

CS Options

Events: Core Strategy Options for Consideration – Chapter 14 Meeting Local Needs

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18256	14		General Comment	<p>ETAG recommends that new development and associated green infrastructure should be required to enhance the character of natural and cultural landscapes and biodiversity, to reduce consumption of natural resources and waste, and to mitigate impacts of climate change. This should be achieved through policies designed to ensure that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development is appropriate to its setting in terms of sustainability, landscape, sense of place and local distinctiveness and the long term viability of natural ecosystems. • High quality design standards are promoted to ensure that development is well-planned with a healthy functioning network of green infrastructure and a reduced need for private cars and avoids negative impacts such as loss of dark skies or diffuse pollution. The full implications of the damaging effect of excessive artificial light on people and their environment should be recognised and local guidance on further reductions introduced. • Green infrastructure seeks to mitigate climate change and to create wildlife corridors and stepping stones through identification, management and enhancement of key greenspaces. Urban public open spaces are designed to be wildlife and people friendly. • Construction methods and materials and their transport to building sites meet stringent sustainability criteria. Off site prefabrication is used where this reduces the development's total energy budget. The value of embodied energy in historic buildings is recognised, as is their capacity for modification to meet 			1271

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 consumption standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built environments are able to withstand significantly hotter drier summers and longer periods of prolonged heavy rainfall. • On site renewable energy provision will include provision for renewable heat and electricity. The policy for zero carbon homes targets will be implemented now. 			
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17889	14	Object		<p>This section of the Core Strategy will need to take on greater prominence to reflect the aspirations of the Localism Bill. It remains that local needs should reflect the evidence collected. This section of the Core Strategy needs to be less prescriptive and more locally derived and supported by stakeholder interests. Particular concerns for the Meyrick Estate Management Ltd relate to the thresholds for affordable housing and tenure split. Given the very fragile housing market, intermediate housing plays an increasing role to increase affordability given the lack of availability of mortgage finance. To reduce it in favour of higher social rented targets may affect the housing market recovery</p>			1271
496532	Mr R.S Irish		CSO1734	14.3	Object		<p>Past history of criminal damage to facilities at the site provided by EDDC (therefore council tax payers). Feuding between gypsy families Increase in crime in the local area Near lowland heath SSSI and Ramsar site High voltage overhead power cables / health issues Site will have detrimental impact on the amenities of adjacent occupiers and the natural environment. Why did EDDC grant a certificate of lawful use for this site under delegated powers without consulting local parish councils? See attached press cuttings.</p>	Option LN8 Mannington Park should be deleted from the Core Strategy.		1274
474462	Mrs Sheila		CSO536	14.4		General Comment	An observation. Fordham's Research 2008 for East Dorset District Council begins with			1275

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
	Bourton						the 2001 Census which shows a net inflow of migration into Dorset of 10,314 with more people coming into Dorset from within the UK than is found leaving to elsewhere in the UK, Importantly, there is no information since the 2001 Census on how many people have arrived and left Dorset from international sources, therefore it is surely not possible to put a correct figure on the population increase in Dorset.			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO537	Preferred Option LN 1	Support		I consider that each development site should be assessed on a site by site basis.			1279
484502	Mr John Turner		CSO614	Preferred Option LN 1	Support		This is one area where the 'market' can distort outcomes - housing mix can be driven more by developer profit than actual demand.			1279
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO980	Preferred Option LN 1	Support					1279
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2573	Preferred Option LN 1	Support					1279
497370	Mrs Amanda Williams	Director of Business Development Synergy Housing	CSO2285	Preferred Option LN 1	Object		Whilst I support the overall approach, I am concerned that if there is no threshold stated, this will make it difficult for developers to assess viability of individual sites at an early opportunity, and it could lead to the reduction in provision of affordable housing.	I would prefer a threshold of 5 units to be adopted for the provision of affordable housing.		1279
360246	Mr Gavin Fauvel	Cranborne Estate	CSO17411	Preferred Option LN 1	Support		Support. Local housing needs, however, should be truly local and based on parish and not just district. Local need for affordable housing isn't just those on housing needs lists. Should the criteria for assessing local housing needs be revised?			1279
507178	Mr Paul		CSO17359	Preferred Option LN	Object		Turning to the proposal for the types of development, and the assertion that more			1279

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
	Banning			1			'affordable' houses are needed. In our view, Verwood comprises of mainly small to medium sized houses. Houses are cheaper in Verwood than comparable ones across Dorset and Devon (in spite of high levels of Council Tax). And unlike those areas there are almost no houses above £500,000. So it could be argued that what Verwood needs is more large, prestigious houses, that will provide a counterbalance for the rump of the small to medium sized ones. This would at least result in a smaller impact on the environment and infrastructure.			
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18257	Preferred Option LN 1		General Comment	Policy should seek to maximise the provision of affordable housing to ensure dwellings are for local people. Endless building of luxury market homes is unsustainable. The problem of people registering on multiple housing lists must be addressed as this invalidates housing needs data.			1279
517880	Mr Russ Booker		CSO17250	Preferred Option LN 1	Support	General Comment	Affordable housing for local people is very important but unless care is taken will it not also go to people moving to the area, encouraging further influx from elsewhere within the UK. "Improve affordability by increasing the supply of housing." – This won't happen due to the influx of people from elsewhere in the UK who may be able to outbid local residents who are struggling to afford a property. "Almost all new housing developments will contribute to the provision of affordable housing, creating a step change in delivery of affordable dwellings and a significant reduction in waiting lists." Why almost? It should be all if we are truly committed to affordable housing and to avoid the concentration of it in one area leading to social segregation and the problems that can cause. It should also be seamlessly integrated into each development and the community.			1279

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
518195	Mr M Willcocks		CSO17339	Preferred Option LN 1	Object		<p>I would like to make a further point relating to the high percentage of affordable housing proposed. The proposed strategy seems to centre on solving East Dorset District Council's problem of having to provide lots more social housing by getting private developers to financially contribute significantly to the cost of the social housing. To my mind, this raises a number of important questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you guarantee that the private housing situated on the same development as the proposed high volume of social housing will be desirable to potential purchasers? • What will happen if the private housing fails to sell? 			1279
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19319	Preferred Option LN 1	Object		<p>Artificially defining the size and type of 'new market and affordable housing' is not supported. Affordable homes need to be attractive to Housing Associations and Corporate bodies who are going to have to fund them before being passed on to prospective residents for rent or intermediate ownership. Pressure should not be exerted on developers to build houses for which there is no demand.</p>			1279
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO18014	Preferred Option LN 1	Object		<p>We support the councils' intention to deliver housing that meets needs set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, however we are concerned that having no threshold for this policy could stifle development and become overly bureaucratic. When applied to small developments this could be a very subjective issue with significant scope for debate over what is considered to be the wider area within which a development is located in and to what extent the development should take in to account the surrounding mix of houses. Furthermore, the need identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment will</p>			1279

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
							presumably be district-wide and may not reflect the specific demands within different areas. Finally, we consider it is also likely to lead to more appeals as developers will have more to lose in terms of viability on smaller schemes. We consider that the Non-Preferred Option LN 2 with a threshold of 10 units would be a better use of officer time and leads to less unnecessary disputes in the planning process			
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	CSO18380	Preferred Option LN 1	Support		We support the need for size and type of dwellings to meet the strategic housing market assessment as set out in option LN1.			1279
507546	Mr Nigel Pugsley	Senior Planner BNP Paribas Real Estate	CSO17991	Preferred Option LN 1	Object		It is considered that the Council should not have policy which specifies dwelling types and sizes for market housing. Government guidance in the form of PPS3 (Paragraph 23) places the onus on developers to "bring forward proposals for market housing which reflect demand and the profile of households requiring market housing". It is considered that the evidence base to be used by the local authorities inform policy is out of date, particularly in respect of demand for market housing.			1279
524495	Mr Stanley Jackson		CSO18595	Preferred Option LN 1		General Comment	As far as older people are concerned I would like to see more sheltered accommodation with warden assistance, as in the case of Tapper Court, so that residents can retain their homes and not be forced prematurely into residential or care homes. The effects of a disproportionately high number of the population in homes, with the absence of footfall on the streets and in the shops are damaging to towns as appears to be happening in Ferndown. Good quality care for older people in their own homes should also be a priority.			1279
524723	Mr	Chair	CSO18724	Preferred		General	As far as older people are concerned we			1279

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
	John Worth	Wimborne Civic Society		Option LN 1		Comment	would like to see more sheltered accommodation with warden assistance, as in the case of Tapper Court, so that residents can retain their homes and not be forced prematurely into residential or care homes. The effects of a disproportionately high number of the population in homes, with the absence of footfall on the streets and in the shops, are damaging to towns as appears to be happening in Ferndown. Good quality care for older people in their own homes should also be a priority;			
359288	Mr Steve Molnar	Terence O'Rourke	CSO18982	Preferred Option LN 1	Support		Banner Homes supports the proposal that there should be no thresholds that dictate a mix of sizes and types of housing, which should reflect current and projected needs identified in the SHMA.			1279
527905	Mr Paul Morgan	Strategic Commissioning Manager, Adult Services Dorset County Council	CSO19086	Preferred Option LN 1		General Comment	<p>In summary, we wish to raise the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That affordable housing quotas be applied to all future care homes and extra care developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That Lifetime Homes obligations be applied to all new developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That any proposed new care home development fits in with the strategic aims and objectives of this Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these two authorities; • That any proposed care home development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). • That provision is made in Change of Use for C2 permissions to ensure a viable care home market in Christchurch and East Dorset locality. • That the roles listed as key worker status 			1279

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>are revised and updated to include care assistants, domiciliary care workers, personal assistants, health care support workers, and health care assistants.</p> <p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>Whilst the new Government has signalled the revocation of Regional Strategies, and the determination of housing numbers will now be down to local planning authorities, we would hope that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils will recognise the need for a mixed economy and in particular to ensure that affordable housing quotas are applied to all future accommodation - in particular for older people.</p> <p>It is the Directorate's position that all types of new housing and residential care provision that are proposed in Dorset ought to be available and accessible to the whole of the community that we serve and not just those who can afford to pay privately for their own care. Care homes are classed as accommodation by the County Council in that residents that we fund are charged for their accommodation costs. The financial position of someone whose health deteriorates to the extent that they need to enter a care home remains the same. Therefore if someone needed funding from the public purse or affordable housing prior to entering a care home or Extra Care scheme, they will still require affordable and publicly funded residential care, nursing care or Extra Care. The Directorate is now working with all 6 of our District and Borough Council partners to urge them to adopt local planning rules that oblige new care homes and Extra Care schemes to provide affordable housing (via the standard Local Authority funding rate or NHS Continuing Health Care rate for care homes and Housing Benefit for Extra Care schemes). We are keen to ensure that care home providers who are building care homes in</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>Dorset accept public funding rates. It is important that providers/developers produce business models that ensure that homes are viable with guaranteed access to people who are funded by the County Council and NHS Dorset.</p> <p>Lifetime Homes The view of the Directorate is that Lifetime Homes standards ought to be applied to all developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality from the start date of the Core Strategy. We feel that public services should adopt preventative approaches and concentrate our efforts and investment in new developments that will limit the need for adaptations/re-housing in 10-20 years time and beyond. Across the County we have a current over reliance on Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) to convert homes for those whose physical health deteriorates. If we could ensure that all new homes were built to Lifetime Homes standards (irrespective of whether they are private or public) we would negate the need to undertake Occupational Therapy assessments to decide if someone should be entitled to a DFG. Similarly, the call on DFGs would reduce over time.</p> <p>Elderly Person's Accommodation Dorset is a net importer of older people and exporter of younger working age people. This situation is compounded year on year. We already face challenges in having sufficient numbers of people to participate in the social care workforce to care for a population of older people that is in excess of the national average. A real concern for the Directorate is that any further in migration of older people to Dorset places an additional burden upon local infrastructures. This additional demand cuts across spheres of social care, health care, transport and roads, cultural and leisure services. Further in-migration of older people to Dorset will also create additional pressure and capacity issues for our local</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>fieldwork staff along with associated finance, admin and contracts staff.</p> <p>It is the joint intention of both the County Council and Primary Care Trust to resist the building of care homes unless there is an agreed identified need. Our strategic vision is to support the building of Extra Care Housing developments together with more intense community based services that can be delivered to people in their own homes. We recognise that the best way to achieve this is to work with District Councils to ensure that the strategic intentions of the local NHS and County Council are reflected in Local Development Frameworks.</p> <p>The national direction given to local authorities from the Government, the Department of Health and the National Personalisation lead is that we should stop building care homes and develop intensive, personalised, home based care. Therefore the Directorate, together with NHS Dorset, continue to increase the availability of services that support people in their own homes. For the last few years the numbers of care home placements funded by the County Council has declined. This is despite a demography that shows an ongoing older and more dependent population.</p> <p>In addition to this, Older People in Dorset (via the Age Partnership and Older People's Forums) tell us that they do not want to live in care homes and that they prefer to stay at home with intensive support or live in Extra Care schemes with support.</p> <p>In general, our view regarding the development of proposed new care home schemes in Dorset is that any such scheme should meet the following requirements –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed development fits in with the Strategic aims and objectives of the Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these 2 authorities. 			

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 any proposed development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset).</p> <p>This is an extremely crucial issue to this Directorate. Up to now, new care homes have been built by developers on the basis of an appropriate piece of land becoming available, largely irrespective of whether it is needed or not and without regard to taking into account the views of the Local Authority with Social Services Responsibilities or the local NHS. Experience tells us that once a care home has been built, the beds will become filled. We need to break into this cycle to influence wider choices for older people in Dorset so that we do not continue to have a situation where care homes are viewed as (often) the first port of call for older people as their needs increase. It would be really helpful to have Planning Policy Statements adopted across Dorset that incorporate national policy developments around the personalisation of care, the views of older people in the county and the views of commissioners in NHS Dorset and within this Directorate.</p> <p>Change of Use</p> <p>The care home market is constantly changing in Dorset. At various times there can either be a shortage or over-provision of beds. It would be appropriate for the new Core Strategy to include provision for resisting future Planning Applications that are submitted for a change of use away from category C2 usage.</p> <p>Similarly, there is a genuine case for the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to consider using a general power of wellbeing and The Sustainable Communities Act to refuse future applications to convert/demolish care homes and to</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>consider revoking previously agreed applications. See link below. http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/aio/1293811 Of course, this road is fraught with potential legal difficulty but it is important to ensure that enough flexibility is built into the LDF to give the Council a mechanism to deal with any situation should it arise in the locality in the future, and to ensure that an appropriate range care home capacity continues to exist. Housing for key workers The Directorate understands that key worker dwellings are those provided for key worker households that cannot afford market prices/rents. We further understand that when considering proposals for key workers, Councils use the following nationally recognised categories: Health care Social services Local government Education Public transport Emergency services A big challenge relating to the future demography of Dorset is securing sufficient numbers of social care staff to deliver the care that people will need. To this end, we would ask that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils revise the current list of key worker roles to include health care support workers and assistants, care assistants in care homes, domiciliary care workers and (in the light of the emerging national personalisation agenda) personal assistants. We understand that councils and Registered Social Landlords can vary the standard key worker role lists in accordance with local need and the views of the authorities listed above. We have had a fairly recent good practice example in Christchurch where social care staff have been identified as key workers and have tenancies tied to their employment at Bure House (Extra Care scheme) or Avon</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
							View (care home).			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO18015	Non Preferred Option LN 2	Support		<p>We support the councils' intention to deliver housing that meets needs set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, however we are concerned that having no threshold for this policy could stifle development and become overly bureaucratic.</p> <p>When applied to small developments this could be a very subjective issue with significant scope for debate over what is considered to be the wider area within which a development is located in and to what extent the development should take in to account the surrounding mix of houses. Furthermore, the need identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment will presumably be district-wide and may not reflect the specific demands within different areas. Finally, we consider it is also likely to lead to more appeals as developers will have more to lose in terms of viability on smaller schemes.</p> <p>We consider that the Non-Preferred Option LN 2 with a threshold of 10 units would be a better use of officer time and leads to less unnecessary disputes in the planning process. Furthermore, we also consider that there is guidance on this matter in PPS3, which states that:</p> <p>In planning at site level, Local Planning Authorities should ensure that the proposed mix of housing on large strategic sites reflects the proportions of households that require market or affordable housing and achieves a mix of households as well as a mix of tenure and price. For smaller sites, the mix of housing should contribute to the creation of mixed communities having regard to the proportions of households that require market or affordable housing and the existing mix of housing in the locality.</p> <p>Whilst it does not set a specific threshold,</p>			1281

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
							PPS3 clearly suggests that smaller sites and strategic sites should be treated differently in this respect. It should be up to the Council to determine what a strategic site is, but it may ultimately be larger than 10 units in Preferred Option LN 2.			
527905	Mr Paul Morgan	Strategic Commissioning Manager, Adult Services Dorset County Council	CSO19093	Non Preferred Option LN 2		General Comment	<p>In summary, we wish to raise the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That affordable housing quotas be applied to all future care homes and extra care developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That Lifetime Homes obligations be applied to all new developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That any proposed new care home development fits in with the strategic aims and objectives of this Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these two authorities; • That any proposed care home development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). • That provision is made in Change of Use for C2 permissions to ensure a viable care home market in Christchurch and East Dorset locality. • That the roles listed as key worker status are revised and updated to include care assistants, domiciliary care workers, personal assistants, health care support workers, and health care assistants. <p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>Whilst the new Government has signalled the revocation of Regional Strategies, and the determination of housing numbers will now be down to local planning authorities, we would hope that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils will recognise the need for a mixed economy and in particular to ensure</p>			1281

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 affordable housing quotas are applied to all future accommodation - in particular for older people.</p> <p>It is the Directorate's position that all types of new housing and residential care provision that are proposed in Dorset ought to be available and accessible to the whole of the community that we serve and not just those who can afford to pay privately for their own care. Care homes are classed as accommodation by the County Council in that residents that we fund are charged for their accommodation costs. The financial position of someone whose health deteriorates to the extent that they need to enter a care home remains the same. Therefore if someone needed funding from the public purse or affordable housing prior to entering a care home or Extra Care scheme, they will still require affordable and publicly funded residential care, nursing care or Extra Care. The Directorate is now working with all 6 of our District and Borough Council partners to urge them to adopt local planning rules that oblige new care homes and Extra Care schemes to provide affordable housing (via the standard Local Authority funding rate or NHS Continuing Health Care rate for care homes and Housing Benefit for Extra Care schemes). We are keen to ensure that care home providers who are building care homes in Dorset accept public funding rates. It is important that providers/developers produce business models that ensure that homes are viable with guaranteed access to people who are funded by the County Council and NHS Dorset.</p> <p>Lifetime Homes The view of the Directorate is that Lifetime Homes standards ought to be applied to all developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality from the start date of the Core Strategy. We feel that public services should</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>adopt preventative approaches and concentrate our efforts and investment in new developments that will limit the need for adaptations/re-housing in 10-20 years time and beyond. Across the County we have a current over reliance on Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) to convert homes for those whose physical health deteriorates. If we could ensure that all new homes were built to Lifetime Homes standards (irrespective of whether they are private or public) we would negate the need to undertake Occupational Therapy assessments to decide if someone should be entitled to a DFG. Similarly, the call on DFGs would reduce over time.</p> <p>Elderly Person's Accommodation Dorset is a net importer of older people and exporter of younger working age people. This situation is compounded year on year. We already face challenges in having sufficient numbers of people to participate in the social care workforce to care for a population of older people that is in excess of the national average. A real concern for the Directorate is that any further in migration of older people to Dorset places an additional burden upon local infrastructures. This additional demand cuts across spheres of social care, health care, transport and roads, cultural and leisure services. Further in-migration of older people to Dorset will also create additional pressure and capacity issues for our local fieldwork staff along with associated finance, admin and contracts staff.</p> <p>It is the joint intention of both the County Council and Primary Care Trust to resist the building of care homes unless there is an agreed identified need. Our strategic vision is to support the building of Extra Care Housing developments together with more intense community based services that can be delivered to people in their own homes. We recognise that the best way to achieve this is to work with District Councils to ensure that</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 strategic intentions of the local NHS and County Council are reflected in Local Development Frameworks.</p> <p>The national direction given to local authorities from the Government, the Department of Health and the National Personalisation lead is that we should stop building care homes and develop intensive, personalised, home based care. Therefore the Directorate, together with NHS Dorset, continue to increase the availability of services that support people in their own homes. For the last few years the numbers of care home placements funded by the County Council has declined. This is despite a demography that shows an ongoing older and more dependent population.</p> <p>In addition to this, Older People in Dorset (via the Age Partnership and Older People's Forums) tell us that they do not want to live in care homes and that they prefer to stay at home with intensive support or live in Extra Care schemes with support.</p> <p>In general, our view regarding the development of proposed new care home schemes in Dorset is that any such scheme should meet the following requirements –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed development fits in with the Strategic aims and objectives of the Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these 2 authorities. • That any proposed development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). <p>This is an extremely crucial issue to this Directorate. Up to now, new care homes have been built by developers on the basis of an appropriate piece of land becoming available, largely irrespective of whether it is needed or not and without regard to taking</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>into account the views of the Local Authority with Social Services Responsibilities or the local NHS. Experience tells us that once a care home has been built, the beds will become filled. We need to break into this cycle to influence wider choices for older people in Dorset so that we do not continue to have a situation where care homes are viewed as (often) the first port of call for older people as their needs increase. It would be really helpful to have Planning Policy Statements adopted across Dorset that incorporate national policy developments around the personalisation of care, the views of older people in the county and the views of commissioners in NHS Dorset and within this Directorate.</p> <p>Change of Use The care home market is constantly changing in Dorset. At various times there can either be a shortage or over-provision of beds. It would be appropriate for the new Core Strategy to include provision for resisting future Planning Applications that are submitted for a change of use away from category C2 usage.</p> <p>Similarly, there is a genuine case for the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to consider using a general power of wellbeing and The Sustainable Communities Act to refuse future applications to convert/demolish care homes and to consider revoking previously agreed applications. See link below. http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/aio/1293811</p> <p>Of course, this road is fraught with potential legal difficulty but it is important to ensure that enough flexibility is built into the LDF to give the Council a mechanism to deal with any situation should it arise in the locality in the future, and to ensure that an appropriate range care home capacity continues to exist.</p> <p>Housing for key workers The Directorate understands that key worker</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>dwelling are those provided for key worker households that cannot afford market prices/rents. We further understand that when considering proposals for key workers, Councils use the following nationally recognised categories:</p> <p>Health care Social services Local government Education Public transport Emergency services</p> <p>A big challenge relating to the future demography of Dorset is securing sufficient numbers of social care staff to deliver the care that people will need. To this end, we would ask that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils revise the current list of key worker roles to include health care support workers and assistants, care assistants in care homes, domiciliary care workers and (in the light of the emerging national personalisation agenda) personal assistants. We understand that councils and Registered Social Landlords can vary the standard key worker role lists in accordance with local need and the views of the authorities listed above. We have had a fairly recent good practice example in Christchurch where social care staff have been identified as key workers and have tenancies tied to their employment at Bure House (Extra Care scheme) or Avon View (care home).</p>			
527905	Mr Paul Morgan	Strategic Commissioning Manager, Adult Services Dorset County Council	CSO19095	Non Preferred Option LN 3		General Comment	<p>In summary, we wish to raise the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That affordable housing quotas be applied to all future care homes and extra care developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That Lifetime Homes obligations be applied to all new developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That any proposed new care home 			1283

