

## CS Options

### Events: Core Strategy Options for Consideration – Chapter 15 Creating Prosperous Communities

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	15		General Comment	<p>Development of some of the proposed employment sites is also likely to raise environmental concerns. Having reviewed the proposed sites, we are aware for example that a number are likely to be used by foraging nightjars, as they are adjacent to or very close to known breeding sites. Nightjars are specially protected and are listed on Annex 1 of the EU Birds Directive. The sites include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PC4 – Blunt's Farm Ferndown</li> <li>• PC5 – Woolsbridge Industrial Estate (especially site 05)</li> <li>• PC7 - St Leonard's Hospital</li> <li>• PC8 – Stourbank Nurseries</li> <li>• PC9 - Manor Farm, Stapehill</li> </ul> <p>We recommend therefore as part of any progression of these sites consideration must be given to the sites' environmental context. Safeguards should be added to the above policies to ensure appropriate environmental assessment.</p>			1353
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	15		General Comment	<p>ETAG recommends that the Core Strategy should recognise the natural and historic environment's contribution to the agricultural, tourist and leisure industries and that such activities are supported as a major driver of the economy of East Dorset. Economic activities and employment opportunities that protect, enhance and make beneficial use of the natural environment and ecosystem services should be encouraged e.g. woodland restoration for hurdles and woodfuel, heathland restoration for grazing. Use of redundant farm or other buildings to facilitate such opportunities should be supported.</p> <p>Longer term environmental and community benefit should take precedence over short term unsustainable economic gain. The Atkins DaSTS Phase 1 report (2010) states that based on RSS projections ... forecasts for future population and employment growth in SE Dorset are not aligned... and that ...an increase in jobs will need to be supported through importing workers from outside the South East Dorset district areas. Thus, as discussed</p>			1353

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>below, not only do the proposed employment sites pose significant threat to the ecological integrity of heathland and river basin ecology (notably the Moors River SSSI) the need for these employment sites to provide local jobs for local people is clearly not proven.</p> <p>Visitor access to more vulnerable ecosystems should be managed sensitively to ensure their protection for future generations.</p> <p>Local jobs for local people should be encouraged to reduce travel by car and land used for parking.</p> <p>Proposals for employment land should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) identify biodiversity interest present; this interest should be retained and be subject to the same protection and management as advocated in ME3 and ME4;</li> <li>ii) ensure that there is no risk of accidental pollution to rivers and water courses, notably those of the important and vulnerable Moors River drainage basin; and</li> <li>iii) minimise land take by building at high density and maximising employment opportunities.</li> </ul> <p>The Moors River and its tributaries drain the larger part of East Dorset within the Core Strategy area. This river system has born the brunt of the rapid residential and employment growth of previous decades. Although treated foul drainage now mainly by-passes the Moors River for discharge into the Stour (a notable exception being Bournemouth Airport), surface water drainage from anywhere in the catchment inevitably continues to discharge directly into the Moors River system. Such surface water from employment land habitually contains low level pollution and may, as a result of accidental discharges, contain high level pollutants. The Moors River catchment contains a number of employment sites and it has, in the past, been subject to severe pollution incidents from surface water discharges which have been severely damaging to its water quality and biodiversity. (In 1986 and 1988 there were accidental releases of pollutants from the Ferndown Industrial Estate into the Uddens Water causing severe decline in water quality and prolonged loss of biodiversity).</p> <p>Pollution protection measures include on site bunding, oil interceptors to hold back insoluble pollutants, and off site water retention features to hold back soluble pollutants – hopefully for removal before they can continue their course downstream.</p> <p>However these measures require good design, ongoing inspection</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>and regular maintenance to be effective: even then risks remain. For example, accidentally discharged soluble pollution during wet weather may easily pass through a retention pond before being detected. Further, and most significantly, there has been no clarity as to who takes responsibility for the inspection and maintenance of pollution control mechanisms. The Moors River Standing Committee, functioning during the 1980s and 1990s and attended by representatives from all relevant authorities including EDDC, regularly debated this collective failure to accept responsibility, to no practical avail.</p> <p>In reality, the only way not to increase the threat posed by employment land to the Moors River system is not to promote any new employment sites or extensions to sites within the catchment unless their use can be reliably restricted (and rigorously monitored) to those where storage or use of potential pollutants is not involved. Such restriction would presumably be unachievable for B2 (general industry), and at least challenging for B1 (office and light industrial) and possibly B8 (Warehousing and Distribution), the latter having the added disadvantage of involving most land absorption for least employment opportunity. It may be the case that there is a real need to introduce properly constructed and maintained pollution control mechanisms at particular existing sites. Allocation of land for that primary function could be regarded as exceptional.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has recently produced (Jan. 2011) document GP3, Groundwater Protection, Policy and Practice which explains the need for the precautionary approach and the very real problems that pollution can cause, sometimes taking decades to resolve. Please note in particular Part 2, the Technical Framework and the section on pollutants.</p>			
361044	Mr John Nichols		15.2	Support		<p>The area must be accessible to those who live in it, to those who pass through it and those who work in it, not forgetting tourists who want to absorb the area. Currently there are many times of the day and in a number of unexpected situations where this is not currently possible. Whilst this document highlights some of this particular area it does not have a cure for the problem. Words are worthless unless they are supported by action. Not being able to move around in ones back yard seriously undermines an important aim.</p>			1355

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		15.5	Support		However in practice this is not always feasible particularly around East Dorset where greenbelt and environmentally protected sites are situated			1358
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		15.7	Support		However, because of the many environmentally sensitive areas and internationally protected sites in East Dorset, infrastructure improvements such as new road building would not be possible. I do not agree with a mix of housing and employment development on the same site; it is important for employees to have a complete break both mental & physical from their workplace. We must be careful to protect our beautiful landscape to enable us to remain a tourist destination. Tourism brings in vital business to support our economy			1360
497370	Mrs Amanda Williams	Director of Business Development Synergy Housing	15.7	Support		We support the intention to create sustainable places whereby people have the maximum opportunity to live and work.			1360
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		15.9	Object		You have decided to build homes in Verwood where everyone commutes, therefore this increases Verwood's carbon footprint as there is not enough facilities or amenities to live in Verwood without having to travel outside of Verwood. For example, Upper School, Jobs, Dentists, Health Clinics, Adult Education, College Courses, Clothes Shopping, Shoe Shopping, Baby Goods, Restaurants. Another potential 800 cars on the road impacting on Verwood and West Moors and Three Cross traffic problems.			1363
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		15.9	Support					1363
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		15.12	Object		Verwood should have been included on this list as is has a Village infrastructure.			1366
359422	Mrs Sally FAIRCHILD	Clerk Cranborne & Edmondsham	15.12	Support		Support the identification of Cranborne as a 'Key Rural Centre'. This is considered important in order to maintain and enhance facilities within the Village and reduce wasteful travel.			1366

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Parish Council							
359529	Mrs Gill Martin	Clerk to the Council Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council	15.12		General Comment	<p>Under Connectivity and Accessibility (para 15.12) there is a contradiction between the requirement to maintain and expand existing employment, shops and facilities in order to reduce the number of car journeys to the nearest town centre locations which can also be achieved by the use of deliveries resulting from internet shopping. Too much of the latter will undermine the former and cause the closure of local amenities as has happened over the border in neighbouring Wiltshire communities. The local services and workforce are considerably enhanced as a result of the relatively high proportion of retired people, many of whom carry out a wide range of voluntary work. However, it is felt that the current belief, especially on the part of Central Government, that there is an army of potential volunteers just waiting to leap out of the wood work is misplaced. A study by Salisbury District Council some years ago revealed that there were far more people doing voluntary work than was thought and that significantly, many of them did not see their labours as 'voluntary' per se but merely getting on with living a life in a rural community.</p> <p>The current public transport service in the north east are currently seen as adequate. There is a regular service (Wilts and Dorset No 184) along the A354 - a dangerous road - to Blandford and Salisbury - the primary centres - and less frequent routes operated by Damory and Shaftesbury and District to both those other destinations. The continued provision of free bus passes for the elderly is considered absolutely essential and there should be no restrictions imposed on the time that they can be used. This is well balanced at present by both use of private vehicles and voluntary shared journeys for trips to hospital. for example. It cannot be forgotten that the nearest metropolis - Blandford Forum - is 11 miles distant.</p>			1366
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	15.13	Object		<p>Taylor Wimpey considers this paragraph highlights the importance of providing sufficient homes, particularly affordable homes, within the plan area to attract and boost the economically active workforce and the economy of the plan area. This should be clarified in the housing and employment policies of the plan. Current references to providing for local housing needs imply this is not being given appropriate weight in the calculation of strategic</p>			1367

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						housing requirements.			
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		15.16	Object		There is no need to build on the green belt until the planners have spent a considerable time looking a old buildings, vacant land and possible regeneration in the brown belt.			1370
485695	Mr John Cornish		15.16	Support		Excellent. I would welcome the additional spaces earmarked for light industrial, high tech business park in North Dorset that would provide the "incubation" facilities for the entrepreneurial -start-up businesses for post graduates linked to the Bournemouth and Weymouth universities.			1370
495527	Miss Caroline Green	Planner Broadway Malyan	Preferred Option PC 1	Support		We support the site hierarchy as presented, particularly the inclusion of Bailie Gate Industrial Estate, Sturminster Marshall, within the East Dorset sites. This is a high quality site in a good location with the potential to help meet the extra demand for B1, B2 and B8 uses within the district. We support a review of the Green Belt policy in selected areas to provide employment land for East Dorset in order to allow the local and regional economy to grow and to develop new employment sectors in line with Objective 4. We support the allocation of 3.3 hectares of land at Bailie Gate in Sturminster Marshall for the provision of B1, B2 and B8 employment uses, to act as an extension to the exiting employment uses on the industrial estate, which will also Sturminster Marshall's position as a rural service centre as set out in the Settlement Hierarchy. The site has good existing public transport links and is located within close proximity of an hourly bus service. The site is also within walking distance of the residential areas and is therefore sustainable.			1371
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		Preferred Option PC 1	Support					1371
499532	Bournemouth Borough Council	Bournemouth Borough Council	Preferred Option PC 1		General Comment	We have concerns about the proposed strategy for the airport northern business parks in particular as the strategy appears to be promoting significant office development. Clarification is sought whether the Economic Study of Development Land at Bournemouth Airport undertaken by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners considered the economic impact on Bournemouth Town			1371

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>Centre, in particular as the Core Strategy is promoting office uses at the airport, including in the 'financial and business services sectors and ICT sector'. Major office schemes should be resisted at the airport as such development, in particular in the uses specified, could adversely impact on the vitality and viability of office development in Bournemouth town centre. The identification of financial and business services sectors and the ICT sector as appropriate uses at the airport is objected to as these uses will be more appropriately and sustainability located in Bournemouth town centre.</p> <p>Hotel accommodation at the airport should be of a scale and function that does not impact on the viability and vitality of the existing and proposed hotel stock in Bournemouth. It is presumed such a hotel use will be purely ancillary to the airport operation. Likewise we have concerns about the scale of the proposed conference and leisure facilities at the airport. Such facilities should be solely for, and be ancillary to, companies at the airport, the scale of these uses should reflect this. Many such facilities already exist in Bournemouth, we have concerns that the viability and vitality of similar uses in Bournemouth could be compromised. It is a more sustainable approach to concentrate uses such as these in the existing urban area.</p>			
359278	Mr Karl Cradick	Savills	Preferred Option PC 1	Object		<p>Beagle Aerospace Limited objects to preferred option PC1 because the company's site in Stony Lane is identified 'for upgrading'. In reality, the company's premises in Stony Lane are elderly and largely beyond a condition in which they can merely be upgraded. This can be demonstrated to planning officers by means of a site visit, if requested.</p>	<p>It is requested that Beagle Aerospace site is deleted from the list of sites identified for 'upgrading' and included in the further list of sites listed later in PC1, for which 'a more flexible approach will be adopted for the following sites where B1, B2 and B8 uses will be accommodated in addition to a more</p>		1371

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>diverse range on non-B uses'.</p> <p>This policy approach is justified by the inclusion of the Beagle site in Stony Lane as a strategic development site (preferred option CH1) within the proposed boundary of Christchurch town centre (preferred option CH2). Given the important contribution that the Stony Lane area can make to maintaining the vitality of Christchurch town centre, in accordance with the core strategy vision (para. 3.34) and preferred option CH1 generally, it is essential that the core strategy enables a flexible approach to be taken to the future use of land in this key strategic development site. Limiting the area to a simple 'upgrading' of existing uses would not deliver the required regeneration objectives.</p>		
507462	Mr	Senior	Preferred	Support		The option confirms that a more flexible approach will be adopted	The aim of		1371

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Chris Cox	Consultant DTZ	Option PC 1			for certain sites, including Somerford Road, Christchurch, where B1, B2 and B8 uses will be accommodated in addition to a more diverse range of non B employment uses. We support the flexible approach because creating a mix of uses will create successful and sustainable communities, add variety to the area and ensure that a range of services and uses are provided within relatively close distance of each other, which will help promote forms of transport other than the private car. We do however have some concerns with the identification of sites located directly off Somerford Road for 'upgrading'. It is not clear what is intended by 'upgrading' and could be taken to mean environmental improvements, encouraging new high quality developments, the removal of lower quality uses and/or the introduction of new uses.	'upgrading' should be clarified.		
360379	Mr Andrew MURRAY	Planning Advisor Manchester Airport	Preferred Option PC 1	Support		Support inclusion of Bournemouth Airport Business Park at the top of the hierarchy of sites. The site is important for the whole SE Dorset conurbation in terms of the contribution it can make to the employment land supply over the plan period and beyond.			1371
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	Preferred Option PC 1	Support		The CS proposes an employment site hierarchy designed to influence the location of higher order employment uses. The sites listed are indicated to possess the "necessary locational attributes", and include the airport business park together with a number of other locations around Christchurch and East Dorset. The Agency has no objection in principle to the use of a hierarchical approach but recommends that the site selection is reviewed once the transport authorities have had the opportunity to assess relevant impacts utilising the SEDMMT			1371
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	Preferred Option PC 1		General Comment	Preferred Option PC 1, page 320 Under the sub heading Bournemouth Airport Northern Business Park (West and Eastern Sectors), Christchurch, we recommend the sentence is amended to read: '....such as improvements in transport and flood risk management infrastructure ...			1371
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		Preferred Option PC 1	Object		We support the site hierarchy. We would hope the 'improvements in transport infrastructure' were extended to include the introduction of public transport serving the main industrial sites.			1371

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						We object to the waste of valuable land resources with B8 uses. In particular we object to the inclusion of 20 hectares of Green Belt at Blunt's Farm if B8 (distribution) is included in its development. Less waste of land on low return/low wage business and less parking facilities.			
521395	D2 Planning	D2 Planning Limited	Preferred Option PC 1	Object		<p>Terrance Hill (Christchurch) Limited own the former BAE site located off Runway Road, Christchurch. They are presently developing part of the site for some 10,439 sqm of employment floorspace approved under Application No. 8/10/0244.</p> <p>They object to Preferred Option PC1 as presently drafted as it makes no reference to national planning policy within PPS4. In particular, reference is made to paragraph 4 which states: "For the purposes of the policies in this PPS economic development includes development within the B Use Classes, public and community uses and main town centre uses. The policies also apply to their development which achieves at least one of the following objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Provides employment opportunities</li> <li>2) Generates wealth; or</li> <li>3) Produces or generates an economic output or product." <p>Clearly PPS 4 makes it clear that economic activity and growth should not be solely restricted to the B classes only. Preferred Option PC1 seeks to restrict development on the BAE site to the 'B' classes only. The option does allow non B Class Use "where it makes a significant contribution to raising levels of productivity and offers skilled employment opportunities". It is considered that this criterion is not explained or defined either within the supporting text or evidence base. Accordingly, the policy needs significant clarification as to what is specifically meant by these terms.</p> <p>The Preferred Option PC1 also identifies the former BAE site for 'upgrading'. However again the policy is silent on what exactly is meant by 'upgrading'. Accordingly, clarification is required on this term.</p> <p>Objections are raised to this option as presently drafted. The former BAE site should have flexibility to enable other economic uses to be allowed in line with advice in PPS4. There are a number of aspects of the policy which are vague and lack definition. These make the application of the policy difficult at the Development Management Stage as it lacks clear guidance and certainty.</p> </li></ol>			1371

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
523366	Mr Raymond Silverthorne		Preferred Option PC 1	Support	General Comment	<p>We are concerned that the Council should improve the existing Estates as a priority. The existing directional signage is poor and layout of the Estate is hard to follow. Overall the Estate is sadly lacking in modern appearance. It has unrealised potential. The location of the Estate next to the A31 is excellent and because of this it has great potential to attract needed Business into the area.</p> <p>Our recommended plan of action is –</p> <p>1 – Improve the existing Estates infrastructure and signage. Bringing it up to the standard of 2011.</p> <p>2 – Free up the Blunts Farm site for development.</p> <p>3 - Carry out road improvements at Canford Bottom and “dual” the A31 from Ferndown to Merley.</p> <p>4 – Allocate a portion of land by the Ameysford Roundabout entrance to the Estate for a “Premier Inn” style hotel with an adjoining Conference facility to be used by local businesses. This Hotel would draw revenue from passing travellers along the A31 and provide useful accommodation for visiting Business personnel.</p> <p>5 – Local Bus companies to be encouraged to commence serving the Estate and the new Hotel, providing rapid public transport links to the Airport, Railways and Nearby Town Centres.</p> <p>6 – Blunts Farm to then be promoted to London &amp; Home Counties “Blue Chip” companies as a prime target for a regional HQ. Locally we have the natural environment to entice people to live in the area and if we can promote Blunts Farm as being the ideal location for large Business, with its excellent road links to the West and to London, along with the proximity of Bournemouth Airport and the Channel Port then we will attract new companies to the area. Part of the Blunts Farm site to be allocated for supporting services for the Estate such as a Children’s Nursery and “Breakout Areas”</p> <p>6 – Incoming Businesses to be encouraged to form links with Ferndown Upper School and Bournemouth University to cultivate useful local employees and provide a “future” for local young people.</p> <p>As previously mentioned the Upper School needs to cultivate increased links with the local Business community to provide realistic employment opportunities locally.</p>			1371
519114	Mr Malcolm	Sibbett Gregory	Preferred Option PC	Support		There is clear evidence that more needs to be done in order to promote a prosperous community in East Dorset. For many years			1371

