing roads, and to ensure that new road developments avoid or adequately mitigate for any potential impacts on otters. Mitigation may involve construction of an open span bridge, otter underpass, otter ledge or fencing, etc. For further guidance please view the Highways Agency's "Design Manual For Roads and Bridges, Volume10. http://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/vol10/section4/ha8199.pdf</p> <p>If mitigation is not carried out it could affect the successful re-colonisation of some areas as well as adversely affecting existing populations.</p>			
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22779	Preferred Option ME 1	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1126
521337	Christine Charlesworth		CSO17860	Preferred Option ME 1	Support		I would also observe, finally, that the protection of the heathland of the District is a key objective in the proposed measures. It is a worthy idea and one I wholeheartedly support, but it must be noted that only two years ago the District Council sought to ban dog owners and their dogs from taking proper exercise in public recreation areas such as Corfe Mullen RG and the comparable Ferndown facility, and tried to force them to use adjacent heathland instead. This was successfully opposed, which was a victory for common sense and the local taxpayers' democratic rights, but it is ironic that the rationale for these unworkable proposals includes prevention on the very same increase in heathland destruction to which the Dog Control Orders would have led.			1126
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18192	Preferred Option ME 1	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.25, preferred option ME1 noted, ME2 – SANGs can be provided and delivered as part of the proposed development. ME3 noted as are the			1126

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							remaining ME's			
533728	Mr Mike Garrity	Chair of the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Steering Group Dorset County Council	CSO19 167	Preferred Option ME 1	Support		Preferred Option ME1 (biodiversity and geodiversity): the commitment to avoiding adverse impacts upon designated sites is welcomed, as is the requirement that development should make provision for appropriate mitigation where harm would otherwise occur.			1126
359288	Mr Steve Molnar	Terence O'Rourke	CSO18 987	Preferred Option ME 2	Support		Banner Homes supports proposals in ME2 for SANG south of Ferndown/West Parley, which also has potential to aid delivery of a future Stour Valley Country Park. As can be seen from the submitted sketch master plan, Banner's land interests at West Parley have potential to deliver SANG with river frontage within the Stour valley, and will therefore be beneficial to this goal.			1128
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	CSO18 378	Preferred Option ME 2	Object		Preferred Option ME2 deals with the need for heathland mitigation. We object to the specific identification of SANG north of the railway line as this is premature in view of on-going discussions with Natural England about appropriate mitigation for the under the habitats regulations . This is also repeated in policies UE1-3 and which should likewise be less site specific on SANG location at this stage.			1128
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 508	Preferred Option ME 2		General Comment	We consider that detailed specifications for SANGs should come forward as part of the design and specifications for each of the new neighbourhoods, informed by biological survey and the need to divert pressure away from heathland sites in the vicinity. As this policy refers specifically to internationally and nationally designated sites, opportunity can be taken here to consider non-heathland sites such as the Moors River SSSI, and strategic plans which could relieve the adverse impacts that are currently resulting from development in its catchment.			1128
359482	Ms	Conservation	CSO18	Preferred	Object		Natural England supports the overall aims of the			1128

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Helen POWELL	Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	773	Option ME 2			preferred option but considers that further consideration is needed on how mitigation for the proposed new neighbourhoods will be provided. The IPF and emerging DPD are intended to provide mitigation for small developments where it is not possible for individual developments to provide mitigation. The IPF/DPD cannot be expected to provide (or guide) mitigation for larger developments, such as the proposed new neighbourhoods in the draft Core Strategy. These strategic housing developments require mitigation that is specific to the particular issues and problems that each would generate. Thus we consider it would be appropriate for the Joint Heathlands DPD to provide detailed specifications for the SANGs intended as mitigation for the new neighbourhoods listed in ME2. The mitigation measures should be an integral part of the proposed new neighbourhoods. Moreover, the SANGs that would need to be delivered as mitigation for the proposed new neighbourhoods would, by their very nature need to be bespoke, directly related to and necessary for each of the new neighbourhoods. Finally, we consider that the Core Strategy should contain a policy for the protection of SANGs once they have been established.			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18737	Preferred Option ME 2	Support					1128
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19269	Preferred Option ME 2	Object		The document correctly underlines the importance of the Dorset Heathlands. However it is essential to note that at this stage there is no evidence to support the theory that development of SANGs will actually sufficiently alleviate unacceptable pressure on the Dorset Heathlands. Indeed what evidence there is indicates that the approach is unlikely to be fully successful. Yet the Core Strategy is based on the			1128

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>assumption that the approach will work, and there is even a detectable implication that the Dorset Heathlands actually need income generated from further development to be protected and managed! This is a gross distortion of the concept of SANGs. Actually SE Dorset cannot continue to accept open ended growth without damage to heathland and the now apparently universal approach of tacking on an area of SANG to every new development on the basis that it protects, or even somehow enhances heathland biodiversity, is extremely worrying.</p> <p>Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously having damaging implications for heathlands, be they SSSIs or SNCIs, include KS3, KS4 (Coopers Lane south), VWM4 and VMW7.</p> <p>There is a commitment to restore and link heathland within south-east Dorset and areas most suitable for such restoration have been identified. There are options within the CS which would preclude such beneficial restoration including KS3/ PC7, PC4, and PC5.</p>			
360112	Mr Kenneth BROOKS	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19087	Preferred Option ME 2	Object		<p>This Section includes the following statements:- "Christchurch and East Dorset have an existing high quality historic built environment which is important to the character of the area. These features need to be protected and enhances when considering future developments. Of particular significance are the Dorset Heaths. However, the protected environment heavily influences where future development can be located, which in turn puts more pressure on areas outside these designations." The Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework has been in operation since January 2007, and it is clear by now the 400 metre limit for increasing residential occupancy is absolutely insufficient to provide any protection to the heathlands in the way it was envisaged. Clearly developer contributions will not provide any protection. Prior to formulating a more permanent and full Dorset Heathland Planning Policy from 2012, the current 400m limit must be substantially</p>			1128

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							increased to at least 1 kilometre from the arbitrarily drawn boundaries and not used in a precipice manner i.e. 390 m from the boundary - no increase in residential occupancy, 410m from the boundary - the Local Authorities are comfortable with a 6 fold increase in residential occupancy.			
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 211	Preferred Option ME 2	Support		ETAG supports this option. It may need amending if the housing proposals for these areas are not carried forward. Freehold ownership of the areas proposed for the SANGs should be transferred to the LPA from whom there should be a commitment that the land will be protected from development in perpetuity. Continuity of management with appropriate funding and staffing (as outlined under ME1) is essential.			1128
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO23 48	Preferred Option ME 2	Support		ARC support this option.			1128
361028	Helen Patton	Head of Policy and Plans New Forest National Park Authority	CSO18 951	Preferred Option ME 2	Support		One of the key attributes of the plan areas is the quality of its natural environment. The proximity of the New Forest National Park to the east of the plan area also benefits residents of Christchurch and East Dorset. The Authority supports the inclusion of wording relating to the Section 62 duty on page 252 and the reference to impacts on the National Park in Preferred Option ME2.			1128
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO44 6	Preferred Option ME 2		General Comment	I neither support or object but express my main concerns: SANGS have not been tested and therefore it cannot be known whether or not the increased population from any new housing development would impact in a detrimental way to our Internationally Protected Sites. (Once the development has taken place it cannot be reversed) also, I am concerned as to whether developers will have sufficient finance to contribute to all the necessary infrastructure in addition to contributions to, or on site			1128

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							provision of SANGS			
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO976	Preferred Option ME 2		General Comment	Agreed that the west of Corfe Mullen could provide a potential SANG. Disagree that the north is acceptable or accessible for the village in general.			1128
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	CSO2198	Preferred Option ME 2	Object		<p>This Option refers to internationally and nationally designated sites. It mentions the emerging Dorset Heathlands Joint Development Plan Document which will identify a mix of appropriate mitigation and avoidance measures. It also states that projects delivered through the Interim Planning Framework and the Heathlands Joint Development Plan Document will include suitable SANGS, heathland access and management, wardening, education, habitat re-creation and other appropriate measures. Hurn Parish Council is not aware of this emerging Joint Document, and has not been consulted on it, and therefore we are unsure of its content. This would appear to be pure 'top down' bureaucracy at work where a Government Body is pushing through a Plan Document without any consultation with local communities. This results in a 'dictatorial' policy approach as outlined in Option ME2. There is no reference anywhere to the importance of 'robust areas' which already exist in many communities, and no mention of any interaction with local people who may be affected by this Option.</p> <p>The Option should be more balanced towards discussion with communities regarding all the issues mentioned – SANGS (where should they be?); heathland access and management (sometimes access is restricted, i.e. fencing, with no consultation); wardening and education (there may be local volunteers); habitat re-creation (where will this creation be and what other habitats or robust areas may be destroyed or affected?). This Option should be more balanced in its approach (bottom up) instead of dictatorial (top down). This would then be in line with another emerging document, which is not mentioned in the Option, being the Localism Bill and government</p>	Soften the tone of the Option so that local views can be considered when decisions are taken		1128

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							policy of the 'Big Society'.			
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 592	Preferred Option ME 2	Support		We support Preferred Options ME1, ME2, ME3, ME4, ME5, ME6, ME7, ME10, ME11, ME12 and ME13. In particular we are pleased that these include recognition of undesignated sites and the potential creation of a new Stour Valley country park.			1128
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22 780	Preferred Option ME 2	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1128
521337	Christine Charlesworth		CSO17 861	Preferred Option ME 2	Support		I would also observe, finally, that the protection of the heathland of the District is a key objective in the proposed measures. It is a worthy idea and one I wholeheartedly support, but it must be noted that only two years ago the District Council sought to ban dog owners and their dogs from taking proper exercise in public recreation areas such as Corfe Mullen RG and the comparable Ferndown facility, and tried to force them to use adjacent heathland instead. This was successfully opposed, which was a victory for common sense and the local taxpayers' democratic rights, but it is ironic that the rationale for these unworkable proposals includes prevention on the very same increase in heathland destruction to which the Dog Control Orders would have led.			1128
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17 880	Preferred Option ME 2	Object		Policy ME2 - This policy is supported in part in respect of the need for off site SANG for the Roeshot urban extension. However at this stage Meyrick Estate Management object to the location being limited to 'North of Railway' and believe more flexibility is required as to location. Negotiations are on-going with Natural England to find a workable solution based upon a proper understanding of the basis and purpose of SANG. Meyrick Estate Management Ltd are opposed to significant on-site SANG at Roeshot as this limits the capacity of the site to provide the optimum solution and			1128