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 fits in with the strategic aims and objectives of this Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these two authorities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That any proposed care home development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). • That provision is made in Change of Use for C2 permissions to ensure a viable care home market in Christchurch and East Dorset locality. • That the roles listed as key worker status are revised and updated to include care assistants, domiciliary care workers, personal assistants, health care support workers, and health care assistants. <p>Affordable Housing Whilst the new Government has signalled the revocation of Regional Strategies, and the determination of housing numbers will now be down to local planning authorities, we would hope that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils will recognise the need for a mixed economy and in particular to ensure that affordable housing quotas are applied to all future accommodation - in particular for older people.</p> <p>It is the Directorate's position that all types of new housing and residential care provision that are proposed in Dorset ought to be available and accessible to the whole of the community that we serve and not just those who can afford to pay privately for their own care. Care homes are classed as accommodation by the County Council in that residents that we fund are charged for their accommodation costs. The financial position of someone whose health deteriorates to the extent that they need to enter a care home remains the same. Therefore if someone needed funding from</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 public purse or affordable housing prior to entering a care home or Extra Care scheme, they will still require affordable and publicly funded residential care, nursing care or Extra Care. The Directorate is now working with all 6 of our District and Borough Council partners to urge them to adopt local planning rules that oblige new care homes and Extra Care schemes to provide affordable housing (via the standard Local Authority funding rate or NHS Continuing Health Care rate for care homes and Housing Benefit for Extra Care schemes). We are keen to ensure that care home providers who are building care homes in Dorset accept public funding rates. It is important that providers/developers produce business models that ensure that homes are viable with guaranteed access to people who are funded by the County Council and NHS Dorset.</p> <p>Lifetime Homes The view of the Directorate is that Lifetime Homes standards ought to be applied to all developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality from the start date of the Core Strategy. We feel that public services should adopt preventative approaches and concentrate our efforts and investment in new developments that will limit the need for adaptations/re-housing in 10-20 years time and beyond. Across the County we have a current over reliance on Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) to convert homes for those whose physical health deteriorates. If we could ensure that all new homes were built to Lifetime Homes standards (irrespective of whether they are private or public) we would negate the need to undertake Occupational Therapy assessments to decide if someone should be entitled to a DFG. Similarly, the call on DFGs would reduce over time.</p> <p>Elderly Person's Accommodation Dorset is a net importer of older people and</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>exporter of younger working age people. This situation is compounded year on year. We already face challenges in having sufficient numbers of people to participate in the social care workforce to care for a population of older people that is in excess of the national average. A real concern for the Directorate is that any further in migration of older people to Dorset places an additional burden upon local infrastructures. This additional demand cuts across spheres of social care, health care, transport and roads, cultural and leisure services. Further in-migration of older people to Dorset will also create additional pressure and capacity issues for our local fieldwork staff along with associated finance, admin and contracts staff.</p> <p>It is the joint intention of both the County Council and Primary Care Trust to resist the building of care homes unless there is an agreed identified need. Our strategic vision is to support the building of Extra Care Housing developments together with more intense community based services that can be delivered to people in their own homes. We recognise that the best way to achieve this is to work with District Councils to ensure that the strategic intentions of the local NHS and County Council are reflected in Local Development Frameworks.</p> <p>The national direction given to local authorities from the Government, the Department of Health and the National Personalisation lead is that we should stop building care homes and develop intensive, personalised, home based care. Therefore the Directorate, together with NHS Dorset, continue to increase the availability of services that support people in their own homes. For the last few years the numbers of care home placements funded by the County Council has declined. This is despite a demography that shows an ongoing older and more dependent population.</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>In addition to this, Older People in Dorset (via the Age Partnership and Older People's Forums) tell us that they do not want to live in care homes and that they prefer to stay at home with intensive support or live in Extra Care schemes with support.</p> <p>In general, our view regarding the development of proposed new care home schemes in Dorset is that any such scheme should meet the following requirements –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed development fits in with the Strategic aims and objectives of the Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these 2 authorities. • That any proposed development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). <p>This is an extremely crucial issue to this Directorate. Up to now, new care homes have been built by developers on the basis of an appropriate piece of land becoming available, largely irrespective of whether it is needed or not and without regard to taking into account the views of the Local Authority with Social Services Responsibilities or the local NHS. Experience tells us that once a care home has been built, the beds will become filled. We need to break into this cycle to influence wider choices for older people in Dorset so that we do not continue to have a situation where care homes are viewed as (often) the first port of call for older people as their needs increase. It would be really helpful to have Planning Policy Statements adopted across Dorset that incorporate national policy developments around the personalisation of care, the views of older people in the county and the views of commissioners in NHS Dorset and within this Directorate.</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>Change of Use The care home market is constantly changing in Dorset. At various times there can either be a shortage or over-provision of beds. It would be appropriate for the new Core Strategy to include provision for resisting future Planning Applications that are submitted for a change of use away from category C2 usage.</p> <p>Similarly, there is a genuine case for the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to consider using a general power of wellbeing and The Sustainable Communities Act to refuse future applications to convert/demolish care homes and to consider revoking previously agreed applications. See link below. http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/aio/1293811</p> <p>Of course, this road is fraught with potential legal difficulty but it is important to ensure that enough flexibility is built into the LDF to give the Council a mechanism to deal with any situation should it arise in the locality in the future, and to ensure that an appropriate range care home capacity continues to exist.</p> <p>Housing for key workers The Directorate understands that key worker dwellings are those provided for key worker households that cannot afford market prices/rents. We further understand that when considering proposals for key workers, Councils use the following nationally recognised categories: Health care Social services Local government Education Public transport Emergency services</p> <p>A big challenge relating to the future demography of Dorset is securing sufficient numbers of social care staff to deliver the care that people will need. To this end, we would ask that Christchurch and East Dorset</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
							Councils revise the current list of key worker roles to include health care support workers and assistants, care assistants in care homes, domiciliary care workers and (in the light of the emerging national personalisation agenda) personal assistants. We understand that councils and Registered Social Landlords can vary the standard key worker role lists in accordance with local need and the views of the authorities listed above. We have had a fairly recent good practice example in Christchurch where social care staff have been identified as key workers and have tenancies tied to their employment at Bure House (Extra Care scheme) or Avon View (care home).			
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	Clerk West Parley Parish Council	CSO17943	Non Preferred Option LN 4	Support		Parish Council support as non preferred option.			1285
527905	Mr Paul Morgan	Strategic Commissioning Manager, Adult Services Dorset County Council	CSO19098	Non Preferred Option LN 4		General Comment	<p>In summary, we wish to raise the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That affordable housing quotas be applied to all future care homes and extra care developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That Lifetime Homes obligations be applied to all new developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That any proposed new care home development fits in with the strategic aims and objectives of this Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these two authorities; • That any proposed care home development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). • That provision is made in Change of Use for C2 permissions to ensure a viable care 			1285

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>home market in Christchurch and East Dorset locality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the roles listed as key worker status are revised and updated to include care assistants, domiciliary care workers, personal assistants, health care support workers, and health care assistants. <p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>Whilst the new Government has signalled the revocation of Regional Strategies, and the determination of housing numbers will now be down to local planning authorities, we would hope that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils will recognise the need for a mixed economy and in particular to ensure that affordable housing quotas are applied to all future accommodation - in particular for older people.</p> <p>It is the Directorate's position that all types of new housing and residential care provision that are proposed in Dorset ought to be available and accessible to the whole of the community that we serve and not just those who can afford to pay privately for their own care. Care homes are classed as accommodation by the County Council in that residents that we fund are charged for their accommodation costs. The financial position of someone whose health deteriorates to the extent that they need to enter a care home remains the same.</p> <p>Therefore if someone needed funding from the public purse or affordable housing prior to entering a care home or Extra Care scheme, they will still require affordable and publicly funded residential care, nursing care or Extra Care. The Directorate is now working with all 6 of our District and Borough Council partners to urge them to adopt local planning rules that oblige new care homes and Extra Care schemes to provide affordable housing (via the standard Local Authority funding rate or NHS Continuing Health Care rate for care homes and</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>Housing Benefit for Extra Care schemes). We are keen to ensure that care home providers who are building care homes in Dorset accept public funding rates. It is important that providers/developers produce business models that ensure that homes are viable with guaranteed access to people who are funded by the County Council and NHS Dorset.</p> <p>Lifetime Homes The view of the Directorate is that Lifetime Homes standards ought to be applied to all developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality from the start date of the Core Strategy. We feel that public services should adopt preventative approaches and concentrate our efforts and investment in new developments that will limit the need for adaptations/re-housing in 10-20 years time and beyond. Across the County we have a current over reliance on Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) to convert homes for those whose physical health deteriorates. If we could ensure that all new homes were built to Lifetime Homes standards (irrespective of whether they are private or public) we would negate the need to undertake Occupational Therapy assessments to decide if someone should be entitled to a DFG. Similarly, the call on DFGs would reduce over time.</p> <p>Elderly Person's Accommodation Dorset is a net importer of older people and exporter of younger working age people. This situation is compounded year on year. We already face challenges in having sufficient numbers of people to participate in the social care workforce to care for a population of older people that is in excess of the national average. A real concern for the Directorate is that any further in migration of older people to Dorset places an additional burden upon local infrastructures. This additional demand cuts across spheres of social care, health care, transport and roads, cultural and</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>leisure services. Further in-migration of older people to Dorset will also create additional pressure and capacity issues for our local fieldwork staff along with associated finance, admin and contracts staff.</p> <p>It is the joint intention of both the County Council and Primary Care Trust to resist the building of care homes unless there is an agreed identified need. Our strategic vision is to support the building of Extra Care Housing developments together with more intense community based services that can be delivered to people in their own homes. We recognise that the best way to achieve this is to work with District Councils to ensure that the strategic intentions of the local NHS and County Council are reflected in Local Development Frameworks.</p> <p>The national direction given to local authorities from the Government, the Department of Health and the National Personalisation lead is that we should stop building care homes and develop intensive, personalised, home based care. Therefore the Directorate, together with NHS Dorset, continue to increase the availability of services that support people in their own homes. For the last few years the numbers of care home placements funded by the County Council has declined. This is despite a demography that shows an ongoing older and more dependent population.</p> <p>In addition to this, Older People in Dorset (via the Age Partnership and Older People's Forums) tell us that they do not want to live in care homes and that they prefer to stay at home with intensive support or live in Extra Care schemes with support.</p> <p>In general, our view regarding the development of proposed new care home schemes in Dorset is that any such scheme should meet the following requirements –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed development fits in with the Strategic aims and objectives of the 			

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>Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these 2 authorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That any proposed development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). <p>This is an extremely crucial issue to this Directorate. Up to now, new care homes have been built by developers on the basis of an appropriate piece of land becoming available, largely irrespective of whether it is needed or not and without regard to taking into account the views of the Local Authority with Social Services Responsibilities or the local NHS. Experience tells us that once a care home has been built, the beds will become filled. We need to break into this cycle to influence wider choices for older people in Dorset so that we do not continue to have a situation where care homes are viewed as (often) the first port of call for older people as their needs increase. It would be really helpful to have Planning Policy Statements adopted across Dorset that incorporate national policy developments around the personalisation of care, the views of older people in the county and the views of commissioners in NHS Dorset and within this Directorate.</p> <p>Change of Use</p> <p>The care home market is constantly changing in Dorset. At various times there can either be a shortage or over-provision of beds. It would be appropriate for the new Core Strategy to include provision for resisting future Planning Applications that are submitted for a change of use away from category C2 usage.</p> <p>Similarly, there is a genuine case for the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to consider using a general power of wellbeing</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>and The Sustainable Communities Act to refuse future applications to convert/demolish care homes and to consider revoking previously agreed applications. See link below. http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/aio/1293811 Of course, this road is fraught with potential legal difficulty but it is important to ensure that enough flexibility is built into the LDF to give the Council a mechanism to deal with any situation should it arise in the locality in the future, and to ensure that an appropriate range care home capacity continues to exist. Housing for key workers The Directorate understands that key worker dwellings are those provided for key worker households that cannot afford market prices/rents. We further understand that when considering proposals for key workers, Councils use the following nationally recognised categories: Health care Social services Local government Education Public transport Emergency services A big challenge relating to the future demography of Dorset is securing sufficient numbers of social care staff to deliver the care that people will need. To this end, we would ask that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils revise the current list of key worker roles to include health care support workers and assistants, care assistants in care homes, domiciliary care workers and (in the light of the emerging national personalisation agenda) personal assistants. We understand that councils and Registered Social Landlords can vary the standard key worker role lists in accordance with local need and the views of the authorities listed above. We have had a fairly recent good practice example in Christchurch where social care</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
							staff have been identified as key workers and have tenancies tied to their employment at Bure House (Extra Care scheme) or Avon View (care home).			
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2574	Preferred Option LN 5	Support					1289
497370	Mrs Amanda Williams	Director of Business Development Synergy Housing	CSO2286	Preferred Option LN 5	Support		As well as ensuring adequate space standards, it is important to ensure that both private and affordable housing is provided to the same standards.			1289
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	Clerk West Parley Parish Council	CSO17946	Preferred Option LN 5	Support		Parish Council supports living space standard as defined in Supplementary Planning Document, i.e. Not more than 35 to hectare – complimentary to existing properties in West Parley.			1289
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18258	Preferred Option LN 5	Support		Supported. This increases flexibility in the potential use of dwellings and will ensure that any surplus market housing can be occupied by those on waiting lists rather than remaining outside the "suitable" category as other market homes are at present.			1289
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO18017	Preferred Option LN 5		General Comment	Prior to the General Election, The Homes and Communities Agency was working on new standards for affordable housing. The Rt Hon Grant Shapps MP has since stated that these standards will not be implemented and instead he will expect all market and affordable housing to be built to the same standard. Given the Localism agenda, it seems likely that local authorities will be allowed to set their own standards rather than them being determined nationally, however the councils should await further announcements before deciding what route to take for their own space standards.			1289
359291	Mr	Woolf Bond	CSO18382	Preferred	Object		We question whether that option LN5 will not			1289

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
	Jeremy Woolf	Planning		Option LN 5			be required due to the government statement regarding housing standards as announced by the housing minister at the end of 2010.			
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22894	Preferred Option LN 5	Support		Option LN5 Support subject to improved clarity of intent to recognise that living space standards should not preclude purchase of existing market homes for affordable housing. They will permit greater flexibility in allowing those on housing waiting lists to be accommodated.			1289
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO538	Preferred Option LN 6	Support					1293
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO981	Preferred Option LN 6	Support					1293
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2578	Preferred Option LN 6	Support		Need a policy on housing density, but how do we define the density of development that is acceptable?			1293
497370	Mrs Amanda Williams	Director of Business Development Synergy Housing	CSO2287	Preferred Option LN 6	Support		The sustainability and quality of housing to be developed is important when delivering higher density development.			1293
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18259	Preferred Option LN 6	Support		Broadly supported as it reduces land take. Acceptability of increased housing density and form is likely to be a contentious issue. The Masterplan documents are disappointing in that they have not considered the impact of new neighbourhoods on adjacent development or on undeveloped land. Their selection of areas for comparison seems to be arbitrary and ill conceived. It is likely that the high densities being proposed will be unacceptable to local communities if they are dramatically different from neighbouring land use. High quality design that complements			1293

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
							existing landscapes will be essential. Simply having good access to public transport (in terms of distance to a bus stop) is inadequate if the services are infrequent, unreliable or do not run at convenient times. Need or ownership of potential development land should not over-ride other principles.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17756	Preferred Option LN 6	Support		We support the provision of high density development in areas that are considered sustainable. Preferred Option LN6 is therefore preferable to Non Preferred Option LN7 because it restricts the location of high density developments to sustainable locations.			1293
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19321	Preferred Option LN 6	Object		This Option is not supported. The minimum density 'encouraged' of 30dph is well out of date and refers to the obsolete PPS3 policy introduced 10 years ago, which has directly resulted in an oversupply of unattractive flats throughout the UK which remain unsold years after being completed. The current government has removed all housing density targets from their planning policies.			1293
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO18018	Preferred Option LN 6	Object		NB - On the form the box for Object was ticked. We broadly support this policy. With regard to encouraging higher densities on land owned by housing associations, this is welcomed. However, if the aim is to promote higher densities on schemes brought forward by housing associations then the councils should bear in mind that housing associations will often apply for planning permission on sites for which they have an option, rather than own the land. We therefore recommend that this sentence of the policy is re-worded as below: 'In areas where there is a high level of need for affordable housing, or on land already owned by housing associations, or where a housing association is the applicant.			1293

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
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	CSO18383	Preferred Option LN 6	Object		Option LN6 is also now out of step with revised PPS3 (June 2010) as minimum density thresholds have been removed. We are of the view that density is a result of good masterplanning rather than any adherence to any prescribed figure.			1293
507546	Mr Nigel Pugsley	Senior Planner BNP Paribas Real Estate	CSO17992	Preferred Option LN 6	Support		My client is supportive of the preferred option which supports higher-density residential development in town centre locations. It is considered that the preferred option provides flexibility in the use of densities in order to maximise the use of housing land.			1293
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO18043	Preferred Option LN 6	Support		We agree that the design should maximise density as land is such a valuable commodity, but we do have some reservations on the methods by which density is increased. An example of an estate with housing and flats of a reasonable design is on Turlin Moor, Poole. However, the parking places have been reduced per house and the roads are narrow. Therefore there are cars parked everywhere to the detriment of the design and layout of the estate. No room was designated for wheely bins, and many houses do not have access to their back gardens except through the house. Therefore, not only are cars everywhere but also, in the front of many houses, about 3 bins. The perception of the estate is one of neglect, yet the homes appear to be of a reasonable design. Save space, yes, but a design must look good when lived in, not just on the drawing board. We support increased density in town centres and in the other areas you list.			1293
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22895	Preferred Option LN 6	Support		Option LN6 Support subject to amending the wording to include recognition of damage to the environment that could result from high density or size of development. It is not just character that is important.			1293

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
							Only relatively low density and low rise development would be appropriate for VMW1, 2 or 4 because of the conflict with local character and distinctiveness. The proposed sites are not on a Prime Transport Corridor and do not have adequate access to good public transport.			
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18263	Non Preferred Option LN 7	Object		Not supported. Not all proposals for the new neighbourhoods/urban extension sites will be compatible with a housing density of 40-60dph.			1295
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17757	Non Preferred Option LN 7	Support		We support the provision of high density development in areas that are considered sustainable. Preferred Option LN6 is therefore preferable to Non Preferred Option LN7 because it restricts the location of high density developments to sustainable locations.			1295
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19322	Non Preferred Option LN 7	Object		Even in central London a dph of 120 is ridiculously high. This option should be deleted from the Core Strategy forthwith.			1295
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO539	Preferred Option LN 8	Object		Travelling people have chosen that way of life and although their needs should be taken into account, any site should not be located near to the existing settled community because when that happens it has been shown time and time again that conflict occurs between the Gypsies and the existing residents of a town or village. Gypsy and Traveller sites should NOT be located on Greenbelt.	Add a further paragraph: sites should not be located on greenbelt		1305
359498	Mrs Lisa Goodwin	Clerk Holt Parish Council	CSO1685	Preferred Option LN 8	Object		The PC objects to the use of Mannington Site as a transit / permanent site as it would be unsuitable according to present day planning policies in respect of environmental protection and government advice in respect of suitability of sites for gypsy and traveller accommodation due to its proximity to an			1305

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
							SSSI and high voltage overhead power lines. In view of recent findings regarding childhood leukaemia it would be imprudent to place any person under a high voltage power line.			
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2580	Preferred Option LN 8	Support		Need a policy for permanent and transit pitches, but what criteria should be used to assess proposals for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites?			1305
496532	Mr R.S Irish		CSO1736	Preferred Option LN 8	Object		Past history of criminal damage to facilities at the site provided by EDDC (therefore council tax payers). Feuding between gypsy families Increase in crime in the local area Near lowland heath SSSI and Ramsar site High voltage overhead power cables / health issues Site will have detrimental impact on the amenities of adjacent occupiers and the natural environment. Why did EDDC grant a certificate of lawful use for this site under delegated powers without consulting local parish councils? See attached press cuttings.	Option LN8 Mannington Park should be deleted from the Core Strategy.		1305
360789	Mr Steve Staines	Friends, Family & Travellers Planning	CSO3807	Preferred Option LN 8	Object		We welcome the development of policy in relation to this matter and the commitment to work with other authorities to produce a dedicated DPD for the county. However we have some concerns about the numbers that the councils intend to plan for. The Panel report for the SW RSS Partial Review stated in relation to needs in Dorset: '4.94 On residential pitches we agree with the evidence of the Benchmarking Report that the Dorset GTAA housing transfer figure was incorrectly assessed at 105. However we have not had any compelling evidence to suggest this should be at the lower end of the scale. The only reasons given in Dorset CC's evidence is that it would be prudent to apply the lower figure of 14 and the results of the Bournemouth newsletter trawl. On the	The Options: What criteria should be used to assess proposals for sites? We have some concerns about some of the criteria which in our view will make it extremely difficult to identify land which is both available and affordable. Criterion 2 requires sites to be located in close proximity to facilities without identifying what close proximity means. This		1305