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Brown		1			<p>employers have said that when they came to examine land allocations in fact land was not available. There are still clearly serious issues with regard to the delivery of employment land at Bournemouth Airport. There is clear evidence from two of the area's leading commercial agents that there is a demand for but not a matching supply of, employment land currently available. It is admitted by East Dorset District Council that Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is a high quality site, offering the necessary locational attributes to attract higher order uses. The owners of the land at Woolsbridge started development there in the early 70s and, with the approval of the Local Planning Authority, installed infrastructure works for the 10 acres which was originally developed plus an additional 30 acres. The cost of the infrastructure works has been written down so that the land is included in the Company's Accounts at agricultural value. Subject to the additional infrastructure needed to service individual plots and any contributions which may be required to the wider infrastructure, this site is clearly deliverable. The land owners have developed in the order of 1.5 million sq. ft. of commercial space throughout the area and have retained approximately 1 million sq. ft. in their portfolio which they continue to operate and manage. In support of Policy PC5, I am submitting to the Planning Authority a Deliverability Statement by Ankers &amp; Rawlings which is supported by a letter from their bank, which shows that Ankers &amp; Rawlings could in fact develop the site out of their own cash and facilities, although the bank would clearly like to participate. That is not something we hear every day at the moment. The Deliverability Statement is also supported by letters from Nettleship and Sawyer and Goadsby, commercial agents. My own company generally supports these statements although it was felt better to seek evidence from independent agents.</p> <p>Much of the existing Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is occupied by employers falling within the B1 Use Class with an element of B2 and B8 uses. It is anticipated that on the land in Option PC5 if adopted, all of the users would fall within the same categories with the exception of perhaps a small service hub.</p>			
557299	Mr Peter Weatherhead	DTZ Planning	Preferred Option PC 1						1371

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
485695	Mr John Cornish		15.17	Object		This report needs to recognise the demise of the RDAs across the UK particularly the SWRDA. EDDC and Christchurch must face the chance that the Business Link (that supports entrepreneurial and start-up businesses might disappear sooner than later. And, make alternative provision to support new businesses.			1373
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Preferred Option PC 2	Support					1374
495527	Miss Caroline Green	Planner Broadway Malyan	Preferred Option PC 2	Support		We support this preferred option as it will allow greater flexibility and provide alternatives in how to most efficiently use allocated land within the district.			1374
360653	Mr M A Hodges		Preferred Option PC 2	Support		I commuted daily from Christchurch to London for 15 years.			1374
475552	Jane Russell		Preferred Option PC 2	Object		This could mean that employment land could be lost forever due to a dip in the market but, on the other hand, potential development land could be left completely undeveloped without some flexibility.	Where there is strong evidence of the lack of market demand over the plan period (2012 – 2027) sites could be considered for high quality mixed use schemes to ensure a site can be brought forward for development.		1374
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		Preferred Option PC 2	Object		This would mean that potential employment land could be lost for ever due to a dip in the market			1374
359278	Mr Karl Cradick	Savills	Preferred Option PC 2	Object		Beagle Aerospace Limited objects to preferred option PC10 only because the option does not recognise the potential of the Stony Lane site to accommodate a wider range of land uses, consistent with its inclusion as the principal strategic development site	It is requested that the reference to Stony Lane in preferred option		1374

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						(preferred option CH1) within the town centre boundary for Christchurch (preferred option CH2).	<p>PC10 is amended as follows ( Beagle's added text shown in bold italics):  <b>Stony Lane</b>                      Small business units (industrial), warehouses, start-up incubator premises;                      Small purpose-built offices (moderate demand);                      Suggested text by Beagle - other employment - generating uses in Use Class A compatible with the location of the site in Christchurch town centre.                      This policy approach is justified by the inclusion of the Stony Lane area as a strategic development site (preferred option CH1) within the proposed boundary of Christchurch town centre (preferred option CH2). Given the important contribution that the Stony Lane area can make to maintaining the vitality of Christchurch town centre, in accordance</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							with the core strategy vision (para. 3.34) and preferred option CH1 generally, it is essential that the core strategy enables a flexible approach to be taken to the future use of land in the Stony Lane strategic development site.		
507462	Mr Chris Cox	Senior Consultant DTZ	Preferred Option PC 2	Support		We support this policy. It is important to retain flexibility and where the use of existing sites is no longer viable or where there is no demand for their current use it would be beneficial that sites be brought back into use.	We do however suggest the following change. There may be circumstances whereby alternative uses may be preferable to existing employment uses, for example where there are concerns for residential amenity, where more efficient use of land can be made or where the density of development can be increased at areas well served by public transport.		1374
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	Preferred Option PC 2		General Comment	We note the possibility of alternative uses for employment land under option PC2, post 2012. We would comment that some of the sites identified for employment are close to European sites and therefore residential development may either be restricted (for sites within 400m) or subject to the provisions of the forthcoming Dorset Heathland Joint Development Plan Document (DHJDPD). This important context needs to be added.			1374

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	Preferred Option PC 2	Support		The Agency reserves the right to comment on applications for the change of use from employment as some alternative uses could result in an increase in vehicle trips generated from the site, which could be detrimental to the SRN. Where no impact would arise, the Agency would support the provision of mixed use developments that are well served by public transport.			1374
507546	Mr Nigel Pugsley	Senior Planner BNP Paribas Real Estate	Preferred Option PC 2	Support		My client is supportive of the preferred option which would permit alternative uses for existing employment land where a lack of market demand can be demonstrated. It is considered that this option protects employment sites required by the market which assists the economy and provides flexibility to address other land use requirements.			1374
521395	D2 Planning	D2 Planning Limited	Preferred Option PC 2	Object		Support is given to this option in so far as it seeks to allow alternative uses for employment land. The option is caveated by a need to produce 'strong evidence of lack of market demand' Objections are raised to this on the basis that there is no definition of what constitutes 'strong evidence'. In addition, the list of new employment uses is incorrect as leisure and retail uses are defined within PPS4, as economic growth which provides employment opportunities. Objections are made to this option until it is amended in line with national planning policy.			1374
495858	Mr P W Coupe		15.25	Object		Both of these proposed developments (PC 8 and PC 9) would seriously overload Canford Bottom roundabout and the A31 East and West from it. The prospect of an additional stream or 38 ton articulated lorries and other transport into these rural areas would be detrimental to the ambience of the green belt in which they lie.			1385
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		15.27	Object		The greenbelt is an important part of our Dorset landscape. There is room on the brown belt, regeneration and rebuilding is obviously too costly for the council therefore not an option, and I feel that using the greenbelt just because you're short of cash is a tragedy as big as when they pulled up the railway lines, and it will be remembered.			1387
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment	15.28	Object		Paragraph 15.28 - Blunt's Farm, Ferndown, page 324 Flood Risk Option PC4 - Both sites (01 & 07) lie within Flood Zone 1. The			1388