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							much needed housing in the Borough. Likewise they object to the suggestion in the draft policy option that the Interim Planning Framework (IPF) and its successor document could provide heathland mitigation for larger developments. The IPF is intended to deal with small developments that cannot provide mitigation in isolation. The urban extension can and should provide physical mitigation related to the development. Meyrick Estate Management Ltd has the ability to provide high quality SANG outside the development site.			
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 193	Preferred Option ME 2	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.25, preferred option ME1 noted, ME2 – SANGs can be provided and delivered as part of the proposed development. ME3 noted as are the remaining ME's			1128
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSO18 333	Preferred Option ME 2	Object		Taylor Wimpey supports the need to identify the new neighbourhoods and SANG land on the Key Diagram and has land available to contribute towards such provision. Taylor Wimpey is willing to work with the Council to identify the most suitable and deliverable options for housing and SANG provision north / north west of Corfe Mullen. Further evidence will be provided to elaborate on these representations through subsequent consultation stages of this DPD.			1128
533728	Mr Mike Garrity	Chair of the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Steering Group Dorset County Council	CSO19 169	Preferred Option ME 2	Support		More specifically, ME2 deals with internationally protected habitats and sets out a commitment to the emerging joint heathlands development plan document, while ME3 and ME4 deal with more local designations. Natural habitats are a key component of green infrastructure and it is important to ensure that development plays a positive role in supporting their ability to promote biodiversity.			1128
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 509	Preferred Option ME 3	Support		DWT strongly support this option. Option ME1 rather than ME2, as detailed in the text, would apply to these sites. However we seek clarification on whether the policy will immediately protect new SNCIs when they are designated, as this is ambiguous in the text. We			1130

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							strongly recommend that this should be the case. All sites must be protected under this policy when they are identified or updated.			
359482	Ms Helen POWELL	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18 790	Preferred Option ME 3	Support					1130
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 738	Preferred Option ME 3	Support					1130
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 348	Preferred Option ME 3	Object		. The identification of SNCIs is an ongoing process and several have been identified since the publication of the East Dorset Local Plans. It is clearly vital that the Core Strategy formally recognises these sites and indeed makes provision to protect those which will inevitably be recognised post publication of the Core Strategy itself.			1130
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 212	Preferred Option ME 3	Support		Strongly supported in principle with the following amendments to the wording. Those sites which have already been selected as meeting SNCI criteria since the last Local Plan will be formally adopted and given the same protection as all other SNCIs. New sites that are identified subsequently by the Panel will also be formally designated. Unlike all other local authorities in Dorset, EDDC has been unwilling to acknowledge that SNCI designation is a continuous process and that new ones that are identified by the SNCI Panel should be incorporated as and when the information about them is received by the LPA. Any amendments to sites where part or whole sites are deleted will also come through continuously			1130

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							this way. It is understood that the information is submitted electronically (on GIS) by DERC annually: previous records submitted by the SNCI Panel were submitted as hard copy.			
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO2349	Preferred Option ME 3	Support		ARc support this option.			1130
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO447	Preferred Option ME 3	Support					1130
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	CSO2199	Preferred Option ME 3	Object		The last sentence of Option ME3 states that "Option ME2 will apply to all these sites". As we have objected to Option ME2, we therefore object to Option ME3.	Amend Option ME2 as per our suggested amendments		1130
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17593	Preferred Option ME 3	Support		We support Preferred Options ME1, ME2, ME3, ME4, ME5, ME6,ME7, ME10, ME11, ME12 and ME13. In particular we are pleased that these include recognition of undesignated sites and the potential creation of a new Stour Valley country park.			1130
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22781	Preferred Option ME 3	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1130
521337	Christine Charlesworth		CSO17863	Preferred Option ME 3	Support		I would also observe, finally, that the protection of the heathland of the District is a key objective in the proposed measures. It is a worthy idea and one I wholeheartedly support, but it must be noted that only two years ago the District Council sought to ban dog owners and their dogs from taking proper exercise in public recreation areas such as Corfe Mullen RG and the comparable Ferndown facility, and tried to force them to use adjacent heathland instead. This was successfully opposed, which was a victory for common sense and the local taxpayers' democratic rights, but it			1130

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							is ironic that the rationale for these unworkable proposals includes prevention on the very same increase in heathland destruction to which the Dog Control Orders would have led.			
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18194	Preferred Option ME 3	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.25, preferred option ME1 noted, ME2 – SANGs can be provided and delivered as part of the proposed development. ME3 noted as are the remaining ME's			1130
533728	Mr Mike Garrity	Chair of the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Steering Group Dorset County Council	CSO19170	Preferred Option ME 3	Support		More specifically, ME2 deals with internationally protected habitats and sets out a commitment to the emerging joint heathlands development plan document, while ME3 and ME4 deal with more local designations. Natural habitats are a key component of green infrastructure and it is important to ensure that development plays a positive role in supporting their ability to promote biodiversity.			1130
359362	Mr Justin MILWARD	Regional Policy Officer Woodland Trust	CSO3185	Preferred Option ME 4	Object		<p>We are pleased to see the implication that ancient woodland and ancient trees will be protected by a combination of Options ME1, 3 & 4. However we have concerns over the wording in ME1 that : 'Policy will aim to protect, maintain and enhance the condition of nature conservation sites through the development process'.</p> <p>We believe that a simple 'aim' to protect ancient woodland does not provide the absolute protection that this irreplaceable semi natural habitat needs. We would therefore like to see support in ME1 and 4 for absolute protection of ancient woodland.</p> <p>This is supported by the Government's publication Keepers of time (A statement of policy for England's ancient and native woodlands, Forestry Commission, 2005) PPS9 and the South West Woodland & Forestry Framework 2005 (Forestry Commission). In addition, under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, all public authorities now have a statutory duty to conserve biodiversity.</p> <p>Ancient woodland still does not benefit from full</p>	We would therefore like to see the 'Managing the Natural Environment Options ME1, 3 and 4 support absolute protection of ancient woodland, and for this to be backed up in a Trees and Woodland Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).		1132

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>statutory protection: for instance 86% of ancient woodland in the South West has no statutory protection. This is particularly relevant as ancient woodland is still facing considerable threats – research from the Woodland Trust shows that in the last decade 100 square miles (26,000 hectares or 5% of the total amount of ancient woodland remaining in the UK) of ancient woodland in the UK has come under threat from destruction or degradation. Development threats associated with transport and infrastructure appeared to be the most significant (31% of cases), followed by amenity and leisure developments (14%), housing (10%), and quarrying and mineral extraction (6%). 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 Council does all it can to protect this above average resource. Once removed or destroyed, ancient woodland cannot be replaced or its loss mitigated. It is our richest habitat for wildlife being home to more species of conservation concern than any other habitat (supporting some 232 species as outlined in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan, 1994). This is supported by PPS9 on Biodiversity – ‘Ancient woodland is a valuable biodiversity resource both for the diversity of species and for its longevity as woodland. Once lost it cannot be recreated. Local planning authorities should identify any areas of ancient woodland in their areas that do not have statutory protection (e.g. as an SSSI). They should not grant planning permission for any developments that would result in its loss or deterioration’.</p> <p>The Dorset Trees, Woods & Forests Strategy (Dorset AONB, 2005) has a key recommendation: ‘The Management of Ancient Semi-Natural Woodlands - Maintain, improve, protect and manage existing sites’.</p>			
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 510	Preferred Option ME 4	Object		<p>DWT consider this wording ambiguous and confusing. It is not clear what the policy seeks to protect and DWT would welcome clarification and further discussion. We welcome the intention to provide protection for other</p>			1132

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>sites of biodiversity and geological value, and welcome reference to the Dorset Biodiversity Strategy, green corridors and ancient woodlands. However, the policy as worded seems to suggest another tier of wildlife protection ('undesigned sites') with a role for local biodiversity stakeholders in identifying them. It then refers back to ME1 or ME3 for policy implementation. It is therefore unclear how these sites fit in with the existing SNCI system and biodiversity protocol.</p> <p>We have recommended clarification under ME3 that new sites of SNCI quality should be considered and selected as SNCIs and fall under that policy. DWT, as administrators of the SNCI system, is always pleased to hear of potential SNCI sites from any local stakeholder. Other sites, either not meeting SNCI guidelines but still of biodiversity value or where no survey data is available, would be covered by ME1 and therefore survey, protection and enhancement required as appropriate. We have suggested that ME1 should specifically cover ancient woodlands, veteran trees and habitats and species of principal importance. If these changes are made, it is possible ME4 is redundant from a biodiversity point of view.</p> <p>Green corridors might remain as a concern, but, bearing in mind our comments on the green infrastructure section of the strategy, they should be considered part of the green infrastructure network, even if not providing public access. Important green corridors should therefore be identified as green infrastructure and receive appropriate levels of protection and enhancement.</p> <p>As a final point, we consider designation of biodiversity sites on an ad hoc basis as they come under "significant threat" from development to be a last resort. As far as possible, sites should be identified in advance, so that developers have foresight of the potential constraints around a particular site. Our experience from running the SNCI system is that designating sites in the middle of a development proposal is likely to lead to conflict and, often, damage or destruction of the biodiversity</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							interest. The requirements of the Dorset Biodiversity Protocol and policy ME1 will make it clear to developers that survey work is required for any sites which are not already designated.			
359482	Ms Helen POWELL	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18 791	Preferred Option ME 4	Support					1132
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 739	Preferred Option ME 4	Support					1132
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 278	Preferred Option ME 4	Object		The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be			1132

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options. However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported.			
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 310	Preferred Option ME 4	Object		Woodlands Ancient woodland is of course of recognised biodiversity importance, but developing secondary woodland is also valuable for biodiversity, carbon retention and landscape. Impacts can be both direct, when the habitat itself is replaced, but also indirect through access by humans and domestic pets. While problems caused by these factors on heathlands is now generally recognised, (predation by pets, disturbance by both humans and pets, dumping, trampling, and light pollution) they are also of relevance to other habitats, including and perhaps especially, woodland. Preferred Options in the Core Strategy which impact directly or indirectly upon woodland include KS4 (Woodland Walk), VW2 and VWM4.			1132
360246	Mr Gavin FAUVEL	Cranborne Estate	CSO17 397	Preferred Option ME 4	Object		Object. Criteria for designation that falls outside legislation is often inconsistent. Designation can lead to protection 'through the back door'. See comments in similar vein in relation to HE 15.			1132
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 213	Preferred Option ME 4	Support		Strongly supported in principle As highlighted in Lawton's report, the need to afford greater protection to Local Wildlife Sites (SNCLs and BAP habitats) both through planning and site management is essential if we are to establish a coherent and resilient ecological network.			1132