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>contrary, we believe evidence suggests there may be a "hidden" demand due to travelling families being unwilling to commit to moving out until a choice of good sites is available. We are far from convinced of the value of the newsletter and consider it an inappropriate means of assessing likely demand for a move out of housing.</p> <p>4.95 We therefore recommend the high end of the range at 26 pitches divided in proportion to the number of households forecast for each District by 2016, after taking account of the additional households identified in the final Proposed Changes to the RSS net dwelling requirement. (See Recommendation 13)'. We would point out that the GTAA was fully tested at the RSS and that the needs identified for residential provision were locally based on the best available information (which still stands). Revocation of the RSS does not render the evidence base presented and decided upon during the RSS partial review void. In any event the recent Carla Homes judgement means that the RSS still stands. The councils have provided no more evidence than that presented at the RSS Review (and tested via an independent benchmarking exercise) which was found to be wanting. There is therefore no evidential basis for reducing the numbers of pitches to be provided for. In view of this the council should commit to finding land for the numbers identified in the RSS partial review and quoted in the key facts.</p> <p>There is ample evidence from other areas in the UK that there is considerable hidden demand for pitches for members of the community who live in housing but who have a need for a site. The more recent GTAAs for both London and Manchester identify such needs. The situation is similar in the Poole / Bournemouth conurbation where there are large numbers of the community living in</p>	<p>requirement overly limits potentially available sites and ignores the advice contained in circular 1/2006 which recognises the difficulties which Gypsies and Travellers have in finding affordable land (para 47) and points out the need for local planning authorities to be realistic about alternatives to the car in accessing services (para 54). As such we think that it would be pragmatic and sensible to replace the word 'close' by the word 'reasonable'. This would help widen choice as regards sites and be likely to deliver a wider range of locations for this need. As it stands criterion 2 is unreasonably restrictive. Criteria 5 and 6 both use the word detrimental in relation to impacts on residential amenity and natural environment. The use of the word detrimental without balancing impact on the benefits of meeting needs is unduly restrictive. Any development of</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
							houses for the sole reason that there have not historically been enough sites to meet their needs.	whatever sort can be held to have some sort of detrimental impact on amenity and the natural environment. Its use in this context opens the door to NIMBY objections based on racial prejudice. We suggest that the word 'unacceptable' be inserted before the words detrimental in the two criteria. This will ensure that the planning authorities will be enabled to strike a balance between need and impact and resist racially motivated objections. This is especially important given the need identified in criterion 2 for close proximity to existing communities - as they stand these criteria are mutually exclusive and without alteration would mean that sites would be nigh on impossible to find.		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18768	Preferred Option LN 8	Support		We note and support the reference in option LN8 of the need to ensure that the siting of gypsy and traveller sites should not have a detrimental impact on the natural environment.			1305
361026	Mr Steve	Network Planning	CSO17758	Preferred Option LN	Support		The Agency would expect to see reference to maintaining the safe and efficient operation			1305

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
	Hellier	Manager Highways Agency		8			of the SRN when considering the location for such sites under Preferred Option LN8.			
484502	Mr John Turner		CSO615	14.17	Support			Add: Options for improving the provision of social housing that is funded or subsidised will be refreshed. Where significant developments are approved, a number of such dwellings will be included in the approval, whenever this remains consistent with the local area.		1307
497370	Mrs Amanda Williams	Director of Business Development Synergy Housing	CSO2289	14.17	Support		There is an overwhelming need for more affordable housing provision in the District which needs to be provided through planning policy.			1307
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO540	14.18	Support		I support with reservations. The need for affordable housing must be established by evidence. I have personally requested information concerning this question which is not yet available. The Council should know how many people on the Housing Waiting List are from outside the East Dorset area and whether there are any applicant duplications of that list i.e. multiple applications to different councils in other areas. If we are to build so many new affordable houses, they should be for existing East Dorset residents. Future need based on projections are unproven because they are projections. Greenbelt/greenfield areas should NOT be developed and in any case, it is important that previously developed, brownfield sites should be developed first before contemplating any greenbelt development.			1308

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>I note the word "limited" affordable housing in this Option; I would hardly call the proposed over 1000 new houses proposed for the Wimborne/Colehill area as being a limited number although I accept that not all of this number would be affordable. Of course the proposed number of new houses suggested for the Wimborne area and mentioned in this Core Strategy document does not include the approximate number of 1100 new homes identified in the SHLAA process which could be built on brown field sites.</p> <p>I would suggest that this amount of new development for Wimborne and Colehill would be unsustainable.</p> <p>I object to swathes of market housing being built which will not have the effect of bring down the overall cost of housing in East Dorset. Well off people from outside the area will quickly buy the new market housing.</p>			
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19323	14.19	Object		<p>Although the provision of affordable housing is admittedly difficult in the East Dorset area, the predicted demand appears well above reality and a more detailed analysis of the actual core demand needs to be carried out before setting any firm targets.</p> <p>Para. 14.19 states:- 'flats are unpopular'. So why are they included as a 'Preferred option' and why are East Dorset District Council 'continuing to invest in the provision of 1 bed flats'? The summary of East Dorset District council's Affordable Housing Report 2008 is clearly in urgent need of a complete rethink and even this document admits 'the 2009 target of 120 is judged unachievable and need to be revised downwards.'</p>			1309
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO549	Preferred Option LN 9	Object		<p>In my opinion we don't want or need swathes of market housing and the only reason (as I understand it) that the Council is considering a greenbelt special exception to building on this protected land is the need for Affordable Housing. I therefore consider that a target of</p>			1313

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
							at least 40% on all sites is required to enable as much Affordable Housing to come forward as possible.			
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO982	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO2408	Preferred Option LN 9	Object		35% of all new residential development to be social housing (rented) is much too high, such would change the character of this retirement and heritage tourist area (look at the awful example of Boscombe) Social engineering is at risk of destroying what makes Christchurch a desirable place to live. As a policy 35% would be certain to cause political and electoral disruption.			1313
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2581	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
497370	Mrs Amanda Williams	Director of Business Development Synergy Housing	CSO2288	Preferred Option LN 9	Support		Whilst this will no doubt be a stretching target, we firmly support the provision of as much affordable housing as possible to be provided in the District.			1313
508198	Mr Lorraine		CSO11621	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
508218	Mr P Heaton		CSO11629	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
508360	Ms Jocelyn Britton		CSO11682	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
508369	Mr A Hill		CSO11690	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
508402	Mr		CSO11777	Preferred	Object		Neither, both too high!			1313

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
	J Priest			Option LN 9						
508440	Mr Angus Macmillan		CSO11791	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
508467	Mr Trevor Crutcher		CSO11818	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
360099	Mr John FOSKETT		CSO11724	Preferred Option LN 9	Object		Did not follow LN9/10? Why not less than 35%			1313
360575	Mr Roy Avery		CSO11877	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
360975	Mrs Julia Woodward		CSO11997	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
507414	Mr L Wijesinghe		CSO10983	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
507452	Jill Turvey		CSO10996	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
507477	Mrs Sally Owen		CSO11024	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
507585	Mrs Angela Everitt		CSO11157	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
508623	Mr Allan Thompson		CSO12039	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
508936	Mr M		CSO12375	Preferred Option LN	Support					1313

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
	Brawner			9						
508994	Mr & Mrs L Ruckley		CSO12454	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
509220	Mrs U Richard		CSO12584	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
507178	Mr Paul Banning		CSO17360	Preferred Option LN 9	Object		One of the most dangerous aspects of the proposals to the social balance of Verwood is the high proportion of 'affordable' homes. We do not support high levels of concentration of Local Authority or Housing Association owned properties. The higher the level of density of the housing the greater the social issues, the greater the dilution of private ownership in properties, the less personal investment there is in their maintenance. Verwood is thankfully, relatively safe and free of many types of anti-social behaviour. And it would be relatively easy to upset this balance by ill-judged changes to the type of property and its ownership. Again, any future plans must reflect the current balance of working families and retirees that exists in Verwood, relatively free of the social problems and anti-social behaviours that numerous towns experience. Especially those, that have experienced rapid growth over a relatively short period of time, with the building of large estates.			1313
518195	Mr M Willcocks		CSO17341	Preferred Option LN 9	Object		The Profile of the Proposed Housing The Core Strategy proposes that between 40% and 50% of the new housing should be for affordable homes. I assume that many of these homes will be for working families. My concern here is that Verwood itself has very little potential to offer jobs. Your strategy document mentions job opportunities in Ferndown or further afield, as a possible source of employment. However, this would			1313

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>entail considerable travel expense for anyone living in Verwood, which would particularly hurt people living in social housing on low incomes.</p> <p>It is my firm belief from my own experience that is extremely important to locate residents very close to their place of work. Otherwise, they fall into the trap of taking social benefits. I believe that the last thing Verwood needs is a high proportion of its residents being forced to live on benefits because there is no work available locally, or it is too expensive to travel long distances to that work. At its worst, this could lead to a situation whereby a significant area of housing displays all the problems associated with high unemployment and the associated social problems.</p> <p>I would like to make a further point relating to the high percentage of affordable housing proposed. The proposed strategy seems to centre on solving East Dorset District Council's problem of having to provide lots more social housing by getting private developers to financially contribute significantly to the cost of the social housing. To my mind, this raises a number of important questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you guarantee that the private housing situated on the same development as the proposed high volume of social housing will be desirable to potential purchasers? • What will happen if the private housing fails to sell? 			
359327	Cllr. Mr Peter Hall	Town Centre Ward Christchurch Borough Council	CSO19361	Preferred Option LN 9	Support					1313
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19326	Preferred Option LN 9	Object		Preferred option LN9 and Non Preferred Option LN10 cannot be supported because they are totally unrealistic.			1313

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		CSO18044	Preferred Option LN 9	Object		<p>We believe the overall affordable housing target should be 40%. We have two reasons for this: the first, that the only way we can agree to any market house building on the Green Belt is by creating our own 'exceptional circumstances'. These 'exceptional circumstances' are to answer the need for affordable housing only, and so we set this need at 40%.</p> <p>The other reason is that there is no definition of 'small sites' and as we object to the more lucrative large Green Belt sites, we feel that not enough affordable housing may be generated.</p>			1313
521337	Mrs Christine Charlesworth		CSO17865	Preferred Option LN 9	Object		<p>This whole set of proposals is premised upon the issue of 'affordable housing' and the fact that in the current market situation, young local people are unable to remain in the area, as they wish to do. Although the term 'affordable' is widely used, it is not clear to me, and no doubt it is unclear to others, what precisely is the definition of that term, not how (by what mechanisms) the desired affordability is to be achieved. Many questions spring to mind. Given the fact that size-for-size, type-for-type, new build is generally more expensive on the open market than is older housing stock, how are the proposed additional houses to be made 'affordable'? Will they be subsidised through national or local taxation. What will the affordable stock consist of? Will it be small, modest, minimal footprint housing? By the tone of the introductory material, and the proposed location in the case of WMC4, it is unlikely to be flats, so presumably it will be house-plus-garden. What size? What facilities? Nobody wishes to return to the era of tenement flats without proper sanitation, or back-to-back housing of yesteryear, but one hopes that the affordable will be basic by modern standards, having excellent</p>			1313

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
							insulation and security, but not offering large gardens and multiple garage/parking spaces. There is no reason for local people, especially those young couples already struggling to pay their mortgages and bring up their own families, to subsidise others through their taxes.			
527905	Mr Paul Morgan	Strategic Commissioning Manager, Adult Services Dorset County Council	CSO19101	Preferred Option LN 9		General Comment	<p>In summary, we wish to raise the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That affordable housing quotas be applied to all future care homes and extra care developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That Lifetime Homes obligations be applied to all new developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That any proposed new care home development fits in with the strategic aims and objectives of this Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these two authorities; • That any proposed care home development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). • That provision is made in Change of Use for C2 permissions to ensure a viable care home market in Christchurch and East Dorset locality. • That the roles listed as key worker status are revised and updated to include care assistants, domiciliary care workers, personal assistants, health care support workers, and health care assistants. <p>Affordable Housing Whilst the new Government has signalled the revocation of Regional Strategies, and the determination of housing numbers will now be down to local planning authorities, we would hope that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils will recognise the need for a</p>			1313

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>mixed economy and in particular to ensure that affordable housing quotas are applied to all future accommodation - in particular for older people.</p> <p>It is the Directorate's position that all types of new housing and residential care provision that are proposed in Dorset ought to be available and accessible to the whole of the community that we serve and not just those who can afford to pay privately for their own care. Care homes are classed as accommodation by the County Council in that residents that we fund are charged for their accommodation costs. The financial position of someone whose health deteriorates to the extent that they need to enter a care home remains the same. Therefore if someone needed funding from the public purse or affordable housing prior to entering a care home or Extra Care scheme, they will still require affordable and publicly funded residential care, nursing care or Extra Care. The Directorate is now working with all 6 of our District and Borough Council partners to urge them to adopt local planning rules that oblige new care homes and Extra Care schemes to provide affordable housing (via the standard Local Authority funding rate or NHS Continuing Health Care rate for care homes and Housing Benefit for Extra Care schemes). We are keen to ensure that care home providers who are building care homes in Dorset accept public funding rates. It is important that providers/developers produce business models that ensure that homes are viable with guaranteed access to people who are funded by the County Council and NHS Dorset.</p> <p>Lifetime Homes The view of the Directorate is that Lifetime Homes standards ought to be applied to all developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality from the start date of the Core</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>Strategy. We feel that public services should adopt preventative approaches and concentrate our efforts and investment in new developments that will limit the need for adaptations/re-housing in 10-20 years time and beyond. Across the County we have a current over reliance on Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) to convert homes for those whose physical health deteriorates. If we could ensure that all new homes were built to Lifetime Homes standards (irrespective of whether they are private or public) we would negate the need to undertake Occupational Therapy assessments to decide if someone should be entitled to a DFG. Similarly, the call on DFGs would reduce over time.</p> <p>Elderly Person's Accommodation Dorset is a net importer of older people and exporter of younger working age people. This situation is compounded year on year. We already face challenges in having sufficient numbers of people to participate in the social care workforce to care for a population of older people that is in excess of the national average. A real concern for the Directorate is that any further in migration of older people to Dorset places an additional burden upon local infrastructures. This additional demand cuts across spheres of social care, health care, transport and roads, cultural and leisure services. Further in-migration of older people to Dorset will also create additional pressure and capacity issues for our local fieldwork staff along with associated finance, admin and contracts staff.</p> <p>It is the joint intention of both the County Council and Primary Care Trust to resist the building of care homes unless there is an agreed identified need. Our strategic vision is to support the building of Extra Care Housing developments together with more intense community based services that can be delivered to people in their own homes. We recognise that the best way to achieve this is</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>to work with District Councils to ensure that the strategic intentions of the local NHS and County Council are reflected in Local Development Frameworks.</p> <p>The national direction given to local authorities from the Government, the Department of Health and the National Personalisation lead is that we should stop building care homes and develop intensive, personalised, home based care. Therefore the Directorate, together with NHS Dorset, continue to increase the availability of services that support people in their own homes. For the last few years the numbers of care home placements funded by the County Council has declined. This is despite a demography that shows an ongoing older and more dependent population.</p> <p>In addition to this, Older People in Dorset (via the Age Partnership and Older People's Forums) tell us that they do not want to live in care homes and that they prefer to stay at home with intensive support or live in Extra Care schemes with support.</p> <p>In general, our view regarding the development of proposed new care home schemes in Dorset is that any such scheme should meet the following requirements –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed development fits in with the Strategic aims and objectives of the Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these 2 authorities. • That any proposed development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). <p>This is an extremely crucial issue to this Directorate. Up to now, new care homes have been built by developers on the basis of an appropriate piece of land becoming available, largely irrespective of whether it is</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>needed or not and without regard to taking into account the views of the Local Authority with Social Services Responsibilities or the local NHS. Experience tells us that once a care home has been built, the beds will become filled. We need to break into this cycle to influence wider choices for older people in Dorset so that we do not continue to have a situation where care homes are viewed as (often) the first port of call for older people as their needs increase. It would be really helpful to have Planning Policy Statements adopted across Dorset that incorporate national policy developments around the personalisation of care, the views of older people in the county and the views of commissioners in NHS Dorset and within this Directorate.</p> <p>Change of Use</p> <p>The care home market is constantly changing in Dorset. At various times there can either be a shortage or over-provision of beds. It would be appropriate for the new Core Strategy to include provision for resisting future Planning Applications that are submitted for a change of use away from category C2 usage.</p> <p>Similarly, there is a genuine case for the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to consider using a general power of wellbeing and The Sustainable Communities Act to refuse future applications to convert/demolish care homes and to consider revoking previously agreed applications. See link below. http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/aio/1293811</p> <p>Of course, this road is fraught with potential legal difficulty but it is important to ensure that enough flexibility is built into the LDF to give the Council a mechanism to deal with any situation should it arise in the locality in the future, and to ensure that an appropriate range care home capacity continues to exist. Housing for key workers</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 Directorate understands that key worker dwellings are those provided for key worker households that cannot afford market prices/rents. We further understand that when considering proposals for key workers, Councils use the following nationally recognised categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health care Social services Local government Education Public transport Emergency services <p>A big challenge relating to the future demography of Dorset is securing sufficient numbers of social care staff to deliver the care that people will need. To this end, we would ask that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils revise the current list of key worker roles to include health care support workers and assistants, care assistants in care homes, domiciliary care workers and (in the light of the emerging national personalisation agenda) personal assistants. We understand that councils and Registered Social Landlords can vary the standard key worker role lists in accordance with local need and the views of the authorities listed above. We have had a fairly recent good practice example in Christchurch where social care staff have been identified as key workers and have tenancies tied to their employment at Bure House (Extra Care scheme) or Avon View (care home).</p>			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO555	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
508135	E P Wright		CSO11613	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315

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
508241	Mr L Hibbard		CSO11645	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
508254	Mr R B Holloway		CSO11653	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
508353	Mr J Codling		CSO11674	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
508456	Rev. Dudley Powell		CSO11811	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
507575	Mr M Adams		CSO11140	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
507591	Mr Mark		CSO11178	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
507599	Mr M Avnir		CSO11198	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
508518	Mr Warren Brown		CSO11851	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
508542	Mr H Cramer		CSO11892	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315

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
508661	Mr Burton		CSO12066	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
508679	Mr A O'Connor		CSO12081	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
508689	Mr Andy Jones		CSO12157	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support		In the present economic climate when the threat of negative equity and high rents are a reality for many families the importance of affordable housing and social housing is greater than it has been for many decades. I believe that this has to be a fundamental part of the core strategy and that the options selected above will best achieve this.			1315
508847	Mr V Cromer		CSO12267	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
508885	Mr J Heath		CSO12336	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
509082	Mr Richard		CSO12546	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
509235	Mr M Kenny		CSO12593	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support					1315
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	Clerk West Parley Parish Council	CSO17947	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support		Parish Council support non-preferred option of 40%			1315
360112	Mr	St Leonards &	CSO19327	Non	Object		Preferred option LN9 and Non Preferred			1315

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
	Kenneth Brooks	St Ives Parish Plan Group		Preferred Option LN 10			Option LN10 cannot be supported because they are totally unrealistic.			
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO18045	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Support		<p>We believe the overall affordable housing target should be 40%. We have two reasons for this: the first, that the only way we can agree to any market house building on the Green Belt is by creating our own 'exceptional circumstances'. These 'exceptional circumstances' are to answer the need for affordable housing only, and so we set this need at 40%. The other reason is that there is no definition of 'small sites' and as we object to the more lucrative large Green Belt sites, we feel that not enough affordable housing may be generated.</p>			1315
527905	Mr Paul Morgan	Strategic Commissioning Manager, Adult Services Dorset County Council	CSO19105	Non Preferred Option LN 10		General Comment	<p>In summary, we wish to raise the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That affordable housing quotas be applied to all future care homes and extra care developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That Lifetime Homes obligations be applied to all new developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That any proposed new care home development fits in with the strategic aims and objectives of this Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these two authorities; • That any proposed care home development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). • That provision is made in Change of Use for C2 permissions to ensure a viable care home market in Christchurch and East Dorset locality. 			1315