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Agency				'Areas susceptible to surface water flooding map' shows that both sites include areas which may be prone to surface water flooding.			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		Option PC 4	Support		<p>I only support with reservations because it was voted on and agreed by East Dorset District Council that this site could be used for employment purposes.</p> <p>My main concern is taking land out of Greenbelt for any development and traffic problems which could be made even worse by any new development in this area.</p> <p>The Highways Agency in the Issues &amp; Options exercise (UE13) in 2008 raised its concern on this issue with regard to the A31 trunk road. It said "This urban extension relates to 20 ha of employment provision east of Ferndown. The Agency has previously raised concerns ( and has an existing holding direction for an application)with regard to additional development at the Ferndown Industrial Estate due to concerns over the capacity of this single carriageway section of the A31. Further consideration will need to be given to this proposal once the findings of the Transport Study are known"</p> <p>I am of the opinion that simply making improvements to Canford Bottom roundabout will be insufficient to alleviate the traffic congestion on the A31 which is even now at capacity.</p>			1389
360714	Carol Morgan		Option PC 4	Object		Moving businesses already on industrial estates in or near towns out of the town is counter productive in terms of jobs and accessibility. 500+ houses and schools etc is in effect another village and will not connect easily with the town of Wimborne. Take a look at Poundbury, good idea but now far too big.			1389
361055	Mr David OAKLEY		Option PC 4	Support					1389
361111	Mr Raymond Brown		Option PC 4	Object					1389
490823	Ferndown Town Council Paul	Deputy Town Clerk Ferndown	Option PC 4	Object		The proposal to change this large swathe of Green Belt over to a commercial industrial use would have a detrimental effect on the highways infrastructure and turn the Stapehill ward into a mix of			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Falconbridge	Town Council				Green Belt and Industry which are not at all compatible. The Town Council are aware that the development could potentially bring further employment opportunities to the area but this should not be at a cost to the natural environment and resident's quality of life.			
491401	S Ost		Option PC 4	Object		The local roads, schools, hospitals would be unable to cope with extra movements of traffic and people coming into the area.			1389
495200	Mr and Mrs J M B Webber		Option PC 4	Object		Canford Bottom Roundabout needs urgent improvements. A31 / Wimborne Road - pressures on these roads E / W. Reduction in industrial traffic through Ferndown.			1389
495562	Mr MJ Banting		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
495625	Mr Michael McMath		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
496188	Mr RE Vogel		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
496479	Charlotte Dixon		Option PC 4	Object					1389
496564	JH Lockwood		Option PC 4	Object					1389
496612	Mr and Mrs JP Lovell		Option PC 4	Object					1389
496958	Mrs J Beech		Option PC 4	Object					1389
360037	Mr Dave BARNES		Option PC 4	Support					1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361041	Mr & Mrs G K HAMPTON		Option PC 4	Support					1389
361170	Mr TR HARVEY		Option PC 4	Object					1389
491311	Mr Kevin GILLING		Option PC 4	Support					1389
495971	T A Reith		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
497014	Mary Haw		Option PC 4	Support					1389
497026	Doreen Smith		Option PC 4	Object		This amount of building will create extra traffic in Ferndown and Parley which already has a lot of road build up in the busy morning and evening travel. Also taking a lot of natural land for our wild life.			1389
497060	Mrs Mary Tuffrey		Option PC 4	Object					1389
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
497184	Mr Hilling		Option PC 4	Support					1389
497239	Martine Lewis		Option PC 4	Support					1389
497343	Sharon Sutcliffe		Option PC 4	Object		If traffic lights/alternative measures were put into effect at Canford Bottom roundabout prior to development then I would support this development.			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
497773	R Johnstone		Option PC 4	Support		I am fully supportive of the employment options as local people would have a wider choice of work and travelling should be less for them.			1389
498044	Carolyne BANKS		Option PC 4	Object		Transport needs to be sorted out centrally - to get something that works properly - this is the biggest showstopper to all of these schemes - the current roads will not support any more traffic.			1389
498047	CD Bradford		Option PC 4	Support					1389
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		Option PC 4	Support		Although I live in Ferndown I work and travel around a lot in the local area, so feel I can voice my opinion on developments around the area.			1389
498084	Mr P HARTLEY		Option PC 4	Object					1389
498125	Mr and Mrs P DASHWOOD		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
498160	Mrs Gwendoline Martin		Option PC 4	Object		When road is improved will support			1389
498169	Mrs D WEAVER		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
498184	Mrs Angela BARKER		Option PC 4	Object		All the employment land options are currently in the Green Belt - this should be protected! Erode it and we'll have none left in the not too distant future.			1389
498268	Mr and Mrs R Cullen		Option PC 4	Object					1389
498271	Mandy CHEESEMA		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	N								
498335	Mr and Mrs Lester		Option PC 4	Object					1389
498582	Mr Andy Hartstone		Option PC 4	Object		1. Increase in traffic in an area that already can be gridlocked at rush hour. 2. This area forms a "wildlife packed green buffer" between the existing industrial area and the bypass.			1389
498711	Mr T CHANT		Option PC 4	Support					1389
498996	M E CLARKE		Option PC 4	Support					1389
499044	Mrs Carolyn MASKELL		Option PC 4	Object					1389
360685	Mr M.P HOSE		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
361106	Mr and Mrs Robin and Janet WALL		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
498495	Mr John Williams		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
499231	Mrs A Lathbury		Option PC 4	Support					1389
499236	J PIPE		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
499245	Mr and Mrs N BUTLER		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
499261	Mrs Norma JACKSON		Option PC 4	Support					1389
499290	Mrs Lisa TURNBULL		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
499355	Mrs MEREDITH		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
499384	Mr A I ROSE		Option PC 4	Support					1389
499683	S Crotch-Harvey		Option PC 4	Object					1389
499873	Mr Graham Holt		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
500060	Mr Stuart PIDDOCK		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
500222	S Hartley		Option PC 4	Object					1389
500350	Mr P H BARTLETT		Option PC 4	Support					1389
500361	Mr and Miss N and A Middleton		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	and Turner								
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		Option PC 4	Support					1389
500558	A Baker		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
500694	Mr and Mrs J R MANSBRIDGE		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
500697	Mr Thomas SMITH		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
500706	R & J Jeans		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
500720	Mrs VALLIER		Option PC 4	Object					1389
500748	Mrs Lauren MATTHEWS		Option PC 4	Support					1389
500802	J Hayward		Option PC 4	Support					1389
500818	Mr J LADD		Option PC 4	Support		GREEN BELT LAND MUST BE PROTECTED, otherwise what is the point of having 'Green Belt'? I have supported PC 4 only because business development is important for the jobs and economy of the area and the development could be at the expense of the other options. Please listen to public opinion and don't just say 'we will listen and then disregard it'. I expect this will happen anyway.			1389
500836	Mrs Sylvia		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Hines								
500903	Mr and Mrs S and R Harris		Option PC 4	Object					1389
501012	Louise ARNOLD		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		Option PC 4	Support					1389
501106	Mr John Victor Rogers		Option PC 4	Support					1389
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501114	John Lee		Option PC 4	Support					1389
501118	Mr Ron Cook		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501135	Charlie Wassell		Option PC 4	Support					1389
501194	Mrs Colton		Option PC 4	Support					1389
359856	Mrs B Breeze		Option PC 4	Support		Planners should look again at PC4 and PC8 for mixed development. Clearly many are travelling to work in that area and there is the scope to create further local jobs easily.			1389
359895	Mr Jeff REECE		Option PC 4	Support		Road Infrastructure needs to be tackled before any development takes place.			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359908	Mr F.D.A REVILL		Option PC 4	Support					1389
359927	Mrs Ann BISSEX		Option PC 4	Object		The green belt should not be encroached on any further. No building should be allowed on flood plains. Much more serious effort needs to be put into reducing necessity of relying on car travel.			1389
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501324	Julie Light		Option PC 4	Support					1389
501351	Mr and Mrs R D'Cruze		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501364	Mr M Devetta		Option PC 4	Support					1389
501485	Mrs J JACKSON		Option PC 4	Object					1389
501488	Chris LAMB		Option PC 4	Object					1389
501502	Mr Michael WAREHAM		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501520	Mrs Z MERRIFIELD		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501523	Rita Gilbert		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501556	Mr and Mrs VEAL		Option PC 4	Object					1389
501560	Mr Christopher CLARKE		Option PC 4	Support					1389
501574	Mr & Mrs B S Nippard		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501607	Dr Fairchild		Option PC 4	Object		The road network will not support these developments. Long Lane & Colehill Lane have now become "rat runs" for traffic trying to access the A31 and more houses will increase this very big issue			1389
501616	R J Joyce		Option PC 4	Support					1389
501626	Mrs J A Russell		Option PC 4	Object					1389
501694	Mr R BRYAN		Option PC 4	Support					1389
501699	B THOMAS		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501720	Dr and Mrs D HARLOW		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501738	RJ Jenkins		Option PC 4	Support					1389
501750	K G Holloway		Option PC 4	Support					1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501751	Mr RG Birch		Option PC 4	Support					1389
501761	Mr D Curtis		Option PC 4		General Comment	The most urgent and critical limiting factors are the A31 single carriageways E and W and density of traffic using Canford Bottom roundabout - Encouraging increased commercial traffic re. PC 4 to PC 9 would only exacerbate the present traffic problems.			1389
501804	Mr Glyn Davies		Option PC 4	Object	General Comment	Do not entertain any further 'traffic calming' measures such as the dangerous/expensive version in Colehill. Re-allocate money to the surface quality of minor roads.			1389
501823	Mr and Mrs E A Osgood		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501867	Mrs I M Marks		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501873	Mr and Mrs Harold A and D Joan Lilley		Option PC 4	Object		All proposals of this nature have a number of basic needs. One of the most important is infrastructure. Subject to finance being available Canford Bottom Roundabout is to be drastically amended for the Olympic Games. The reference to "Improvements to Canford Bottom therefore appear to have been superseded. Since I cannot find any intention to improve the road network all these proposals will only add to our present problems and cannot be supported.			1389
501876	J Long		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501881	B W Deverill		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502022	Mr HWR Stevens		Option PC 4	Object		Dorset's villages and small towns should be preserved as such. So called "developers" are only concerned with profits. There'll always be an England? Not when it has been built over and occupied by strangers.			1389
502029	Mr J MacArthur		Option PC 4	Object					1389
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502041	Mrs M Franklin		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502059	Mr R Seddon		Option PC 4	Object					1389
502076	Kay Stead		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502092	Mr and Mrs A Watkinson		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502099	Carolyn Lourens		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502114	Mr P Foster		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		Option PC 4	Support					1389
502138	Mrs E Mason		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359598	Mr A KETCHLEY		Option PC 4	Support		Unfortunately whatever is finally decided on the following well known saying will occur: 'You can please some of the people all the time, You can please all of the people some of the time, But you cannot please all of the people all of the time!' I wish you well in whatever is decided. Some will see it as inevitable due to the area's population increases, whereas others will see it as a necessary evil, and some will accept it without question			1389
359977	Miss M.G. EARP		Option PC 4	Object					1389
361113	Mr Alan Meade		Option PC 4	Support		.I like the rate of affordable housing to private homes. We all know that there is a shortage. Jobs will be created, money brought in, good for all in East Dorset, Christchurch			1389
361123	Mr Iain STEVENSON		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		Option PC 4	Support					1389
501940	Mr M J Godfrey		Option PC 4	Support					1389
502224	Mr and Mrs Larcombe		Option PC 4	Support					1389
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502317	Cllr Peter Lucas		Option PC 4	Object		Blunts Farm and other development may be possible off a flyover if built at Canford Bottom roundabout area, otherwise, even with improvements to the roundabout traffic problems resulting from the development may be insurmountable.			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502322	Mrs J C Critchell		Option PC 4	Support					1389
502326	Mr and Mrs T Bennett		Option PC 4	Object		With more homes will need more employment, a vicious circle. Our roads are too busy now. We surely have enough community areas and centres.			1389
502333	B M Andrews		Option PC 4	Object		Make parents walk their children to school. Stop parents 4x4s, etc. Spend more money on our area. Council tax far too high and what benefits do we receive from the Parish Council?			1389
502345	Mr and Mrs Ray and Irene Coulson		Option PC 4	Support					1389
502347	Sarah Cobb		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502364	FD Peach		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502381	Mr Cyril Josey		Option PC 4	Support					1389
502387	Mr George Kilpatrick		Option PC 4	Support		I would like to see the justification for increased housing in East Dorset e.g., demographics, immigration, increased work opportunities etc. I would also like to understand how transport strategy (and infrastructure) is coordinated with this in such a way to make expansion sustainable.			1389
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		Option PC 4	Object					1389
502468	Robert Lambert		Option PC 4	Support					1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502492	M L Portugal		Option PC 4	Support		It is vital with any development that the local infrastructure can handle the influx. Concerns over health-care, and social services, parking etc which are already struggling to cope! Also what constitutes affordable housing in East Dorset?!			1389
502568	Sarah Morgan		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		Option PC 4	Support					1389
502570	Mr Samways		Option PC 4	Support					1389
502579	Mr & Mrs R L Thorne		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502595	Mr Colin House		Option PC 4	Object		All these developments will cause an impact on the local heathland and the proposals in all areas will cause road chaos on the A31, Ferndown, Parley and Wimborne. A new road structure is required before any development takes place.			1389
502596	A C Hayter		Option PC 4	Object					1389
502610	John Jackson		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502635	Mrs JS Brough		Option PC 4	Support					1389
502673	Mrs A Powell		Option PC 4	Object		The infrastructure in this area needs to be sorted out before anymore building goes ahead. There are times you cannot move on the roads. The area is being ruined with all this building works			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						that are already going on.			
502701	Mrs M Williams		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502708	Ms Julia Owen		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502745	Mrs J.M Kenny		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		Option PC 4	Object					1389
502921	Mr and Mrs L Forinton		Option PC 4	Support					1389
502935	Mr Roger Parker		Option PC 4	Object					1389
502999	Mrs Marion E Lock		Option PC 4	Object					1389
503022	Mr and Mrs D Money		Option PC 4	Object					1389
503156	Richard and Jackie Blunderfield		Option PC 4	Object		Also objected to in Options for Employment leaflet			1389
503171	Sally Cooke		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503183	B Chissell		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503250	Mrs Helen Poole		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503303	Mr Anthony Roberts		Option PC 4	Object					1389
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		Option PC 4	Support					1389
503347	Ms Hardwick		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
359873	Mrs M HUGHES		Option PC 4	Support					1389
359889	Mr and Mrs P CLARK		Option PC 4	Support		With any developments we would need to be assured that infrastructure improvements are in place BEFORE any development is consented to. This is particularly important with regard to public transport provisions. It is also important that feedback is forthcoming as an acknowledgement of our response to this survey.			1389
359920	S PARKER		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		Option PC 4	Support		1. I want to know the projected time scale for these options to start to become active. 2. It is most important that there is adequate employment to accommodate the houses to be built. 3. More attention must be made to supply of affordable housing. 4. The green belt must be respected where possible. 5. The estates around Wimborne must be consulted fully.			1389
360029	Mr		Option PC	Support		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Christchurch &			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	David LANIGAN		4			<p>East Dorset Core Strategy Document, Managing Growth and Development up to the year 2027. I agree with the preamble stating that we need to meet local housing needs, with the emphasis on growing the main settlements where we have good access to facilities that people require. Some development of smaller communities should continue however, especially the provision of low cost housing. The community as a whole, needs the services of teachers, nurses, firemen, postmen, and policemen who are poorly paid because they commit to a vocation rather than a high salary job. We also need the services of skilled people such as builders, electricians, plumbers, gas fitters, and motor mechanics, the essentially blue collar professionals. They must not be priced out of the market in terms of being able to buy a starter home, in the community that they serve.</p> <p>Having bought my first home in 1963, a two bedroom bungalow for £2,200 I am aware that locally such a property is currently one hundred times as much. This makes things difficult for young couples with the ratio of house prices to wages being the highest in the country. Many struggle with getting mortgages that now require typically a 25% deposit on an already expensive property.</p> <p>I moved to West Moors 15 years ago and appreciate the planning decisions that have taken place affecting this village. We now have a new build shopping centre on Station Road, complete with flats, good pavements, lighting, pelican crossing and trees. I am pleased to have seen built several small, three storey, blocks of retirement and two bed flats close to the village centre. I support the gradual expansion of the</p> <p>Village, current population around 7,500 as we have good schools, a large Memorial hall, Churches with halls, two public houses, doctors, dentists and good bus services to both Poole and Bournemouth. We have footpath access to open land such as Holt Heath, as well as being able to use the old railway line route through the village to Ringwood, - the Castleman Trail. Recently St Marys Church has had built a new Church Hall which will serve the community and thanks to the National Lottery grant we now have an excellent Bowling Club. I support the continued slow expansion of the village as currently we have many facilities for people of all ages to enjoy.</p> <p>My current house was built in the mid 70s, and has trebled in value since my wife and I moved here 15 years ago. In the 1970s West</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						Moors doubled in size and acquired new schools and since then other infrastructure improvements. In recent years the Library was refurbished. The facilities for retirees in West Moors, with access to Ferndown and Verwood, are very good, and coupled with excellent hospitals at Poole, Bournemouth and Wimborne, and I have felt no need to move from East Dorset area in the conceivable future. I therefore support the proposals for additional housing as outlined in the Core Strategy Consultation, as well as the proposals for business sites for employment. I also support provisions for new schools particularly a new Secondary School at Verwood, and recreation areas to cater for the population increase. I understand that net immigration into Dorset is running at two thousand people a year so clearly we need to plan for housing, jobs, education, recreation, road improvements especially at busy junctions, and off road car parking in town centres and on new housing estates. There are many reasons why East Dorset and Christchurch, are attractive places for people to live, work and retire to. Long term planning that caters for the needs of a steady population increase is sensible and is to be welcomed.			
360095	Mr & Mrs John & Barbara POLKINGHORN		Option PC 4	Support					1389
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		Option PC 4	Support					1389
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E HACK		Option PC 4	Support					1389
361105	Mr John	Also member of Colehill	Option PC 4	Object					1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	GOOCH	Parish Council							
503024	Valerie Measey		Option PC 4	Object					1389
503306	Ian and Freda Hancock		Option PC 4	Object					1389
503355	Mr Robert Griffiths		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503358	H C Hoare		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503421	Mr Geof Haywood		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503444	R Hobbs		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503476	Mrs AM Hawkins		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		Option PC 4	Support					1389
503527	Claire Smith		Option PC 4		No Opinion	Apportion part of employment land options to housing of all categories for potential employees at these locations thereby reducing transport needs.			1389
503598	Mr John Turner		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503603	Mrs DJ		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Morley								
503621	A G Haines		Option PC 4	Support		As I'm sure you are perfectly aware, all developments I have ticked require serious consideration to the whole road network in the areas concerned.			1389
503624	Mr RT Jackson		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503635	Mr J Gough		Option PC 4	Support					1389
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		Option PC 4	Object		The A31 is already over-saturated with regular gridlock on Friday/Saturday without major redevelopment (min 2 lane dual carriageway from Ferndown industrial estate to Tolpuddle) it is incapable of taking any more traffic. Wimborne, Ferndown and Parley cross- we object to more building on green field sites Parley Cross area is already over-saturated with traffic and is incapable of taking any more. The entire East Dorset area already been over-developed versus other areas of the country. It does not have the transport, social, educational. etc resources for any more.			1389
503640	N J and S A White		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503644	Mr J Riley		Option PC 4	Object					1389
503659	Mr JD Jenkins		Option PC 4	Object					1389
503687	Mr Nick Smith		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		Option PC 4	Object					1389
503709	Mr and Mrs A Fairclough		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503759	Mr D.J. Middleton		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		Option PC 4	Support					1389
503861	Mr E Hawkins		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503878	Mr Peter Smith		Option PC 4	Object					1389
503879	Mr S Smithson		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
503943	Mr & Mrs Rumball		Option PC 4	Object					1389
504093	Mr & Mrs Vivian		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
504101	Mrs Mary Trevis-Bell		Option PC 4	Object					1389
504285	Mr P Miller		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
504314	Ms Selina Roper		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
505273	Mrs Lorraine Hubbard		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
505288	Mrs S Cramer		Option PC 4	Support	General Comment	As a married mother of 3 children, 2 girls and 1 boy, living in a 2 bed Council flat (first floor), I welcome more housing to the Wimborne area for young families needing affordable housing / rented housing.			1389
505320	Mrs M Puttick		Option PC 4	Object		PC 4 - Increased local traffic would have a hugely negative impact			1389
361037	Mr P STRATFORD		Option PC 4	Object		I expect that my objection to everything is not very practical. However, I have lived in the area for most of the last fifty years. In that time there has been a constant cycle of the council saying we need more housing, followed by we need more industrial areas to provide extra jobs for all the new homes. Then in turn the council says we require extra jobs for the new homes, then in turn the council says we require extra homes for the new workers. This process is never ending. During this time I've witnessed the creation and expansion of the industrial estates at Ferndown, Uddens, Ebblake and Wimborne. A whole new housing estate at Tricketts Cross, Glenmoor Rd Ferndown, the expansion of West Moors, Colehill, Verwood turned from sleepy village into a town. In this time I am not aware of any developed area being returned to its natural state from a developed one. Please let me know if you think differently. I hope you agree that my objection to development is rational and that the never ending cycle of expansion is stopped.			1389
475526	Mr Geoffrey Dark		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary		Option PC 4	Object		The Green Belt should stay Green.			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Hendy								
498775	Mrs P L Buckler		Option PC 4	Object					1389
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
505369	J Young		Option PC 4	Object					1389
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		Option PC 4	Object	General Comment	Building more houses has NOTHING to do with meeting the needs of (existing) local residents. We do not need or want more houses in our area. Planning to build more houses is driven by the 'need' to meet externally imposed quotas based on false assumptions on the desirability of further population and economic growth. Instead of wasting resources on building more housing which is ecologically unsustainable, we should be using them to make a transition to a low energy sustainable future for our children. Please listen to local residents and reject further development.			1389
505523	Mr & Mrs A Turner		Option PC 4	Object					1389
505561	Mr. D. Calvert		Option PC 4	Object					1389
505590	M Spalding		Option PC 4	Object					1389
505656	Mr Dave Evans		Option PC 4	Object					1389
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
505760	J Evans		Option PC 4	Object					1389
505802	Mr RGH Chapman		Option PC 4	Object					1389
506116	Mr and Mrs P and SJ Simpson		Option PC 4	Object					1389
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		Option PC 4	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			1389
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		Option PC 4	Support					1389
506754	Mr Derek E Marsh		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
507026	Mr David Craig		Option PC 4	Object	General Comment	I would like to see priority given to projects which have a higher concentration of social housing inclusion, and also include a higher green/renewable energy provision. Particular concentration on family areas, playgrounds and social/community facilities should be considered.			1389
507032	Mr David Oliver		Option PC 4	Support					1389
507033	A R Twaits		Option PC 4	Support	General Comment	Despite improvements to public transport, cycling and walking, the reality is that the vast majority of journeys will continue to be made by car. Local roads are already congested and the extent of development proposed is not acceptable without significant increases in the capacity of these roads for cars. In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507070	Mr and Mrs Earwicker		Option PC 4	Support		The 3 sites we support have good main road access although Horton Road/Ringwood Road would need updating for Woolsbridge. The A31 behind Blunts Farm needs to be dual carriageway all the way from the Lidl roundabout to Canford Bottom roundabout. Access to any industrial estate in Blunts Farm should be from the A31 not via Uddens Estate.			1389
507218	Mr and Mrs J Smith		Option PC 4	Object					1389
507286	Mr N P Butler		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
507336	Mr John Page		Option PC 4	Support					1389
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
507388	Mr David Huggins		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
507474	Mark and Jean Cording		Option PC 4	Object		<p>1) We are still due a correctment in housing prices, housing benefits have artificially underpinned the bubble. The so called shortage of housing is also caused by breaking up of the family unit (teenagers and young people do not need their own homes)</p> <p>2) The Green Belt must be protected, a temporary supposed need would and could not be reversed. There are hundreds of brown sites which could be utilised, without the need for more disruptive and expensive infrastructures.</p> <p>3) Green Belt land was created to protect open land between and around developments. We anticipated development and councils</p>			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						saying they need more land, it was and is vital so please do not change the policy. Times change, needs change, populations (immi and emigration) demands disappear but green land cannot be replaced.			
507524	Mr C G Richardson		Option PC 4	Support					1389
507555	Mr and Mrs C Lamond		Option PC 4	Object					1389
507572	GJ Pettifer		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
507595	Mr D Johnson		Option PC 4	Support					1389
507652	Mrs Isabel Brooks		Option PC 4	Object		My objections to the grey area (employment land options) above are because enough land, brownfield sites, on existing industrial estates will suffice for more businesses! Again, the green belt is under stress for biodiversity.			1389
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
507693	Mrs P Carter		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
507760	Mr and Mrs R Gardner		Option PC 4	Object					1389
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		Option PC 4	Support					1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507800	Mrs K M Platt		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
507980	Sylvia Allen		Option PC 4	Support					1389
508383	Ms Emma Hayter		Option PC 4	Support					1389
508413	Mrs S Best		Option PC 4	Object					1389
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		Option PC 4	Object		The Council is always after land for housing or business development. Whatever is granted is never enough and a few years later they want more. This process has been going on for over 50 years and it is time it came to a stop. Enough is enough as it is ruining the area.			1389
508852	Mrs L.A. Chesshire		Option PC 4	Object					1389
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		Option PC 4	Support					1389
508928	Mr D.W. Lonsdale		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
509065	Mrs B Burge		Option PC 4	Support					1389
360097	Mr John DOWLING		Option PC 4	Object					1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361121	Mrs Elizabeth JONES		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
361161	Mr Douglas FORWARD		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
361184	Mr S MOON		Option PC 4	Object		In most situations I will object to the build of additional housing / business premises, as I do not believe that other options have first been considered or if not possible 'today' are being pursued for the longer term. For example, 1) There are many properties, particularly in Dorset, which are second homes and for most of the year are empty. Action needs to be taken to make these available for renting / purchase as even today, let alone the future, houses are unoccupied, for whatever reason, is not an option. (I would support legislation.) Empty properties also need to be addressed. 2) The development of "brownfield" sites, even if these may not be profitable as other options or as desirable to live or work. 3) Thinking outside the box or in this case outside the areas of this Strategy Consultation. Dorset is not alone in having to address these issues and we need to have some "joined up thinking" with other authorities to see if there are joint opportunities. In this respect Hamworthy Engineering buildings have been empty for many years but do not appear to be in anyone's options.			1389
510420	Mr Peter Stevens		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		Option PC 4	Object					1389
510532	W.W. Chant		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
510623	Mr Douglas		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Priest								
510798	Mr F Sullivan		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
510844	Mr Michael Guilmany-Cush		Option PC 4	Support		It was rather cheeky of you not to provide mapping of the Employment land options sites. I had to consult an OS map.			1389
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R. Mayes		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
510974	Mr Jim Cullumbine		Option PC 4	Support					1389
510993	R.A. Cherrett		Option PC 4	Support					1389
511015	Mr Christopher White		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
511076	Mr Ian Burden		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
511219	Ms Kathleen Smith		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and Diana Froud		Option PC 4	Support					1389
511430	A.D. May		Option PC 4	Object					1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511489	Mr H G Holden		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
511571	Colin Alborough		Option PC 4	Support		We are in desperate need of more affordable housing in the East Dorset area. There is also a shortage of employment opportunities in the area. The provision of more houses should help to push house prices down to give young people a change of getting on the property ladder.			1389
511618	Mrs V Blunden		Option PC 4	Support					1389
511621	Ms Mary A Combe		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
511711	Coombes		Option PC 4	Support					1389
511747	Mr T W Tonge		Option PC 4	Support					1389
360002	Mr Mike BARTLETT		Option PC 4	Support		Very well set out in booklet and well thought out proposals. Speed is the essence - I have 3 children in need!			1389
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
361196	Mr J.M BULLIVANT		Option PC 4	Support					1389
476264	Mr David Reddaway		Option PC 4	Support					1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
491252	Margaret Wareham		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
507899	R J Potts		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
511639	Paul Hockey		Option PC 4	Object					1389
512281	Graham Roberts		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
512326	Mr Ian Willis		Option PC 4		No Opinion	Not sure where this is.			1389
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A Kirby		Option PC 4	Object					1389
513692	Mrs A Willis		Option PC 4	Support					1389
513881	Mrs S Bagg		Option PC 4	Support		By ticking 'SUPPORT BOXES' I am not actively supporting the locations but, if we must have so much development, making the best of a bad job. We must not spoil the area by over development. More houses only bring more people to our already over crowded area. Local houses for local people, yes, but how can that be ensured?			1389
513900	Mr P Wall		Option PC 4	Object		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed e.g. road improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			1389
513954	Mr RW Heseltine		Option PC 4	Support					1389
513966	Mr and Mrs Howard		Option PC 4	Support					1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
513974	Mr A Moore		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
514039	Mrs R Doman		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
514049	Mrs E Hellier		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
514091	Mr RJ Potts		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
514099	Mr and Mrs T C Blakeley		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
514111	Penelope Webiery		Option PC 4	Object					1389
514136	Mrs J Crumb		Option PC 4	Object					1389
514225	Mr Simon Dixon	Secretary West Moors Traders Association	Option PC 4	Support					1389
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon Chaffey		Option PC 4	Object					1389
514274	Mr Showell		Option PC 4	Object		Instead of new housing there should be a new strategy of providing more public open space. The lessons of the Edwardians/Victorians should be learnt. New public parks like Poole Park, Queens Park and Kings Park save an			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						area from urban crowding. Perhaps all the land proposed for housing could be reallocated to public parks.			
514355	Mr T Gee		Option PC 4	Object					1389
514379	Mrs Denise Bannister		Option PC 4	Object					1389
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option PC 4	Object		DWT object to this option. Land here is in the Green Belt and is currently farmland likely to support protected species and habitats of biodiversity interest. This option should be informed by a biological survey. We have concerns over the protection of the Ferndown Bypass SNCI (SU00/60), dry and wet heathland which would need significant buffering, as indicated for the north and west) and ,through pollution of the water environment, concerns over potential impacts on Uddens Heath SSSI and the Moors River catchment and SSSI. The protection of all these and protected species should be a pre-requisite for development, with a need for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems. We also have concerns over impacts of light pollution from a development, disturbance due to noise, and provision of road access. The site has potential to be restored to heathland connecting with the SNCI and SSSI to the east. This would be a significant opportunity to make biodiversity enhancements, not just to the land itself but through reducing the isolation and fragmentation of the designated sites.			1389
359477	Ms Natasha Mackenzie	Clerk Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council	Option PC 4	Object	General Comment	The proposed additional housing and employment areas will therefore only increase the traffic problems at Ringwood and thus on the roads in our Parish, especially on the B3081, A338 and Linwood Road if the A31 is blocked. The junction at Bakers Hanging will also become even more saturated. The Parish Council agree that these developments should only go ahead if road improvements at Bakers Hanging and the junction of the A338 and A31 are carried out.			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359916	JB Cossins		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
360626	Mr Frank Miller	Chair Person Sturminster Marshall Affordable Housing Self Build Homes Group	Option PC 4	Object		We have more than plenty sites empty which need filling so why build more factory units? Get the rates down which will allow empty units to be let. Alter the big units into smaller one / two type units. Drive out and look. Please stop doing desk top plans. I would love to help in putting forward real working plans instead of dreams. Please live in the real world.			1389
361014	Mr Peter Hammond		Option PC 4	Support		Redevelopment of Canford Bottom roundabout will require, as a minimum, a flyover for the A31.			1389
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		Option PC 4	Object		<p>I object again to the size of this development and it's encroachment into Uddens. It is virtually adjacent to the other industrial areas of Ferndown (which is good) but there are quite a number of units still empty on these sites and have been since they were built. So why is it necessary to build more?</p> <p>Two last paragraphs from my letter of 29th April 2008.</p> <p>To return to my original point, I do not believe that this level of development is necessary, justified, sustainable, or desirable for this part of East Dorset and I feel EDDC is being railroaded into accepting the strategy simply in order to satisfy Government broad housing targets irrespective of their relevance to the locality. I have felt for some years now that East Dorset is continually being sacrificed in order to preserve what may be seen by some as more open countryside further west in the county and which has greater protection from conservation laws and the National Trust.</p> <p>Wimborne, Colehill, West Parley , and Corfe Mullen are still separately identifiable villages surrounded by agricultural land; they are not part of the big conurbations such as Poole and Bournemouth and they should be respected as being different and treated differently. I understand the difficulty EDDC might well have with these strategy documents and I'm sure they will do their best for the area. However i would like to see the council standing up and really challenging the basic premises of this plan and propose much less development in the area based on real local need and not a notional level set essentially by Central Government.</p>			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
476792	Mr and Mrs Lomas		Option PC 4	Support		Could island be added to Ferndown Bypass, which should be modified in ? area to a dual carriageway. Can't Ferndown Industrial Estate be enlarged.			1389
481604	Mr Gerald Toomer		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
485695	Mr John Cornish		Option PC 4	Support		Please consider the provision of incubator offices and small workshops for businesses spawned out of the Bournemouth University and Executive Business Centre in Holdenhurst Road. Reference Site Chillworth Science Park. This could be sited off road in North Dorset, say Sixpenny Handley to improve local economy.			1389
496996	Mr Hayward		Option PC 4	Support					1389
500746	Mrs J Lothian		Option PC 4	Object		Traffic is already horrendous from estate exits.			1389
500817	Mr L Lothian		Option PC 4	Object		Already too much traffic on the roads which are in poor condition after 2 years of frosts.			1389
508562	K Clayson		Option PC 4	Object					1389
508993	Mr A Samways		Option PC 4	Support					1389
509795	Mr R Ridley		Option PC 4	Support					1389
511761	Mr G Burge		Option PC 4	Support					1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
513651	Mrs W Pearsall		Option PC 4	Support		1. Improved public transport to these employment sites. 2. Business centres for starting business with full back office support. 3. Tax breaks to encourage businesses to move to our area. 4. Subsidised training for all age groups in starting up and running a business. 4. Part time apprenticeship training for all age groups.			1389
514467	Mrs Lesley Cripps		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
514482	C E T Gilbert		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		Option PC 4	Object					1389
514674	Mrs J Williams		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
514752	Claire Richardson & Jamie Shirley		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
514812	Mr C Sawyer		Option PC 4	Object					1389
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		Option PC 4	Object		Seeking the opinion of the general public on planning issues is all very commendable - but setting aside all political persuasion my feeling is that this is no more than a Public Relations exercise because in the end the final decisions are always to the advantage of the developers whoever they may be because of money, greed and looks good on paper.			1389
514913	Mr and Mrs M Clark		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514939	D Porter		Option PC 4	Object		Many industrial units are empty why do need more?			1389
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		Option PC 4	Object		The area is already over-developed and congested - further development on the scales proposed would lead to deterioration of the environment and a reduction in the quality of life. I am particularly dismayed by continued threats to the Green Belt, especially as this Government pledged to protect it. I do not believe that such massive development is necessary or beneficial to the vast majority of inhabitants. Pressure on our area should be reduced by Government tackling such issues as population growth through immigration control and regeneration of brownfield sites in Midlands and North. There is a need for limited affordable and social housing locally, but not more executive homes. It is wrong to build new homes while second homes and investment properties continue to exist.			1389
515033	Mr T Crump		Option PC 4	Object		These proposals are typical of the failures contrived by Council and Consultants to address short term solutions to Government edict. Fundamental to any significant further development is the need for joined up thinking for transportation. All of these proposals further the burden on traffic flow through and around conurbation centres. These major roads are the responsibility of the government highways department. They should foot the bill for their improvements prior to further development. Some of these proposals virtually adjoin 100 instance flood lines. This is totally unacceptable. Any proposal to move allotments, away from the housing that uses them, increases road usage and has a negative impact on the community.			1389
515287	Mr L Jackson		Option PC 4	Support		The A31 trunk road from Ferndown by-pass should be widened to form a dual carriageway all the way through to Bere Regis.			1389
515367	Mr & Mrs J		Option PC 4	Object		Please save the Green Belt			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Pottinger								
515479	Mr D Lenehan		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
515763	Mr V S Harris		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
515788	J M May		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
516313	Mr Julian Humphries		Option PC 4	Object		PC 4 is on green land. Use PC7 first.			1389
517528	Dr Susan Burton		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
517835	Mr G D Rodrigues		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
518027	Mr J Talbot		Option PC 4	Object					1389
359482	Ms Helen POWELL	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	Option PC 4	Object		Parts of this site have a significant nature conservation importance with the known presence of both Smooth snake and Sand lizard. Our opinion on this option will therefore be shaped by the strength of mitigation proposals to protect, enhance and expand the habitats of protected European protected species in this location. This option could be detrimental to the water environment of the heathland European site, Ramsar site and SSSI at Uddens Heath and the Moors River System SSSI further downstream. However, the site is of a size that could incorporate green infrastructure of sufficient scale to remove this detriment and contribute towards lessening the detriment to water environment from part of the existing industrial estates. The option detail is silent on road			1389