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>1st sentence. We have assumed that the “pressures generated by new development” includes SANGs. The SANGs will form part of the development packages of new housing sites so they could create additional pressure on some BAP habitats and species. We recommend that this should be specified if there could be any room for doubt in its interpretation.</p> <p>2nd sentence is not entirely clear and may perhaps be a little too specific for this document? Alternative wording might be,</p> <p>These sites will include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local features that do not meet size or biodiversity criteria for SNCI designation, and • existing or potential extensions/linkages. <p>Experience has shown that surveys carried out at an inappropriate time of year or following inappropriate land management practice yield misleading results, particularly on grassland sites. Existing provision for Phase 1 Habitat Surveys should provide adequate protection if properly adhered to and if surveys are carried out for a full 12 month period, say March, May, July/August and October/November. Further survey may also be required on some sites for over wintering birds. The crucial point is that it is essential that any survey work should not be a simple one or two day snapshot at an inappropriate time of year but are carried out over a 12 month period to take account of what is apparent or present in all seasons. Independent surveys which adequately target relevant habitats and species over sufficient time and area must be conducted.</p> <p>We understand that DWT are proposing refinement of the wording of ME1 that will encompass the intentions of ME4. ETAG supports this approach but recommends that the points made above are also included.</p> <p>DWT, NE and DCC are currently developing a Dorset Biodiversity Protocol and it may be possible for this to be used as an additional mechanism to protect undesignated sites. ETAG recommends that the detail of the policy should be examined further and would welcome involvement in this.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO23 50	Preferred Option ME 4	Support		ARC support this option.			1132
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	CSO22 01	Preferred Option ME 4	Object		This Option mentions protection for undesignated sites. We believe that 'robust' areas should be included in this Option, as they should be acknowledged as being valuable to the protection of other fragile habitats, and should themselves be protected although undesignated. They should be identified by local communities who use them for recreation.	Include 'robust areas' in the list of sites to be protected. Include local community groups and Parish Councils in the list of those stakeholders to be consulted in identifying undesignated sites to be protected.		1132
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 594	Preferred Option ME 4	Support		We support Preferred Options ME1, ME2, ME3, ME4, ME5, ME6, ME7, ME10, ME11, ME12 and ME13. In particular we are pleased that these include recognition of undesignated sites and the potential creation of a new Stour Valley country park.			1132
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22 782	Preferred Option ME 4	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1132
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 195	Preferred Option ME 4	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.25, preferred option ME1 noted, ME2 – SANGs can be provided and delivered as part of the proposed development. ME3 noted as are the remaining ME's			1132
533728	Mr Mike Garrity	Chair of the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Steering Group Dorset County Council	CSO19 171	Preferred Option ME 4	Support		More specifically, ME2 deals with internationally protected habitats and sets out a commitment to the emerging joint heathlands development plan document, while ME3 and ME4 deal with more local designations. Natural habitats are a key component of green infrastructure and it is important to ensure that development plays a positive role in supporting their			1132

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							ability to promote biodiversity.			
359362	Mr Justin MILWARD	Regional Policy Officer Woodland Trust	CSO3186	Preferred Option ME 5	Support		<p>We are pleased to support this Option. The Option's aim of: 'Reconnecting fragmented habitats and establishing wildlife corridors will be included as objectives within a strategy to develop a network of interconnected Green Infrastructure' is highly relevant to protecting and buffering ancient woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In their current state, key habitats such as ancient woodland are simply not sustainable given their fragmented character and the immobile nature of many of their characteristic species, which frequently "locked in" by a surrounding environmentally hostile landscape, exacerbated by the anticipated effects of climate change. • To this end we would like to see creation of new natural habitats around existing valuable conservation habitats such as ancient woodland, together with a reduction in intensity of agricultural practice, so that species are better able to move around – or 'permeate' - into other natural habitats. This 'landscape scale' approach can deliver significant benefits as it enables both 'structural' (i.e. physical connectivity) and 'functional' (ecological connectivity) linkages to develop, particularly to the benefit of native woodland under pressure from climate change. A useful example of this approach is Forest Research's BEETLE model (http://www.forestry.gov.uk/fr/INFD-69PLA5). This 'Biological and Environmental Evaluation Tools for Landscape Ecology' (BEETLE) comprises a suite of tools developed to model and analyse fragmentation and connectivity using GIS (Geographic Information Systems). • Under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, all public authorities now have a statutory duty to conserve biodiversity under the definition of 'Conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat'. Given that individual habitats like ancient woodland continue to be 	We therefore support Option ME 5 on climate change adaptation.		1134

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							threatened by fragmentation and isolation, exacerbated by climate change effects, it is important that we deliver an increase in wider linked areas of conservation management in the landscape as a whole.			
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 511	Preferred Option ME 5	Support		DWT support this option			1134
359482	Ms Helen POWELL	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18 792	Preferred Option ME 5	Support					1134
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 741	Preferred Option ME 5	Support					1134
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 234	Preferred Option ME 5		General Comment	<p>ETAG is concerned that the climate change issues that are being considered are largely restricted to aspects covered by existing County policy documents. Please see comments above under Critical issues, problems and challenges and those on the Climate Change Key Issue Paper. The impact of transport should be considered in this section and should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • emissions, • damage to roadside habitats, • light pollution from street lights, headlights and reflection from road surfaces. <p>Climate change impact on soil and ecosystem services will be discussed in the supporting document on soil and soil carbon.</p>			1134

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO2351	Preferred Option ME 5	Support		ARC support this option.			1134
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO448	Preferred Option ME 5	Support					1134
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	CSO2203	Preferred Option ME 5	Object		<p>This Option refers to Climate Change adaptation and mentions reconnecting fragmented habitats and establishing wildlife corridors. The wording of this Option could give a 'green light' to reconnect habitats or establish corridors through any area/environment/other habitat, which may be inappropriate, and the wording should be refined. In particular we would like to see the value of 'robust areas' acknowledged in this Option, so their individual important use by the general public, their own biodiversity for many species, and their contribution to climate change is not compromised by the current wording of this Option. As we have commented on other ME Options, the wording of the Option should be softened to reflect the fact that by having regard to other non designated sites, climate change resilience may be enhanced on designated sites. For instance retention of woodland on a robust area will assist climate change in general, whereas mass felling on a robust site to 'reconnect habitats' may promote climate change. The Option should reflect more 'balance' and should also include reference to consultation with local community groups and Parish Councils. Also, we think that the Option should refer to a policy objective of carbon balance, which if promoted, would have a positive effect for fragile habitats. It is a fact that there is a reduction in long term average carbon store of 168 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per hectare of woodland removed. Often areas cleared to reconnect habitats are large areas of woodland. Those areas should be acknowledged as assets in helping to achieve the country's objectives to reduce greenhouse gases and</p>	<p>After the mention in the Option of reconnecting habitats, there should be additional wording: "Such reconnection should, where suggested through robust areas, be limited to green and wildlife corridors, thus minimising the impingement upon, and acknowledging the value of, those robust areas to the protection of other fragile designated areas. Any proposed habitat reconnection through a robust area should be subject to local consultation as to its extent." With regards to carbon balance, there should be additional wording in the Option to the effect that existing woodland areas and new tree planting</p>		1134

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							address climate change, and therefore assist fragile habitats.	should be recognised as assets in helping to achieve objectives to reduce greenhouse gases and assist in fragile habitat resilience to climate change.		
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 595	Preferred Option ME 5	Support		We support Preferred Options ME1, ME2, ME3, ME4, ME5, ME6, ME7, ME10, ME11, ME12 and ME13. In particular we are pleased that these include recognition of undesignated sites and the potential creation of a new Stour Valley country park.			1134
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		CSO17 811	Preferred Option ME 5	Object		<p>Offsetting the effects of Climate Change</p> <p>It is clear that people are looking for governments, businesses and councils to lead the way in controlling green house gas emissions and to create opportunities for reducing energy consumption. Consequently they need schemes to be introduced that will mitigate harmful effects to our climate by offsetting our polluting habits.</p> <p>Most people recognise that burning fossil fuels leads to the release of Carbon Dioxide and other pollutants into the atmosphere and increases global warming. They can however be offset by using green solutions to create energy and by increasing forestation to soak up pollutants.</p> <p>If we take example from Europe most countries have constructed wind and solar energy farms close to their settlements, and increased the expanse of their deciduous forests. Wind Farms seem to be a very contentious issue on land in the UK, but not at sea, and so I am very pleased to note that parts of the Dorset coast line will be developed as a Wind Farm 13.</p> <p>However this does not detract from the fact that each community should play its part in offsetting the effects of climate change, which in fact it causes.</p> <p>I would therefore have expected EDDC to recognise</p>			1134