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 the roles listed as key worker status are revised and updated to include care assistants, domiciliary care workers, personal assistants, health care support workers, and health care assistants.</p> <p>Affordable Housing Whilst the new Government has signalled the revocation of Regional Strategies, and the determination of housing numbers will now be down to local planning authorities, we would hope that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils will recognise the need for a mixed economy and in particular to ensure that affordable housing quotas are applied to all future accommodation - in particular for older people.</p> <p>It is the Directorate's position that all types of new housing and residential care provision that are proposed in Dorset ought to be available and accessible to the whole of the community that we serve and not just those who can afford to pay privately for their own care. Care homes are classed as accommodation by the County Council in that residents that we fund are charged for their accommodation costs. The financial position of someone whose health deteriorates to the extent that they need to enter a care home remains the same. Therefore if someone needed funding from the public purse or affordable housing prior to entering a care home or Extra Care scheme, they will still require affordable and publicly funded residential care, nursing care or Extra Care. The Directorate is now working with all 6 of our District and Borough Council partners to urge them to adopt local planning rules that oblige new care homes and Extra Care schemes to provide affordable housing (via the standard Local Authority funding rate or NHS Continuing Health Care rate for care homes and Housing Benefit for Extra Care schemes). We are keen to ensure that care home</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>providers who are building care homes in Dorset accept public funding rates. It is important that providers/developers produce business models that ensure that homes are viable with guaranteed access to people who are funded by the County Council and NHS Dorset.</p> <p>Lifetime Homes The view of the Directorate is that Lifetime Homes standards ought to be applied to all developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality from the start date of the Core Strategy. We feel that public services should adopt preventative approaches and concentrate our efforts and investment in new developments that will limit the need for adaptations/re-housing in 10-20 years time and beyond. Across the County we have a current over reliance on Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) to convert homes for those whose physical health deteriorates. If we could ensure that all new homes were built to Lifetime Homes standards (irrespective of whether they are private or public) we would negate the need to undertake Occupational Therapy assessments to decide if someone should be entitled to a DFG. Similarly, the call on DFGs would reduce over time.</p> <p>Elderly Person's Accommodation Dorset is a net importer of older people and exporter of younger working age people. This situation is compounded year on year. We already face challenges in having sufficient numbers of people to participate in the social care workforce to care for a population of older people that is in excess of the national average. A real concern for the Directorate is that any further in migration of older people to Dorset places an additional burden upon local infrastructures. This additional demand cuts across spheres of social care, health care, transport and roads, cultural and leisure services. Further in-migration of older people to Dorset will also create additional</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>pressure and capacity issues for our local fieldwork staff along with associated finance, admin and contracts staff.</p> <p>It is the joint intention of both the County Council and Primary Care Trust to resist the building of care homes unless there is an agreed identified need. Our strategic vision is to support the building of Extra Care Housing developments together with more intense community based services that can be delivered to people in their own homes. We recognise that the best way to achieve this is to work with District Councils to ensure that the strategic intentions of the local NHS and County Council are reflected in Local Development Frameworks.</p> <p>The national direction given to local authorities from the Government, the Department of Health and the National Personalisation lead is that we should stop building care homes and develop intensive, personalised, home based care. Therefore the Directorate, together with NHS Dorset, continue to increase the availability of services that support people in their own homes. For the last few years the numbers of care home placements funded by the County Council has declined. This is despite a demography that shows an ongoing older and more dependent population.</p> <p>In addition to this, Older People in Dorset (via the Age Partnership and Older People's Forums) tell us that they do not want to live in care homes and that they prefer to stay at home with intensive support or live in Extra Care schemes with support.</p> <p>In general, our view regarding the development of proposed new care home schemes in Dorset is that any such scheme should meet the following requirements –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed development fits in with the Strategic aims and objectives of the Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these 2 			

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>authorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That any proposed development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). <p>This is an extremely crucial issue to this Directorate. Up to now, new care homes have been built by developers on the basis of an appropriate piece of land becoming available, largely irrespective of whether it is needed or not and without regard to taking into account the views of the Local Authority with Social Services Responsibilities or the local NHS. Experience tells us that once a care home has been built, the beds will become filled. We need to break into this cycle to influence wider choices for older people in Dorset so that we do not continue to have a situation where care homes are viewed as (often) the first port of call for older people as their needs increase. It would be really helpful to have Planning Policy Statements adopted across Dorset that incorporate national policy developments around the personalisation of care, the views of older people in the county and the views of commissioners in NHS Dorset and within this Directorate.</p> <p>Change of Use</p> <p>The care home market is constantly changing in Dorset. At various times there can either be a shortage or over-provision of beds. It would be appropriate for the new Core Strategy to include provision for resisting future Planning Applications that are submitted for a change of use away from category C2 usage.</p> <p>Similarly, there is a genuine case for the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to consider using a general power of wellbeing and The Sustainable Communities Act to refuse future applications to</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>convert/demolish care homes and to consider revoking previously agreed applications. See link below. http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/aio/1293811 Of course, this road is fraught with potential legal difficulty but it is important to ensure that enough flexibility is built into the LDF to give the Council a mechanism to deal with any situation should it arise in the locality in the future, and to ensure that an appropriate range care home capacity continues to exist. Housing for key workers The Directorate understands that key worker dwellings are those provided for key worker households that cannot afford market prices/rents. We further understand that when considering proposals for key workers, Councils use the following nationally recognised categories: Health care Social services Local government Education Public transport Emergency services A big challenge relating to the future demography of Dorset is securing sufficient numbers of social care staff to deliver the care that people will need. To this end, we would ask that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils revise the current list of key worker roles to include health care support workers and assistants, care assistants in care homes, domiciliary care workers and (in the light of the emerging national personalisation agenda) personal assistants. We understand that councils and Registered Social Landlords can vary the standard key worker role lists in accordance with local need and the views of the authorities listed above. We have had a fairly recent good practice example in Christchurch where social care staff have been identified as key workers and have tenancies tied to their employment at</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
							Bure House (Extra Care scheme) or Avon View (care home).			
360099	Mr John FOSKETT		CSO22745	Non Preferred Option LN 10	Object		Did not follow LN9/10? Why not less than 35%			1315
497370	Mrs Amanda Williams	Director of Business Development Synergy Housing	CSO2291	14.22	Support		Whilst I support this approach to maximise provision of affordable housing, it may be that 'social' rented housing will no longer be a relevant term - the government is moving towards the provision of an 'affordable rented' product which may supersede 'social' rented housing.	Replace the term 'social rented' housing with 'affordable rented' housing.		1317
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO556	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO993	Preferred Option LN 11	Support		Whilst the Parish Council supports the tariff-based approach it believes that in certain circumstances the aggregating of all tariffs may make development sites unviable. There should therefore be flexibility allowed for officers of the district council to reduce the overall cost if it is judged to be in the public interest that a site be brought forward. The Parish Council understands that viability tests called 'the three dragons' are used in some locations which may be appropriate.	In addition, it should be stated in LN11 that any contributions collected should be ring-fenced for affordable housing only.		1318
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2575	Preferred Option LN 11	Support			What is the definition of 'intermediate housing'?		1318
508135	E P Wright		CSO11614	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
508254	Mr R B Holloway		CSO11654	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
508360	Ms		CSO11683	Preferred	Support					1318

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
	Jocelyn Britton			Option LN 11						
508456	Rev. Dudley Powell		CSO11812	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
360975	Mrs Julia Woodward		CSO11998	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
507414	Mr L Wijesinghe		CSO10984	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
507477	Mrs Sally Owen		CSO11025	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
507575	Mr M Adams		CSO11141	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
507585	Mrs Angela Everitt		CSO11159	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
508518	Mr Warren Brown		CSO11852	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
508542	Mr H Cramer		CSO11938	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
508623	Mr Allan Thompson		CSO12040	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
508679	Mr A O'Connor		CSO12082	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
508689	Mr Andy		CSO12159	Preferred Option LN	Support		In the present economic climate when the threat of negative equity and high rents are a			1318

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
	Jones			11			reality for many families the importance of affordable housing and social housing is greater than it has been for many decades. I believe that this has to be a fundamental part of the core strategy and that the options selected above will best achieve this.			
508847	Mr V Cromer		CSO12269	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
508885	Mr J Heath		CSO12337	Preferred Option LN 11	Support					1318
360246	Mr Gavin Fauvel	Cranborne Estate	CSO17413	Preferred Option LN 11	Support		Support in principle. Financial contribution alternative for sites of 5 units or less must be kept locally and enable the developer where possible to influence where it is spent. Many longer term landowners in the district still give great consideration to social and other more philanthropic needs in their locality than property development companies might.			1318
507178	Mr Paul Banning		CSO17361	Preferred Option LN 11	Object		One of the most dangerous aspects of the proposals to the social balance of Verwood is the high proportion of 'affordable' homes. We do not support high levels of concentration of Local Authority or Housing Association owned properties. The higher the level of density of the housing the greater the social issues, the greater the dilution of private ownership in properties, the less personal investment there is in their maintenance. Verwood is thankfully, relatively safe and free of many types of anti-social behaviour. And it would be relatively easy to upset this balance by ill-judged changes to the type of property and its ownership. Again, any future plans must reflect the current balance of working families and retirees that exists in Verwood, relatively free of the social problems and anti-social behaviours that numerous towns experience. Especially those, that have			1318

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
							experienced rapid growth over a relatively short period of time, with the building of large estates.			
359422	Mrs Sally FAIRCHILD	Clerk Cranborne & Edmondsham Parish Council	CSO17676	Preferred Option LN 11	Object	General Comment	Support in principle, including provision of 40% Affordable Housing.	For sites under 5 Housing units where the Policy proposes a 'Financial Contribution' by the Developer of equivalent value to on site provision, the Policy should make it clear that the resultant funding for Affordable Housing must be directed back to the Parish or Town in which the original development took place.		1318
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	Clerk West Parley Parish Council	CSO17949	Preferred Option LN 11	Support		Parish Council supports plan to maximise delivery of affordable housing.			1318
518195	Mr M Willcocks		CSO17346	Preferred Option LN 11	Object		<p>The Profile of the Proposed Housing The Core Strategy proposes that between 40% and 50% of the new housing should be for affordable homes. I assume that many of these homes will be for working families. My concern here is that Verwood itself has very little potential to offer jobs. Your strategy document mentions job opportunities in Ferndown or further afield, as a possible source of employment. However, this would entail considerable travel expense for anyone living in Verwood, which would particularly hurt people living in social housing on low incomes.</p> <p>It is my firm belief from my own experience that is extremely important to locate residents very close to their place of work. Otherwise, they fall into the trap of taking social benefits. I believe that the last thing</p>			1318

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>Verwood needs is a high proportion of its residents being forced to live on benefits because there is no work available locally, or it is too expensive to travel long distances to that work. At its worst, this could lead to a situation whereby a significant area of housing displays all the problems associated with high unemployment and the associated social problems.</p> <p>I would like to make a further point relating to the high percentage of affordable housing proposed. The proposed strategy seems to centre on solving East Dorset District Council's problem of having to provide lots more social housing by getting private developers to financially contribute significantly to the cost of the social housing. To my mind, this raises a number of important questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you guarantee that the private housing situated on the same development as the proposed high volume of social housing will be desirable to potential purchasers? • What will happen if the private housing fails to sell? 			
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19333	Preferred Option LN 11	Object		<p>To suggest that all residential development 'which results in a net increase of housing has to provide a minimum 40% affordable housing on site' is too ridiculous for serious comment. A developer financial contribution is not a 'free gift', but a charge on the purchaser/occupier in one form or another. This option should be deleted from this document forthwith.</p>			1318
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17890	Preferred Option LN 11	Object		<p>Particular concerns for the Meyrick Estate Management Ltd relate to the thresholds for affordable housing and tenure split. Given the very fragile housing market, intermediate housing plays an increasing role to increase affordability given the lack of availability of mortgage finance. To reduce it in favour of higher social rented targets may affect the</p>			1318

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
							housing market recovery.			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO18019	Preferred Option LN 11	Object		<p>The policy proposes a 'minimum' of 40% housing to be affordable on all new developments. Whilst we would always want the councils to seek the highest level of affordable possible, there will be a number of occasions when a 40% requirement will not be viable or feasible. The councils' own viability assessment highlights that 40% will be difficult to achieve in some areas. To reflect this, the 40% requirement should be a starting point for negotiation. This has been the stance taken by numerous inspectors during examination in to various core strategies.</p> <p>We support the Council in having two levels of affordable housing requirement, one for off-site contributions on smaller developments and another on site requirement for larger developments. However, the Council will need to carefully consider whether it is a good use of resources to remove the threshold entirely. Bournemouth Borough Council recently adopted this policy and has found that it is; fraught with difficulty; has led to a delay in the time it takes to approve planning applications; and more appeals. Non Preferred Option LN 13 may therefore be the most effective option.</p> <p>The policy also contains proposals to ensure that all affordable housing remains so through a legal agreement. This essentially makes this housing affordable in perpetuity. Whilst we understand that the councils want to retain as much affordable housing as possible, this does not accord with Government guidance and may make it difficult for developers to acquire funding. Previously, inspectors have noted that the Annex to PPS3, called Delivering Affordable Housing states that the emphasis should be placed on recycling the public subsidy from</p>			1318

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 sale of properties through the Right to Acquire legislation. We attach the Inspector's Report for the South Hams Affordable Housing DPD, which supports this.</p> <p>This preferred policy option proposes that in Christchurch 90% of affordable housing should be for social rent, unless 'local circumstances would dictate otherwise' and that 'Variation of this requirement must be clearly justified in relation to meeting the needs of the district'. However, given changes to housing benefit; the Coalition Government's change of emphasis to 'Affordable Rent'; and the scarcity of public subsidy following the Comprehensive Spending Review; this policy will need to be reconsidered.</p> <p>In the case of schemes delivered by Housing Associations, where previously they had delivered 100% affordable housing on site, lack of public funding may mean that they have to look at delivering lower, but still significant levels of affordable housing on their sites. This may mean cross subsidy through a variety of different products. This may not accord with the affordable housing mix set out in this document, but would still provide housing that helps to address the acute affordability problems in the Christchurch housing market.</p> <p>We are also concerned that the provision of 90% social rented housing may not contribute to the creation of mixed and balanced communities. Alternative Preferred Option LN 15 with no recommended tenure split or a variation of it may therefore be the most suitable option at this time.</p>			
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	CSO18387	Preferred Option LN 11	Object		Option LN11 sets out the Council's preferred position on affordable housing levels. We believe these must be tested in relation to viability for each site. It is not clear if the tenure split of 90% social rented and 10% intermediate is to become part of the formal			1318

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. This may not be viable.. Availability of mortgage finance and HCA grants has also changed significantly and will continue to affect delivery and uptake of affordable housing.			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO19128	Preferred Option LN 11	Object		<p>This preferred policy option proposes that in Christchurch 90% of affordable housing should be for social rent, unless 'local circumstances would dictate otherwise' and 'Variation of this requirement must be clearly justified in relation to meeting the needs of the district'. However, given changes to housing benefit; the Coalition Government's change of emphasis to 'Affordable Rent'; and the scarcity of public subsidy following the Comprehensive Spending Review; this policy will need to be reconsidered.</p> <p>In the case of schemes delivered by Housing Associations, where previously they had delivered 100% affordable housing on site, lack of public funding may mean that they have to look at delivering lower, but still significant levels of affordable housing on their sites. This may mean cross subsidy through a variety of different products. This may not accord with the affordable housing mix set out in this document, but would still provide housing that helps to address the acute affordability problems in the Christchurch housing market.</p> <p>We are also concerned that the provision of 90% social rented housing may not contribute to the creation of mixed and balanced communities. Alternative Preferred Option LN 15 of no recommended tenure split or a variation of it may therefore be the most suitable option at this time.</p>			1318
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		CSO17813	Preferred Option LN 11	Object		<p>The Housing Need? Do we really need to build 1005 homes in Wimborne and Colehill, of which only 50% will be affordable? EDDC objective in building affordable homes</p>			1318

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>is stated as "There is a significant need to provide affordable housing in East Dorset. Because house prices are high compared to wages, the number of public sector homes are very low and there are consequently a large number of residents who cannot afford to live in the private sector and cannot access affordable housing." Additionally it adds, "It wants to support the provision of increased affordable housing opportunities for young people in order that they can have the same opportunities to live and work within their local communities."¹</p> <p>EDDC have also recognised that "with a growing number of older people there will be an increased demand for accessible and supportable housing."¹</p> <p>Interestingly the Core Strategy Area Profile identifies;</p> <p>a) Only 31 homes are needed in East Colehill and 87 in Wimborne making a total housing need of 118 at the present time. 2</p> <p>b) In East and West Colehill 76% of households are composed of adults, without children and 24% of these are of pensionable age. 2</p> <p>c) In Wimborne 84% of households are composed of adults, without children and over 40% of these are of pensionable age. 2</p> <p>Perhaps the reason for this is that young people do not necessarily want to live in Wimborne or Colehill, maybe the area is seen as lacking in job opportunities or perhaps it's too tranquil and boring to live among so many older folk!</p> <p>I believe that if EDDC build 1005 homes, 50% of these will be occupied by couples that want to move to, and retire, in Dorset. Not that I have objection to this, but this would tend to defeat the object of providing affordable housing solutions because this would again increase house prices rather than reduce them.</p> <p>My view therefore is that the additional</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>homes provided should only be in the category of affordable housing and therefore the number of homes to be built should be restricted to a maximum of 500 over the next 15 years. Clearly the benefit of this policy would be to avoid building in rural areas, avoid coalescence, provide an opportunity for a Green infrastructure for the town, and reduce the impact on the local environment, particularly through transportation.</p> <p>I see no point in creating another local community in Wimborne Minster at WMC4 when we have an existing local community at Leigh Park which is recognised as one of the most deprived areas of the County.¹ Surely we should concentrate our effort in bringing this area out of deprivation and enhancing it with a first school, open space and shops. I doubt that we can afford to do this in two locations.</p> <p>But where should 500 affordable homes be built?</p> <p>If we consider that area WMC4 is now allocated to mitigating the effects of Climate Change then we still have WMC1 (170 homes), WMC2 (50 homes), WMC3 (35 homes) and WMC5 (200 homes) which provides 455 houses of mixed quality (affordable to non-affordable in the ratio of approx 50%.³) I am sure if the density of housing were increased where practical, from 20 per hectare, to 25 per hectare, in excess of 500 affordable homes could be built on these sites, and still provide much open and play spaces.</p> <p>In this deliberation we should not rule out the area of land South of The Acorns, and to the North side of the A31, which could provide at least another 70 homes of an affordable nature. (refer to Map Option D)</p> <p>The noise issues in this area could be abated by using Gabion Walls to edge the North side of the A31 between Canford Bottom and Merley House Roundabouts.</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>Access into the proposed Sports Complex, Allotments, and the additional 70 homes proposed above, could also be provided from the A31. (notionally on an Eastbound Carriageway – see my views on Transportation Issues which follow)</p> <p>If we consider it to be absolutely paramount that 1005 homes still have to be built, and after having established a commitment to offset the effects of Climate Change, and agreeing that this can be achieved by sighting suitable Green Projects at WMC4, then I recommend that all of the “undeveloped” land South of Leigh Road and East of WMC5 is utilised to create the same number of houses proposed for WMC4. (refer to Map Option E)</p> <p>I am totally convinced that within this context there are greater benefits in developing all of the land South of Leigh Road to provide greater mobility for Employment, Education, Shopping and Leisure than there are in leaving it as Green Belt. (see my views on Transportation Issues which follow)</p> <p>It is also important to remember that Leigh Park is recognised as one of the most deprived areas in the County and one of the 40% most deprived areas in the Country.¹</p> <p>Here then would be an opportunity to redress the balance in this location.</p> <p>If this “undeveloped” land is not taken up in this review, I am sure this area will be the target for future housing development. I also see no practical reason why the “Scheduled Ancient Monument” cannot be fully preserved in this area, segregated from both housing and an adjacent Sports Complex. In fact if development were to take place in this area it would ensure the Section of Roman Road was preserved in perpetuity.¹²</p> <p>SEE ATTACHMENT</p>			
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul		CSO18046	Preferred Option LN	Support		We agree with this policy. It is most important to obtain a financial contribution on small			1318

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
	Timberlake			11			<p>sites as the potential for 3000+ houses on brown field sites will mainly be under 5 units. So many of the brown field sites are just split sites or large gardens being developed. You cannot afford to miss contributions on these very small developments, so we support a policy which would raise contributions. The tenure split. In the light of the Governments new policy of flexible tenancies, it may be worth considering a larger % of intermediate housing. It would give a more secure tenure to those with a slightly higher income.</p>			
521337	Mrs Christine Charlesworth		CSO17866	Preferred Option LN 11	Object		<p>This whole set of proposals is premised upon the issue of 'affordable housing' and the fact that in the current market situation, young local people are unable to remain in the area, as they wish to do. Although the term 'affordable' is widely used, it is not clear to me, and no doubt it is unclear to others, what precisely is the definition of that term, not how (by what mechanisms) the desired affordability is to be achieved. Many questions spring to mind. Given the fact that size-for-size, type-for-type, new build is generally more expensive on the open market than is older housing stock, how are the proposed additional houses to be made 'affordable'? Will they be subsidised through national or local taxation. What will the affordable stock consist of? Will it be small, modest, minimal footprint housing? By the tone of the introductory material, and the proposed location in the case of WMC4, it is unlikely to be flats, so presumably it will be house-plus-garden. What size? What facilities? Nobody wishes to return to the era of tenement flats without proper sanitation, or back-to-back housing of yesteryear, but one hopes that the affordable will be basic by modern standards, having excellent insulation and security, but not offering large gardens and multiple garage/parking spaces.</p>			1318

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
							There is no reason for local people, especially those young couples already struggling to pay their mortgages and bring up their own families, to subsidise others through their taxes.			
359284	Miss Lynne Evans	Consultant Southern Planning Practice	CSO18412	Preferred Option LN 11	Object		Objection is raised to the requirement that all development securing a net increase in residential development should provide affordable housing - either on site or through financial contribution. Whilst the scale of affordable housing need is recognised, the imposition of this requirement on very small-scale development will add a level of burden, which will restrict development coming forward. There may well be a number of small scale development opportunities which will bring forward a range of other benefits but will not come forward because of this policy requirement. The provision of viability exercises for very small scale development also adds another layer of cost and delays to small projects.	Policy needs to be reconsidered to reconsider the scale of development to which affordable housing provision (on site or through financial contributions) will be sought.		1318
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSO18334	Preferred Option LN 11	Object		Given the reduced availability of grant funding for affordable housing following the Government's October 2010 Spending Review, Taylor Wimpey consider it prudent for the suggested tenure split to be as flexible as possible. Where viability evidence proves a need, there should be flexibility to vary the tenure split to ensure the successful delivery of affordable housing is not thwarted. The last sentence of the penultimate paragraph should be revised to provide flexibility in the social rented percentage as well as intermediate where this is proven necessary to maintain scheme viability.			1318
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSO18434	Preferred Option LN 11	Object		The proposed tenure mix in Preferred Option LN 11 lacks sufficient flexibility and will be difficult to attain with the current economic	Delete the percentage tenure mix requirements from Preferred Option LN 11		1318