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>access. Detriment to the designated sites at Uddens Heath should be avoided. A short road crossing on the western edge of this site, compensated by removal of the existing local distributor road that divides up the heathland may be acceptable. Our opinion, if this option is taken forward into the Draft Submission Core Strategy, will therefore be shaped by the strength of policy on green infrastructure as an integral part of the development and road access.</p> <p>The following requirements for green infrastructure are essential: Provision of a comprehensive package of Sustainable Urban Drainage solutions. The SUDs should both ameliorate flood volumes to the designated sites and reduce and clean water of poor quality from urban surfaces and drainage thereby protecting against a deterioration of water quality in these sites. Drainage of the development should not be dependant on existing drainage capacity in Uddens Heath. The historical drainage modifications carried out in this heathland wetland need to be ameliorated as they preclude recovery of designated wetland habitats to favourable condition.</p>			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	Option PC 4	Object		<p>Given that most of the proposed employment-related development will be in close proximity to the designated sites, the Core Strategy must demonstrate that this development can be accommodated without adverse effects on the European sites.</p> <p>There is uncertainty as to where this deployment will be exactly focused, however given the broad locations identified, scrutiny for possible adverse effects on European sites will be necessary. We object to option KS13 and options PC4, PC5, PC7, PC8, PC9, PC13 and PC14 pending resolution of outstanding issues identified in the HRA in relation to the European sites.</p>			1389
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		Option PC 4	Object		<p>The Moors River system, including the River Crane, Ebblake Stream and Uddens Water has already been subject to excessive development within its catchment including the establishment of a number of very ill advised employment/industrial estates. It has suffered severely from all the above impacts resulting in temporary or permanent losses to biodiversity. Continued development within the catchment, especially in close proximity to its water courses, and particularly of employment/industrial development, is wholly inappropriate. Preferred options in the Core Strategy most</p>			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						obviously impinging on the Moors River system and its corridor include KS3/ PC7 (St Leonards Hospital), KS4 (Woodland Walk), VM 1,2,3 and 4 (Verwood), PC4 (Blunts Farm), and PC 5 (Woolsbridge).			
359891	Mrs Susanne Parkin		Option PC 4	Support		There should be more places of employment nearer to existing housing - this should be small units and sites. To enlarge existing sites is not very sustainable in terms of traffic - it is foolish to exacerbate existing bad traffic conditions as we have at present e.g. the A31 at peak time from the Ferndown Industrial Estate. Villages surrounding the conurbation should all support a degree of employment and industry.			1389
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	Option PC 4	Object		<p>The 4.5 acre farmland and buildings on this site is currently on the market. According to the current FC plans, their conifer plantation section of the site is due to be felled in 2047. Their proposals for the land as part of the Open Habitats restoration policy (Felling and Habitat Management map, 30.3.2009) included restoration and maintenance of heathland and management of two areas of wet woodland through removal of non-native species. This accords with the RSPB maps which indicate that there is indeed high potential for heathland restoration here with linkages to the SNCI and SSSI. This option would thus thwart agreed plans for significant biodiversity protection and enhancement.</p> <p>Surface water drainage from this site is to the Uddens Water and thence Moors River posing an ever present threat of accidental pollution.</p> <p>As with all industrial sites, the risk of light pollution is high. Precise lighting specifications should be drawn up as part of planning consent.</p> <p>In his report on the Bournemouth, Dorset &amp; Poole Waste Local Plan, March 2005, the Inspector said,</p> <p>13.14.8 Although unremarkable in its appearance in terms of landscape or natural beauty, the land contributes significantly, and in my view importantly, to Green Belt openness at this location. It serves as a natural buffer between the employment land and the A31.</p> <p>13.14.9 The development would consequently prejudice a purpose of including land within the Green Belt, intrude deep into the Green Belt, and would severely reduce its openness.</p>			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						No reasons have been put forward in the Core Strategy Options for this to change.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	Option PC 4	Support		<p>The Core Strategy Options for Consideration identifies a number of major employment opportunities which are located close to the A31 corridor, including the largest at Ferndown (Option PC4). The Agency recognises the role of Ferndown as the leading employment centre in the district and confirms that further growth in this area, as envisaged under Option PC4, should be assessed at the strategic level through the SEDMMT model. Option PC7 at St Leonard's Hospital is of particular concern to the Agency due to its direct access on to the A31. Detailed Transport Assessments would also be required at the appropriate stage.</p> <p>The Agency endorses the identification of transport improvements required, given in respect of Ferndown and other locations, which include upgrading of the A31 Canford bottom junction and preparation of comprehensive travel plans including public transport measures. The Agency looks forward to contributing to the progression of the development briefs proposed for the major employment sites.</p>			1389
521337	Christine Charlesworth		Option PC 4	Object		<p>Detailed local planning matters have always, naturally, been the responsibility of local authorities, but in the past planning strategies been responsive to local conditions set within the wider social and financial framework. A good deal of guesswork is normally involved in these processes, but whenever government at any level has sought artificially to skew the commercial, industrial, demographic or financial base, the result has been a disaster. In the present case one suspects that the guesses are misguided and the rationale is wrong. The proposed amount of new commercial and industrial development does not match the volume of new housing stock. The danger is that Wimborne will expand its existing role as an outlier/dormitory for Poole and Bournemouth, without sufficient local opportunities. Simply building a new industrial estate will not, in itself, cause an improvement in local employment opportunities. The background (national and international) financial situation will be the governing factor. Likewise, building affordable housing to accommodate the theoretical new workers in their theoretical new jobs will not solve any problem.</p> <p>Current recession conditions cannot be overcome by putting up a</p>			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						few new buildings and a mass of new housing to accommodate the theoretical future workers. Nor should we seek to build a major new commercial enterprise artificially. The likes of 'Flight Refuelling', local farming enterprises and ancillary operations, local growers' initiatives and other commercial ventures within the town grew up 'organically' in response to prevailing circumstances - not because local planners decided that they would be there. The proposed industrial/commercial development for Wimborne is remote from the majority of the new housing. In reality, even assuming that new ventures do indeed take up the new space, it is unlikely that many of the workforce will walk or cycle to this site. Its creation will add pressure to an already over-pressed local roads network.			
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		Option PC 4	Support					1389
524495	Mr Stanley Jackson		Option PC 4	Support		Attention needs to be concentrated on keeping and ideally increasing the number of younger people in the area, through providing additional employment opportunities, affordable or low-cost housing to purchase and an increase in rented accommodation. I would therefore support all attempts PC4 -PC9 to locate more employment land options.			1389
524723	Mr John Worth	Chair Wimborne Civic Society	Option PC 4	Support		Attention needs to be concentrated on keeping and ideally increasing the number of younger people in the area, through providing additional employment opportunities, affordable or low-cost housing to purchase and an increase in rented accommodation. We would therefore support all attempts (PC4 to PC6) to locate more employment land options.			1389
489765	Derek KEAREY		Option PC 4	Object					1389
490854	D MUTTON		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
507361	Mr Kenneth		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Archer								
507737	Mrs S Philpot		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
523366	Mr Raymond Silverthorne		Option PC 4	Support	General Comment	<p>We would strongly recommend the Council to pursue the idea of developing Blunts Farm. This site with its 20 hectares of land adjoining the existing Estate and the A31 whilst being far enough away from Housing to not cause undue disturbance makes it very desirable. The location of the Estate next to the A31 is excellent and because of this it has great potential to attract needed Business into the area.</p> <p>Our recommended plan of action is –</p> <p>1 – Improve the existing Estates infrastructure and signage. Bringing it up to the standard of 2011.</p> <p>2 – Free up the Blunts Farm site for development.</p> <p>3 - Carry out road improvements at Canford Bottom and “dual” the A31 from Ferndown to Merley.</p> <p>4 – Allocate a portion of land by the Ameysford Roundabout entrance to the Estate for a “Premier Inn” style hotel with an adjoining Conference facility to be used by local businesses. This Hotel would draw revenue from passing travellers along the A31 and provide useful accommodation for visiting Business personnel.</p> <p>5 – Local Bus companies to be encouraged to commence serving the Estate and the new Hotel, providing rapid public transport links to the Airport, Railways and Nearby Town Centres.</p> <p>6 – Blunts Farm to then be promoted to London &amp; Home Counties “Blue Chip” companies as a prime target for a regional HQ. Locally we have the natural environment to entice people to live in the area and if we can promote Blunts Farm as being the ideal location for large Business, with its excellent road links to the West and to London, along with the proximity of Bournemouth Airport and the Channel Port then we will attract new companies to the area.</p> <p>Part of the Blunts Farm site to be allocated for supporting services for the Estate such as a Children’s Nursery and “Breakout Areas”</p> <p>6 – Incoming Businesses to be encouraged to form links with Ferndown Upper School and Bournemouth University to cultivate useful local employees and provide a “future” for local young people.</p>			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						Blunts Farm is an ideal choice for large scale development with its excellent location and good potential for sustainable transport connections.			
527501	Eve Thompson		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
527661	W Barnes		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		Option PC 4	Object					1389
527863	A Barratt		Option PC 4	Object					1389
534820	Paul Batten		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
534833	Frederick Wall		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
534837	Mrs P Martin		Option PC 4		No Opinion	Horses need grazing land. No infrastructure in place for the total number of homes planned. I do not go out between 8.00 and 9.30 am and 3.00pm and 6.30pm because of the traffic on the roads now.			1389
534875	Brian Lane		Option PC 4	Support					1389
534914	Mrs P Froud		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535070	Mr Alan Reade		Option PC 4	Object					1389
535094	MS Tracey		Option PC 4	Object		I am very concerned about increased housing in W Parley, the traffic is horrendous around here so much that at weekends and			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Tucker					bank holidays I try not to go out and to travel into work at the wrong time is just a nightmare. Additional traffic is just not needed. With regards the industrial development at Blunts Farm, there is no much empty office and factory space on Ferndown Ind estate, why is more needed at Uddens? I keep my horse in Uddens Drive and entrance to the ind estate is so dangerous with the size of the lorries coming into Uddens drive both for drivers and horse riders. I am surprised there has not been a serious accident or death there. The A31 does not need any additional traffic, any proposed ind development should be subject to access being made through Ferndown ind estate and not Uddens drive			
535112	Mr Jack Tindall		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535167	Lynda Lake		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535170	Ms Sharon Coomes		Option PC 4	Object					1389
535173	Mr Andrew Robins		Option PC 4	Support					1389
535209	Mr P Webster		Option PC 4	Object		Please liaise with NFDC and NPA, as the additional traffic generated by the extra housing and employment zones will increase the traffic problems at the already congested bottleneck at Ringwood and cause yet more problems for the people who live in New Forest hamlets such as Linwood, Brook and Burley as motorists try to find alternative routes. Can the New Forest take any more pressure from additional numbers of visitors? Has Dorset got enough sand and gravel in the land bank to meet the needs of the developers? Can you force Tarmac to start mining gravel by the Spur Road near Hurn? What will happen to the pollution levels close to the trunk roads e.g. at Ringwood, especially particulate pollution? Can Bournemouth Water meet the increased demands for water?			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535349	P Thomas		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		Option PC 4	Object		I think that this whole core strategy consultation needs a full review in light of the proposed changes being brought in under the new government. I particularly object to all the proposed Verwood development as the infrastructure is not in place to support the current population let alone adding even further to it by building a further 400 homes. Any EDDC councillor who has the affront to say that the infrastructure is in place to support this development does not know what they are talking about and obviously do not live in the town.			1389
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		Option PC 4	Object		The document correctly underlines the importance of the Dorset Heathlands. However it is essential to note that at this stage there is no evidence to support the theory that development of SANGs will actually sufficiently alleviate unacceptable pressure on the Dorset Heathlands. Indeed what evidence there is indicates that the approach is unlikely to be fully successful. Yet the Core Strategy is based on the assumption that the approach will work, and there is even a detectable implication that the Dorset Heathlands actually need income generated from further development to be protected and managed! This is a gross distortion of the concept of SANGs. Actually SE Dorset cannot continue to accept open ended growth without damage to heathland and the now apparently universal approach of tacking on an area of SANG to every new development on the basis that it protects, or even somehow enhances heathland biodiversity, is extremely worrying. Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously having damaging implications for heathlands, be they SSSIs or SNCIs, include KS3, KS4 (Coopers Lane south), VWM4 and VMW7. There is a commitment to restore and link heathland within south-east Dorset and areas most suitable for such restoration have been identified. There are options within the CS which would preclude such beneficial restoration including KS3/ PC7, PC4, and PC5.			1389
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		Option PC 4	Object		The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options.</p> <p>However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported.</p> <p>This site comprises SNCI heathland, conifer plantation with residual and potential heathland interest and grassland of currently unknown interest. The whole site drains into the Uddens Water and hence the Moors River. Thus even if the SNCI heathland itself is not directly damaged, this is not a happy choice for employment expansion in that it poses an additional threat to the water quality of the Uddens Water and Moors River, and will permanently remove the opportunity for useful heathland restoration/expansion leaving the SNCI more vulnerable and permanently isolated. There may also be a loss of grassland biodiversity since that potential interest is currently unknown.</p> <p>In summary all these three employment options are objectionable for similar biodiversity reasons – threat to the Moors River system, loss of opportunity for heathland restoration and actual or potential loss of grassland. It is also argued above that promotion of employment land is a key factor in our housing conundrum. The case is therefore made for the deletion of these 3 sites and if</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						absolutely necessary, allocation of a more modest and more thoughtfully placed site.			
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		Option PC 4	Support					1389
498446	W A Murphy		Option PC 4	Support					1389
533834	Mr Tim Harris		Option PC 4	Object					1389
535387	Mr Brian Cox		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535393	Jeremy Berg		Option PC 4	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			1389
535421	Mr Roland Andrews		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535457	Mr Matthew Newman		Option PC 4	Object					1389
535500	David Veevers		Option PC 4	Object					1389
535504	Mr Michael Beer		Option PC 4	Support					1389
535509	Mrs S Durant		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535517	Roy Rich		Option PC 4	Object					1389
535547	Mr M Folland		Option PC 4	Support					1389
535567	Ms Judy McMath		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535550	Mrs D Mogg		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		Option PC 4	Support					1389
535591	A Walker		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535670	Dave Allen		Option PC 4	Object					1389
535678	Andrew Bryant		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535688	Susan Hobbs		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535701	Mr Andy Skeats		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535718	Richard Green		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535815	Mrs C M Davies		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535836	Peter Parsons		Option PC 4	Support					1389
535865	Darren Charles Bryson		Option PC 4	Support					1389
535875	John Kitchenside		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		Option PC 4	Object		The majority of residents in this area relocated because of the permanent despoiling of their places of birth by elected local and national 'representatives' who would not listen or care about the needs of the people that voted for them. Do you want to be remembered as the people who finally ruined this area or the people who saved it. Do not forget that people still visit this area as tourists and we welcome them and accept their contribution to the local economy. They will stop coming if the developments continue. How many tourists visit the outer London sprawl? Can I quote p227 from the Core Strategy Options paper - para 11.28 The Government's key housing policy is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. This is an impossible dream that can never and will never, be fulfilled. If the developments did go ahead what would be the effect of another 5000 cars on our local roads be ? If Morrisons developments go ahead where are the customers going to park? The parking within Verwood is just about adequate at the moment.			1389
536014	Mrs Dawn Tindall		Option PC 4	Support					1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536046	L Appleton		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
536050	Mr Andrew Collin		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
536169	Mr Tony Trewiss-Bell		Option PC 4	Support					1389
360768	Cllr. Mr David Packer	Colehill West Ward East Dorset District Council	Option PC 4	Support					1389
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny PEARCE		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
475508	Mr and Mrs Marshall		Option PC 4	Object		We live in West Parley and the transport infrastructure (especially along Hurn Road, Christchurch Road, Ringwood Road and New Road) is already struggling to support the volume of daily traffic. There are always hold-ups along Hurn Road (by the airport), which will become more frequent once the traffic lights are installed at the junction into the airport (being done at present). Longham Bridge and the bends through Longham along Ringwood Road is a notoriously dangerous stretch of road, which is not helped by the ever increasing amount of heavy lorries which use it as a 'short cut' to Poole Ferry Terminal instead of using the Wimborne by-pass because that is also not up to the task, being single carriageway and having both Merley & Canford Bottom roundabouts unable to cope with the shear volume of traffic coming onto them. New Road (which is the main route in & out of Bournemouth for local people) also struggles with traffic, especially during the rush hour periods. When absurd? We do not need developers trying to 'sweeten the			1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						pill' with new facilities at West Parley, which are not needed or wanted. I would much rather see the present shopping facilities at Parley Cross and the Children's park by the Memorial Hall improved for the benefit of the local community. Small offices are not required - there are lots of such offices / industrial units in Ferndown which remain empty. We believe the impact of any development would detrimentally change the character of the village of West Parley and therefore do not support the proposed developments.			
475530	Mr George Phillips		Option PC 4	Object		You need to have a plan on how the infrastructure will be improved to support these housing and commercial developments before we decide on any housing or commercial developments. Infrastructure includes roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, etc. And for roads, I don't mean links from the developments to the existing roads. Everything round here is already overloaded. We need more bridges over the Stour, and a motorway link from Poole to the M27. Motorways north to the M4 and west to the M5 should also be built. These will take the load off the local roads round here. I also think we should only build decent homes. Everyone has to live somewhere, and they should have somewhere decent. It's the cost of land that drives up the cost of accommodation, and building land is expensive because it's in short supply.			1389
482494	Mrs Yvette Jones		Option PC 4	Object		Why would we want office buildings? Thousands lie empty. Expansion 'projects' smack of driven unnecessary waste and change for all the wrong reasons.			1389
484088	Mr David Price		Option PC 4	Support					1389
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		Option PC 4	Support		I			1389
498211	Mrs J AUCKLAND		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
498402	Mrs T Hughes		Option PC 4	Object		Re: Employment Land Options Whilst employment is obviously needed in the area, before building new sites please take a look around the existing industrial estates and see just how many units are empty. For example on Cobham Road on the Ferndown Ind Estate there are currently lots of 'To Let' boards. The traffic problems of the A31 need to be addressed before numerous new homes/businesses are built, throughout the summer routes through Ringwood/Ferndown/Wimborne become totally gridlocked. Whilst we can hope and encourage local people to use buses or cycle to work or for shopping, many of the cars coming into and through the area are driven by holidaymakers. With more people taking their holidays in the UK this problem is likely to get worse.			1389
508735	Mr Peter Barham		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
514507	Mr and Mrs C Macy		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		Option PC 4	Support					1389
536271	Mrs D Holt		Option PC 4	Object		No development should be supported within Green belt areas at all.			1389
536282	Mrs Doreen Kingaby		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
536324	Paul Sumner		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
536332	Emmanuelle Hutton		Option PC 4	Object					1389
536341	Adrian Bowyer		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536342	Lily Hutton		Option PC 4	Object					1389
536346	Mr Ben Richards		Option PC 4	Support					1389
536349	Mrs C Bowyer		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
536351	Mr John Hutton		Option PC 4	Object					1389
536449	Dave Isaacs		Option PC 4	Object					1389
536543	Samantha Fysh		Option PC 4	Support		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD.. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!			1389
536572	Roger Fysh		Option PC 4	Support		I strongly object to the proposal to increase the housing in and around Verwood. Verwood has been extensively developed over the years and there is inadequate services to support the extra cars and people. Also having seen the housing density of the Ebblake housing estate it is clear that agreeing to more housing will only create 'no go' areas in the very near future. I also note that in and around Wimborne there are huge areas of open land, which could easily be developed, especially between Ferndown and Wimborne which also has excellent road networks in place as it could immediately open onto the A31			1389
536628	Mr C.A Wills		Option PC 4	Support					1389
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		Option PC 4	Support					1389
536702	Mr		Option PC	Support					1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Mark Hirst		4						
536790	David Steadman		Option PC 4	Object					1389
536808	Ms Yvette Allen		Option PC 4	Object					1389
536812	R H Barker		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
536848	Ola Steadman		Option PC 4	Object					1389
536850	Mr Michael Hird		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
536866	Emma Huns		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
536930	Mrs Susannah Spencer		Option PC 4	Support		I also support Employment Options KS13 and BA1-11. For further crucial comments please see the PDF File "Response to EDDC Options for Wimborne and Colehill" emailed to Judy Windwood on 13th January 2011.			1389
536932	Paul Bason		Option PC 4	Support					1389
537050	Diane Fletcher		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
537075	Mrs Elaine Holt		Option PC 4	Object					1389