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>that it has but one opportunity, not to be missed, to include within its core strategy, areas for both a solar energy farm and a deciduous forest to offset the effects of climate change. We cannot afford to waste another 15 years in debating where these should be situated. We need to provide suitable space to locate a Solar Energy Farm capable of generating in excess of 5 Megawatts of Electricity.¹¹</p> <p>We need to provide suitable space to locate a deciduous Forest capable of extracting 7000 tonnes of Carbon Dioxide from the Atmosphere.^{17,18}</p> <p>I therefore make the following alternative recommendations for the Core Strategy;</p> <p>Suitable sites for these two requirements would be WMC4 and “undeveloped” land South of Leigh Road and East of WMC5. It is worth mentioning that these two areas have the same surface area.</p> <p>My favoured option is to use WMC4 for the following reasons;</p> <p>The land to the East of the Cranborne Road is elevated; it is not obscured from the South, and at 35 acres would be able to house a Solar Energy Farm capable of generating in excess of 7 Megawatts of Electricity. (refer to Map Option A)</p> <p>The distance between Holt Heath and Walford Close is exactly 3 miles (4.8Km) by road. As the crow flies this is 4.5 Km to the Cranborne Road and therefore the area to the East of the Cranborne Road is within 5Km of protected Heath land. Consequently EDDC will be obliged to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space, as required by EU legislation, but this does not seem to have been addressed within the Core Strategy. Complementing the recommendation for the land East of the Cranborne Road, to aid Heath Land protection, and provide recreational facilities in the nature of a Country Park, I would plant a new deciduous Forest to the West of the Cranborne Road of 28 acres which will be capable of extracting in excess of 7000 tonnes of Carbon Dioxide from the Atmosphere.</p> <p>In time the forest will blend with the tree belt known as</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>"The Row" and could be extended all the way up to, and to include Catley Copse. I would recommend that it is established on the lines of the successful Moors Valley Country Park. If further "infill" is created between the new deciduous Forest and the Cranborne Road it could be landscaped to include a Golf Course in the locality. (refer to Map Option A)</p> <p>Thinking more laterally about other potential uses for WMC4, I can conceive that it would be possible to level the fields to the East of the Cranborne Road in order to facilitate the relocation of the Rugby and Football Clubs and also allow expansion of the facilities into a Sports Complex. With regards to the field to the West of the Cranborne Road this could be set out as allotments, which would be significantly larger than the existing sites. The remainder of the space could be allocated as new deciduous Forest as identified in the paragraphs above. (refer to Map Option B)</p> <p>If this option was considered to be more practical the space at WMC5, allocated currently for Sports Facilities, could become a Solar Energy Farm, which would overcome the problem of what to site in this area because of odour emanating from the adjacent Sewage Works. (refer to Map Option C)</p> <p>I believe either of these proposals would be more palatable to local Burts Hill and Walford Close residents than Urbanising the Rural area at WMC4 and of course any of these schemes is capable of creating much needed additional revenue for EDDC.</p> <p>In addition Walford Close and Burts Hill residents would be able to continue to observe the family of deer that forage and feed in this area at dawn and dusk during Spring and Autumn before haymaking destroys their cover and food supply.</p> <p>Recognising that this would remove the housing options for WMC4, I propose that these should be re-established in the "undeveloped" land South of Leigh Road and to the East of WMC5. (refer to Map Option E, but see also my views on "The Housing Need?" which follows)</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>If this last suggestion proves not to be feasible then perhaps deciduous forestation could be established in this “undeveloped” land South of Leigh Road. However it would not have the same potential for expansion as that to the East of the Cranborne Road, since any expansion would have to straddle the A31 which is likely to lead to a high percentage of road kill and / or an increasing number of accidents in this area. (refer to Map Option C)</p> <p>Regarding sites for a Solar Energy Farm, I can only propose one other alternative site which is in the Northern sub-area of Leigh Road, but I believe this would be a contentious issue between Wimborne and Colehill residents, regarding coalescence.</p> <p>It is fantastic to learn that Eco Sustainable Solutions^{6,7} have put forward a planning application to Christchurch Borough Council for a Solar Energy Farm at Parley along the lines I am suggesting above. I truly believe this to be a really worthwhile venture and I hope that EDDC will give this application its full backing.</p> <p>I have also discovered that Solar Energy Farms are being proposed and introduced by other County Councils in the South West of England see http://www.thisiscornwall.co.uk/news/Massive-solar-farms-planned/article-2166168-detail/article.html for details of this, and associated business and industrial opportunities for their local industries.¹¹</p> <p>I would hope that the EDDC realises that we cannot wait another 15 years until the next Core Strategy to mitigate the effects of Climate Change.</p> <p>We have only ONE CHANCE, TIME IS RUNNING OUT. We must ACT NOW.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In this paper I have tried to prick the conscience of the EDDC to consider the wider aspects of their Core Strategy, particularly in relation to Climate Change. I have also indicated the benefits that embracing solutions to combat Climate Change can bring to the community as a whole.</p> <p>I have put forward two further options for consideration</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>which major on the need for mitigating the effects of global warming. These are;</p> <p>a) A Solar Energy Farm and deciduous Forest at WMC4 with housing development limited to affordable and supportable housing in locations identified in EDDC's Options for Housing in the Wimborne and Colehill area, other than at WMC4.</p> <p>b) A Sports Complex, allotments and a deciduous Forest at WMC4, which will allow a Solar Energy Farm to be sited at WMC5 and additional housing to be developed in the "undeveloped" land to the South of Leigh Road and adjacent to WMC5.</p> <p>I have questioned the amount of homes to be built in our locality based on current needs and the detrimental effect that over population would have on our Rural and Natural environment. I have recommended the number be reduced by 50%.</p> <p>I have analysed the anticipated travel requirements of Wimborne and Colehill residents and concluded that the A31 is a major contributor to mobility in our catchment area. Thus for any Core Strategy for Wimborne and Colehill to be successfully implemented MAJOR SURGERY is necessary to improve traffic flow along or over the A31. I have outlined proposals for achieving this.</p> <p>I have looked at the issue of car parking, and proposed a solution to overcome this which it is hoped would encourage more pedestrians into the town, whilst controlling parking spaces for residential use.</p> <p>The question now arises does the EDDC have the courage and commitment to pursue these greater choices and accept that it must make truly sustainable decisions for the benefit of future generations.</p> <p>As a final thought; "How embarrassing would it be for our County if the most prestigious and affluent area of Dorset became submerged under the sea at Sandbanks?" It is a very real possibility unless we take action now.</p> <p>As a final, final thought wouldn't it be just fantastic to see the EDDC putting Dorset at the forefront of a</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							movement, and an industry, that is capable of leading the rest of the country to carbon neutrality. Think of the kudos this could bring to our County and the increased revenue and prosperity for our Market Town. SEE ATTACHMENT			
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22 783	Preferred Option ME 5	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1134
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 196	Preferred Option ME 5	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.25, preferred option ME1 noted, ME2 – SANGs can be provided and delivered as part of the proposed development. ME3 noted as are the remaining ME's			1134
533728	Mr Mike Garrity	Chair of the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Steering Group Dorset County Council	CSO19 172	Preferred Option ME 5	Support		Preferred Option ME5 deals with climate change adaptation and recognises the importance of developing a network of green infrastructure in supporting this. The steering group strongly supports this policy and commends the strategic recognition of the role that a network of green infrastructure can play in relation to climate change.			1134
359362	Mr Justin MILWARD	Regional Policy Officer Woodland Trust	CSO31 87	Preferred Option ME 6	Support		We are pleased to support this Option, driven by the SNAs of the South West Nature Map, as it is particularly relevant to both protecting ancient woodland and expanding native woodland via new woodland creation. The Government's published policy on ancient and native woodland, Keepers of Time: A statement of Policy for England's Ancient and Native Woodland (Defra, Forestry Commission, 2005, p.17), clearly promotes a landscape scale approach: 'Woodlands have traditionally been managed in isolation from other habitats in the landscape. Much of our wildlife sees and uses the landscape as a whole and there is growing recognition in the face of climate change that we need to re-connect the semi-natural components of our landscapes into ecologically functional units. Woodlands and trees will be among the most important features of	We therefore support Option ME 6 on landscape scale biodiversity		1136

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							such habitat networks. Woodland creation should focus on increasing the area of semi-natural habitats available to wildlife and reducing the negative edge effects of intensive adjacent land use'.			
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 512	Preferred Option ME 6	Object		Should this read 'and those referred to in preferred option ME1'? If the DWT and/or Dorset Environmental Records Centre are to monitor the biodiversity improvements associated with new developments, appropriate funding would be required.			1136
359482	Ms Helen POWELL	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18 793	Preferred Option ME 6	Support					1136
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 742	Preferred Option ME 6	Support					1136
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 236	Preferred Option ME 6	Support		ETAG supports this option. Please note that the provisional mapping of SNAs include some boundary inaccuracies that will need correcting.			1136
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO23 52	Preferred Option ME 6	Support		ARC support this option.			1136
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO44 9	Preferred Option ME 6	Support					1136

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	CSO22 05	Preferred Option ME 6	Object		<p>The first paragraph of this Option refers to the South West Nature Map. There appears to be a serious oversight, in that the map is not included in the Core Strategy. This map apparently shows "areas with potential for landscape-scale habitat enhancement and re-creation". It is not possible to see this map so we do not know if this Option will have any effect on Hurn. It may be, that the whole of Hurn is identified on this map as the best area to expand priority habitats, in which case we would like to comment. Therefore we do not consider this a viable Option, as it is not possible for anyone to comment without sight of the map. For information, we did try to find it on line via a link provided to us, but were unsuccessful.</p> <p>The second paragraph of this Option again refers to enhancement and re-creation of the Strategic Nature Areas (as per the missing map). It also refers to many organisations who may be involved in aiding delivery of the objectives. Again, as with other ME Options there is no reference at all to contact with community groups or Parish Councils who represent the very people who may be affected by these proposals.</p>	Forward a copy of the South West Nature Map to any person or organisation who has objected to this Option, and allow them to comment before responses are considered. Include local people/Parish Councils as consultees on any proposals.		1136
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 596	Preferred Option ME 6	Support		We support Preferred Options ME1, ME2, ME3, ME4, ME5, ME6, ME7, ME10, ME11, ME12 and ME13. In particular we are pleased that these include recognition of undesignated sites and the potential creation of a new Stour Valley country park.			1136
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22 784	Preferred Option ME 6	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1136
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 197	Preferred Option ME 6	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.25, preferred option ME1 noted, ME2 – SANGs can be provided and delivered as part of the proposed development. ME3 noted as are the remaining ME's			1136
477183	Mrs		CSO18	12.11	Object		Verwood's carbon footprint will be increased due to an			1138

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Sarah Sumner		2				extra 800 cars on the road having to go our of town. We are rural and although called urban in this document, thats just the number of houses, we are a village with a town population. Our carbon footprint is massive and will increase with this.			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO450	12.12	Support					1139
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO451	12.13	Support					1140
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO541	12.13	Object		The River Crane is also liable to flooding in Verwood, blocking access to the town via 3X. This is an area planned for development in this strategy document.			1140
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17589	12.13	Object		Paragraph 12.13 (water) Bullet point 1 - We have a small point to raise - the Bure is a Brook rather than a river, and this should be reflected in the document. Also the Core Strategy should include the River Mude. Bullet point 3 - We believe using the term "Groundwater Protection Zones" may be confusing. It may be better to say something similar to: 'The majority of the district is underlain by Principal or Secondary Aquifers. In addition, a significant proportion of the district falls within Groundwater Source Protection Zones'. Bullet point 4 - We suggest adding "and groundwater" at the end of the sentence. Paragraph 12.18 (Sustainable Development) - We recommend this paragraph includes reference to the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).			1140
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO452	12.14	Support		In particular I express my concern with any potential housing development north of Wimborne and to the east of Cranborne Road. That area slopes steeply south and there is concern about rain water run off from any new			1141