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
							climate and spending cuts. Government policy in relation to affordable housing is changing and a more flexible approach is required in order to ensure the Core Strategy remains consistent with national guidelines and initiatives.			
359288	Mr Steve Molnar	Terence O'Rourke	CSO18979	Preferred Option LN 11	Object		Whilst accepting that affordable housing should be provided, Banner Homes objects to the setting of a minimum requirement of 40%. Other demands on a site, such as contributions to infrastructure, will mean that the ability to provide affordable housing will need to be weighed in the balance of what is possible whilst providing a viable development. Whilst this is recognised in the policy, the 40% would be better expressed as a target than as a minimum requirement.	Change text of LN11 to refer to a target rather than a minimum requirement of 40%.		1318
527905	Mr Paul Morgan	Strategic Commissioning Manager, Adult Services Dorset County Council	CSO19108	Preferred Option LN 11		General Comment	In summary, we wish to raise the following points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That affordable housing quotas be applied to all future care homes and extra care developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That Lifetime Homes obligations be applied to all new developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That any proposed new care home development fits in with the strategic aims and objectives of this Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these two authorities; • That any proposed care home development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). • That provision is made in Change of Use for C2 permissions to ensure a viable care home market in Christchurch and East Dorset locality. 			1318

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 the roles listed as key worker status are revised and updated to include care assistants, domiciliary care workers, personal assistants, health care support workers, and health care assistants.</p> <p>Affordable Housing Whilst the new Government has signalled the revocation of Regional Strategies, and the determination of housing numbers will now be down to local planning authorities, we would hope that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils will recognise the need for a mixed economy and in particular to ensure that affordable housing quotas are applied to all future accommodation - in particular for older people.</p> <p>It is the Directorate's position that all types of new housing and residential care provision that are proposed in Dorset ought to be available and accessible to the whole of the community that we serve and not just those who can afford to pay privately for their own care. Care homes are classed as accommodation by the County Council in that residents that we fund are charged for their accommodation costs. The financial position of someone whose health deteriorates to the extent that they need to enter a care home remains the same. Therefore if someone needed funding from the public purse or affordable housing prior to entering a care home or Extra Care scheme, they will still require affordable and publicly funded residential care, nursing care or Extra Care. The Directorate is now working with all 6 of our District and Borough Council partners to urge them to adopt local planning rules that oblige new care homes and Extra Care schemes to provide affordable housing (via the standard Local Authority funding rate or NHS Continuing Health Care rate for care homes and Housing Benefit for Extra Care schemes). We are keen to ensure that care home</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>providers who are building care homes in Dorset accept public funding rates. It is important that providers/developers produce business models that ensure that homes are viable with guaranteed access to people who are funded by the County Council and NHS Dorset.</p> <p>Lifetime Homes The view of the Directorate is that Lifetime Homes standards ought to be applied to all developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality from the start date of the Core Strategy. We feel that public services should adopt preventative approaches and concentrate our efforts and investment in new developments that will limit the need for adaptations/re-housing in 10-20 years time and beyond. Across the County we have a current over reliance on Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) to convert homes for those whose physical health deteriorates. If we could ensure that all new homes were built to Lifetime Homes standards (irrespective of whether they are private or public) we would negate the need to undertake Occupational Therapy assessments to decide if someone should be entitled to a DFG. Similarly, the call on DFGs would reduce over time.</p> <p>Elderly Person's Accommodation Dorset is a net importer of older people and exporter of younger working age people. This situation is compounded year on year. We already face challenges in having sufficient numbers of people to participate in the social care workforce to care for a population of older people that is in excess of the national average. A real concern for the Directorate is that any further in migration of older people to Dorset places an additional burden upon local infrastructures. This additional demand cuts across spheres of social care, health care, transport and roads, cultural and leisure services. Further in-migration of older people to Dorset will also create additional</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>pressure and capacity issues for our local fieldwork staff along with associated finance, admin and contracts staff.</p> <p>It is the joint intention of both the County Council and Primary Care Trust to resist the building of care homes unless there is an agreed identified need. Our strategic vision is to support the building of Extra Care Housing developments together with more intense community based services that can be delivered to people in their own homes. We recognise that the best way to achieve this is to work with District Councils to ensure that the strategic intentions of the local NHS and County Council are reflected in Local Development Frameworks.</p> <p>The national direction given to local authorities from the Government, the Department of Health and the National Personalisation lead is that we should stop building care homes and develop intensive, personalised, home based care. Therefore the Directorate, together with NHS Dorset, continue to increase the availability of services that support people in their own homes. For the last few years the numbers of care home placements funded by the County Council has declined. This is despite a demography that shows an ongoing older and more dependent population.</p> <p>In addition to this, Older People in Dorset (via the Age Partnership and Older People's Forums) tell us that they do not want to live in care homes and that they prefer to stay at home with intensive support or live in Extra Care schemes with support.</p> <p>In general, our view regarding the development of proposed new care home schemes in Dorset is that any such scheme should meet the following requirements –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed development fits in with the Strategic aims and objectives of the Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these 2 			

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>authorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That any proposed development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). <p>This is an extremely crucial issue to this Directorate. Up to now, new care homes have been built by developers on the basis of an appropriate piece of land becoming available, largely irrespective of whether it is needed or not and without regard to taking into account the views of the Local Authority with Social Services Responsibilities or the local NHS. Experience tells us that once a care home has been built, the beds will become filled. We need to break into this cycle to influence wider choices for older people in Dorset so that we do not continue to have a situation where care homes are viewed as (often) the first port of call for older people as their needs increase. It would be really helpful to have Planning Policy Statements adopted across Dorset that incorporate national policy developments around the personalisation of care, the views of older people in the county and the views of commissioners in NHS Dorset and within this Directorate.</p> <p>Change of Use</p> <p>The care home market is constantly changing in Dorset. At various times there can either be a shortage or over-provision of beds. It would be appropriate for the new Core Strategy to include provision for resisting future Planning Applications that are submitted for a change of use away from category C2 usage.</p> <p>Similarly, there is a genuine case for the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to consider using a general power of wellbeing and The Sustainable Communities Act to refuse future applications to</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>convert/demolish care homes and to consider revoking previously agreed applications. See link below. http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/aio/1293811 Of course, this road is fraught with potential legal difficulty but it is important to ensure that enough flexibility is built into the LDF to give the Council a mechanism to deal with any situation should it arise in the locality in the future, and to ensure that an appropriate range care home capacity continues to exist. Housing for key workers The Directorate understands that key worker dwellings are those provided for key worker households that cannot afford market prices/rents. We further understand that when considering proposals for key workers, Councils use the following nationally recognised categories: Health care Social services Local government Education Public transport Emergency services A big challenge relating to the future demography of Dorset is securing sufficient numbers of social care staff to deliver the care that people will need. To this end, we would ask that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils revise the current list of key worker roles to include health care support workers and assistants, care assistants in care homes, domiciliary care workers and (in the light of the emerging national personalisation agenda) personal assistants. We understand that councils and Registered Social Landlords can vary the standard key worker role lists in accordance with local need and the views of the authorities listed above. We have had a fairly recent good practice example in Christchurch where social care staff have been identified as key workers and have tenancies tied to their employment at</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
							Bure House (Extra Care scheme) or Avon View (care home).			
540139	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO22867	Preferred Option LN 11		General Comment	<p>I must however stress private developers are not responsible for the shortage of affordable housing throughout south east Dorset. If any bodies are responsible it is the housing authorities who failed to deliver when they had the power and resources to do so in the second half of the last century and the planning authorities who have pushed up prices by artificially limiting supply through their policies since the late 1970s.</p> <p>Beware affordable housing and infrastructure policies in Bournemouth and Poole are forcing down land prices to the extent that owners are becoming reluctant to sell. In many cases development land value is below existing use value. So much for the advice of 3 Dragons!!!!!!!!!!</p> <p>Many developers will help solve this problem but you must not forget they are in business to make a profit and they only continue in business by reinvesting a significant part of the profit. The business is also risky with ups and downs in the market over which they have no influence. Profits in the good times balance what can be huge losses in the bad times. £millions are being written off land values currently, and sites bought in the good times may well be left undeveloped rather than built out at a loss.</p> <p>Please bear these factors in mind when selecting your preferred policies, otherwise development may well slow down even more , supply will be restricted, prices which are a product of supply and demand will go up and the affordability gap will increase.</p> <p>Often the result of treating symptoms rather than causes is that there are side effects.</p>			1318
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO557	Alternative Preferred Option LN	Support		This option would allow the building of more Affordable housing which is needed. We do not want or need swathes of market housing			1320

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
				12			which will, if past history is anything to go by, only attract in- comers from outside the East Dorset area and will not contribute in any way to bringing down the cost of market housing. However, I object to any large scale housing on Greenfield sites			
497370	Mrs Amanda Williams	Director of Business Development Synergy Housing	CSO2292	Alternative Preferred Option LN 12	Support		I support this in order to maximise the potential for providing affordable housing.			1320
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19334	Alternative Preferred Option LN 12	Object		Alternative Preferred Option LN12 incredibly proposes 50% affordable housing on all Greenfield sites, and this clearly should not be imposed in this arbitrary fashion. It should be deleted from this document forthwith.			1320
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO18048	Alternative Preferred Option LN 12	Support		This is a theoretical support only as we would object to the larger Green Belt sites being developed.			1320
359288	Mr Steve Molnar	Terence O'Rourke	CSO18977	Alternative Preferred Option LN 12	Object		Whilst accepting that affordable housing should be provided, Banner Homes objects to the this alternative option that sets a minimum requirement of 50%. Other demands on a site, such as contributions to infrastructure, will mean that the ability to provide affordable housing will need to be weighed in the balance of what is possible whilst providing a viable development. The preferred option LN11 looks for a 40% minimum, and this would be more acceptable, if it were to be expressed as a target rather than as a requirement in amendment to LN11	This alternative option LN12 should not go forward.		1320
527905	Mr Paul Morgan	Strategic Commissioning Manager, Adult Services	CSO19110	Alternative Preferred Option LN 12		General Comment	In summary, we wish to raise the following points • That affordable housing quotas be applied to all future care homes and extra care			1320

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
		Dorset County Council					<p>developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That Lifetime Homes obligations be applied to all new developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That any proposed new care home development fits in with the strategic aims and objectives of this Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these two authorities; • That any proposed care home development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). • That provision is made in Change of Use for C2 permissions to ensure a viable care home market in Christchurch and East Dorset locality. • That the roles listed as key worker status are revised and updated to include care assistants, domiciliary care workers, personal assistants, health care support workers, and health care assistants. <p>Affordable Housing Whilst the new Government has signalled the revocation of Regional Strategies, and the determination of housing numbers will now be down to local planning authorities, we would hope that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils will recognise the need for a mixed economy and in particular to ensure that affordable housing quotas are applied to all future accommodation - in particular for older people.</p> <p>It is the Directorate's position that all types of new housing and residential care provision that are proposed in Dorset ought to be available and accessible to the whole of the community that we serve and not just those who can afford to pay privately for their own care. Care homes are classed as accommodation by the County Council in</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>that residents that we fund are charged for their accommodation costs. The financial position of someone whose health deteriorates to the extent that they need to enter a care home remains the same. Therefore if someone needed funding from the public purse or affordable housing prior to entering a care home or Extra Care scheme, they will still require affordable and publicly funded residential care, nursing care or Extra Care. The Directorate is now working with all 6 of our District and Borough Council partners to urge them to adopt local planning rules that oblige new care homes and Extra Care schemes to provide affordable housing (via the standard Local Authority funding rate or NHS Continuing Health Care rate for care homes and Housing Benefit for Extra Care schemes). We are keen to ensure that care home providers who are building care homes in Dorset accept public funding rates. It is important that providers/developers produce business models that ensure that homes are viable with guaranteed access to people who are funded by the County Council and NHS Dorset.</p> <p>Lifetime Homes The view of the Directorate is that Lifetime Homes standards ought to be applied to all developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality from the start date of the Core Strategy. We feel that public services should adopt preventative approaches and concentrate our efforts and investment in new developments that will limit the need for adaptations/re-housing in 10-20 years time and beyond. Across the County we have a current over reliance on Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) to convert homes for those whose physical health deteriorates. If we could ensure that all new homes were built to Lifetime Homes standards (irrespective of whether they are private or public) we would</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>negate the need to undertake Occupational Therapy assessments to decide if someone should be entitled to a DFG. Similarly, the call on DFGs would reduce over time.</p> <p>Elderly Person's Accommodation Dorset is a net importer of older people and exporter of younger working age people. This situation is compounded year on year. We already face challenges in having sufficient numbers of people to participate in the social care workforce to care for a population of older people that is in excess of the national average. A real concern for the Directorate is that any further in migration of older people to Dorset places an additional burden upon local infrastructures. This additional demand cuts across spheres of social care, health care, transport and roads, cultural and leisure services. Further in-migration of older people to Dorset will also create additional pressure and capacity issues for our local fieldwork staff along with associated finance, admin and contracts staff.</p> <p>It is the joint intention of both the County Council and Primary Care Trust to resist the building of care homes unless there is an agreed identified need. Our strategic vision is to support the building of Extra Care Housing developments together with more intense community based services that can be delivered to people in their own homes. We recognise that the best way to achieve this is to work with District Councils to ensure that the strategic intentions of the local NHS and County Council are reflected in Local Development Frameworks.</p> <p>The national direction given to local authorities from the Government, the Department of Health and the National Personalisation lead is that we should stop building care homes and develop intensive, personalised, home based care. Therefore the Directorate, together with NHS Dorset, continue to increase the availability of</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>services that support people in their own homes. For the last few years the numbers of care home placements funded by the County Council has declined. This is despite a demography that shows an ongoing older and more dependent population.</p> <p>In addition to this, Older People in Dorset (via the Age Partnership and Older People's Forums) tell us that they do not want to live in care homes and that they prefer to stay at home with intensive support or live in Extra Care schemes with support.</p> <p>In general, our view regarding the development of proposed new care home schemes in Dorset is that any such scheme should meet the following requirements –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed development fits in with the Strategic aims and objectives of the Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these 2 authorities. • That any proposed development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). <p>This is an extremely crucial issue to this Directorate. Up to now, new care homes have been built by developers on the basis of an appropriate piece of land becoming available, largely irrespective of whether it is needed or not and without regard to taking into account the views of the Local Authority with Social Services Responsibilities or the local NHS. Experience tells us that once a care home has been built, the beds will become filled. We need to break into this cycle to influence wider choices for older people in Dorset so that we do not continue to have a situation where care homes are viewed as (often) the first port of call for older people as their needs increase. It would be really helpful to have Planning Policy</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>Statements adopted across Dorset that incorporate national policy developments around the personalisation of care, the views of older people in the county and the views of commissioners in NHS Dorset and within this Directorate.</p> <p>Change of Use The care home market is constantly changing in Dorset. At various times there can either be a shortage or over-provision of beds. It would be appropriate for the new Core Strategy to include provision for resisting future Planning Applications that are submitted for a change of use away from category C2 usage.</p> <p>Similarly, there is a genuine case for the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to consider using a general power of wellbeing and The Sustainable Communities Act to refuse future applications to convert/demolish care homes and to consider revoking previously agreed applications. See link below. http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/aio/1293811</p> <p>Of course, this road is fraught with potential legal difficulty but it is important to ensure that enough flexibility is built into the LDF to give the Council a mechanism to deal with any situation should it arise in the locality in the future, and to ensure that an appropriate range care home capacity continues to exist.</p> <p>Housing for key workers The Directorate understands that key worker dwellings are those provided for key worker households that cannot afford market prices/rents. We further understand that when considering proposals for key workers, Councils use the following nationally recognised categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health care Social services Local government Education Public transport 			

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
							Emergency services A big challenge relating to the future demography of Dorset is securing sufficient numbers of social care staff to deliver the care that people will need. To this end, we would ask that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils revise the current list of key worker roles to include health care support workers and assistants, care assistants in care homes, domiciliary care workers and (in the light of the emerging national personalisation agenda) personal assistants. We understand that councils and Registered Social Landlords can vary the standard key worker role lists in accordance with local need and the views of the authorities listed above. We have had a fairly recent good practice example in Christchurch where social care staff have been identified as key workers and have tenancies tied to their employment at Bure House (Extra Care scheme) or Avon View (care home).			
508198	Mr Lorraine		CSO11622	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
508218	Mr P Heaton		CSO11630	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
508241	Mr L Hibbard		CSO11646	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
508353	Mr J Codling		CSO11675	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
508369	Mr		CSO11691	Non	Support					1322

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
	A Hill			Preferred Option LN 13						
508402	Mr J Priest		CSO11780	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
508440	Mr Angus Macmillan		CSO11792	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
508467	Mr Trevor Crutcher		CSO11819	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
360099	Mr John FOSKETT		CSO11727	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Object		Did not follow LN9/10? Why not less than 35%			1322
360575	Mr Roy Avery		CSO11878	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
507452	Jill Turvey		CSO10997	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
507591	Mr Mark		CSO11179	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
507599	Mr M Avnir		CSO11199	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
508661	Mr		CSO12067	Non	Support					1322

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
	Burton			Preferred Option LN 13						
508936	Mr M Brawner		CSO12376	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
508994	Mr & Mrs L Ruckley		CSO12456	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
509082	Mr Richard		CSO12548	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
509220	Mrs U Richard		CSO12585	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
359327	Cllr. Mr Peter Hall	Town Centre Ward Christchurch Borough Council	CSO19362	Non Preferred Option LN 13	Support					1322
527905	Mr Paul Morgan	Strategic Commissioning Manager, Adult Services Dorset County Council	CSO19111	Non Preferred Option LN 13		General Comment	In summary, we wish to raise the following points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That affordable housing quotas be applied to all future care homes and extra care developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That Lifetime Homes obligations be applied to all new developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That any proposed new care home development fits in with the strategic aims and objectives of this Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these two authorities; 			1322

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"> • That any proposed care home development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). • That provision is made in Change of Use for C2 permissions to ensure a viable care home market in Christchurch and East Dorset locality. • That the roles listed as key worker status are revised and updated to include care assistants, domiciliary care workers, personal assistants, health care support workers, and health care assistants. <p>Affordable Housing Whilst the new Government has signalled the revocation of Regional Strategies, and the determination of housing numbers will now be down to local planning authorities, we would hope that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils will recognise the need for a mixed economy and in particular to ensure that affordable housing quotas are applied to all future accommodation - in particular for older people.</p> <p>It is the Directorate's position that all types of new housing and residential care provision that are proposed in Dorset ought to be available and accessible to the whole of the community that we serve and not just those who can afford to pay privately for their own care. Care homes are classed as accommodation by the County Council in that residents that we fund are charged for their accommodation costs. The financial position of someone whose health deteriorates to the extent that they need to enter a care home remains the same. Therefore if someone needed funding from the public purse or affordable housing prior to entering a care home or Extra Care scheme, they will still require affordable and publicly funded residential care, nursing care</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>or Extra Care. The Directorate is now working with all 6 of our District and Borough Council partners to urge them to adopt local planning rules that oblige new care homes and Extra Care schemes to provide affordable housing (via the standard Local Authority funding rate or NHS Continuing Health Care rate for care homes and Housing Benefit for Extra Care schemes). We are keen to ensure that care home providers who are building care homes in Dorset accept public funding rates. It is important that providers/developers produce business models that ensure that homes are viable with guaranteed access to people who are funded by the County Council and NHS Dorset.</p> <p>Lifetime Homes The view of the Directorate is that Lifetime Homes standards ought to be applied to all developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality from the start date of the Core Strategy. We feel that public services should adopt preventative approaches and concentrate our efforts and investment in new developments that will limit the need for adaptations/re-housing in 10-20 years time and beyond. Across the County we have a current over reliance on Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) to convert homes for those whose physical health deteriorates. If we could ensure that all new homes were built to Lifetime Homes standards (irrespective of whether they are private or public) we would negate the need to undertake Occupational Therapy assessments to decide if someone should be entitled to a DFG. Similarly, the call on DFGs would reduce over time.</p> <p>Elderly Person's Accommodation Dorset is a net importer of older people and exporter of younger working age people. This situation is compounded year on year. We already face challenges in having sufficient numbers of people to participate in the social</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>care workforce to care for a population of older people that is in excess of the national average. A real concern for the Directorate is that any further in migration of older people to Dorset places an additional burden upon local infrastructures. This additional demand cuts across spheres of social care, health care, transport and roads, cultural and leisure services. Further in-migration of older people to Dorset will also create additional pressure and capacity issues for our local fieldwork staff along with associated finance, admin and contracts staff.</p> <p>It is the joint intention of both the County Council and Primary Care Trust to resist the building of care homes unless there is an agreed identified need. Our strategic vision is to support the building of Extra Care Housing developments together with more intense community based services that can be delivered to people in their own homes. We recognise that the best way to achieve this is to work with District Councils to ensure that the strategic intentions of the local NHS and County Council are reflected in Local Development Frameworks.</p> <p>The national direction given to local authorities from the Government, the Department of Health and the National Personalisation lead is that we should stop building care homes and develop intensive, personalised, home based care. Therefore the Directorate, together with NHS Dorset, continue to increase the availability of services that support people in their own homes. For the last few years the numbers of care home placements funded by the County Council has declined. This is despite a demography that shows an ongoing older and more dependent population.</p> <p>In addition to this, Older People in Dorset (via the Age Partnership and Older People's Forums) tell us that they do not want to live in care homes and that they prefer to stay at</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>home with intensive support or live in Extra Care schemes with support.</p> <p>In general, our view regarding the development of proposed new care home schemes in Dorset is that any such scheme should meet the following requirements –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed development fits in with the Strategic aims and objectives of the Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these 2 authorities. • That any proposed development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). <p>This is an extremely crucial issue to this Directorate. Up to now, new care homes have been built by developers on the basis of an appropriate piece of land becoming available, largely irrespective of whether it is needed or not and without regard to taking into account the views of the Local Authority with Social Services Responsibilities or the local NHS. Experience tells us that once a care home has been built, the beds will become filled. We need to break into this cycle to influence wider choices for older people in Dorset so that we do not continue to have a situation where care homes are viewed as (often) the first port of call for older people as their needs increase. It would be really helpful to have Planning Policy Statements adopted across Dorset that incorporate national policy developments around the personalisation of care, the views of older people in the county and the views of commissioners in NHS Dorset and within this Directorate.</p> <p>Change of Use</p> <p>The care home market is constantly changing in Dorset. At various times there can either be a shortage or over-provision of</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>beds. It would be appropriate for the new Core Strategy to include provision for resisting future Planning Applications that are submitted for a change of use away from category C2 usage.</p> <p>Similarly, there is a genuine case for the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to consider using a general power of wellbeing and The Sustainable Communities Act to refuse future applications to convert/demolish care homes and to consider revoking previously agreed applications. See link below. http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/aio/1293811</p> <p>Of course, this road is fraught with potential legal difficulty but it is important to ensure that enough flexibility is built into the LDF to give the Council a mechanism to deal with any situation should it arise in the locality in the future, and to ensure that an appropriate range care home capacity continues to exist.</p> <p>Housing for key workers</p> <p>The Directorate understands that key worker dwellings are those provided for key worker households that cannot afford market prices/rents. We further understand that when considering proposals for key workers, Councils use the following nationally recognised categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health care Social services Local government Education Public transport Emergency services <p>A big challenge relating to the future demography of Dorset is securing sufficient numbers of social care staff to deliver the care that people will need. To this end, we would ask that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils revise the current list of key worker roles to include health care support workers and assistants, care assistants in care homes, domiciliary care workers and (in the</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
							light of the emerging national personalisation agenda) personal assistants. We understand that councils and Registered Social Landlords can vary the standard key worker role lists in accordance with local need and the views of the authorities listed above. We have had a fairly recent good practice example in Christchurch where social care staff have been identified as key workers and have tenancies tied to their employment at Bure House (Extra Care scheme) or Avon View (care home).			
497370	Mrs Amanda Williams	Director of Business Development Synergy Housing	CSO2293	Non Preferred Option LN 14	Object		The government is moving towards the provision of 'affordable rented' housing rather than 'social rented housing'.			1324
527905	Mr Paul Morgan	Strategic Commissioning Manager, Adult Services Dorset County Council	CSO19112	Non Preferred Option LN 14		General Comment	<p>In summary, we wish to raise the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That affordable housing quotas be applied to all future care homes and extra care developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That Lifetime Homes obligations be applied to all new developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality; • That any proposed new care home development fits in with the strategic aims and objectives of this Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these two authorities; • That any proposed care home development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset). • That provision is made in Change of Use for C2 permissions to ensure a viable care home market in Christchurch and East Dorset locality. • That the roles listed as key worker status 			1324