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
537106	C Hebditch		Option PC 4	Object					1389
537362	Peter Constable		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
537435	Ms Pauline Burton		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
537571	Nick and Marion Leatherdale		Option PC 4		No Opinion				1389
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter Griffiths		Option PC 4	Support		Support all proposals subject to the prerequisites are fully implemented BEFORE development starts or substantial monies are deposited by developers before development. This will safeguard Council Tax payers against any future failure for whatever reason the developers fails to carry out the prerequisites.			1389
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	15.29	Object		Option PC4- Both sites (01 and )& lie within Flood zone 1. The " areas susceptible to surface water flooding map" shows that both sites include areas which may be prone to surface water flooding.			1393
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		Option PC 5	Support		This option would provide employment for residents living in West Moors and Verwood. Great care though would need to be taken to avoid flood risk areas and environmentally sensitive areas. Also I am against greenbelt development			1394
361055	Mr David OAKLEY		Option PC 5	Support					1394
361111	Mr Raymond Brown		Option PC 5	Support					1394
491401	S Ost		Option PC 5	Support		The local roads, schools, hospitals would be unable to cope with extra movements of traffic and people coming into the area.			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
495562	Mr MJ Banting		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
495625	Mr Michael McMath		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
496188	Mr RE Vogel		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
496479	Charlotte Dixon		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
496564	JH Lockwood		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
496588	Mr and Mrs Richardson		Option PC 5	Object		The roads around Three Legged Cross are already congested with heavy goods vehicles coming off the A31 into Three Cross and Verwood via West Moors Road and Ringwood Road			1394
496612	Mr and Mrs JP Lovell		Option PC 5	Support					1394
496958	Mrs J Beech		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
360037	Mr Dave BARNES		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	Option PC 5	Object		At present, ARC would have to object to the southern most proposal area (05) due to its proximity to protected heathland habitats and the areas probability of already containing European Protected Species.			1394
361041	Mr & Mrs G K		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	HAMPTON								
361170	Mr TR HARVEY		Option PC 5	Support					1394
484088	Mr David Price		Option PC 5	Support					1394
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		Option PC 5	Support					1394
491311	Mr Kevin GILLING		Option PC 5	Support					1394
495971	T A Reith		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
497026	Doreen Smith		Option PC 5	Object		This amount of building will create extra traffic in Ferndown and Parley which already has a lot of road build up in the busy morning and evening travel. Also taking a lot of natural land for our wild life.			1394
497060	Mrs Mary Tuffrey		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
497184	Mr Hilling		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
497239	Martine Lewis		Option PC 5	Object					1394
497343	Sharon		Option PC	Support		If traffic lights/alternative measures were put into effect at Canford			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Sutcliffe		5			Bottom roundabout prior to development then I would support this development.			
497773	R Johnstone		Option PC 5	Support		I am fully supportive of the employment options as local people would have a wider choice of work and travelling should be less for them.			1394
498044	Carolyne BANKS		Option PC 5	Object		Transport needs to be sorted out centrally - to get something that works properly - this is the biggest showstopper to all of these schemes - the current roads will not support any more traffic.			1394
498047	CD Bradford		Option PC 5	Support					1394
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		Option PC 5	Support		Although I live in Ferndown i work and travel around a lot in the local area, so feel I can voice my opinion on developments around the area.			1394
498084	Mr P HARTLEY		Option PC 5	Object					1394
498125	Mr and Mrs P DASHWOOD		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
498160	Mrs Gwendoline Martin		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
498169	Mrs D WEAVER		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
498184	Mrs Angela BARKER		Option PC 5	Object		All the employment land options are currently in the Green Belt - this should be protected! Erode it and we'll have none left in the not too distant future.			1394
498268	Mr and Mrs R Cullen		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
498271	Mandy CHEESEMAN		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
498335	Mr and Mrs Lester		Option PC 5	Support					1394
498711	Mr T CHANT		Option PC 5	Support					1394
498996	M E CLARKE		Option PC 5	Object					1394
499044	Mrs Carolyn MASKELL		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
360685	Mr M.P HOSE		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
361106	Mr and Mrs Robin and Janet WALL		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
498495	Mr John Williams		Option PC 5	Support					1394
499231	Mrs A Lathbury		Option PC 5	Support					1394
499236	J PIPE		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
499245	Mr and Mrs N BUTLER		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
499261	Mrs Norma JACKSON		Option PC 5	Support					1394
499290	Mrs Lisa TURNBULL		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
499355	Mrs MEREDITH		Option PC 5	Object		Employment development areas must have immediate access to main roads and classified roads. They should not draw commercial traffic through residential areas on inadequate un-classified roads.			1394
499384	Mr A I ROSE		Option PC 5	Support					1394
499449	B W White		Option PC 5	Object		My objection is related to the likely impact of additional traffic along Woolsbridge and Horton Roads, which are already overloaded with heavy vehicles destined for the industrial estate. ANY SUCH DEVELOPMENT MUST BE PRECEDED BY A NEW LINK ROAD BETWEEN THE Azalea (?) roundabout and the estate, which is already long overdue. WOOLSBRIDGE Rd is after all a residential road and does not deserve such traffic. My objection would be withdrawn if the link road was constructed.			1394
499873	Mr Graham Holt		Option PC 5	Support					1394
500060	Mr Stuart PIDDOCK		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
500196	Mike & Ruth Smith		Option PC 5	Object					1394
500222	S Hartley		Option PC 5	Support					1394
500350	Mr P H		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	BARTLETT								
500361	Mr and Miss N and A Middleton and Turner		Option PC 5	Support					1394
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		Option PC 5	Support					1394
500558	A Baker		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
500694	Mr and Mrs J R MANSBRIDGE		Option PC 5	Support		Homes and jobs increase movement of people. Therefore the roads must be able to cater for an increase in use. Public transport or company coaches to places of work - like J P Morgan at Littledown. Canford Bottom needs a FLYOVER - nothing less. Think of the flyover at Ringwood and what a bottleneck that was years ago. With a lot more homes in and around West Parley something should be done to alleviate traffic going down New Road. A second road and an additional bridge is the answer there.			1394
500697	Mr Thomas SMITH		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
500706	R & J Jeans		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
500720	Mrs VALLIER		Option PC 5	Object					1394
500748	Mrs Lauren MATTHEWS		Option PC 5	Support					1394
500802	J Hayward		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
500818	Mr J LADD		Option PC 5	Object		GREEN BELT LAND MUST BE PROTECTED, otherwise what is the point of having 'Green Belt'? Please listen to public opinion and don't just say 'we will listen and then disregard it'. I expect this will happen anyway.			1394
500836	Mrs Sylvia Hines		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
500903	Mr and Mrs S and R Harris		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
501012	Louise ARNOLD		Option PC 5	Object					1394
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501018	Mr Robert P Hand		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
501068	Mr and Mrs P Bain		Option PC 5	Object		We strongly object to any plans to develop Woolsbridge Ind Est that would inevitably put more traffic on the Horton Road. as the only entry/exit for all traffic (heavy goods, cars, m/cycles) is via the Horton Road, this increase would only add to the frequency of road repairs and allied inconvenience this would bring and costs. Even a one way in and another exit would be helpful.			1394
501106	Mr John Victor Rogers		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
501114	John Lee		Option PC 5	Object					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501118	Mr Ron Cook		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501135	Charlie Wassell		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501194	Mrs Colton		Option PC 5	Support					1394
359895	Mr Jeff REECE		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
359908	Mr F.D.A REVILL		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
359927	Mrs Ann BISSEX		Option PC 5	Support					1394
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
501324	Julie Light		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501351	Mr and Mrs R D'Cruze		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
501364	Mr M Devetta		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501485	Mrs J JACKSON		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501488	Chris LAMB		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
501502	Mr Michael WAREHAM		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
501520	Mrs Z MERRIFIELD		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
501523	Rita Gilbert		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501531	Mr Boyd Read		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
501560	Mr Christopher CLARKE		Option PC 5	Object					1394
501565	Mr P Keeping		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501574	Mr & Mrs B S Nippard		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501607	Dr Fairchild		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
501616	R J Joyce		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501626	Mrs J A		Option PC 5	Object					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Russell								
501694	Mr R BRYAN		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501699	B THOMAS		Option PC 5	Object		The Woolsbridge Estate development will only put more HIGH SPEED traffic on Woolsbridge Road and more H.G.V's that ignore the 7.5 tonne restriction; this lot already infringe on our RIGHTS TO A PEACEFUL LIFE.			1394
501720	Dr and Mrs D HARLOW		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
501738	RJ Jenkins		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501750	K G Holloway		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501751	Mr RG Birch		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501761	Mr D Curtis		Option PC 5		General Comment	The most urgent and critical limiting factors are the A31 single carriageways E and W and density of traffic using Canford Bottom roundabout - Encouraging increased commercial traffic re. PC 4 to PC 9 would only exacerbate the present traffic problems.			1394
501804	Mr Glyn Davies		Option PC 5	Object	General Comment	Do not entertain any further 'traffic calming' measures such as the dangerous/expensive version in Colehill. Re-allocate money to the surface quality of minor roads.			1394
501823	Mr and Mrs E A Osgood		Option PC 5	Support					1394
501867	Mrs I M Marks		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501873	Mr and Mrs Harold A and D Joan Lilley		Option PC 5	Object		All proposals of this nature have a number of basic needs. One of the most important is infrastructure. Subject to finance being available Canford Bottom Roundabout is to be drastically amended for the Olympic Games. The reference to "Improvements to Canford Bottom therefore appear to have been superseded. Since I cannot find any intention to improve the road network all these proposals will only add to our present problems and cannot be supported.			1394
501876	J Long		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
501881	B W Deverill		Option PC 5	Object					1394
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
501961	G Ginn		Option PC 5	Object		There should not be any increase in use of the Woolsbridge Industrial estate until a link road to the A31 is put in place. Horton Road is not able to take any increase in traffic.			1394
502022	Mr HWR Stevens		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502029	Mr J MacArthur		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		Option PC 5	Object		The whole area is congested, there is no real provision for new TRANSPORT OR services for new homes i.e. doctors, local shops or community centres. There are already MANY EMPTY industrial units. Building more industrial is only viable if a tax loss for developers. Verwood has lost its soul now, and does not need any more ad-hock development. Wimborne will follow if the development of this (at present) lovely Town is carried out in the same way as Verwood has been.			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502059	Mr R Seddon		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502076	Kay Stead		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
502078	Mr R Marlow		Option PC 5	Object		Why waste more tax payers money!!! Too much now!!! These proposals are ridiculous, as any further work prospects in this are "zero". So why more homes and cars when the road/transport structure is obsolete for modern days need, let alone provision for the future 20/30 years. Just building more houses will not solve the long standing problems in Dorset i.e. jobs and road structures.			1394
502092	Mr and Mrs A Watkinson		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502099	Carolyn Lourens		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
502113	Mr A Garner		Option PC 5	Object					1394
502114	Mr P Foster		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
502117	Mr P A Beard		Option PC 5	Object		The Horton Road is only a 'B' road and already has a number of very large lorries using it as a shortcut to the bypass, and these alone make it dangerous. On top of this there is the Army petrol collection point, Moors Valley - which is a great success but this also is now attracting coaches, and on Sunday's we have the boot sale. Now that Golden Acres has taken over Mr Browns Garden Centre this has also increased traffic numbers. All these combined make the Horton Road area completely unsuitable for any new developments.			1394
502121	Mr K C		Option PC 5	Object		NO Heavy goods traffic should be allowed through residential areas, i.e.: Woolsbridge Road.			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Brown					HEAVY GOODS ONLY use in future A31 road into Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. Block off Woolsbridge Road to HGV's - damage is being caused by HGV's etc. Also stagger working hours of companies.			
502131	M R Grayston		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
502138	Mrs E Mason		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
359598	Mr A KETCHLEY		Option PC 5	Support		Unfortunately whatever is finally decided on the following well known saying will occur: 'You can please some of the people all the time, You can please all of the people some of the time, But you cannot please all of the people all of the time!' I wish you well in whatever is decided. Some will see it as inevitable due to the area's population increases, whereas others will see it as a necessary evil, and some will accept it without question			1394
359977	Miss M.G. EARP		Option PC 5	Object					1394
361113	Mr Alan Meade		Option PC 5	Support		.I like the rate of affordable housing to private homes. We all know that there is a shortage. Jobs will be created, money brought in, good for all in East Dorset, Christchurch			1394
361123	Mr Iain STEVENSON		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502224	Mr and Mrs Larcombe		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502244	MT Williams		Option PC 5	Object		Whilst not wishing to stifle development the traffic on the Horton Road has increased significantly over the past few years. Horton Road is an unclassified (c) road and was never designed to cope with today's traffic. Heavy duty and large loads are often seen and in fact, often have to straddle the "white centre line". Any further development of the industrial estate should be subject to the developers paying for alternative access and egress to the A31 as was originally the considered option.			1394
502264	Mr Colin Craig		Option PC 5	Object		The current transport system for W.I.E is not suitable as all the traffic has to use the Horton Road, huge articulated lorries continuously speed up and down the road from around 5am to 8pm causing the house to shake and traffic noise. Why can't an entry and exit road be built from the back of W.I.E onto the dual carriageway?			1394
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		Option PC 5	Object	General Comment	No new building should be anywhere near a floodplain with sea levels rising. Transport issues on and around the A31 are already over capacity - no development should proceed without that being sorted - including knock on effects of A31 issues. Has it actually been established that there is a need for all the homes and industrial development? Are we at risk of creating a need in order to service developers rather than establishing if there will be a real need in the first place?			1394
502317	Cllr Peter Lucas		Option PC 5	Object					1394
502322	Mrs J C Critchell		Option PC 5	Object					1394
502326	Mr and Mrs T Bennett		Option PC 5	Object		With more homes will need more employment, a vicious circle. Our roads are too busy now. We surely have enough community areas and centres.			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502329	Mrs Rosemary Rooke		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502332	Mr and Mrs D Blanch		Option PC 5	Object		Horton Road is very busy and it will be increasingly difficult to cope with extra traffic. Extra traffic on the A31 is not desirable at all. Noise levels to residential areas already too intrusive. If this does go ahead then additional noise reductions should (and must) be introduced, i.e. noise absorbing road surfaces and accounting fencing on the A31 adjacent to the residential areas of St Leonards and St Ives.			1394
502333	B M Andrews		Option PC 5	Support		Make parents walk their children to school. Stop parents 4x4s, etc. Spend more money on our area. Council tax far too high and what benefits do we receive from the Parish Council?			1394
502341	Mr Richard Quainton		Option PC 5	Object		Speeding vehicles and commercial vehicles flouting 7.5 ton limit on Woolsbridge Road. Already most of the commercial traffic is for the existing industrial estate. I do not object to developments for jobs providing proper vehicular access for commercial traffic and workers is provided from the main traffic artery i.e. the A31 (roundabout is already there) Expecting local residents to suffer more traffic noise and pollution and more risk from speeding drivers and over limit commercial vehicles is not acceptable. Make developer construct suitable direct access.			1394
502345	Mr and Mrs Ray and Irene Coulson		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502347	Sarah Cobb		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
502364	FD Peach		Option PC 5	Object		No further development should take place on Woolsbridge I. Estate until the road linking the A&E! is developed. Horton Road is not wide enough to take the present traffic. Cars/lorries currently have to mount the pavement when products (i.e. Portacabins etc) leave the site. It is an accident waiting to happen.			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502381	Mr Cyril Josey		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502387	Mr George Kilpatrick		Option PC 5	Support		I would like to see the justification for increased housing in East Dorset e.g., demographics, immigration, increased work opportunities etc. I would also like to understand how transport strategy (and infrastructure) is coordinated with this in such a way to make expansion sustainable.			1394
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502468	Robert Lambert		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502568	Sarah Morgan		Option PC 5	Object					1394
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
502570	Mr Samways		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
502579	Mr & Mrs R L Thorne		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
502595	Mr Colin House		Option PC 5	Object		All these developments will cause an impact on the local heathland and the proposals in all areas will cause road chaos on the A31, Ferndown, Parley and Wimborne. A new road structure is required before any development takes place.			1394
502596	A C Hayter		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502610	John Jackson		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502635	Mrs JS Brough		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502673	Mrs A Powell		Option PC 5	Object		The infrastructure in this area needs to be sorted out before anymore building goes ahead. There are times you cannot move on the roads. The area is being ruined with all this building works that are already going on.			1394
502701	Mrs M Williams		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
502708	Ms Julia Owen		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502745	Mrs J.M Kenny		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
502921	Mr and Mrs L Forinton		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502935	Mr Roger Parker		Option PC 5	Support					1394
502999	Mrs Marion E		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lock								
503022	Mr and Mrs D Money		Option PC 5	Object					1394
503044	Mr and Mrs R Setchfield		Option PC 5	Support					1394
503156	Richard and Jackie Blunderfield		Option PC 5	Support		Also supported in Options for Employment leaflet			1394
503171	Sally Cooke		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503183	B Chissell		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503230	P Andrews		Option PC 5	Support					1394
503233	F Parkes		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503250	Mrs Helen Poole		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503303	Mr Anthony Roberts		Option PC 5	Support					1394
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		Option PC 5	Support					1394
503347	Ms Hardwick		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359873	Mrs M HUGHES		Option PC 5	Support					1394
359889	Mr and Mrs P CLARK		Option PC 5	Support		With any developments we would need to be assured that infrastructure improvements are in place BEFORE any development is consented to. This is particularly important with regard to public transport provisions. It is also important that feedback is forthcoming as an acknowledgement of our response to this survey.			1394
359920	S PARKER		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		Option PC 5	Support		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I want to know the projected time scale for these options to start to become active.</li> <li>2. It is most important that there is adequate employment to accommodate the houses to be built.</li> <li>3. More attention must be made to supply of affordable housing.</li> <li>4. The green belt must be respected where possible.</li> <li>5. The estates around Wimborne must be consulted fully.</li> </ol>			1394
360029	Mr David LANIGAN		Option PC 5	Support		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Christchurch &amp; East Dorset Core Strategy Document, Managing Growth and Development up to the year 2027. I agree with the preamble stating that we need to meet local housing needs, with the emphasis on growing the main settlements where we have good access to facilities that people require. Some development of smaller communities should continue however, especially the provision of low cost housing. The community as a whole, needs the services of teachers, nurses, firemen, postmen, and policemen who are poorly paid because they commit to a vocation rather than a high salary job. We also need the services of skilled people such as builders, electricians, plumbers, gas fitters, and motor mechanics, the essentially blue collar professionals. They must not be priced out of the market in terms of being able to buy a starter home, in the community that they serve.</p> <p>Having bought my first home in 1963, a two bedroom bungalow for £2,200 I am aware that locally such a property is currently one hundred times as much. This makes things difficult for young</p>			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>couples with the ratio of house prices to wages being the highest in the country. Many struggle with getting mortgages that now require typically a 25% deposit on an already expensive property.</p> <p>I moved to West Moors 15 years ago and appreciate the planning decisions that have taken place affecting this village. We now have a new build shopping centre on Station Road, complete with flats, good pavements, lighting, pelican crossing and trees. I am pleased to have seen built several small, three storey, blocks of retirement and two bed flats close to the village centre. I support the gradual expansion of the</p> <p>Village, current population around 7,500 as we have good schools, a large Memorial hall, Churches with halls, two public houses, doctors, dentists and good bus services to both Poole and Bournemouth. We have footpath access to open land such as Holt Heath, as well as being able to use the old railway line route through the village to Ringwood, - the Castleman Trail. Recently St Marys Church has had built a new Church Hall which will serve the community and thanks to the National Lottery grant we now have an excellent Bowling Club. I support the continued slow expansion of the village as currently we have many facilities for people of all ages to enjoy.</p> <p>My current house was built in the mid 70s, and has trebled in value since my wife and I moved here 15 years ago. In the 1970s West Moors doubled in size and acquired new schools and since then other infrastructure improvements. In recent years the Library was refurbished. The facilities for retirees in West Moors, with access to Ferndown and Verwood, are very good, and coupled with excellent hospitals at Poole, Bournemouth and Wimborne, and I have felt no need to move from East Dorset area in the conceivable future.</p> <p>I therefore support the proposals for additional housing as outlined in the Core Strategy Consultation, as well as the proposals for business sites for employment. I also support provisions for new schools particularly a new Secondary School at Verwood, and recreation areas to cater for the population increase. I understand that net immigration into Dorset is running at two thousand people a year so clearly we need to plan for housing, jobs, education, recreation, road improvements especially at busy junctions, and off road car parking in town centres and on new housing estates.</p> <p>There are many reasons why East Dorset and Christchurch, are attractive places for people to live, work and retire to. Long term</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						planning that caters for the needs of a steady population increase is sensible and is to be welcomed.			
360095	Mr & Mrs John & Barbara POLKINGHORN		Option PC 5	Support					1394
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		Option PC 5	Support					1394
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		Option PC 5	Object		The Horton Road already suffers from heavy traffic and heavy and wide vehicle movements. Any additional traffic which is often fast moving would be a detriment to the area and a danger to local inhabitants on this very narrow road. Lorries wing mirrors already overhang the footpath causing a danger to pedestrians, especially as the footpaths are not kept clean. The Horton Road cannot take any extra traffic.			1394
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E HACK		Option PC 5	Support					1394
361105	Mr John GOOCH	Also member of Colehill Parish Council	Option PC 5	Support					1394
503024	Valerie Measey		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503355	Mr Robert Griffiths		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503358	H C Hoare		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503421	Mr		Option PC	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Geof Haywood		5						
503444	R Hobbs		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503476	Mrs AM Hawkins		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503527	Claire Smith		Option PC 5		No Opinion	Apportion part of employment land options to housing of all categories for potential employees at these locations thereby reducing transport needs.			1394
503556	Houghton		Option PC 5	Object		Local residents are increasingly concerned about the sheer volume of traffic especially heavy good vehicles, using Horton Road from the A31 interchange to the Woolsbridge Road Ind Estate, and consequent speeds. HR was originally intended as a minor B road, and it is already difficult on occasion to access this from minor roads along the way. Woolsbridge Rd and West Moors Rd are not viable alternatives.			1394
503598	Mr John Turner		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503603	Mrs DJ Morley		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503621	A G Haines		Option PC 5	Support		As I'm sure you are perfectly aware, all developments I have ticked require serious consideration to the whole road network in the areas concerned.			1394
503624	Mr RT Jackson		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503635	Mr J Gough		Option PC 5	Support					1394
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		Option PC 5	Object		The A31 is already over-saturated with regular gridlock on Friday/Saturday without major redevelopment (min 2 lane dual carriageway from Ferndown industrial estate to Tolpuddle) it is incapable of taking any more traffic. Wimborne, Ferndown and Parley cross- we object to more building on green field sites Parley Cross area is already over-saturated with traffic and is incapable of taking any more. The entire East Dorset area already been over-developed versus other areas of the country. It does not have the transport, social, educational. etc resources for any more.			1394
503640	N J and S A White		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503644	Mr J Riley		Option PC 5	Object					1394
503687	Mr Nick Smith		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		Option PC 5	Support					1394
503709	Mr and Mrs A Fairclough		Option PC 5	Object					1394
503759	Mr D.J. Middleton		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503787	Mrs P A		Option PC 5	Object					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Dent								
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		Option PC 5	Support					1394
503861	Mr E Hawkins		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503878	Mr Peter Smith		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503879	Mr S Smithson		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
503943	Mr & Mrs Rumball		Option PC 5	Support					1394
504093	Mr & Mrs Vivian		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
504101	Mrs Mary Trevis-Bell		Option PC 5	Support					1394
504216	Mr Mark Rich		Option PC 5	Object					1394
504285	Mr P Miller		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
504314	Ms Selina Roper		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
505273	Mrs		Option PC		No Opinion				1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lorraine Hubbard		5						
505288	Mrs S Cramer		Option PC 5	Support	General Comment	As a married mother of 3 children, 2 girls and 1 boy, living in a 2 bed Council flat (first floor), I welcome more housing to the Wimborne area for young families needing affordable housing / rented housing.			1394
505320	Mrs M Puttick		Option PC 5	Support		PC 5 - Guarded support because of increased traffic movement in that area.			1394
361037	Mr P STRATFORD		Option PC 5	Object		I expect that my objection to everything is not very practical. However, I have lived in the area for most of the last fifty years. In that time there has been a constant cycle of the council saying we need more housing, followed by we need more industrial areas to provide extra jobs for all the new homes. Then in turn the council says we require extra jobs for the new homes, then in turn the council says we require extra homes for the new workers. This process is never ending. During this time I've witnessed the creation and expansion of the industrial estates at Ferndown, Uddens, Ebblake and Wimborne. A whole new housing estate at Tricketts Cross, Glenmoor Rd Ferndown, the expansion of West Moors, Colehill, Verwood turned from sleepy village into a town. In this time I am not aware of any developed area being returned to its natural state from a developed one. Please let me know if you think differently. I hope you agree that my objection to development is rational and that the never ending cycle of expansion is stopped.			1394
475526	Mr Geoffrey Dark		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary Hendy		Option PC 5	Object		The Green Belt should stay Green.			1394
498775	Mrs P L Buckler		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		Option PC 5	Support					1394
505369	J Young		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		Option PC 5	Object	General Comment	Building more houses has NOTHING to do with meeting the needs of (existing) local residents. We do not need or want more houses in our area. Planning to build more houses is driven by the 'need' to meet externally imposed quotas based on false assumptions on the desirability of further population and economic growth. Instead of wasting resources on building more housing which is ecologically unsustainable, we should be using them to make a transition to a low energy sustainable future for our children. Please listen to local residents and reject further development.			1394
505523	Mr & Mrs A Turner		Option PC 5	Support					1394
505561	Mr. D. Calvert		Option PC 5	Support					1394
505572	Mr and Mrs LJ Hinton		Option PC 5	Object		From our perspective a proposed development of new industrial units between Three Legged Cross and St Leonards and St Ives would mean a major increase of heavy duty lorries driving down Horton Road, thus making for further noise, environmentally unfriendly, highly dangerous for walking pedestrians, either with children or dog walking. Constant damage to the already heavily used tarmac road, which would need constant repairs, paid for by us all. The Horton Road need protecting not worn out!!!			1394
505590	M Spalding		Option PC 5	Support					1394
505656	Mr Dave Evans		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		Option PC 5	Object					1394
505760	J Evans		Option PC 5	Support					1394
505802	Mr RGH Chapman		Option PC 5	Support					1394
506116	Mr and Mrs P and SJ Simpson		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		Option PC 5	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			1394
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
506754	Mr Derek E Marsh		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
507026	Mr David Craig		Option PC 5	Support	General Comment	I would like to see priority given to projects which have a higher concentration of social housing inclusion, and also include a higher green/renewable energy provision. Particular concentration on family areas, playgrounds and social/community facilities should be considered.			1394
507032	Mr David Oliver		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