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							development affecting existing properties at Walford Close, Great care must be taken to put in suitable drainage systems (maybe SUDS?)			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO453	12.17	Support					1144
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO542	12.17	Object		This strategy highlights the need to adopt sustainable energy sources, but does not indicate what sources will be used, how this will be implemented and where the funding will come from.			1144
484502	Mr John Turner		CSO571	12.17	Support		Agree but this fails to reflect one of the Forestry Commission's targets, namely to increase the use of wood as a sustainable fuel. The area has large tracts of woodland that could be utilised for this. Though it may seem somewhat trite, there may be benefit in supporting the introduction of wood-burning stove in local houses as part of increasing the up-take of renewable energy sources.	Add: In cooperation with the Forestry Commission, increased exploitation of locally available renewable wood fuel for domestic use will also be supported, including encouragement of the domestic use of wood-burning stoves as far as this is feasible.		1144
533867	Ms Emma Woodhouse	SW Food & Farming Adviser NFU	CSO19231	12.17		General Comment	Renewable Energy The farming sector has the potential to contribute significantly to renewable energy targets. Farmers are being encouraged through the introduction of Feed in Tariffs to have on-farm renewable energy systems, including hydro, wind, solar and anaerobic digestion apparatus. Planning policy should reflect government initiatives and support this sort of technology on farm.			1144
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO454	12.18	Support					1145

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17590	12.18	Object		Paragraph 12.18 (Sustainable Development) - We recommend this paragraph includes reference to the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).			1145
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO18009	Preferred Option ME 7	Support		We are broadly supportive of this option, in terms of according with national planning policy, PPS1 Supplement on Planning and Climate Change states that any requirements above the Code for Sustainable Homes must be supported by evidence and that it is necessary due to local circumstances. We have been unable to find this evidence on the Dorset For You website. If no evidence has been produced yet, we strongly urge the councils to do so before the Pre-Submission of this document.			1148
359284	Miss Lynne Evans	Consultant Southern Planning Practice	CSO18419	Preferred Option ME 7	Object		Support is given to the opening sentence which indicates that the Core Strategy will not require new housing to meet higher standards of the Code for Sustainable Homes beyond the programme required nationally. Any requirements in respect of the other items listed should be specified in accordance with nationally described sustainable building standards as advised by para 32 of PPS: Planning and Climate Change. Objection is therefore raised to the requirements of the policy which exceed national requirements and guidelines.	Revise policy to confirm that the Councils will seek to apply and accord with national requirements.		1148
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18743	Preferred Option ME 7	Support					1148
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO455	Preferred Option ME 7	Support		It is only right that both new and existing homes should aim for water and energy efficiency, looking for alternative measures such as solar heating and sufficient insulation in homes.			1148

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Rain water run off could be a big problem on some suggested development sites and suitable protective measures should be put in place i.e. SUDS			
476245	Mr Robert Pearce		CSO17 425	Preferred Option ME 7		General Comment	Can the council stipulate conditions about the energy efficiency of proposed dwellings and local transport links at a time of both legally binding and highly ambitious carbon reduction targets and when peak oil is about to be reached?			1148
517880	Mr Russ Booker		CSO17 251	Preferred Option ME 7	Support	General Comment	<p>The sustainable energy requirements for new developments of 10% are laughably low when we are capable of building carbon neutral buildings. We should be aiming high for the sake of future generations, the planet, and for the increasing flood risk we face locally from climate change. Truly sustainable buildings may initially cost more but with future fuel costs set to rise and rise they will be the future's affordable housing and truly be so for the lifetime of the development. We should not be "...encouraging high standards of building design and construction." We should be insisting on it, otherwise we'll get low standards. Low carbon energy is a very positive part of the strategy and I fully support it. However if the proposed CHP plant is a green-sounding screen actually meaning a waste incinerator I would be utterly against it for the reasons outlined at: http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/MultimediaFiles/Live/FullReport/3809.PDF</p> <p>And for the sake of my unborn child due to the toxic emissions and products they generate (see also other attached document for additional reasons). Even biomass burning CHP plant will add some atmospheric pollution and should be sited so that the prevailing winds do not blow towards a residential area and adversely affect health. Surely we should be investing in wind, solar ground source heat pumps, etc. in residential areas which have only advantages for health?</p>			1148
519991	Ms	Planning	CSO17	Preferred	Support		We support Preferred Options ME1, ME2, ME3, ME4,			1148

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Claire Aldridge	Liaison Officer Environment Agency	597	Option ME 7			<p>ME5, ME6, ME7, ME10, ME11, ME12 and ME13. In particular we are pleased that these include recognition of undesignated sites and the potential creation of a new Stour Valley country park.</p> <p>Preferred Option ME7, page 260</p> <p>We support this policy, but recommend that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and wider groundwater issues are mentioned, this is discussed below.</p> <p>SuDS</p> <p>We recommend the inclusion of SuDS within Preferred Option ME7 (under minimising waste, pollution and water run-off), i.e we recommend the fourth bullet point should read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimising waste, pollution and water run-off, incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems where appropriate. <p>Groundwater</p> <p>We believe that wider groundwater issues need to be considered in this option, including protection and potential impacts on both licensed and unlicensed water supplies. We recommend the following amendment to the penultimate paragraph in this option:</p> <p>'Groundwater sources will be afforded protection through a criteria-based policy for new development which refers to the Environment Agency's Ground Water Source Protection Zones, which 'Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice (GP3)' document.</p> <p>Groundwater Source Protection Zones will be shown on the Core Strategy proposals map, if appropriate. The criteria will assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The type of development and its likely impact on groundwater in terms of contaminants from construction and from use. • The need for development affecting a Groundwater Source Protection Zones. • Proximity to a Ground Water Source Protection Zone. • Proximity and impact on licensed and unlicensed water supplies • The sensitivity of underground aquifers. <p>If groundwater Source Protection Zones are to be</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							included in the Core Strategy proposals map, we wish to add that we regularly review and update the delineated SPZ areas and for this reason we would certainly wish to see a very clear caveat on any reproduction of maps showing SPZ extents. The up to date zones are available on the Environment Agency's website. Alternatively please contact us if you have any queries.			
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22785	Preferred Option ME 7	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1148
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17882	Preferred Option ME 7	Object		Policies ME7 – ME13 lack ambition and do not reflect in practice the intentions of the Government. These are expressed in the Climate Change Act 2008, EU Directive 2009/28 EC and the UK Low Carbon Transition Plan and UK Renewable Energy Strategy 2009. In short the targets in the draft policies are out of step with national guidance and are unworkable. ME7 splits parts of the Code for Sustainable Homes to different ratings which is not practical as a single certificate for code rating is made by the assessor.			1148
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18745	Preferred Option ME 8	Support					1150
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO456	Preferred Option ME 8	Support					1150
495527	Miss Caroline Green	Planner Broadway Malyan	CSO1483	Preferred Option ME 8	Support		We support preferred option ME8 as we feel it would be potentially harmful to the viability of future non-residential developments to impose standards without having regard to national policy.			1150

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
517880	Mr Russ Booker		CSO17 259	Preferred Option ME 8	Support	General Comment	<p>The sustainable energy requirements for new developments of 10% are laughably low when we are capable of building carbon neutral buildings. We should be aiming high for the sake of future generations, the planet, and for the increasing flood risk we face locally from climate change. Truly sustainable buildings may initially cost more but with future fuel costs set to rise and rise they will be the future's affordable housing and truly be so for the lifetime of the development. We should not be "...encouraging high standards of building design and construction." We should be insisting on it, otherwise we'll get low standards. Low carbon energy is a very positive part of the strategy and I fully support it. However if the proposed CHP plant is a green-sounding screen actually meaning a waste incinerator I would be utterly against it for the reasons outlined at: http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/MultimediaFiles/Live/FullReport/3809.PDF</p> <p>And for the sake of my unborn child due to the toxic emissions and products they generate (see also other attached document for additional reasons). Even biomass burning CHP plant will add some atmospheric pollution and should be sited so that the prevailing winds do not blow towards a residential area and adversely affect health. Surely we should be investing in wind, solar ground source heat pumps, etc. in residential areas which have only advantages for health?</p>			1150
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 598	Preferred Option ME 8		General Comment	<p>Preferred Option ME8, page 261</p> <p>We recommend this policy should refer to BREEAM standards, or equivalent. BREEAM standards in particular are well used within non-residential developments and should be used as a starting point for achieving sustainable construction within this types of development. If there is concern that these standards may not be as relevant in future years, when other standards might become more widely recognised, then to address this the policy could make reference to being flexible to future innovations, regulations and other</p>			1150

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							requirements.			
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22786	Preferred Option ME 8	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1150
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17883	Preferred Option ME 8	Object		Policies ME7 – ME13 lack ambition and do not reflect in practice the intentions of the Government. These are expressed in the Climate Change Act 2008, EU Directive 2009/28 EC and the UK Low Carbon Transition Plan and UK Renewable Energy Strategy 2009. In short the targets in the draft policies are out of step with national guidance and are unworkable.			1150
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO183	Alternative Preferred Option ME 9	Object		Commercial development must be included to be green and policed.			1152
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22787	Alternative Preferred Option ME 9	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1152
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17884	Alternative Preferred Option ME 9	Object		Policies ME7 – ME13 lack ambition and do not reflect in practice the intentions of the Government. These are expressed in the Climate Change Act 2008, EU Directive 2009/28 EC and the UK Low Carbon Transition Plan and UK Renewable Energy Strategy 2009. In short the targets in the draft policies are out of step with national guidance and are unworkable.			1152
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of	CSO18750	Preferred Option ME 10	Support					1155