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>are revised and updated to include care assistants, domiciliary care workers, personal assistants, health care support workers, and health care assistants.</p> <p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>Whilst the new Government has signalled the revocation of Regional Strategies, and the determination of housing numbers will now be down to local planning authorities, we would hope that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils will recognise the need for a mixed economy and in particular to ensure that affordable housing quotas are applied to all future accommodation - in particular for older people.</p> <p>It is the Directorate's position that all types of new housing and residential care provision that are proposed in Dorset ought to be available and accessible to the whole of the community that we serve and not just those who can afford to pay privately for their own care. Care homes are classed as accommodation by the County Council in that residents that we fund are charged for their accommodation costs. The financial position of someone whose health deteriorates to the extent that they need to enter a care home remains the same. Therefore if someone needed funding from the public purse or affordable housing prior to entering a care home or Extra Care scheme, they will still require affordable and publicly funded residential care, nursing care or Extra Care. The Directorate is now working with all 6 of our District and Borough Council partners to urge them to adopt local planning rules that oblige new care homes and Extra Care schemes to provide affordable housing (via the standard Local Authority funding rate or NHS Continuing Health Care rate for care homes and Housing Benefit for Extra Care schemes). We are keen to ensure that care home providers who are building care homes in</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>Dorset accept public funding rates. It is important that providers/developers produce business models that ensure that homes are viable with guaranteed access to people who are funded by the County Council and NHS Dorset.</p> <p>Lifetime Homes The view of the Directorate is that Lifetime Homes standards ought to be applied to all developments in Christchurch and East Dorset locality from the start date of the Core Strategy. We feel that public services should adopt preventative approaches and concentrate our efforts and investment in new developments that will limit the need for adaptations/re-housing in 10-20 years time and beyond. Across the County we have a current over reliance on Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) to convert homes for those whose physical health deteriorates. If we could ensure that all new homes were built to Lifetime Homes standards (irrespective of whether they are private or public) we would negate the need to undertake Occupational Therapy assessments to decide if someone should be entitled to a DFG. Similarly, the call on DFGs would reduce over time.</p> <p>Elderly Person's Accommodation Dorset is a net importer of older people and exporter of younger working age people. This situation is compounded year on year. We already face challenges in having sufficient numbers of people to participate in the social care workforce to care for a population of older people that is in excess of the national average. A real concern for the Directorate is that any further in migration of older people to Dorset places an additional burden upon local infrastructures. This additional demand cuts across spheres of social care, health care, transport and roads, cultural and leisure services. Further in-migration of older people to Dorset will also create additional pressure and capacity issues for our local</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>fieldwork staff along with associated finance, admin and contracts staff.</p> <p>It is the joint intention of both the County Council and Primary Care Trust to resist the building of care homes unless there is an agreed identified need. Our strategic vision is to support the building of Extra Care Housing developments together with more intense community based services that can be delivered to people in their own homes. We recognise that the best way to achieve this is to work with District Councils to ensure that the strategic intentions of the local NHS and County Council are reflected in Local Development Frameworks.</p> <p>The national direction given to local authorities from the Government, the Department of Health and the National Personalisation lead is that we should stop building care homes and develop intensive, personalised, home based care. Therefore the Directorate, together with NHS Dorset, continue to increase the availability of services that support people in their own homes. For the last few years the numbers of care home placements funded by the County Council has declined. This is despite a demography that shows an ongoing older and more dependent population.</p> <p>In addition to this, Older People in Dorset (via the Age Partnership and Older People's Forums) tell us that they do not want to live in care homes and that they prefer to stay at home with intensive support or live in Extra Care schemes with support.</p> <p>In general, our view regarding the development of proposed new care home schemes in Dorset is that any such scheme should meet the following requirements –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed development fits in with the Strategic aims and objectives of the Directorate and NHS Dorset and that no care home is built without the approval of these 2 authorities. 			

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 any proposed development has a robust supporting needs analysis that demonstrates a need for the service in the locality (and that this need analysis can stand up to scrutiny by the Directorate and NHS Dorset).</p> <p>This is an extremely crucial issue to this Directorate. Up to now, new care homes have been built by developers on the basis of an appropriate piece of land becoming available, largely irrespective of whether it is needed or not and without regard to taking into account the views of the Local Authority with Social Services Responsibilities or the local NHS. Experience tells us that once a care home has been built, the beds will become filled. We need to break into this cycle to influence wider choices for older people in Dorset so that we do not continue to have a situation where care homes are viewed as (often) the first port of call for older people as their needs increase. It would be really helpful to have Planning Policy Statements adopted across Dorset that incorporate national policy developments around the personalisation of care, the views of older people in the county and the views of commissioners in NHS Dorset and within this Directorate.</p> <p>Change of Use</p> <p>The care home market is constantly changing in Dorset. At various times there can either be a shortage or over-provision of beds. It would be appropriate for the new Core Strategy to include provision for resisting future Planning Applications that are submitted for a change of use away from category C2 usage.</p> <p>Similarly, there is a genuine case for the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to consider using a general power of wellbeing and The Sustainable Communities Act to refuse future applications to convert/demolish care homes and to</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>consider revoking previously agreed applications. See link below. http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/aio/1293811 Of course, this road is fraught with potential legal difficulty but it is important to ensure that enough flexibility is built into the LDF to give the Council a mechanism to deal with any situation should it arise in the locality in the future, and to ensure that an appropriate range care home capacity continues to exist. Housing for key workers The Directorate understands that key worker dwellings are those provided for key worker households that cannot afford market prices/rents. We further understand that when considering proposals for key workers, Councils use the following nationally recognised categories: Health care Social services Local government Education Public transport Emergency services A big challenge relating to the future demography of Dorset is securing sufficient numbers of social care staff to deliver the care that people will need. To this end, we would ask that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils revise the current list of key worker roles to include health care support workers and assistants, care assistants in care homes, domiciliary care workers and (in the light of the emerging national personalisation agenda) personal assistants. We understand that councils and Registered Social Landlords can vary the standard key worker role lists in accordance with local need and the views of the authorities listed above. We have had a fairly recent good practice example in Christchurch where social care staff have been identified as key workers and have tenancies tied to their employment at Bure House (Extra Care scheme) or Avon</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
							View (care home).			
359288	Mr Steve Molnar	Terence O'Rourke	CSO18978	Alternative Preferred Option LN 15	Object		Whilst accepting that affordable housing should be provided, Banner Homes objects to this alternative option that sets a minimum requirement of 40%, as in preferred option LN11, but without a tenure split. Other demands on a site, such as contributions to infrastructure, will mean that the ability to provide affordable housing will need to be weighed in the balance of what is possible whilst providing a viable development. Compared with preferred option LN11 the removal of the tenure split is welcomed, but the minimum requirement should be removed and referred to instead as a target.	Change text of LN15 to refer to a target rather than a minimum requirement of 40%.		1326
533867	Ms Emma Woodhouse	SW Food & Farming Adviser NFU	CSO19227	14.23		General Comment	Rural Housing Planning policy documents should allow for the provision of housing in rural areas both within villages and on farm. This would not only provide accommodation for first time buyers but also allow the older generation to retire out of farming whilst ensuring they are part of the community they have lived and worked in often all of their lives. This would enable the succession of the next generation allowing young and old to continue to live and work in our rural communities.			1328
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO558	Preferred Option LN 16	Support		I would support this provided that 100% was affordable housing and that there were local facilities available for the population increase			1329
484502	Mr John Turner		CSO616	Preferred Option LN 16	Object		Opening sentence suggests Green Belt status can be ignored when building 100% social housing developments in rural or urban areas.	Add 6th bullet to first section: Areas designated as Green Belt will not be used.		1329
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO984	Preferred Option LN 16	Support			Corfe Mullen should be included in the list of areas suitable for exception sites, to allow for the possibility		1329

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
								of future opportunities.		
359295	Mrs Maria Humby	Alderholt Parish Council	CSO1386	Preferred Option LN 16	Object		Object to the definition of Local needs in bullet point 2 Land that is otherwise considered inappropriate for development should only be used to house families and individuals with a proven local connection to the parish where the land is being provided.	Bullet point 2 be amended to read; Local Needs defined as being "solely for local families and individuals with a proven local connection to the parish where the land is being provided".		1329
359498	Mrs Lisa Goodwin	Clerk Holt Parish Council	CSO1678	Preferred Option LN 16	Object		Criteria 2 - The recent housing needs survey for Holt indicated only a need for 6 homes. With a return rate of only 28%. The Parish Council does not feel a local need has been clearly demonstrated. Criteria 5 - This point requires a settlement to have 'community facilities and services'. Holt only has a very limited pre bookable bus service , no shop or post office and therefore does not comply and should be removed from this option. (NB Planning Appeal 3/09/0370) Stated reason for refusal for one additional dwelling in the countryside was due to 'sustainability issues as a result of an additional dwelling being located away from services and facilities. The inspector noted the importance the government attaches to reducing the need to travel by car.			1329
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO2409	Preferred Option LN 16	Object		Burton and Somerford (Grange ward) already have a lot of social housing.			1329
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2576	Preferred Option LN 16	Support					1329
497370	Mrs Amanda Williams	Director of Business Development Synergy	CSO2295	Preferred Option LN 16	Support		To maximise affordable housing provision and to ensure longer term sustainability of rural areas.			1329

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
		Housing								
359546	Mrs K. Bradbury	Clerk Vale of Allen Parish Council	CSO4620	Preferred Option LN 16	Object		Many of the rural villages do not have facilities; shops, transport etc; to make building here sustainable. This preferred option would appear to contradict the statement on page 40, paragraph 4.12 and also its own statement in LN16 "The development is well related to community facilities and services". Hinton Martell for example has suffered from this policy and should not be included in the list. Other villages without shops, pubs, post offices or transport should not have this type of development imposed upon them.			1329
360246	Mr Gavin Fauvel	Cranborne Estate	CSO17414	Preferred Option LN 16	Support		Support with the ability of the developer/landowner to retain an element of nomination rights and needs based truly on local needs.			1329
475545	Ms Sarah Zyga		CSO17372	Preferred Option LN 16	Object					1329
359422	Mrs Sally FAIRCHILD	Clerk Cranborne & Edmondsham Parish Council	CSO17675	Preferred Option LN 16	Support		Support for this policy. This support is conditional on the Policy continuing to include the provision (as at present) that any such Affordable Housing must be to meet local needs, be small scale and reflect the setting, form and character of the Settlement.			1329
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17520	Preferred Option LN 16	Object		We consider that this should not apply where sites are already protected under policies ME1 and ME3			1329
359529	Mrs Gill Martin	Clerk to the Council Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council	CSO17977	Preferred Option LN 16		General Comment	Although there is a genuine need for affordable housing for local people there is also a need for balanced housing development to encourage potential business owners and contributors into the rural domain. A modest growth in population is necessary to ensure the continued			1329

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
							functioning of services notably shops and school.			
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	Clerk West Parley Parish Council	CSO17951	Preferred Option LN 16	Support		Parish Council supports the Rural and & Urban Village Exceptions policy as proposed.			1329
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18770	Preferred Option LN 16		General Comment	We recognize the need to provide affordable housing. We would highlight that as with open market housing environmental impacts need to be considered.	We suggest the inclusion of an additional bullet point in option LN16 on the lines of point 6 in LN8.		1329
360245	Mr Richard Burden	Landscape and Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB	CSO18815	Preferred Option LN 16	Support	General Comment	The AONB is supportive of the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs to enable local communities and local workers to sustain a livelihood within the AONB. We note the criteria set out in Preferred Option LN 16 and that the implication is that in exceptional cases land outside of the normal development boundary would be considered for affordable housing. This would, if adopted, apply to a significant number of villages within the AONB. We are, however, concerned that this policy is essentially contradictory as sites outside of the normal development boundary of these villages are likely to be some distance from facilities and services and therefore not only unsustainable but unlikely to be genuinely easily accessible without personal private transport.			1329
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18266	Preferred Option LN 16	Support		Rural exception sites will be a valuable mechanism for providing local affordable homes for local people. However, edges of settlements also provide much needed access to open green spaces for existing communities. We have assumed that all policies on the natural and historic environment will apply and suggest that an additional bullet point should be included to clarify this.			1329

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
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17759	Preferred Option LN 16	Support		Whilst we acknowledge the need to deliver some new housing to meet local needs, we would expect such proposals to be small scale and only delivered in settlements which benefit from a range of services and facilities. In particular the Agency is likely to be concerned at any significant housing proposals that come forward within Colehill, West Moors, St Leonards and St Ives, Longham and Sturminster Marshall, all of which are located close to the SRN.			1329
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19335	Preferred Option LN 16	Object	General Comment	Preferred Option LN16 suggests "land adjoining rural and urban settlements which would be inappropriate for market housing may be developed to provide 100% affordable housing." The site at St Leonards Hospital may be suitable for such a development. However, the lack of an site community services and the dangerous entry onto the busy A31 trunk road may detract potential developers.			1329
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17891	Preferred Option LN 16	Support		Meyrick Estate Management Ltd particularly supports policy LN16 that identifies Burton and Winton for affordable housing but reserve their position on mechanisms to secure this and the need to reflect locally derived demands under the proposed new regime. It is likely that to fund this ambition for the villages open market housing will be required to cross subsidise affordable housing following the almost complete removal of Homes and Communities Agency grants. Further representations in Appendix A consider this issue in more detail. The provision of local homes for local people is also affected by the New Homes Bonus scheme and the proposed diversion of the Community Infrastructure Levy funds for local schemes. Appendix A reproduced as follows and attached:- Appendix A			1329

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>Burton – Core Strategy Options Representations Introduction Meyrick Estate Management Ltd (MEM) own and control large areas of land to the immediate south and east of Burton village and as such are a key stakeholder in any future development of the village. MEM have opened a dialogue with Burton Parish Council with a view to working with them positively to bring about development that consolidates and supports the village. They wish to engender a spirit of co operative working with the local community and help improve outcomes for the villagers. This approach is consistent with the new emphasis on community involvement in the Localism Bill.</p> <p>Core Strategy Opportunity The purpose of the Core Strategy is to identify and shape the spatial strategy for the Borough. PPS12 advises that core strategies may allocate strategic sites for development. These should be those sites considered central to achievement of the strategy. MEM believe that a strategy for the future of Burton is an essential part of the spatial strategy for the Borough. In the current options the key spatial requirements for Burton are not adequately addressed. The allocation of a site [for new housing] at Burton is central to achieving the Core Strategy vision if Burton is properly recognised in the settlement hierarchy and acknowledged for a moderate amount of development commensurate with the village size and needs. In addition Burton is likely to be affected by the adjacent site for sand and gravel extraction. This is a significant part of the spatial planning for the Borough and should be acknowledged despite the fact that Minerals Planning is dealt with by a separate authority. The purpose of Core Strategies is to deal comprehensively with all plans and</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>programmes for an area. The post extraction restoration could play an important part in the green infrastructure strategy for the Borough. MEM are at an early stage in their thinking on how the village requirements might be met and are considering what technical evidence is required. It is suggested that this is produced in partnership with the local community and the Borough Council to underpin the broad concept and understand the capacity considerations with regard to issues of transport, flooding, ecology and biodiversity, landscape impact and viability.</p> <p>Burton Profile Burton is a free standing village that enjoys a degree of physical separation and a separate identity from the Christchurch urban area despite its relative proximity. This is reinforced by the railway embankment carrying the main railway line service to Bournemouth which creates a strong physical barrier between the town and the village. This is acknowledged in the 2003 Borough –wide landscape strategy: “The area is visually enclosed by the dominant railway embankment to the south and the rising ground and woodland to the east.” Unlike other green belt designations where small settlements are washed over by green belt Burton village is excluded from the green belt designation. This has served to concentrate redevelopment of existing plots within the village and created pockets of dense development that have begun to alter the existing rural character and quality of the village. The village has a linear form constrained by the River Avon to the west and open farmland to the east. To the north lies the village of Winkton which remains (and should remain) physically separate from Burton. To the south of the village the boundary is less well defined and it is in this area that MEM</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>believes there is scope for a moderate amount of development.</p> <p>Parish Concerns</p> <p>It is understood that Burton Parish Council have made representations to Christchurch Borough Core Strategy Options. The initial contact with the Parish Council has flagged up the following concerns. These are in no particular order but represent those issues felt to be of major concern.</p> <p>Current</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of Village Hall – no venue to contain village functions, leads to unsustainable use of remote facilities • Difficulty of achieving affordable housing secured in perpetuity for Burton residents as an exception site • Redevelopment of existing dwellings within the village at higher densities and subsequent reduction in environmental quality • Revenue costs for maintaining existing open spaces cannot be met through Parish precept, equipped play areas are in need of investment <p>Future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over traffic associated with potential Minerals working • Concern over traffic impact from Roeshot Hill urban extension • Concern that all services will be stretched as a result of Roeshot Hill Urban Extension • Opposition to incursion into the Green Belt • Wish to retain policy L11 from the Local Plan – which relates to public open space <p>Settlement Hierarchy</p> <p>Burton is the third largest settlement in the Borough after Christchurch and in this respect it should be described as a third tier settlement in the hierarchy.</p> <p>It has a range of services including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • primary school • pre-school playgroup • day nursery 			

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"> • a medical practice • two shops • two pubs • St Luke's Church Hall • United Reform Church and Hall. <p>These all help the village to enjoy a degree of self containment, although most residents will travel out of the village for employment and major services, but this is also the case with the main settlement Christchurch.</p> <p>Planning for Change MEM believe a comprehensive approach to the future of Burton is required to sustain the village to 2027. The village is likely to be affected by the following significant changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing housing affordability issues • Increasing pressure on revenue availability for maintenance of open spaces • Viability of local services for example schools, village shop, pubs due to increasing competition in less sustainable forms elsewhere • Visual and physical effects from sand and gravel working adjacent to the east • Increased pressure on recreation routes and areas as a result of new populations at Roeshot Hill • Increased demand and supply of local renewable energy production • New employment patterns that do not exist today • New travel patterns and journey demands <p>The Core Strategy and subsequent more detailed plans provide the opportunity to address the above issues and create viability to become a more self –sustaining centre.</p> <p>Opportunities Development of housing of a moderately sized site will help to facilitate the following potential solutions to issues raised by the Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site for a Village Hall • Affordable Housing to meet some of the increasing demand 			