507033	A R Twaits		Option PC 5	Support	General Comment	Despite improvements to public transport, cycling and walking, the reality is that the vast majority of journeys will continue to be made by car. Local roads are already congested and the extent of development			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						proposed is not acceptable without significant increases in the capacity of these roads for cars. In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.			
507070	Mr and Mrs Earwicker		Option PC 5	Support		The 3 sites we support have good main road access although Horton Road/Ringwood Road would need updating for Woolsbridge. The A31 behind Blunts Farm needs to be dual carriageway all the way from the Lidl roundabout to Canford Bottom roundabout. Access to any industrial estate in Blunts Farm should be from the A31 not via Uddens Estate.			1394
507132	Ms L Joyce		Option PC 5	Support					1394
507286	Mr N P Butler		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
507336	Mr John Page		Option PC 5	Support					1394
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
507388	Mr David Huggins		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
507474	Mark and Jean Cording		Option PC 5	Object		1) We are still due a correctment in housing prices, housing benefits have artificially underpinned the bubble. The so called shortage of housing is also caused by breaking up of the family unit (teenagers and young people do not need their own homes) 2) The Green Belt must be protected, a temporary supposed need			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						would and could not be reversed. There are hundreds of brown sites which could be utilised, without the need for more disruptive and expensive infrastructures. 3) Green Belt land was created to protect open land between and around developments. We anticipated development and councils saying they need more land, it was and is vital so please do not change the policy. Times change, needs change, populations (immi and emigration) demands disappear but green land cannot be replaced.			
507524	Mr C G Richardson		Option PC 5	Support					1394
507555	Mr and Mrs C Lamond		Option PC 5	Support					1394
507572	GJ Pettifer		Option PC 5	Support					1394
507595	Mr D Johnson		Option PC 5	Support					1394
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
507693	Mrs P Carter		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
507760	Mr and Mrs R Gardner		Option PC 5	Object					1394
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507800	Mrs K M Platt		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
507908	Mr Philip H James		Option PC 5	Support					1394
507980	Sylvia Allen		Option PC 5	Support					1394
508383	Ms Emma Hayter		Option PC 5	Support					1394
508413	Mrs S Best		Option PC 5	Object					1394
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		Option PC 5	Object		The Council is always after land for housing or business development. Whatever is granted is never enough and a few years later they want more. This process has been going on for over 50 years and it is time it came to a stop. Enough is enough as it is ruining the area.			1394
508852	Mrs L.A. Chesshire		Option PC 5	Support					1394
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		Option PC 5	Support					1394
508928	Mr D.W. Lonsdale		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
509065	Mrs B Burge		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360097	Mr John DOWLING		Option PC 5	Object					1394
361121	Mrs Elizabeth JONES		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
361161	Mr Douglas FORWARD		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
361184	Mr S MOON		Option PC 5	Object		In most situations I will object to the build of additional housing / business premises, as I do not believe that other options have first been considered or if not possible 'today' are being pursued for the longer term. For example, 1) There are many properties, particularly in Dorset, which are second homes and for most of the year are empty. Action needs to be taken to make these available for renting / purchase as even today, let alone the future, houses are unoccupied, for whatever reason, is not an option. (I would support legislation.) Empty properties also need to be addressed. 2) The development of "brownfield" sites, even if these may not be profitable as other options or as desirable to live or work. 3) Thinking outside the box or in this case outside the areas of this Strategy Consultation. Dorset is not alone in having to address these issues and we need to have some "joined up thinking" with other authorities to see if there are joint opportunities. In this respect Hamworthy Engineering buildings have been empty for many years but do not appear to be in anyone's options.			1394
510420	Mr Peter Stevens		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		Option PC 5	Support					1394
510532	W.W.		Option PC		No Opinion				1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Chant		5						
510623	Mr Douglas Priest		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
510798	Mr F Sullivan		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
510844	Mr Michael Guilmany-Cush		Option PC 5	Support		It was rather cheeky of you not to provide mapping of the Employment land options sites. I had to consult an OS map.			1394
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R. Mayes		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
510974	Mr Jim Cullumbine		Option PC 5	Support					1394
510993	R.A. Cherrett		Option PC 5	Support					1394
511015	Mr Christopher White		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
511076	Mr Ian Burden		Option PC 5	Support					1394
511219	Ms Kathleen Smith		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and Diana		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Froud								
511430	A.D. May		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
511489	Mr H G Holden		Option PC 5	Support					1394
511571	Colin Alborough		Option PC 5	Support		We are in desperate need of more affordable housing in the East Dorset area. There is also a shortage of employment opportunities in the area. The provision of more houses should help to push house prices down to give young people a change of getting on the property ladder.			1394
511618	Mrs V Blunden		Option PC 5	Support					1394
511621	Ms Mary A Combe		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
511711	Coombes		Option PC 5	Support					1394
511747	Mr T W Tonge		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
360002	Mr Mike BARTLETT		Option PC 5	Support		Very well set out in booklet and well thought out proposals. Speed is the essence - I have 3 children in need!			1394
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		Option PC 5	Support					1394
361196	Mr J.M BULLIVANT		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
491252	Margaret Wareham		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
507899	R J Potts		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
511639	Paul Hockey		Option PC 5	Object					1394
512281	Graham Roberts		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
512326	Mr Ian Willis		Option PC 5	Support					1394
512703	Rita Sweatland		Option PC 5	Object					1394
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A Kirby		Option PC 5	Object					1394
513692	Mrs A Willis		Option PC 5	Support					1394
513881	Mrs S Bagg		Option PC 5	Support					1394
513900	Mr P Wall		Option PC 5	Support		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed e.g. road improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			1394
513954	Mr RW Heseltine		Option PC 5	Object					1394
513966	Mr and Mrs Howard		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
513974	Mr A Moore		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
514039	Mrs R Doman		Option PC 5	Support					1394
514049	Mrs E Hellier		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
514091	Mr RJ Potts		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
514099	Mr and Mrs T C Blakeley		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
514111	Penelope Webiery		Option PC 5	Object					1394
514136	Mrs J Crumb		Option PC 5	Object					1394
514225	Mr Simon Dixon	Secretary West Moors Traders Association	Option PC 5	Support					1394
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon Chaffey		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
514274	Mr Showell		Option PC 5	Support		Instead of new housing there should be a new strategy of providing more public open space. The lessons of the Edwardians/Victorians should be learnt. New public parks like Poole Park, Queens Park and Kings Park save an			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						area from urban crowding. Perhaps all the land proposed for housing could be reallocated to public parks.			
514355	Mr T Gee		Option PC 5	Support					1394
514379	Mrs Denise Bannister		Option PC 5	Support					1394
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option PC 5	Object		DWT object to this option due to its close proximity to the Moors River and designated sites. Protection of these should be a pre-requisite for development, with a need to utilise Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems to avoid pollution, and avoid impacts through light pollution and disturbance. Land here may support protected species and habitats of biodiversity interest and should be surveyed to inform this option. The site has potential to be restored to heathland connecting the adjacent heathland SSSI and Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI (SU00/53 – semi-natural wet woodland and unimproved damp neutral grassland) with the river corridor. This would be a significant opportunity to make biodiversity enhancements, not just to the land itself but through reducing the isolation and fragmentation of the designated sites.			1394
359477	Ms Natasha Mackenzie	Clerk Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council	Option PC 5	Object	General Comment	The proposed additional housing and employment areas will therefore only increase the traffic problems at Ringwood and thus on the roads in our Parish, especially on the B3081, A338 and Linwood Road if the A31 is blocked. The junction at Bakers Hanging will also become even more saturated. The Parish Council agree that these developments should only go ahead if road improvements at Bakers Hanging and the junction of the A338 and A31 are carried out.			1394
359894	Mr D.S Medlycott		Option PC 5	Support		I support the extension of this site with an appropriate mix of units and a suitable bus service and/or cycle routes from West Moors/Verwood/Ringwood to service this site. This will promote local employment and encourage private enterprise.			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359916	JB Cossins		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
360626	Mr Frank Miller	Chair Person Sturminster Marshall Affordable Housing Self Build Homes Group	Option PC 5	Object		We have more than plenty sites empty which need filling so why build more factory units? Get the rates down which will allow empty units to be let. Alter the big units into smaller one / two type units. Drive out and look. Please stop doing desk top plans. I would love to help in putting forward real working plans instead of dreams. Please live in the real world.			1394
361014	Mr Peter Hammond		Option PC 5	Support					1394
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
476792	Mr and Mrs Lomas		Option PC 5	Support					1394
481604	Mr Gerald Toomer		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
485695	Mr John Cornish		Option PC 5	Support		Please consider the provision of incubator offices and small workshops for businesses spawned out of the Bournemouth University and Executive Business Centre in Holdenhurst Road. Reference Site Chillworth Science Park. This could be sited off road in North Dorset, say Sixpenny Handley to improve local economy.			1394
490716	Mr Steve Saville	Station Manager Forest FM	Option PC 5	Support		The Verwood and Three Cross area desperately needs new businesses providing jobs locally.			1394
496996	Mr Hayward		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
500746	Mrs		Option PC	Object		Where are the businesses that require all these buildings? The			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	J Lothian		5			resulting traffic will add to West Moors, speeding through the village.			
500817	Mr L Lothian		Option PC 5	Object		Already too much traffic on the roads which are in poor condition after 2 years of frosts.			1394
508562	K Clayson		Option PC 5	Object					1394
508993	Mr A Samways		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
509795	Mr R Ridley		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
511761	Mr G Burge		Option PC 5	Support					1394
513651	Mrs W Pearsall		Option PC 5	Support		1. Improved public transport to these employment sites. 2. Business centres for starting business with full back office support. 3. Tax breaks to encourage businesses to move to our area. 4. Subsidised training for all age groups in starting up and running a business. 4. Part time apprenticeship training for all age groups.			1394
514467	Mrs Lesley Cripps		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
514482	C E T Gilbert		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		Option PC 5	Object					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514674	Mrs J Williams		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
514752	Claire Richardson & Jamie Shirley		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
514812	Mr C Sawyer		Option PC 5	Object					1394
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		Option PC 5	Object		Seeking the opinion of the general public on planning issues is all very commendable - but setting aside all political persuasion my feeling is that this is no more than a Public Relations exercise because in the end the final decisions are always to the advantage of the developers whoever they may be because of money, greed and looks good on paper. However with regard to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, there is some logic in potential increase for development, but I have decided against because of the impact on the surrounding area and it would result in an even greater increase in the traffic flow along Horton Road, which is already extremely busy.			1394
514913	Mr and Mrs M Clark		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
514939	D Porter		Option PC 5	Object		Many industrial units are empty why do need more?			1394
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		Option PC 5	Object		The ever increasing volume of traffic on the A31 and the failure to adhere to the speed limit is a cause for concern. This is aggravated by unsuitable road surface and lack of sound screening. I understand that this is within the remit of the Highways Agency but before any further development there should be some holistic approach to resolve these issues. With reference to Woolsbridge Road it is somewhat surprising that there should be development on a flood plain area.			1394
514993	Dr		Option PC	Object		The area is already over-developed and congested - further			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Peter J Hardwick		5			development on the scales proposed would lead to deterioration of the environment and a reduction in the quality of life. I am particularly dismayed by continued threats to the Green Belt, especially as this Government pledged to protect it. I do not believe that such massive development is necessary or beneficial to the vast majority of inhabitants. Pressure on our area should be reduced by Government tackling such issues as population growth through immigration control and regeneration of brownfield sites in Midlands and North. There is a need for limited affordable and social housing locally, but not more executive homes. It is wrong to build new homes while second homes and investment properties continue to exist.			
515033	Mr T Crump		Option PC 5	Support					1394
515287	Mr L Jackson		Option PC 5	Support		The A31 trunk road from Ferndown by-pass should be widened to form a dual carriageway all the way through to Bere Regis.			1394
515367	Mr & Mrs J Pottinger		Option PC 5	Support					1394
515479	Mr D Lenehan		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
515763	Mr V S Harris		Option PC 5	Support					1394
515788	J M May		Option PC 5	Support					1394
516313	Mr Julian Humphries		Option PC 5	Support		PC5, 6 and 7 are less obtrusive than PC4. 7 is ideal as it has good roads with roundabouts for directive changes. PC 5 and 6 are expansion of existing and appear appropriate.			1394
517528	Dr		Option PC		No Opinion				1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Susan Burton		5						
517692	Mr K Sullivan		Option PC 5	Object		There is already a high level of HGV and white van traffic along Horton Road, some of it being of a wide load nature travelling along a single track highway. The speed at which some of these vehicles travel exceeds the speed limit, only slowing for the speed cameras. The pavements, especially near the bus stops are very narrow and the drag from these vehicles could result in injury to pedestrians. Public transport in this area (No. 36 bus) is based on small single decker buses which run every hour. Any increase in commuter travelling would need to be supported by a suitable increase in public transport at peak times.			1394
517835	Mr G D Rodrigues		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
359482	Ms Helen POWELL	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	Option PC 5		No Opinion	This option could be detrimental to the adjoining heathland European site, Ramsar site and SSSI, and the water environment of the Moors River System SSSI a short distance downstream. The extensions and their boundaries are not well configured to remove this detriment. Our opinion, if this option is taken forward into the Draft Submission Core Strategy, will be shaped by the strength of policy on delivery of green infrastructure as an integral part of the development, and the requirements to be met by the green infrastructure. The following requirements for green infrastructure are essential: 1 Provision of a comprehensive package of Sustainable Urban Drainage solutions. The SUDs should both ameliorate flood volumes to the river SSSI and reduce and clean water of poor quality from urban surfaces and drainage thereby protecting against a deterioration of water quality in the designated site. 2 A wooded-heath buffer zone with the heathland designated sites of sufficient width to remove harmful edge effects on the heathland from commercial development near its boundary.			1394
359571	Mr Renny	Conservation Officer	Option PC 5	Object		Given that most of the proposed employment-related development will be in close proximity to the designated sites, the Core Strategy			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds				must demonstrate that this development can be accommodated without adverse effects on the European sites. There is uncertainty as to where this deployment will be exactly focused, however given the broad locations identified, scrutiny for possible adverse effects on European sites will be necessary. We object to option KS13 and options PC4, PC5, PC7, PC8, PC9, PC13 and PC14 pending resolution of outstanding issues identified in the HRA in relation to the European sites.			
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		Option PC 5	Object		The Moors River system, including the River Crane, Ebblake Stream and Uddens Water has already been subject to excessive development within its catchment including the establishment of a number of very ill advised employment/industrial estates. It has suffered severely from all the above impacts resulting in temporary or permanent losses to biodiversity. Continued development within the catchment, especially in close proximity to its water courses, and particularly of employment/industrial development, is wholly inappropriate. Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously impinging on the Moors River system and its corridor include KS3/ PC7 (St Leonards Hospital), KS4 (Woodland Walk), VM 1,2,3 and 4 (Verwood), PC4 (Blunts Farm), and PC 5 (Woolsbridge).			1394
359891	Mrs Susanne Parkin		Option PC 5	Object		There should be more places of employment nearer to existing housing - this should be small units and sites. To enlarge existing sites is not very sustainable in terms of traffic - it is foolish to exacerbate existing bad traffic conditions as we have at present e.g. the A31 at peak time from the Ferndown Industrial Estate. Villages surrounding the conurbation should all support a degree of employment and industry.			1394
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	Option PC 5	Object		Of the several employment estates in the catchment of the Moors River, the Woolsbridge Estate is arguably one of the most threatening due to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• its extreme proximity to the river so that any contaminated surface water runoff can reach the river very quickly, lessening the opportunity for detection and containment; and</li> <li>• its susceptibility to flood (as witnessed by the constraints map and the transecting public footpath being flooded/waterlogged for 6 months of the year) allowing pollutants to be washed into the</li> </ul>			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>nearby river.</p> <p>The proposed southern extension lies immediately next to heathland SSSI. It comprises heathland (gorse) scrub and is shown on the RSPB map as having heathland restoration potential. Such restoration would again place heathland and river corridor in their natural continuum. The option thus thwarts identified potential heathland restoration priorities.</p> <p>The potential for damaging light pollution, to both heathland and aquatic ecosystems, is high. There are recent records of Garden Warblers there.</p>			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	Option PC 5	Support		<p>The Core Strategy Options for Consideration identifies a number of major employment opportunities which are located close to the A31 corridor, including the largest at Ferndown (Option PC4). The Agency recognises the role of Ferndown as the leading employment centre in the district and confirms that further growth in this area, as envisaged under Option PC4, should be assessed at the strategic level through the SEDMMT model. Option PC7 at St Leonard's Hospital is of particular concern to the Agency due to its direct access on to the A31. Detailed Transport Assessments would also be required at the appropriate stage.</p> <p>The Agency endorses the identification of transport improvements required, given in respect of Ferndown and other locations, which include upgrading of the A31 Canford bottom junction and preparation of comprehensive travel plans including public transport measures. The Agency looks forward to contributing to the progression of the development briefs proposed for the major employment sites.</p>			1394
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		Option PC 5	Support		<p>Travel for Employment, Education, Shopping and Leisure. Where do the residents of Wimborne and Colehill seek Employment, Education, Shopping and Leisure activities?</p> <p>Travel for Employment</p> <p>Data for employment appears only to be available for 2001 in the Core Strategy Area Profile2, which is unlikely to reflect the increased trend of out of town travelling for work. Since the turn of the Century greater mobility has been necessary more and more, not only to secure work, but also to achieve career progression. Travel distances are only available for about 60% of the working population of Wimborne and Colehill, and roughly half of these</p>			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>travel between 10 and 40 Kms to work and the others between 5 and 10 Kms.<sup>2</sup> One wonders about the other 40%, are they perhaps beyond 40 Kms, as I was myself, or do they now work from home? EDDC options for Employment<sup>4</sup> identify a negative effect on the availability of sites in Wimborne and Colehill. When considering the sites proposed at PC5 to PC9 inclusive, KS13, BA1-11, the relocation of Stone Lane Industrial Estate<sup>3</sup>, plus the inclusion of land released at Cobham Gate<sup>5</sup>, it would mean that greater use of the A31 will be necessary for people to travel to work in the future. The location of proposed employment sites will hardly encourage people to walk or cycle to work, and I doubt that they will find it convenient to travel to these proposed locations by public transport. In addition one can expect that many jobs will be filled by "Outsiders" who in turn will utilise private transportation on the A31 to get to their destinations of employment.</p> <p>Travel Issues</p> <p>Clearly then the A31 has a major impact on the mobility of people within the Wimborne and Colehill catchment areas. EDDC states that we have the highest level of car ownership in the country<sup>3</sup> and we can see the reasons for this in the above analysis of people's needs. It suggests that these problems can be overcome by changing attitudes toward the use of public transport to relieve local congestion.</p> <p>I consider this to be a totally unrealistic approach in our highly pressurised, motivated, mobile, materialistic and ageing society. (see Theoretical Human Life Cycle Transportation Requirements attached<sup>19</sup>) We must solve the problem and not skirt round it. Take the issue of employment. All of the proposed Industrial Sites are out of area where travel on or crossing of, the A31 is necessary. The same applies to Higher Education, Shopping, Leisure, and to some extent Hospitalisation. We must recognise that where people's choice is limited they will travel great distances to ensure they get what they want.</p> <p>Take the issue of Housing Development. The development of Land to the East and West of the Cranborne Road appears to endorse the unacceptable use of Burts Hill (a country lane) running into Long Lane (another country lane) in becoming a second bypass of the Town. This became evident during the repairs to Julian's Bridge and the Poole Road Bridge, where GPS's offer alternative routes. These roads have increasingly become busier and noisier as a</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>result. People that used to use this route for cycling, walking and jogging are no longer safe to do this anymore.</p> <p>It is strange that the Core Strategy option containing the largest number of homes is considered best situated on the North side of Wimborne, i.e. at the farthest point from the out of area conduit. (the A31) What sense does this make? Its consequence will be that not only the A31 will be jammed up at peak times, but also Middlehill, Leigh Road, Burts Hill, and the Cranborne Road will all suffer greater congestion. Even after taking into consideration that Walford Bridge will need to be widened to accommodate additional traffic movement across town and an improvement in traffic flow through the Stone Lane junction will have to be addressed. I consider all of this could be avoided if the "undeveloped" land to the South of Leigh Road and East of WMC5 was allocated to satisfy only the required number of affordable and supportable homes.</p> <p>Take the issue of Climate Change. Do we really want to release more Carbon Dioxide into the atmosphere by creating more traffic jams and greater congestion, when with the appropriate amount of forethought we can reduce the effects of Climate Change?</p> <p>Further it is predicted that our ageing local population will increase which will to some extent increase the need for personal motorised transport. Since anyone who has graduated to private transportation is unlikely to relinquish it, even if this means being taxied to their destination at times convenient to themselves, they are highly unlikely to walk, cycle or travel on public transport unless it's becomes an absolute last resort.</p> <p>So what can be done to alleviate this issue?</p> <p>Well clearly the A31 has to be upgraded to a dual carriageway with fly overs or underpasses in the most congested spots. However this leads to the question of finance and timing.</p> <p>As a suggestion;</p> <p>Let's think laterally about the infrastructure of Transport, the uses of arterial roads, the polluting effect of vehicles and the funding for road improvements.</p> <p>The A31, which bypasses our town, blocks frequently at peak times and in holiday periods. The primary bottleneck occurs at the Canford Bottom Roundabout, followed closely by the Merley House Lane Roundabout, the Julian's Road Roundabout and finally the Poole Road Roundabout at Bailey Gate. These bottlenecks bring</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>frustration, high energy consumption and more importantly high pollution to our area. Clearly the A31 will have to undergo major improvement to allow through traffic to flow smoothly through our district. The solution can only be a dual carriageway with a series of flyovers, or under passes, that need to be built between the end of the existing dual carriageway at Cobham Road Roundabout all the way through to Bailey Gate, and perhaps beyond to the dual carriageway at Bere Regis.</p> <p>Local, District and County Councils must lobby Government for a greater say in the distribution of the funding for road improvements and take control of funding to support local transport infrastructure when resolving their housing and industrial needs. The projects are intertwined and have to support each other, it's all very well pushing the housing problem back to councils, but councils must be given allocation of the road improvement budget too.</p> <p>Wimborne's problem will not be resolved by a £6 million sticky plaster solution<sup>8</sup> applied to the Canford Bottom Roundabout which will only, if successful, move the bottleneck from one roundabout on the A31 along to another. IT IS TIME FOR MAJOR SURGERY. How else could the necessary road improvements be funded? Since the A31 is a holiday route and a route to an area of the country that boasts England's first natural World Heritage site "The Jurassic Coast", it can conceivably be funded by contributions to road improvements from the EU.</p> <p>But, neither is there anything stopping this section of the A31 becoming a toll road, and in time putting money back into the coffers of the Highways Agency, after all this is the case when travelling down the M6 and also crossing the River Seven when travelling to Wales. I am sure holiday makers and businesses will gladly factor such costs into their budgets.</p> <p>For the sake of the community, and for future generations, we need to bring pressure to bear on Ministers, MPs and local dignitaries to get the necessary funding in place to support this vital arterial improvement. Only then will the EDDC Core Strategy be capable of being successfully implemented.</p> <p>SEE ATTACHMENT</p>			
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		Option PC 5	Support					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
524495	Mr Stanley Jackson		Option PC 5	Support		Attention needs to be concentrated on keeping and ideally increasing the number of younger people in the area, through providing additional employment opportunities, affordable or low-cost housing to purchase and an increase in rented accommodation. I would therefore support all attempts PC4 -PC9 to locate more employment land options.			1394
524723	Mr John Worth	Chair Wimborne Civic Society	Option PC 5	Support		Attention needs to be concentrated on keeping and ideally increasing the number of younger people in the area, through providing additional employment opportunities, affordable or low-cost housing to purchase and an increase in rented accommodation. We would therefore support all attempts (PC4 to PC6) to locate more employment land options.			1394
489765	Derek KEAREY		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
490854	D MUTTON		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
507361	Mr Kenneth Archer		Option PC 5	Object					1394
507737	Mrs S Philpot		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
527661	W Barnes		Option PC 5	Object		Development at Verwood and Woolsbridge have a direct impact on junctions on to the A31 at St Leonards. These are already very busy/ a danger, which just public transport will not improve.			1394
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	Option PC 5	Support		It is clear from the Consultation Document that East Dorset District Council is concerned about the lack of supply of a choice of employment sites across the District. The Council is clearly conscious of the available space at Bournemouth Airport Business Park but much of that is dependent upon significant infrastructure being provided. It proposes that established locations (existing estates) should remain the focus for future growth because that will allow for effective business inter-action, the implementation of Travel Plans and avoid conflict with residential areas.	Option PC5 confirms allocation of 9.7 hectares of land for new employment. No change to pre-requisites for development other than to indicate that significant work has		1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>The potential for significant additional employment development at Woolsbridge is recognised at paragraph 4.33 and Preferred Option KS13 recognises a need for 30 hectares of employment land in East Dorset as a minimum to meet projected demand to 2027. Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is identified in Preferred Option PC1 as one of the locations on which to focus the requirements for B1, B2 and B8 uses.</p> <p>Option PC5 suggests that approval of a detailed Development Brief is required to be the subject of Public Consultation. The Respondents have undertaken a considerable amount of investigation, as can be seen from the documentation which will be attached or sent under separate cover. The evidence gained has been sufficient for Consultant Architects to prepare a layout for the site which can form the basis of a Development Brief.</p> <p>You seek an agreement of a comprehensive Travel Plan. I can tell you that following a comprehensive Transport Assessment by Consultants Giffords, a framework Travel Plan has already been prepared by Mark Whittingham Associates Limited. Mark Whittingham's survey of employers disclosed that 48% of employees live within the BH21, 22, 24 and 31 post codes, that is Wimborne, Ferndown, Verwood and Ringwood, demonstrating that Woolsbridge, in the main, serves the local population. The GTP encourages support for the use of bus services.</p> <p>The third pre-requisite of Option PC5 is the provision of significant landscape buffers alongside the countryside edges of the site. An extensive Ecological Nature Conservation Report has been commissioned from Giffords and a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment carried out by Hilary Martin. These have informed landscape and ecological proposals embodied in the preliminary site layout.</p> <p>Whilst the Options Paper goes on to say that there are several constraints to overcome, extensive work has been carried out already, including a Flood Risk Assessment by Consulting Engineers, Smith Foster who consulted with the Environment Agency and Wessex Water and a ground investigation by Geo-Environmental Services Limited. The development platforms can be raised slightly, to avoid the risk of flooding, the balancing pond has been remodelled and shows that there is spare capacity and, in addition, a dedicated attenuation facility would be provided. There is no overriding constraint.</p>	<p>already been undertaken in these respects.</p> <p>Under the heading "Why is it an Option?" – amend the text to reflect the fact that identified constraints have been investigated, that the flood risk is not so significant in the light of infrastructure works already carried out and the ability to deal with any additional storage provision.</p> <p>Delete the reference to accessibility being a drawback and instead insert something along the lines of "whilst accessibility to the larger East Dorset settlements and the wider South East Dorset area were initially considered to be a potential drawback the site is well located to serve a number of local settlements and therefore encourage sustainable modes of transport."</p> <p>Delete the last sentence because</p>		