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Birds								
476245	Mr Robert Pearce		CSO17 426	Preferred Option ME 10		General Comment	Can the council stipulate conditions about the energy efficiency of proposed dwellings and local transport links at a time of both legally binding and highly ambitious carbon reduction targets and when peak oil is about to be reached?			1155
517880	Mr Russ Booker		CSO17 260	Preferred Option ME 10	Support	General Comment	<p>The sustainable energy requirements for new developments of 10% are laughably low when we are capable of building carbon neutral buildings. We should be aiming high for the sake of future generations, the planet, and for the increasing flood risk we face locally from climate change. Truly sustainable buildings may initially cost more but with future fuel costs set to rise and rise they will be the future's affordable housing and truly be so for the lifetime of the development. We should not be "...encouraging high standards of building design and construction." We should be insisting on it, otherwise we'll get low standards. Low carbon energy is a very positive part of the strategy and I fully support it. However if the proposed CHP plant is a green-sounding screen actually meaning a waste incinerator I would be utterly against it for the reasons outlined at: http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/MultimediaFiles/Live/FullReport/3809.PDF</p> <p>And for the sake of my unborn child due to the toxic emissions and products they generate (see also other attached document for additional reasons). Even biomass burning CHP plant will add some atmospheric pollution and should be sited so that the prevailing winds do not blow towards a residential area and adversely affect health. Surely we should be investing in wind, solar ground source heat pumps, etc. in residential areas which have only advantages for health?</p>			1155
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment	CSO17 599	Preferred Option ME 10	Support		We support Preferred Options ME1, ME2, ME3, ME4, ME5, ME6, ME7, ME10, ME11, ME12 and ME13. In particular we are pleased that these include recognition			1155

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Agency					of undesignated sites and the potential creation of a new Stour Valley country park.			
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22 788	Preferred Option ME 10	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1155
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17 885	Preferred Option ME 10	Object		Policies ME7 – ME13 lack ambition and do not reflect in practice the intentions of the Government. These are expressed in the Climate Change Act 2008, EU Directive 2009/28 EC and the UK Low Carbon Transition Plan and UK Renewable Energy Strategy 2009. In short the targets in the draft policies are out of step with national guidance and are unworkable.			1155
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO18 011	Preferred Option ME 11	Support		We welcome the councils' emphasis on the need for all individual requirements on new developments to be both viable and feasible.			1157
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 752	Preferred Option ME 11	Support					1157
476245	Mr Robert Pearce		CSO17 427	Preferred Option ME 11		General Comment	Are local micro-generation plants being considered?			1157
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 600	Preferred Option ME 11	Support		We support Preferred Options ME1, ME2, ME3, ME4, ME5, ME6, ME7, ME10, ME11, ME12 and ME13. In particular we are pleased that these include recognition of undesignated sites and the potential creation of a new Stour Valley country park.			1157
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22 789	Preferred Option ME 11	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1157

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17886	Preferred Option ME 11	Object		Policies ME7 – ME13 lack ambition and do not reflect in practice the intentions of the Government. These are expressed in the Climate Change Act 2008, EU Directive 2009/28 EC and the UK Low Carbon Transition Plan and UK Renewable Energy Strategy 2009. In short the targets in the draft policies are out of step with national guidance and are unworkable. In particular Policy ME11 requiring renewable or low carbon energy in new neighbourhoods is out of step with the time table for zero carbon by 2016. In particular Meyrick Estate Management support district wide heat and/or power provision principle of large off-site renewable energy facilities adjacent to new neighbourhoods and in the general vicinity.			1157
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSO18436	Preferred Option ME 11	Object		There is no evidence base to support Preferred Option ME 11.	Preferred Option ME 11 should not be included in the Core Strategy unless the evidence base studies have been prepared to demonstrate that the proposed approach is deliverable and viable.		1157
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18755	Preferred Option ME 12	Support					1159
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO457	Preferred Option ME 12	Support		I would hope that any contribution of this sort would be "ring fenced" for the proposed "carbon offset" fund			1159
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17601	Preferred Option ME 12	Support		We support Preferred Options ME1, ME2, ME3, ME4, ME5, ME6,ME7, ME10, ME11, ME12 and ME13. In particular we are pleased that these include recognition of undesignated sites and the potential creation of a			1159

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							new Stour Valley country park.			
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22 790	Preferred Option ME 12	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1159
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17 887	Preferred Option ME 12	Object		Policies ME7 – ME13 lack ambition and do not reflect in practice the intentions of the Government. These are expressed in the Climate Change Act 2008, EU Directive 2009/28 EC and the UK Low Carbon Transition Plan and UK Renewable Energy Strategy 2009. In short the targets in the draft policies are out of step with national guidance and are unworkable.			1159
533728	Mr Mike Garrity	Chair of the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Steering Group Dorset County Council	CSO19 173	Preferred Option ME 12	Support		Preferred Option ME12 (carbon offset fund): The Steering Group supports in principle a carbon offset fund, including the pooling of contributions to fund various carbon offsetting measures. There may be scope for green infrastructure to play a part in achieving this (for instance through tree planting as a means of absorbing atmospheric CO2 emissions, or the planting of energy crops). Such options should be given consideration when determining the most appropriate carbon offsetting mechanisms and it will be important to ensure that both East Dorset and Christchurch consider the role of the community infrastructure levy (CIL) or its replacement as a mechanism for pooling contributions as Section 106 planning obligations will not be appropriate for this purpose from 2014 onwards.			1159
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 760	Preferred Option ME 13		General Comment	We agree with the findings of the HRA that the impact of ME13 is uncertain. We would advise that the inappropriate siting of wind turbines (for example) close to sensitive sites, particularly heathlands and wetlands, can lead to a number of potentially adverse effects including bird strike, barrier effects and disturbance. We recommend the planned feasibility assessments incorporate environmental considerations at an early stage.			1161

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO458	Preferred Option ME 13	Support					1161
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17602	Preferred Option ME 13	Support		We support Preferred Options ME1, ME2, ME3, ME4, ME5, ME6, ME7, ME10, ME11, ME12 and ME13. In particular we are pleased that these include recognition of undesignated sites and the potential creation of a new Stour Valley country park.			1161
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		CSO17812	Preferred Option ME 13	Object		<p>Offsetting the effects of Climate Change It is clear that people are looking for governments, businesses and councils to lead the way in controlling green house gas emissions and to create opportunities for reducing energy consumption. Consequently they need schemes to be introduced that will mitigate harmful effects to our climate by offsetting our polluting habits.</p> <p>Most people recognise that burning fossil fuels leads to the release of Carbon Dioxide and other pollutants into the atmosphere and increases global warming. They can however be offset by using green solutions to create energy and by increasing forestation to soak up pollutants.</p> <p>If we take example from Europe most countries have constructed wind and solar energy farms close to their settlements, and increased the expanse of their deciduous forests. Wind Farms seem to be a very contentious issue on land in the UK, but not at sea, and so I am very pleased to note that parts of the Dorset coast line will be developed as a Wind Farm 13. However this does not detract from the fact that each community should play its part in offsetting the effects of climate change, which in fact it causes.</p> <p>I would therefore have expected EDDC to recognise that it has but one opportunity, not to be missed, to include within its core strategy, areas for both a solar energy farm and a deciduous forest to offset the effects of climate change. We cannot afford to waste another 15 years in debating where these should be situated.</p>			1161