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"> • Reduce pressure on existing developed area of village – designate character/ density zones? • Comprehensive open space, green infrastructure and possibility for countryside access and recreation • Comprehensive solution for relocated and new allotments • Renewable Energy Provision • Comprehensive post extraction solution to sand and gravel working <p>Affordable Housing The Parish Council have not been able to progress a rural exception site for affordable housing for a considerable period. It is not clear what the barrier to delivery is. Affordable housing need within the Borough is acute, and this situation masks the hidden need of those not on the housing register. The recent tightening of availability of mortgage finance from the banks and building societies has meant that demand for intermediate housing is increasingly significantly and is outstripping supply. It is understood that the Borough Council are to refresh housing needs information throughout the life of the Core Strategy and will also update the SHLAA. The changed circumstances in mortgage finance needs to be factored in to affordable need considerations. Likewise the resistance to further intensification within the existing village will need to be reflected in the consideration of available sites within the SHLAA. What is clear is that rural exceptions sites alone will not meet demand in the village; further work is required to establish both need and capacity, once complete the quantum of development appropriate to the village can be established.</p> <p>Sustainability Burton is an inherently sustainable settlement. With a population of over 4000 in the parish the services of Burton for most</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>daily needs are met within the village. Primarily this is met by the Preschool and day nursery, primary school, medical centre and village shops. Higher order facilities and employment will normally require travel to a larger centre but with changing work and shopping patterns facilitated by the internet, this is becoming increasingly less so and will continue to change for the period to 2027. There will be acceleration in new technologies that reduce travel demand.</p> <p>Flooding Parts of the village are subject to Flood Zone 2 and 3a but the Parish Council have not recognised flooding events as a particular problem. The development of a moderate sized site as indicated would need to deal with flooding issues through a flood risk assessment. There are opportunities to reduce flood risk potential as a result of improved drainage systems to existing residents as well as new residents. This opportunity is not likely to be available without development due to funding constraints.</p> <p>Green Belt The Core Strategy Options document has recognised that the extent of constraints on the urban area must be addressed by green belt change to facilitate development. This view is supported.</p> <p>In considering green belt change at Burton it is worth considering the fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy which is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The most important attribute of green belts is their openness.</p> <p>MEM believe that in order to achieve long term solutions that retain the character and quality and viability of Burton it is necessary to remove some land from the green belt. Subject to further more detailed assessment of landscape impact the development of an area south of Burton village to the rear of</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>Meddler Close, Alder Close, Gordon Way, Burton Close, and Sandy Plot would not harm the open character of the green belt in this location given the exposed nature and urbanising effect of the current development. The area here could be more effectively 'rounded off' and with a well planned comprehensive scheme offer a much better landscape buffer than the currently exposed urban sprawl. The open land between this area and the railway embankment is the critical parcel of land that creates the feeling of openness. This area gives a distinct open buffer and coupled with the railway embankment this prevents the coalescence with the urban area of Christchurch and allows Burton to remain as a free standing settlement.</p> <p>The revision by the Secretary of State to the 1980 South East Dorset Structure Plan to the green belt policy set out its purposes as being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. To protect the separate physical identity of individual settlements in the area by maintaining wedges and corridors of open land between them b. To maintain an area of open land around the conurbation <p>Both of these purposes would remain intact with the moderate level of development and green belt change envisaged.</p> <p>What has not occurred that the 1980 Structure Plan envisaged was that the Green Belt would provide for suitable forms of countryside recreation easily accessible to large numbers of people. Formal designation and laying out of open space as the result of development will give better access to countryside recreation. This would be secured through the necessary SANG provision and open space requirements to support development. Green Belt designation alone has not achieved this.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure</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>As part of the preparation of a Core Strategy advice in PPS12 suggests that a comprehensive approach to green infrastructure is an integral part of the spatial planning of the area.</p> <p>There are a number of issues that should be addressed as part of the spatial planning of the Borough but of particular relevance to Burton and its rural setting are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to countryside recreation through open space networks –opportunities to link to the New Forest along old Lyndhurst Road • Reducing pressure on Burton Common SSSI • SANG provision to mitigate harm to heathland habitats as a result of development • Mitigation during extraction and post extraction restoration of sand and gravel workings to the east of the village • Opportunities to link to wider networks – Avon Valley, Mude Valley, the Chewton Vision area and coastal footpaths <p>Suggested Revisions to Core Strategy Review KS1 to reconsider Burton’s place in the settlement hierarchy. Burton should become a third tier settlement. As the Borough is looking at housing allocation independent of East Dorset the hierarchy should equally be independent of East Dorset. As currently presented the lower order East Dorset settlements take on a higher status.</p> <p>Suggested new policy to set out spatial strategy that seeks major development in and adjacent to Christchurch urban area and moderate development within Burton to support viability of village and create a more self sustained settlement.</p> <p>Suggested Core Strategy Policy Burton is identified as a third tier settlement and as such should accommodate a moderate amount of development commensurate with the village size and</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>needs in order to support the viability of the existing village services and support additional facilities to allow it to become more self sufficient for day to day needs. This will be achieved through a limited green belt release for residential development, located so as not to harm the rural setting of the village. Any development in the village should support the following: provision of a new village hall, affordable housing for local residents, and improvements to green infrastructure and recreation opportunities (possibly including SANG and allotments), improvements to drainage and renewable energy supply and improved travel planning to serve the needs of new residents.</p> <p>Village Character Zones The problem identified by the Parish Council with regard to inappropriate intensification of development is reiterated in the area Profile (CBC October 2010) "Infilling or other further intensification of the housing within Burton would continue to erode the basic village character of the settlement to the general detriment of the existing residential amenity." Given one of the key of purposes of planning control is to protect residential amenity it must fall on the Borough to seek a solution to this issue. If sufficient land is allocated for development to meet the needs and aspirations of the community this can be avoided. Furthermore, the designation of character zones identified within the village can be used to protect character and maintain development at appropriate densities. This more detailed level of control is beyond the scope of the core strategy; however the means to providing the solution by allocating sufficient land for development is appropriately within the scope of the Core Strategy and must be addressed.</p> <p>Conclusion The Borough Council need to consider if the</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>Core Strategy as currently drafted is allowing sufficient support for development of the village community to meet its aspirations to 2027 to increase its viability as a self-sustaining settlement and adapt to changes to life patterns which are accelerating. The currently worded options for the Core Strategy do not sufficiently recognise the spatial needs of this settlement.</p> <p>PPS12, which guides the development of the Core Strategy, is clear that it should provide a robust basis for making bids for funds and assembling land for projects. It also needs to be realistic in accepting the changes that will result from mineral working and the development of the urban extension at Roeshot Hill that must be positively managed for the community.</p> <p>MEM believe that Burton can accept a moderate amount of development which will help sustain and deliver significant benefits to the village. A well designed and sensitively located development will not harm the purpose of the green belt designation, and can provide an exemplar of sustainable development practice whilst providing significant benefits for the local community including meeting local affordable housing need which might otherwise not be met.</p> <p>MEM consider a moderate development at Burton as complementary to Roeshot urban extension and a necessary part of housing delivery given the pressures on land supply set out in the MEM representations with regard to policies KS7-11.</p>			
360744	Cllr. Mr P. G. Bennett	Stour Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO19383	Preferred Option LN 16	Support		<p>There were some voices sympathetic to the concept of village exception sites provided that they genuinely provided homes for local people and especially if their release were as part of arrangements which brought forward land for playing fields and allotments. (Reflecting views expressed at a public meeting in Sturminster Marshall about the</p>			1329

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
							Core Strategy Consultation)			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO18020	Preferred Option LN 16	Object		<p>We are pleased to see the two councils are proposing a Rural Exception Policy in the Core Strategy. The lack of this type of policy in the Christchurch Local Plan has hampered the delivery of these sites. We therefore support its inclusion, but consider that it needs significant re-wording in order to make it 'effective'.</p> <p>In the first sentence, the policy states that only land adjoining the built up rural or urban settlement will be considered. As we have observed during our attempts to find a suitable site for a rural exception scheme, it is not always possible to find available sites that immediately adjoin the settlement boundary. Potential sites may be inappropriate for a number of reasons, such as flooding or landscaping constraints or the landowner may simply not be interested in releasing the land at rural exceptions scheme values. In these instances, it may therefore be appropriate to consider sites that are well linked to settlement, but do not adjoin it.</p> <p>The first bullet point states that the land will only be released for 100% affordable housing. However, as set out above, Housing Associations will find it extremely difficult to deliver 100% affordable housing schemes in the future. They may have to look at cross subsidy from general market housing or affordable housing that does not meet PPS3 definitions. This approach is widely used in Cornwall to help deliver significant levels of affordable housing and has been accepted on appeal by the Secretary of State as appropriate. Further definition of what is considered 'small scale' is required. We agree that it should relate to the size of the development, but we are aware of many rural exception schemes that adjoin larger settlements and provide 25</p>	Please see attachment for suggested revised policy.		1329

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>units. The fifth bullet point states that the development should be 'well related to community facilities and services' this needs to be qualified by the supporting text which is not provided in this document. We therefore recommend that the policy is amended as below: Please see attachment for suggested revised policy.</p>			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO19129	Preferred Option LN 16	Object		<p>Preferred Option LN16 We are pleased to see the two councils are proposing a Rural Exception Policy in the Core Strategy. The lack of this type of policy in the Christchurch Local Plan has hampered the delivery of these sites. We therefore support its inclusion, but consider that it needs significant re-wording in order to make it 'effective'. In the first sentence, the policy states that only land adjoining the built up rural or urban settlement will be considered. As we have observed during our attempts to find a suitable site for a rural exception scheme, it is not always possible to find available sites that immediately adjoin the settlement boundary. Potential sites may be inappropriate for a number of reasons, such as flooding or landscaping constraints or the landowner may simply not be interested in releasing the land at rural exceptions scheme values. In these instances, it may therefore be appropriate to consider sites that are well linked to settlement, but do not adjoin it. The first bullet point states that the land will only be released for 100% affordable housing. However, as set out above, Housing Associations will find it extremely difficult to deliver 100% affordable housing schemes in the future. They may have to look at cross subsidy from general market housing or affordable housing that does not</p>			1329

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>meet PPS3 definitions. This approach is widely used in Cornwall to help deliver significant levels of affordable housing and has been accepted on appeal by the Secretary of State as appropriate. Further definition of what is considered 'small scale' is required. We agree that it should relate to the size of the development, but we are aware of many rural exception schemes that adjoin larger settlements and provide 25 units.</p> <p>The fifth bullet point states that the development should be 'well related to community facilities and services' this needs to be qualified by the supporting text which is not provided in this document.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that the policy is amended as below: Preferred Option LN 16</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptionally, land adjoining the defined rural and urban settlements which would otherwise be considered inappropriate for development sites which would otherwise be considered inappropriate for development may be developed in order to provide affordable housing in perpetuity provided that; • The housing comprises 100% a very significant amount of affordable housing that contributes to combating affordability problems in the local housing market. • The housing is to meet local needs, defined as being within the Parish/Town, or neighbouring Parish/Town. • The proposed development would provide a mix of housing size and type which meets the local needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (see Preferred Option LN1) or Parish Housing Needs Survey. • The scale of the development is small scale and reflects the need for housing, setting, form and character of the settlement and the surrounding landscape. 			

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"> • The development is reasonably well related to community facilities and services. In most cases they will still adjoin the defined rural and urban settlement, but even each site will be considered on its merits. This option policy will apply to the following settlements, but sites at other settlements are not excluded and will be considered on their merits: East Dorset: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colehill • West Moors • St Leonards and St Ives • Three Legged Cross • Alderholt • Cranborne • Furzehill • Gaunt's Common • Gussage St Michael • Gussage All Saints • Hinton Martell • Holt • Horton • Longham • Shapwick • Sixpenny Handley • Sturminster Marshall • Wimborne St Giles • Witchampton • Woodlands Christchurch: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burton • Winkton • Land adjoining the built up area of Christchurch As stated previously, we consider our client's site and the surrounding area to be the most logical choice for the urban extension at Christchurch. It best accords with government policy, in particular PPS1, the PPS1 Supplement on Climate Change, PPS3, PPG2 and PPG13. 			
521315	Janet & Kevin		CSO18049	Preferred	Support		AGREE: 100% affordable housing			1329

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
	Healy Paul Timberlake			Option LN 16			AGREE: Housing to meet local needs. We agree providing the Parish/Town Council are in agreement and backed by a reasonable percentage of residents. AGREE: Mix of house sizes. AGREE: The development is small scale and reflects the setting. CONDITIONAL: The development is well related to community facilities and services. This last point is most important. If the village/town has no facilities and the closest services can only be accessed by car, then no development should take place.			
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22896	Preferred Option LN 16		General Comment	LN16 Comment For greater clarity of intent, the wording of the third bullet point should be amended to read or adjacent Parish/Town. Neighbouring is open to interpretation and depends on the context. Parts of Hampshire and Wiltshire are geographically closer to Verwood than most of Dorset: we have had repeated problems with city dwellers (including those from Bournemouth and Poole) on the Housing List being unhappy in our small towns and villages.			1329
475545	Ms Sarah Zyga		CSO17373	Alternative Preferred Option LN 17	Support					1331
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO2410	14.34	Object		Key facts should include the problems of elderly loneliness and isolation, especially at Highcliffe			1343
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO2412	14.35	Object		Schools are not used enough at night (evenings) or at weekends or during holidays by non pupils.			1345
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO559	Preferred Option LN 18	Support		I would like to see much more use of school facilities after hours including weekends. The aims and suggestions within this Option are very inspirational but in practice I fear			1346

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
							that in the present economic climate even with contributions from developers, many schemes would not be feasible. I fear that the necessary infrastructure to support the new proposed homes will not be available			
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO985	Preferred Option LN 18	Support					1346
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2577	Preferred Option LN 18	Support					1346
360320	Mrs J TRIPP	Friends Of Victoria Hospital Wimborne	CSO17062	Preferred Option LN 18	Support		The health and well being of the population is influenced by healthy lifestyles and safety and involves good housing, recreational and sporting facilities, measures to negate isolation in all age groups as well as appropriate health care. Having easy access to these facilities is important through good bus and cycle routes. Although we are not in a position to comment on each proposal individually, we support any plan to achieve these improvements.			1346
359529	Mrs Gill Martin	Clerk to the Council Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council	CSO17972	Preferred Option LN 18	Support		To Meet Local Needs (Section 14) preferred Option LN18 is welcomed but a distinction should be made between the urban areas listed and the newly designated RSC's of Alderholt, Cranborne and Sixpenny Handley.			1346
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18771	Preferred Option LN 18		General Comment	Similarly, new community facilities (option LN18) should not have adverse environmental impacts.			1346
360146	Mrs Marilyn A WARBURTON		CSO18647	Preferred Option LN 18	Support	General Comment	I am a Pensioner writing in response to your article about the Public helping to shape East Dorset I grew up near Richmond, Surrey with			1346

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>its acclaimed theatre and world famous ice rink attracting skaters from all over London/the world who finds the suggestion of public involvement in East Dorset Planning/Building is nonsensical for no-one responsible for decision-making ever listens and so in Verwood alone we have facilities duplicated/underused at the expense of others being not being implemented at all for want of foresight we have a The Hub a financially failing 'Community Centre' with an underused theatre and cinema which cost thousands still being subsidised by Council Charge sites where there is no evening transport when, we could, with better late night transport have shared facilities with the Barrington in Ferndown and the money saved put into smaller environmentally pleasing to the eye Cranborne size Community Centre with an open all day coffee/teashop to work in tandem with refurbished Memorial hall opposite Verwood's new car park and invested the money saved in better public transport facilities for all. Now there is talk of building a Leisure Centre in Potterne Park where we have a fairly recently built Cricket pavilion which could have incorporated those facilities again a duplication at the expense of other non-existent facilities.</p> <p>East Dorset Housing Association moved frail elderly people from substandard accommodation in central Verwood where they had shops and social activities to beautiful well planned sheltered housing at the outer limit of Verwood, and replaced their convenience for the elderly to enjoy longer independent living instead, with much needed family accommodation for a younger car driving generation well able to walk to all facilities in central Verwood.</p> <p>A private four bed roomed family house has been built next to the Dementia Care Home without affordable accommodation for the</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
							specialist carers who will staff this facility. This endless talk of strategies/plans are themselves costly and decisions eventually limited to too few people without life experience and with personal agendas. I have been making the forgoing points to 'politicians' at all levels for at least five years of my 16 year residency but still the short-sighted duplication of facilities continues unabated.			
360245	Mr Richard Burden	Landscape and Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB	CSO18819	Preferred Option LN 18	Support	General Comment	Whilst the AONB is supportive of the concept of maintaining village facilities it is very concerned at the expressed statement in Preferred Option LN 18 that Cranborne and Sixpenny Handley are 'urban areas'. These are significant villages of the AONB, nevertheless we believe that it is entirely inappropriate to describe them as urban areas in the same sense as Christchurch, Wimborne Minster, Colehill, and Ferndown.			1346
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18267	Preferred Option LN 18		General Comment	The way in which these ideas will be translated into meaningful support for these more rural deprived areas is not made clear in Preferred Option LN18. No-one will dispute the intent of the broad policy framework but these communities need support now. There are significant sustainability issues if we fail them. By definition our rural areas have fewer people than areas proposed for development: as a minority group their needs (which are very different from those who live in urban areas) tend to be misunderstood and overlooked in favour of the majority. It is in the main our rural communities who shape what is so highly valued by us all – our landscape, wildlife and tranquillity.			1346
476474	Ms Hilary Watkins	Assistant Finance Director Commissioning	CSO18597	Preferred Option LN 18		General Comment	'NHS Dorset have considered the document and would make the following comments in relation to health provision: with the existing housing stock in the consultation area there			1346

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
		Programmes NHS Dorset					<p>are already significant space pressures on general practices in Wimborne, Verwood, West Moors and parts of Christchurch. As services continue to develop as local to the patient as is feasible, it is clear that increasing the housing stock as planned will bring additional requirements for health facilities especially as we work towards minimising the need for acute hospital attendances through expansion of more local service provision.</p> <p>An increasingly elderly population is adding to the pressure on hospital and homecare services particularly in relation to intermediate care beds in community hospitals at Wimborne and St Leonards and supporting people in their own homes. Provision of housing for the elderly which may be planned to include extra care housing would therefore be welcomed alongside healthcare facilities to ensure appropriate support for this vulnerable patient group.</p> <p>Similarly plans to provide housing for families with young children, where this increases the numbers of children in the area, will impact upon our ability to provide appropriate support. This is a key area where working with other public sector organisations to offer integrated facilities for local communities on a single site would be beneficial.</p> <p>NHS Dorset is generally supportive of the plans subject to the comments above and specifically supports the concept of working with other public sector organisations to develop facilities to maximise the benefit of shared resources wherever possible.'</p>			
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19338	Preferred Option LN 18	Support		The provision of providing 'facilities and services to support a growing population' sounds promising but is very vague.			1346
521508	Ms Lisa	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17892	Preferred Option LN	Object		Policy LN18 needs to reflect the settlement hierarchy. If Burton is included as a third tier			1346