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>The Assessment goes on to say that accessibility to the larger East Dorset settlements as well as its position in the wide South East Dorset area and hence the potential workforce are a drawback. The survey work undertaken for the Green Travel Plan would suggest that this is not a significant issue with the majority of existing employees residing locally. My own work showed that Ferndown, West Moors, Three Legged Cross, Verwood and St Leonards and St Ives all lie within 5 km. of the Woolsbridge site. There are few opportunities for additional employment in these areas. The major site at Bournemouth International Airport is really only accessible by private car. I would not therefore agree that there is a lack of accessibility to this site and a lack of nearby services will be addressed in the development proposals by the provision of a service hub within the site.</p> <p>One of the major attributes of this site which is not mentioned is its deliverability. One of the major concerns of employers over the past 30 years is that whilst the Strategic Plans have indicated a significant amount of land available for employment purposes, when they have actually come to find sites there have been very few that are actually deliverable at the time. It is my view that there are considerable deliverability issues with regard to most of the sites now identified in the Options Document. However, what I want to do is to assure the Local Planning Authority that an extension to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate can be delivered in the short term, continuing well into the Plan period.</p> <p>As the deliverability statement from Ankers &amp; Rawlings confirms, they purchased this site in the early 70s and, with the agreement of the Local Planning Authority, designed and installed, so far as possible, infrastructure works for the whole 40 acre development. The company has developed some 1.5 million sq. ft. of commercial space throughout the area and retain approximately 1 million sq. ft. which they continue to operate and manage. Having written down the infrastructure costs, the land which is the subject of this discussion, is shown in the Company's Accounts Agricultural Values with no debt attached and only minimal further infrastructure works to carry out development. This puts the Company in an excellent position to bring forward commercial development on a very competitive basis, subject to any financial contributions which the Local Planning Authority may require. The financial situation is confirmed in the enclosed letter from HSBC</p>	<p>the site is large enough to support services and enhanced public transport. The stakeholders would be prepared to subsidise a commercial hub as part of its Green Travel Plan, to reduce journeys off the site during the day and to encourage employees to use modes of transport other than the private car.</p> <p>Under the heading, "Is it informed by Evidence?" reference could be made to independent consultants' reports with regard to ground conditions, flood risks, transportation, ecology and other matters.</p>		