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>We need to provide suitable space to locate a Solar Energy Farm capable of generating in excess of 5 Megawatts of Electricity.¹¹</p> <p>We need to provide suitable space to locate a deciduous Forest capable of extracting 7000 tonnes of Carbon Dioxide from the Atmosphere.^{17,18}</p> <p>I therefore make the following alternative recommendations for the Core Strategy;</p> <p>Suitable sites for these two requirements would be WMC4 and "undeveloped" land South of Leigh Road and East of WMC5. It is worth mentioning that these two areas have the same surface area.</p> <p>My favoured option is to use WMC4 for the following reasons;</p> <p>The land to the East of the Cranborne Road is elevated; it is not obscured from the South, and at 35 acres would be able to house a Solar Energy Farm capable of generating in excess of 7 Megawatts of Electricity. (refer to Map Option A)</p> <p>The distance between Holt Heath and Walford Close is exactly 3 miles (4.8Km) by road. As the crow flies this is 4.5 Km to the Cranborne Road and therefore the area to the East of the Cranborne Road is within 5Km of protected Heath land. Consequently EDDC will be obliged to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space, as required by EU legislation, but this does not seem to have been addressed within the Core Strategy. Complementing the recommendation for the land East of the Cranborne Road, to aid Heath Land protection, and provide recreational facilities in the nature of a Country Park, I would plant a new deciduous Forest to the West of the Cranborne Road of 28 acres which will be capable of extracting in excess of 7000 tonnes of Carbon Dioxide from the Atmosphere.</p> <p>In time the forest will blend with the tree belt known as "The Row" and could be extended all the way up to, and to include Catley Copse. I would recommend that it is established on the lines of the successful Moors Valley Country Park. If further "infill" is created between the new deciduous Forest and the Cranborne Road it could</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>be landscaped to include a Golf Course in the locality. (refer to Map Option A)</p> <p>Thinking more laterally about other potential uses for WMC4, I can conceive that it would be possible to level the fields to the East of the Cranborne Road in order to facilitate the relocation of the Rugby and Football Clubs and also allow expansion of the facilities into a Sports Complex. With regards to the field to the West of the Cranborne Road this could be set out as allotments, which would be significantly larger than the existing sites. The remainder of the space could be allocated as new deciduous Forest as identified in the paragraphs above. (refer to Map Option B)</p> <p>If this option was considered to be more practical the space at WMC5, allocated currently for Sports Facilities, could become a Solar Energy Farm, which would overcome the problem of what to site in this area because of odour emanating from the adjacent Sewage Works. (refer to Map Option C)</p> <p>I believe either of these proposals would be more palatable to local Burts Hill and Walford Close residents than Urbanising the Rural area at WMC4 and of course any of these schemes is capable of creating much needed additional revenue for EDDC.</p> <p>In addition Walford Close and Burts Hill residents would be able to continue to observe the family of deer that forage and feed in this area at dawn and dusk during Spring and Autumn before haymaking destroys their cover and food supply.</p> <p>Recognising that this would remove the housing options for WMC4, I propose that these should be re-established in the "undeveloped" land South of Leigh Road and to the East of WMC5. (refer to Map Option E, but see also my views on "The Housing Need?" which follows)</p> <p>If this last suggestion proves not to be feasible then perhaps deciduous forestation could be established in this "undeveloped" land South of Leigh Road. However it would not have the same potential for expansion as that to the East of the Cranborne Road, since any</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>expansion would have to straddle the A31 which is likely to lead to a high percentage of road kill and / or an increasing number of accidents in this area. (refer to Map Option C)</p> <p>Regarding sites for a Solar Energy Farm, I can only propose one other alternative site which is in the Northern sub-area of Leigh Road, but I believe this would be a contentious issue between Wimborne and Colehill residents, regarding coalescence.</p> <p>It is fantastic to learn that Eco Sustainable Solutions^{6,7} have put forward a planning application to Christchurch Borough Council for a Solar Energy Farm at Parley along the lines I am suggesting above. I truly believe this to be a really worthwhile venture and I hope that EDDC will give this application its full backing.</p> <p>I have also discovered that Solar Energy Farms are being proposed and introduced by other County Councils in the South West of England see http://www.thisiscornwall.co.uk/news/Massive-solar-farms-planned/article-2166168-detail/article.html for details of this, and associated business and industrial opportunities for their local industries.¹¹</p> <p>I would hope that the EDDC realises that we cannot wait another 15 years until the next Core Strategy to mitigate the effects of Climate Change.</p> <p>We have only ONE CHANCE, TIME IS RUNNING OUT. We must ACT NOW.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In this paper I have tried to prick the conscience of the EDDC to consider the wider aspects of their Core Strategy, particularly in relation to Climate Change. I have also indicated the benefits that embracing solutions to combat Climate Change can bring to the community as a whole.</p> <p>I have put forward two further options for consideration which major on the need for mitigating the effects of global warming. These are;</p> <p>a) A Solar Energy Farm and deciduous Forest at WMC4 with housing development limited to affordable and supportable housing in locations identified in EDDC's</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Options for Housing in the Wimborne and Colehill area, other than at WMC4.</p> <p>b) A Sports Complex, allotments and a deciduous Forest at WMC4, which will allow a Solar Energy Farm to be sited at WMC5 and additional housing to be developed in the "undeveloped" land to the South of Leigh Road and adjacent to WMC5.</p> <p>I have questioned the amount of homes to be built in our locality based on current needs and the detrimental effect that over population would have on our Rural and Natural environment. I have recommended the number be reduced by 50%.</p> <p>I have analysed the anticipated travel requirements of Wimborne and Colehill residents and concluded that the A31 is a major contributor to mobility in our catchment area. Thus for any Core Strategy for Wimborne and Colehill to be successfully implemented MAJOR SURGERY is necessary to improve traffic flow along or over the A31. I have outlined proposals for achieving this.</p> <p>I have looked at the issue of car parking, and proposed a solution to overcome this which it is hoped would encourage more pedestrians into the town, whilst controlling parking spaces for residential use.</p> <p>The question now arises does the EDDC have the courage and commitment to pursue these greater choices and accept that it must make truly sustainable decisions for the benefit of future generations.</p> <p>As a final thought; "How embarrassing would it be for our County if the most prestigious and affluent area of Dorset became submerged under the sea at Sandbanks?" It is a very real possibility unless we take action now.</p> <p>As a final, final thought wouldn't it be just fantastic to see the EDDC putting Dorset at the forefront of a movement, and an industry, that is capable of leading the rest of the country to carbon neutrality. Think of the kudos this could bring to our County and the increased revenue and prosperity for our Market Town.</p> <p>SEE ATTACHMENT</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22 791	Preferred Option ME 13	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1161
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17 888	Preferred Option ME 13	Object		Policies ME7 – ME13 lack ambition and do not reflect in practice the intentions of the Government. These are expressed in the Climate Change Act 2008, EU Directive 2009/28 EC and the UK Low Carbon Transition Plan and UK Renewable Energy Strategy 2009. In short the targets in the draft policies are out of step with national guidance and are unworkable. Policy ME13 is in consistent with the current policy ME11. Meyrick Estate Management very much support the development of renewable and low carbon energy generating solutions but object to the technology choices as this is not properly evidence based. As an example the Broadway Malyan master planning draft for Roeshot urban extension gives no comfort as it has dismissed district wide bio-heat on the basis of an incomplete assessment.			1161
527744	Mr Steve Fidgett	Alliance Planning	CSO18 915	Preferred Option ME 13	Object		PO ME13 and omission of strategy for development of renewable energy. While we welcome the acknowledgement within the Core Strategy of the primary importance of tackling climate change, it is considered that the Core Strategy does not deal sufficiently with the requirement to tackle the causes of climate change in accordance with national planning policy. Specifically, the Core Strategy does not present a sound, credible or deliverable approach to the development of renewable energy facilities and hence fails to demonstrate how the Strategy will deliver a step change in the generation of power from renewable sources. We cannot identify in the Core Strategy a specific assessment of the current performance of the Boroughs in terms of renewable energy targets set at the national level or a proposed strategy for increasing the level of contribution sought from low carbon, renewable sources			1161

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>or for monitoring the performance of the Core Strategy in achieving these targets.</p> <p>We know however, that the level of renewable energy achieved in Dorset lags well below the levels achieved for the UK as a whole and the target levels that need to be achieved and addressing this requires urgent action. The renewable electricity installed capacity in Dorset has only increased by 500kW since 2007. Dorset would need approximately 40 times the total existing renewable energy capacity to be installed by 2020 in order to play an equal part in delivering the UK's international legally binding share of the European renewable energy targets. The Dorset Renewable Energy Strategy seeks concerted action for the development of renewable energy and includes solar and heat and power from biomass as energy from waste</p> <p>At the Christchurch level the plan acknowledges the clear implications of climate change for the Borough in terms of flood risk in particular and seeks to mitigate these risks by considering among other things, the location of development. However, it does not tackle the causes of climate change in terms of the reliance of existing development on fossil fuels and traditional energy sources. It does not make any provision either in policy terms or allocations for renewable energy facilities. While we welcome the aspiration of policy ME13 to seek future contributions and a strategy for CHP and renewable energy, there is no clear strategy as to how this will be delivered within the plan period or any locations where this would be supported.</p> <p>Hence, while comments on climate change at para 2.15, 3.28, 3.46 and elsewhere to tackling the effects of climate change, these comments do not adequately set out the scale of the requirement derived from national policy to deliver decentralised renewable energy sources that reduce carbon emissions and reduce reliance on traditional sources. While they require (carried through to ME7, ME8, ME9, ME10, ME11 and ME12) new development to contribute to renewable</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>energy development in different forms, there is no clear strategy for the development of the renewable energy generating capacity that will enable or support these policies other than very small scale schemes.</p> <p>The land shown on the attached plan at Eco Sustainable Solutions is available, viable and can be developed for a strategic Solar Energy Farm for the Borough that helps to significantly increase the level of renewable energy generated within the Borough within the first 5 year period of the Plan. It is deliverable and certain. An application for the development has already been submitted to Christchurch Borough Council.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the outcome of any application however, we would propose that the attached Site A be allocated for the development of a solar energy proposal and that the plan acknowledges that the existing developed site (Area B) has potential for renewable energy generation based on the utilisation and development of existing site activities into biomass and anaerobic digestion with renewable, low carbon energy recovery.</p> <p>We would also refer to our comments on green belt policy and the principle that renewable development, in appropriate locations and dealt with sensitively, need not be inappropriate in green belt locations. One such location is the areas shown on the attached plan.</p> <p>In support of the need for the Core Strategy to make provision for renewable energy development, the key references in national planning policy include: PPS22, Objectives (2004):</p> <p>"The Government's energy policy, including its policy on renewable energy, is set out in the Energy White Paper². This aims to put the UK on a path to cut its carbon dioxide emissions by some 60% by 2050, with real progress by 2020, and to maintain reliable and competitive energy supplies.</p> <p>The development of renewable energy, alongside improvements in energy efficiency and the development of combined heat and power, will make a vital contribution to these aims. The Government has already</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>set a target to generate 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. The White Paper set out the Government's aspiration to double that figure to 20% by 2020, and suggests that still more renewable energy will be needed beyond that date.</p> <p>Increased development of renewable energy resources is vital to facilitating the delivery of the Government's commitments on both climate change and renewable energy. Positive planning which facilitates renewable energy developments can contribute to all four elements of the Government's sustainable development strategy:....."</p> <p>PPS2, Para 1 key principles:</p> <p>"(ii) Regional spatial strategies and local development documents should contain policies designed to promote and encourage, rather than restrict, the development of renewable energy resources. Regional planning bodies and local planning authorities should recognise the full range of renewable energy sources, their differing characteristics, locational requirements and the potential for exploiting them subject to appropriate environmental safeguards.</p> <p>(iii) At the local level, planning authorities should set out the criteria that will be applied in assessing applications for planning permission for renewable energy projects. Planning policies that rule out or place constraints on the development of all, or specific types of, renewable energy technologies should not be included in regional spatial strategies or local development documents without sufficient reasoned justification. The Government may intervene in the plan making process where it considers that the constraints being proposed by local authorities are too great or have been poorly justified."</p> <p>PPS22, Para 13 (2004) – green belt</p> <p>"Policy on development in the green belt is set out in PPG2. When located in the green belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development, which may impact on the openness of the green belt.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Careful consideration will therefore need to be given to the visual impact of projects, and developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances that clearly outweigh any harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.”</p> <p>P3.27 companion guide: “PPS22 identifies several types of location where specific policies may be appropriate at the regional level: - internationally designated sites (nature or heritage conservation); - nationally designated areas (nature conservation or landscape reasons); - locally designated areas (nature conservation or landscape reasons); and, - green belts.</p> <p>In this regard, regional spatial strategies should apply the policies set out in PPS22 paragraphs 9-13. The appropriate treatment of these areas will vary according to the reasons for designation, and may be related to specific landscape, visual or nature conservation characteristics. Authorities may also wish to identify where the submission of “special circumstances” cases would be appropriate, for example in green belt areas.”</p> <p>Command 7124 Energy White Paper “5.3.67 Recognising the particular difficulties faced by renewables in securing planning consent, the Government is also: • underlining that applicants will no longer have to demonstrate either the overall need for renewable energy or for their particular proposal to be sited in a particular location;</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating the expectation amongst applicants that any substantial new proposed developments would need to source a significant proportion of their energy supply from low carbon sources (including on and off-site renewables); • encouraging planners to help create an attractive environment for innovation and in which the private sector can bring forward investment in renewable and low carbon technologies; and • giving a clear steer to planning professionals and local authority decision makers, that in considering applications they should look favourably on renewable energy developments.” <p>“BOX 5.3.3 RENEWABLES STATEMENT OF NEED We remain committed to the important role renewables has to play in helping the UK meet its energy policy goals. In this publication we are reiterating previous commitments we have made, not least in the 2003 Energy White Paper and Planning Policy Statement 22 on renewable energy (PPS22), on the importance of renewable generation and the supporting infrastructure. We intend this to reconfirm the UK Government policy context for planning and consent decisions on renewable generation projects. As highlighted in the July 2006 Energy Review Report 150, the UK faces difficult challenges in meeting its energy policy goals. Renewable energy as a source of low carbon, indigenous electricity generation is central to reducing emissions and maintaining the reliability of our energy supplies</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>at a time when our indigenous reserves of fossil fuels are declining more rapidly than expected. A regulatory environment that enables the development of appropriately sited renewable projects, and allows the UK to realise its extensive renewable resources, is vital if we are to make real progress towards our challenging goals. New renewable projects may not always appear to convey any particular local benefit, but they provide crucial national benefits. Individual renewable projects are part of a growing proportion of low carbon generation that provides benefits shared by all communities both through reduced emissions and more diverse supplies of energy, which helps the reliability of our supplies. This factor is a material consideration to which all participants in the planning system should give significant weight when considering renewable proposals. These wider benefits are not always immediately visible to the specific locality in which the project is sited. However, the benefits to society and the wider economy as a whole are significant and this must be reflected in the weight given to these considerations by decision makers in reaching their decisions. If we are to maintain a rigorous planning system that does not disincentivise investment in renewable generation, it must also enable decisions to be taken in reasonable time. Decision makers should ensure that planning applications for renewable energy developments are dealt</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							with expeditiously while addressing the relevant issues.” Para 20 of PPS1 Supplement on Climate Change (2007) “In particular, planning authorities should: – not require applicants for energy development to demonstrate either the overall need for renewable energy and its distribution, nor question the energy justification for why a proposal for such development must be sited in a particular location ¹⁹ ; – ensure any local approach to protecting landscape and townscape is consistent with PPS22 and does not preclude the supply of any type of renewable energy other than in the most exceptional circumstances ²⁰ ; – alongside any criteria-based policy developed in line with PPS22, consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low-carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources, but in doing so take care to avoid stifling innovation including by rejecting proposals solely because they are outside areas identified for energy generation; and – expect a proportion of the energy supply of new development to be secured from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy sources.”			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18757	Preferred Option ME 14	Support					1165
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO459	Preferred Option ME 14	Support					1165