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
	Jackson			18			<p>settlement, it follows that it should be included in the list of settlements that will improve services and facilities. The rationale behind this is explained in Appendix A. (reproduced below and attached)</p> <p>Appendix A Burton – Core Strategy Options Representations Introduction Meyrick Estate Management Ltd (MEM) own and control large areas of land to the immediate south and east of Burton village and as such are a key stakeholder in any future development of the village. MEM have opened a dialogue with Burton Parish Council with a view to working with them positively to bring about development that consolidates and supports the village. They wish to engender a spirit of co operative working with the local community and help improve outcomes for the villagers. This approach is consistent with the new emphasis on community involvement in the Localism Bill.</p> <p>Core Strategy Opportunity The purpose of the Core Strategy is to identify and shape the spatial strategy for the Borough. PPS12 advises that core strategies may allocate strategic sites for development. These should be those sites considered central to achievement of the strategy. MEM believe that a strategy for the future of Burton is an essential part of the spatial strategy for the Borough. In the current options the key spatial requirements for Burton are not adequately addressed. The allocation of a site [for new housing] at Burton is central to achieving the Core Strategy vision if Burton is properly recognised in the settlement hierarchy and acknowledged for a moderate amount of development commensurate with the village size and needs. In addition Burton is likely to be affected by the adjacent site for sand and gravel</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>extraction. This is a significant part of the spatial planning for the Borough and should be acknowledged despite the fact that Minerals Planning is dealt with by a separate authority. The purpose of Core Strategies is to deal comprehensively with all plans and programmes for an area. The post extraction restoration could play an important part in the green infrastructure strategy for the Borough. MEM are at an early stage in their thinking on how the village requirements might be met and are considering what technical evidence is required. It is suggested that this is produced in partnership with the local community and the Borough Council to underpin the broad concept and understand the capacity considerations with regard to issues of transport, flooding, ecology and biodiversity, landscape impact and viability.</p> <p>Burton Profile</p> <p>Burton is a free standing village that enjoys a degree of physical separation and a separate identity from the Christchurch urban area despite its relative proximity. This is reinforced by the railway embankment carrying the main railway line service to Bournemouth which creates a strong physical barrier between the town and the village. This is acknowledged in the 2003 Borough –wide landscape strategy: “The area is visually enclosed by the dominant railway embankment to the south and the rising ground and woodland to the east.”</p> <p>Unlike other green belt designations where small settlements are washed over by green belt Burton village is excluded from the green belt designation. This has served to concentrate redevelopment of existing plots within the village and created pockets of dense development that have begun to alter the existing rural character and quality of the village.</p> <p>The village has a linear form constrained by</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 River Avon to the west and open farmland to the east. To the north lies the village of Winkton which remains (and should remain) physically separate from Burton. To the south of the village the boundary is less well defined and it is in this area that MEM believes there is scope for a moderate amount of development.</p> <p>Parish Concerns</p> <p>It is understood that Burton Parish Council have made representations to Christchurch Borough Core Strategy Options. The initial contact with the Parish Council has flagged up the following concerns. These are in no particular order but represent those issues felt to be of major concern.</p> <p>Current</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of Village Hall – no venue to contain village functions, leads to unsustainable use of remote facilities • Difficulty of achieving affordable housing secured in perpetuity for Burton residents as an exception site • Redevelopment of existing dwellings within the village at higher densities and subsequent reduction in environmental quality • Revenue costs for maintaining existing open spaces cannot be met through Parish precept, equipped play areas are in need of investment <p>Future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over traffic associated with potential Minerals working • Concern over traffic impact from Roeshot Hill urban extension • Concern that all services will be stretched as a result of Roeshot Hill Urban Extension • Opposition to incursion into the Green Belt • Wish to retain policy L11 from the Local Plan – which relates to public open space Settlement Hierarchy <p>Burton is the third largest settlement in the Borough after Christchurch and 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
							<p>respect it should be described as a third tier settlement in the hierarchy. It has a range of services including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • primary school • pre-school playgroup • day nursery • a medical practice • two shops • two pubs • St Luke's Church Hall • United Reform Church and Hall. <p>These all help the village to enjoy a degree of self containment, although most residents will travel out of the village for employment and major services, but this is also the case with the main settlement Christchurch.</p> <p>Planning for Change MEM believe a comprehensive approach to the future of Burton is required to sustain the village to 2027. The village is likely to be affected by the following significant changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing housing affordability issues • Increasing pressure on revenue availability for maintenance of open spaces • Viability of local services for example schools, village shop, pubs due to increasing competition in less sustainable forms elsewhere • Visual and physical effects from sand and gravel working adjacent to the east • Increased pressure on recreation routes and areas as a result of new populations at Roeshot Hill • Increased demand and supply of local renewable energy production • New employment patterns that do not exist today • New travel patterns and journey demands <p>The Core Strategy and subsequent more detailed plans provide the opportunity to address the above issues and create viability to become a more self –sustaining centre.</p> <p>Opportunities Development of housing of a moderately</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>sized site will help to facilitate the following potential solutions to issues raised by the Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site for a Village Hall • Affordable Housing to meet some of the increasing demand • Reduce pressure on existing developed area of village – designate character/ density zones? • Comprehensive open space, green infrastructure and possibility for countryside access and recreation • Comprehensive solution for relocated and new allotments • Renewable Energy Provision • Comprehensive post extraction solution to sand and gravel working <p>Affordable Housing The Parish Council have not been able to progress a rural exception site for affordable housing for a considerable period. It is not clear what the barrier to delivery is. Affordable housing need within the Borough is acute, and this situation masks the hidden need of those not on the housing register. The recent tightening of availability of mortgage finance from the banks and building societies has meant that demand for intermediate housing is increasingly significantly and is outstripping supply. It is understood that the Borough Council are to refresh housing needs information throughout the life of the Core Strategy and will also update the SHLAA. The changed circumstances in mortgage finance needs to be factored in to affordable need considerations. Likewise the resistance to further intensification within the existing village will need to be reflected in the consideration of available sites within the SHLAA. What is clear is that rural exceptions sites alone will not meet demand in the village; further work is required to establish both need and capacity, once complete the</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>quantum of development appropriate to the village can be established.</p> <p>Sustainability Burton is an inherently sustainable settlement. With a population of over 4000 in the parish the services of Burton for most daily needs are met within the village. Primarily this is met by the Preschool and day nursery, primary school, medical centre and village shops. Higher order facilities and employment will normally require travel to a larger centre but with changing work and shopping patterns facilitated by the internet, this is becoming increasingly less so and will continue to change for the period to 2027. There will be acceleration in new technologies that reduce travel demand.</p> <p>Flooding Parts of the village are subject to Flood Zone 2 and 3a but the Parish Council have not recognised flooding events as a particular problem. The development of a moderate sized site as indicated would need to deal with flooding issues through a flood risk assessment. There are opportunities to reduce flood risk potential as a result of improved drainage systems to existing residents as well as new residents. This opportunity is not likely to be available without development due to funding constraints.</p> <p>Green Belt The Core Strategy Options document has recognised that the extent of constraints on the urban area must be addressed by green belt change to facilitate development. This view is supported. In considering green belt change at Burton it is worth considering the fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy which is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The most important attribute of green belts is their openness. MEM believe that in order to achieve long</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>term solutions that retain the character and quality and viability of Burton it is necessary to remove some land from the green belt. Subject to further more detailed assessment of landscape impact the development of an area south of Burton village to the rear of Medlar Close, Alder Close, Gordon Way, Burton Close, and Sandy Plot would not harm the open character of the green belt in this location given the exposed nature and urbanising effect of the current development. The area here could be more effectively 'rounded off' and with a well planned comprehensive scheme offer a much better landscape buffer than the currently exposed urban sprawl. The open land between this area and the railway embankment is the critical parcel of land that creates the feeling of openness. This area gives a distinct open buffer and coupled with the railway embankment this prevents the coalescence with the urban area of Christchurch and allows Burton to remain as a free standing settlement.</p> <p>The revision by the Secretary of State to the 1980 South East Dorset Structure Plan to the green belt policy set out its purposes as being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. To protect the separate physical identity of individual settlements in the area by maintaining wedges and corridors of open land between them b. To maintain an area of open land around the conurbation <p>Both of these purposes would remain intact with the moderate level of development and green belt change envisaged.</p> <p>What has not occurred that the 1980 Structure Plan envisaged was that the Green Belt would provide for suitable forms of countryside recreation easily accessible to large numbers of people. Formal designation and laying out of open space as the result of development will give better access to</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>countryside recreation. This would be secured through the necessary SANG provision and open space requirements to support development. Green Belt designation alone has not achieved this.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <p>As part of the preparation of a Core Strategy advice in PPS12 suggests that a comprehensive approach to green infrastructure is an integral part of the spatial planning of the area.</p> <p>There are a number of issues that should be addressed as part of the spatial planning of the Borough but of particular relevance to Burton and its rural setting are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to countryside recreation through open space networks –opportunities to link to the New Forest along old Lyndhurst Road • Reducing pressure on Burton Common SSSI • SANG provision to mitigate harm to heathland habitats as a result of development • Mitigation during extraction and post extraction restoration of sand and gravel workings to the east of the village • Opportunities to link to wider networks – Avon Valley, Mude Valley, the Chewton Vision area and coastal footpaths <p>Suggested Revisions to Core Strategy Review KS1 to reconsider Burton's place in the settlement hierarchy. Burton should become a third tier settlement. As the Borough is looking at housing allocation independent of East Dorset the hierarchy should equally be independent of East Dorset. As currently presented the lower order East Dorset settlements take on a higher status.</p> <p>Suggested new policy to set out spatial strategy that seeks major development in and adjacent to Christchurch urban area and moderate development within Burton to support viability of village and create a more</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>self sustained settlement. Suggested Core Strategy Policy Burton is identified as a third tier settlement and as such should accommodate a moderate amount of development commensurate with the village size and needs in order to support the viability of the existing village services and support additional facilities to allow it to become more self sufficient for day to day needs. This will be achieved through a limited green belt release for residential development, located so as not to harm the rural setting of the village. Any development in the village should support the following: provision of a new village hall, affordable housing for local residents, and improvements to green infrastructure and recreation opportunities (possibly including SANG and allotments), improvements to drainage and renewable energy supply and improved travel planning to serve the needs of new residents.</p> <p>Village Character Zones The problem identified by the Parish Council with regard to inappropriate intensification of development is reiterated in the area Profile (CBC October 2010) "Infilling or other further intensification of the housing within Burton would continue to erode the basic village character of the settlement to the general detriment of the existing residential amenity." Given one of the key of purposes of planning control is to protect residential amenity it must fall on the Borough to seek a solution to this issue. If sufficient land is allocated for development to meet the needs and aspirations of the community this can be avoided. Furthermore, the designation of character zones identified within the village can be used to protect character and maintain development at appropriate densities. This more detailed level of control is beyond the scope of the core strategy;</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>however the means to providing the solution by allocating sufficient land for development is appropriately within the scope of the Core Strategy and must be addressed.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The Borough Council need to consider if the Core Strategy as currently drafted is allowing sufficient support for development of the village community to meets its aspirations to 2027 to increase its viability as a self-sustaining settlement and adapt to changes to life patterns which are accelerating. The currently worded options for the Core Strategy do not sufficiently recognise the spatial needs of this settlement.</p> <p>PPS12, which guides the development of the Core Strategy, is clear that it should provide a robust basis for making bids for funds and assembling land for projects. It also needs to be realistic in accepting the changes that will result from mineral working and the development of the urban extension at Roeshot Hill that must be positively managed for the community.</p> <p>MEM believe that Burton can accept a moderate amount of development which will help sustain and deliver significant benefits to the village. A well designed and sensitively located development will not harm the purpose of the green belt designation, and can provide an exemplar of sustainable development practice whilst providing significant benefits for the local community including meeting local affordable housing need which might otherwise not be met.</p> <p>MEM consider a moderate development at Burton as complementary to Roeshot urban extension and a necessary part of housing delivery given the pressures on land supply set out in the MEM representations with regard to policies KS7-11.</p>			
359277	Mr Jamie	Tetlow King	CSO18021	Preferred Option LN	Object		We support the councils in setting out policies which provide for the needs of the	The Council will seek to encourage the full		1346

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
	Sullivan			18			<p>growing elderly population in the district. Given the clear need for such facilities policy coverage on this issue is essential. This policy however only covers services for the elderly, education and community facilities. This does not address the problem of the lack of specialist accommodation in the district. Furthermore, the accommodation needs of this group are specific and complex. Having set out the very significant need for elderly person care and accommodation earlier in the document, the councils need to take the next logical step and set out a policy that encourages the delivery of this type of accommodation.</p> <p>We recommend a policy as suggested below:</p> <p>The Council will seek to encourage the full range of care and accommodation solutions for the elderly. This will include, but will not be limited to: Extra Care housing, residential care homes, sheltered housing and Continuing Care Retirement Communities (CCRCs).</p>	range of care and accommodation solutions for the elderly. This will include, but will not be limited to: Extra Care housing, residential care homes, sheltered housing and Continuing Care Retirement Communities (CCRCs).		
523366	Mr Raymond Silverthorne		CSO18377	Preferred Option LN 18	Support		<p>The Parley area would benefit greatly from a new modern and larger facility as part of the FWP4 housing development.</p> <p>The current Surgeries whilst doing an excellent job in limited circumstances are stretched and would in our opinion be enhanced by new premises.</p> <p>Healthcare Provision is of course critical to an area and should also include in addition to Medical Surgeries, Children's nurseries, Day Centres and provision for the less able. With a high proportion of elderly persons residing in the area, these Care facilities need to be increased. As do areas of public parks which are accessible to all.</p> <p>The Councils should also make allowances for suitable "care in the community" schemes which allow elderly persons to enjoy their own homes whilst receiving care.</p>			1346

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 results of the public consultation showed that there is a need to provide premises for organizations to support voluntary activities in local communities, (section 3.23), and consequently the Core Strategy Vision makes mention of new community facilities (section 3.31).</p> <p>Our trust is set up to provide and maintain suitable meeting rooms for our Christian fellowship, and we are concerned therefore that clear provision should be made in the core strategy for places of worship for all denominations.</p> <p>In common with other Churches our (members) (communicants) play an active part in the community; voluntary care of elderly persons and children is an important part of our (way of life) (ethos) and space to operate is necessary. This needs to be permitted within easy reach of affordable and suitable housing, to reduce travelling time and distance for all.</p> <p>Preferred option LN18 (Page 282) – we would ask that ‘places of worship’ be included specifically along with community buildings.</p> <p>Our halls are not used for any purpose except for celebration of the Lord’s Supper, Bible readings, Gospel preaching’s and prayer. Like many other denominations, our properties are not hired or let out to any other organization for any other purpose. We would ask that the words “where appropriate” should be added after Multi-use of existing facilities (Para.6 LN18 Page 282) Where community facilities are suggested in proposed developments, we would like to see positive references to include places of worship. This should also be added in sections 10.37 and 11.37 as part of a sustainable community strategy statement. It may be of interest to the Councils to know that our own community has produced a 15-year plan, looking ahead to identify the</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
							extent of the need of more meeting rooms and their integration into local communities in East Dorset and Christchurch.			
524495	Mr Stanley Jackson		CSO18599	Preferred Option LN 18	Support		As far as older people are concerned I would like to see more sheltered accommodation with warden assistance, as in the case of Tapper Court, so that residents can retain their homes and not be forced prematurely into residential or care homes. The affects of a disproportionately high number of the population in homes, with the absence of footfall on the streets and in the shops are damaging to towns as appears to be happening in Ferndown. Good quality care for older people in their own homes should also be a priority.			1346
524637	Cherie Murray	Senior Youth Worker DCC	CSO18635	Preferred Option LN 18	Support	General Comment	The only plea I have is that the strategy encompasses youth friendly contraceptive clinics in this area as we have none!			1346
524723	Mr John Worth	Chair Wimborne Civic Society	CSO18726	Preferred Option LN 18	Support		As far as older people are concerned we would like to see more sheltered accommodation with warden assistance, as in the case of Tapper Court, so that residents can retain their homes and not be forced prematurely into residential or care homes. The effects of a disproportionately high number of the population in homes, with the absence of footfall on the streets and in the shops, are damaging to towns as appears to be happening in Ferndown. Good quality care for older people in their own homes should also be a priority;			1346
360029	Mr David Lanigan		CSO22907	Preferred Option LN 18	Support		We also need better bus services, to coax us out of our cars and Park & Ride schemes for Bournemouth & Christchurch, similar to those in Salisbury, which has five with a capacity of more than two thousand cars. We need also to plan to provide more mains water, sewerage, electricity and gas as well as waste disposal possibly involving an			1346

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>incinerator in the local area generation electricity.</p> <p>Some road junctions are already congested and with increased population bringing with it increased road traffic, this problem will need to be addressed or some busy roads will become grid locked. In the short term the Sailing Olympics in 2012, will generate extra traffic along the A31 and the roads around Weymouth. Some temporary measures will be necessary to give priority to this Olympic Games traffic. Long term, improvements will be necessary, however, at currently busy junctions. For instance I have experienced considerable delays approaching the Canford Bottom Roundabout on the edge of Wimborne, and approaching the cross roads in the centre of West Parley.</p> <p>In outline I would propose for the Canford Bottom Roundabout, that the through traffic on the A31 is carried above the roundabout on a dual carriageway. Locally we have an example at Ringwood Where the A31 is elevated over a roundabout used by local traffic. At the West Parley Cross roads the provision of slip roads enabling a left filter not controlled by traffic lights would ease congestion. There is an example of pedestrian underpasses in West Moors where the A31 has a junction with the A348 at the Palmersford Roundabout.</p>			
361342	Mr Graham Clarke	Spatial Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO22838	Preferred Option LN 18		General Comment	<p>School Provision</p> <p>There are complex questions relating to school capacity in East Dorset generally. The proposed housing sites imply a need for more school places and an assessment of whether the existing schools are in the best locations to serve their catchments. This will depend on the level and distribution of housing that is finally agreed.</p> <p>Increased housing provision in the Wimborne and Verwood areas will increase demand for places at Queen Elizabeth's Upper School</p>			1346

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>and Ferndown Upper School and this will have a knock on effect across the joint pyramid. A full appraisal of the need for school places and pyramid structure will be necessary once the level and distribution of housing is known. There is no funding available for new building at present. However the Government has made available capital funding for basic need where there is increased demand for school places, although bids for this would need to be made, with no certainty over securing necessary funds. Developer contributions via the CIL are also likely to be necessary to gap fund the cost of providing increased school places.</p> <p>Culture and Sport Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council are advised that the Dorset Cultural Strategy 2009 -2014 included research on provision of cultural amenities and a Citizens Panel survey on access to culture. A further Citizens Panel survey on access to culture took place in August 2010. This research gives information specific to Christchurch and East Dorset which may be of value in advancing the Core Strategy.</p>			
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO994	Preferred Option LN 19	Support		<p>Whilst the Parish Council supports the tariff-based approach it believes that in certain circumstances the aggregating of all tariffs may make development sites unviable. There should therefore be flexibility allowed for officers of the district council to reduce the overall cost if it is judged to be in the public interest that a site be brought forward. The Parish Council understands that viability tests called 'the three dragons' are used in some locations which may be appropriate.</p>			1349
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO3099	Preferred Option LN 19	Support					1349

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
360246	Mr Gavin Fauvel	Cranborne Estate	CSO17415	Preferred Option LN 19	Object		Object. No control over where money is spent.			1349
360245	Mr Richard Burden	Landscape and Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB	CSO18816	Preferred Option LN 19	Support	General Comment	The AONB notes the discussion on Community Infrastructure Levies in Sections LN 19 and 20. The AONB Management Plan indicates that AONB Management Plan objectives would be a suitable use of Community Infrastructure Levies and we do, therefore, recommend that this is included within the Core Strategy.			1349
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18269	Preferred Option LN 19	Support		Supported. It is essential that developer contributions fund facilities for both on-site and off-site infrastructure and are provided in step with development. To meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, the provision of fully functioning SANGs designed to take pressure off the heaths should be in place before new homes are occupied.			1349
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17760	Preferred Option LN 19	Support		The Agency supports the inclusion of Preferred Option LN19 and LN20 which seek to ensure contributions and infrastructure are provided in step with new development in order to promote self containment of settlements.			1349
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19339	Preferred Option LN 19	Support		On site infrastructure should continue to be provided through Section 106 Agreements and a tariff based approach should be introduced to improve community facilities.			1349
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO18022	Preferred Option LN 19	Object		Now that the Government has confirmed it will not scrap the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), we strongly recommend that the Council introduce a policy which sets the framework for introducing CIL. A tariff based approach would soon become impossible to operate under the current CIL regulations.			1349
521457	Mr and Mrs		CSO17846	Preferred	Support		Developers should contribute to transport			1349

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
	M Daymond			Option LN 19			improvements if this means roads, but they should also contribute to additional facilities. They should not contribute to subsidising bus services.			
359284	Miss Lynne Evans	Consultant Southern Planning Practice	CSO18417	Preferred Option LN 19	Object		Objection is raised to a tariff based approach which would not meet the provisions of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations.	Policy approach needs to be reconsidered.		1349
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSO18335	Preferred Option LN 19	Object		Taylor Wimpey suggests this may be the appropriate place to set out the government's New Homes Bonus provisions, which are specifically designed to benefit the communities within which new development is planned.			1349
523627	Rachel Robinson	WYG Planning & Design	CSO18440	Preferred Option LN 19	Support	General Comment	Option LN19 proposes the introduction of a tariff based approach and on-site infrastructure delivered through S106 agreements. Whereas, Option LN20 proposes to continue to require planning obligations through S106 and not introduce a tariff based approach. It is noted that the use of tariffs is proposed throughout the document in relation to other policies, such as transport and flood defence. It is imperative that the document is consistent in its approach in this respect. We would like to clarify that policy relating to future S106 contributions should accord with circular guidance and the CIL regulations in being fair and reasonable and related to the development proposed.			1349
361342	Mr Graham Clarke	Spatial Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO22839	Preferred Option LN 19		General Comment	Preferred Option LN19 proposes the introduction of a tariff-based approach, combined with section 106 agreements for on-site provision, to help deliver cultural and community facilities in step with new development. LN20 is also a preferred option and yet this proposes not to introduce a tariff-based system and instead to continue with section 106 agreements as the			1349

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>sole means of securing developer contributions. As from 2014 national legislation will require a tariff based CIL to fund infrastructure not directly related to a specific development.</p> <p>It is understood that it is the intention to clarify this position and to reflect the latest Government position regarding tariffs in the plan (refer to paragraph 11) which should help to provide the necessary certainty over the role of developer contributions.</p> <p>In terms of delivery, the Core Strategy was prepared at a time of transition between governments when the future of the CIL was in question - the wording of Preferred Option LN19 and LN20 (tariffs and s.106 contributions) reflect this. It is understood that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils intend to confirm the use of CIL as an important means of gap funding infrastructure in the next version of the Core Strategy. Dorset County Council would welcome such clarification, as the CIL will be an important mechanism for delivering key infrastructure for which the County Council is responsible or in which it has an interest. This infrastructure includes transportation, schools provision and culture and sport, as well as other important community needs.</p>			
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2583	Preferred Option LN 20	Object		Contradictory to LN 19			1351
360246	Mr Gavin Fauvel	Cranborne Estate	CSO17416	Preferred Option LN 20	Support		Support for reasons given in LN19 response above. - No control over where money is spent.			1351
360245	Mr Richard Burden	Landscape and Planning Advisor	CSO18818	Preferred Option LN 20	Support	General Comment	The AONB notes the discussion on Community Infrastructure Levies in Sections LN 19 and 20. The AONB Management Plan			1351

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
		Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB					indicates that AONB Management Plan objectives would be a suitable use of Community Infrastructure Levies and we do, therefore, recommend that this is included within the Core Strategy.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17762	Preferred Option LN 20	Support		The Agency supports the inclusion of Preferred Option LN19 and LN20 which seek to ensure contributions and infrastructure are provided in step with new development in order to promote self containment of settlements.			1351
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17893	Preferred Option LN 20	Support		Policy L20 is in principle supported as the appropriate mechanism for securing payments to mitigate harm from development. The introduction of the tariff based approach through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) seems now fixed following confirmation from the Government. However, its very raison d'être to fund large infrastructure projects is bought into question by the local ring fencing now being introduced. Until the operation of CIL regime is certain my client's reserve their position in relation to its application. It is expected for the urban extension that s106 payments will remain the most effective means of mitigating harm and ensuring development is sufficiently served by infrastructure.			1351
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSO18435	Preferred Option LN 20	Support		.	Delete the percentage tenure mix requirements from Preferred Option LN 11		1351
523627	Rachel Robinson	WYG Planning & Design	CSO18442	Preferred Option LN 20	Support	General Comment	Option LN19 proposes the introduction of a tariff based approach and on-site infrastructure delivered through S106 agreements. Whereas, Option LN20 proposes to continue to require planning obligations through S106 and not introduce a tariff based approach. It is noted that the use of tariffs is proposed throughout the			1351

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
							document in relation to other policies, such as transport and flood defence. It is imperative that the document is consistent in its approach in this respect. We would like to clarify that policy relating to future S106 contributions should accord with circular guidance and the CIL regulations in being fair and reasonable and related to the development proposed.			
361342	Mr Graham Clarke	Spatial Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO22840	Preferred Option LN 20		General Comment	<p>Preferred Option LN19 proposes the introduction of a tariff-based approach, combined with section 106 agreements for on-site provision, to help deliver cultural and community facilities in step with new development. LN20 is also a preferred option and yet this proposes not to introduce a tariff-based system and instead to continue with section 106 agreements as the sole means of securing developer contributions. As from 2014 national legislation will require a tariff based CIL to fund infrastructure not directly related to a specific development.</p> <p>It is understood that it is the intention to clarify this position and to reflect the latest Government position regarding tariffs in the plan (refer to paragraph 11) which should help to provide the necessary certainty over the role of developer contributions.</p> <p>In terms of delivery, the Core Strategy was prepared at a time of transition between governments when the future of the CIL was in question - the wording of Preferred Option LN19 and LN20 (tariffs and s.106 contributions) reflect this. It is understood that Christchurch and East Dorset Councils intend to confirm the use of CIL as an important means of gap funding infrastructure in the next version of the Core Strategy. Dorset County Council would welcome such clarification, as the CIL will be</p>			1351

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
							an important mechanism for delivering key infrastructure for which the County Council is responsible or in which it has an interest. This infrastructure includes transportation, schools provision and culture and sport, as well as other important community needs.			