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17603	Preferred Option ME 14		General Comment	ME14 makes reference to a Supplementary Planning Document on the topic of Flood Risk. We would recommend this is produced as soon as possible.			1165
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22792	Preferred Option ME 14	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1165
359284	Miss Lynne Evans	Consultant Southern Planning Practice	CSO18422	Preferred Option ME 15	Object		It is questioned whether this policy is likely to add to the requirements of PPS25 and therefore whether there is a need for this policy to be included.	Please reconsider the need for this policy.		1167
359362	Mr Justin MILWARD	Regional Policy Officer Woodland Trust	CSO3188	Preferred Option ME 15	Object		<p>Preferred Option ME 15 - Flood mitigation measures</p> <p>We are pleased to see this Option on flood mitigation measures, and would like to see a reference incorporated to the important role that woodland can play here.</p> <p>The Woodland Trust believes that trees and woodlands can deliver a major contribution to resolving a range of water management issues. They offer opportunities to make positive water use change whilst also contributing to other objectives, such as biodiversity, timber & green infrastructure - see the Woodland Trust publication Woodland actions for biodiversity and their role in water management (pdf) - http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/en/about-us/publications/Pages/ours.aspx.</p> <p>Trees and woodland are therefore very well placed to contribute to the emerging agenda of water risk management in the light of a changing climate. For example: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of tree and woodland buffers to improve water quality • Native woodland creation to improve water quality • Restoration of Planted Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS) in upland headwaters to increase water quality and quantity 	<p>We would like to see the role of woodland and water included in Option ME 15 and also:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater recognition that natural processes and in particular trees and woodland, in should play a role Catchment Flood Management plans, alongside any measures for increased engineering solutions. The full value of trees in urban areas recognised in the development by local authorities in flood risk assessments Urban tree cover playing a central role in SUDS. Clear 		1167

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>• Creation/Restoration of floodplain woodland to alleviate, and slow the rate of, flooding Woodland can help adaptation strategies cope with the high profile threats to water quality and volume resulting from climate change. The Forestry Commission's publication, The Case for Trees in development and the urban environment (Forestry Commission, July 2010), explains how: 'the capacity of trees to attenuate water flow reduces the impact of heavy rain and floods and can improve the effectiveness of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems'.</p> <p>The 2007 Pitt Review (Learning the lessons from the 2007 floods, Cabinet Office 2008) highlighted the dangers of surface water flooding and recommended giving Local Authorities new responsibilities for flood risk management and development of surface water management plans, now formalised by the Flood Risk Regulations 2009 and the Floods & Water Management Act 2010.</p> <p>The Commission for Rural Communities report on England's Upland areas (High ground, high potential – a future for England's upland communities, June 2010) recommends that : 'Defra and its agencies should use good practice (such as SCaMP and catchment sensitive farming) to develop models for public-private investment that secures multiple objectives in upland catchments, maintains water quality, reduces flood risk and potentially provides income for hill farmers and land managers'.</p> <p>The Agriculture Minister Jim Paice stated in Parliament that 'trees have a vital role in flood prevention and alleviation' (Answer to Parliamentary Question, 4/11/2010).</p> <p>The South West Framework Implementation Plan 2009-2012 (Forestry Commission, 2009) contains two key actions – "2.4: Undertake pilot projects using new planting or woodland management to manage river flows and contribute to Water Framework Directive objectives" and "2.5: Develop projects to demonstrate and monitor benefits of riparian planting in reducing</p>	<p>responsibility for ownership and maintenance of SUDS♣ The role of native trees and woods fully recognised in the development of Local Surface Water Management plans by local♣ authorities.</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>river temperatures". For instance Wessex Water and FWAG are running a tree planting project in Somerset to help solve flooding issues - http://www.wessexwater.co.uk/news/threecol.aspx?id=6056. Similarly, United Utilities are pioneering woodland creation in their Bassenthwaite Lake Restoration Programme in the Lake District to help provide future flood protection - http://www.lakedistrict.gov.uk/gtga_np_news-article.htm?newsid=15131. In Milton Keynes, the city's Parks Trust has developed an area of floodplain forest to improve both water and landscape quality, but also to manage the risk of flooding – http://www.cabe.org.uk/case-studies/floodplain-forest.</p>			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18758	Preferred Option ME 15	Support					1167
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO460	Preferred Option ME 15	Support		I agree that land should be set aside on new developments for SUDS if required. This should be made clear to developers at the planning stage.			1167
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17604	Preferred Option ME 15		General Comment	Under ME15 (Flood mitigation measures) we recommend the inclusion of 'setting finished floor levels above future predicted flood levels' within the first paragraph (as a means of satisfying this policy). We also recommend that terms such as 'flood resistance resilience measures' are defined within this section or in the Core Strategy glossary. This definition could include examples of these types of measures to help illustrate.			1167
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy		CSO22793	Preferred Option	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the			1167

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Paul Timberlake			ME 15			response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			
533728	Mr Mike Garrity	Chair of the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Steering Group Dorset County Council	CSO19 175	Preferred Option ME 15	Support		Preferred Option ME15 – flood mitigation measures: this policy makes reference to sustainable urban drainage, which is supported. Green infrastructure can contribute positively to flood management issues. The Steering Group would welcome a reference in the policy or supporting text that, where possible, flood measures should have regard to opportunities for improving/using green infrastructure (for example habitats or harbourside parks) where they can serve a dual purpose of delivering flood management and improved open space.			1167
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO46 2	Preferred Option ME 16	Support		It is most important that measures to reduce flooding and rain water run off will be sufficient for the duration of the development ensuring that any measure taken does not increase flood risk elsewhere.,			1169
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 605	Preferred Option ME 16	Support		ME16 Flood Management Strategies and funding flood defence improvements We support this preferred option. Also in the 2nd paragraph final sentence we recommend this is amended to read: 'Where there is no net increase in dwellings or commercial units created, historic buildings and sites may be exempt from this option where measures would harm their character or increase the risk of long-term deterioration to the fabric or fittings.'	Also in the 2nd paragraph final sentence we recommend this is amended to read: 'Where there is no net increase in dwellings or commercial units created, historic buildings and sites may be exempt from this option where measures would harm their character or increase the risk of long-term deterioration to the fabric or fittings.'		1169
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy		CSO22 794	Preferred Option	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the			1169

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Paul Timberlake			ME 16			response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			
360792	Miss Carol Evans	Planning Consultant Evans Traves	CSO18 602	Alternative Preferred Option ME 17	Object		This Preferred Option needs to expand on the issue of the sequential test stating that where a 5 or 15 year supply of land for housing cannot be delivered, development on areas of flood risk can be permitted provided it does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and safe areas can be achieved and flood resistance/resilience measures are proposed to be in place	Where a suggested 5 or 15 year supply of land for housing cannot be delivered, development on areas of flood risk can be permitted provided it does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and safe areas can be achieved and flood resistance/resilience measures are proposed to be in place.		1171
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22 795	Alternative Preferred Option ME 17	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1171
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 606	Preferred Option ME 18	Object		Preferred Option ME18, Development within areas at risk of coastal erosion The second paragraph does not relate to coastal erosion. This second paragraph might make reference to the potential baseline erosion/ recession rates over the next 100 years predicted in the Poole and Christchurch Bays draft Shoreline Management Plan. While policy may include Hold the Line along certain sections of coastline it might be prudent to limit development along potentially vulnerable sections of coast with consideration of only allowing time limited planning permissions or other temporary development. The supporting evidence would then be the Poole and			1174

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Christchurch Bays draft Shoreline Management Plan and not the Strategic Flood Risk Assessments.””			
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO22796	Preferred Option ME 18	Support		Our comments on the environmental aspects of the core Strategy Options document are included in the response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Partnership, which we fully endorse.			1174