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>Bank, from which it is quite clear that if the Company so wished, it could fund the development entirely from existing cash and bank facilities, although if the Company wanted, the bank is only too willing to put in place a separate facility for this scheme.</p> <p>The situation with regard to demand for and supply of employment land is set out in the attached letters from Messrs Nettleship Sawyer and Goadsby, major commercial agents in the area. Goadsby have been open enough to identify clients for whom they are seeking premises and Nettleship Sawyer have pointed to issues with regard to the deliverability of employment land on other sites.</p> <p>Anticipating other concerns of the Local Planning Authority, A &amp; R Developments commissioned a Cultural Heritage desk-based assessment, Arboricultural Reports with regard to trees within and adjoining the Areas 05 and 06. The Ecological Report similarly investigates not only the flora and fauna of the land but also the adjoining land. Whilst further seasonal survey work is required, the conclusion of the Report is that the northern part, that is Site 06 and most of the southern part of the site have very common wildlife habitats and are of only minor local interest for wildlife, supporting a range of common plants and which will be supporting a range of common animal species. A small area of woodland and mire in the south west of the southern part of the site are of very high value and part of an adjacent protected site. This is excluded from Site 05.</p> <p>The supporting research and Reports are being forwarded to the Planning Policy Team under separate cover because of the size of the documents is such that they cannot be all transmitted in one e-mail.</p>			
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		Option PC 5	Support					1394
534820	Paul Batten		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
534837	Mrs P Martin		Option PC 5		No Opinion	Horses need grazing land. No infrastructure in place for the total number of homes planned. I do not go out between 8.00 and 9.30 am and 3.00pm and 6.30pm because of the traffic on the roads			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						now.			
534875	Brian Lane		Option PC 5	Support					1394
534914	Mrs P Froud		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
535070	Mr Alan Reade		Option PC 5	Object					1394
535112	Mr Jack Tindall		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
535167	Lynda Lake		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
535209	Mr P Webster		Option PC 5	Object		Please liaise with NFDC and NPA, as the additional traffic generated by the extra housing and employment zones will increase the traffic problems at the already congested bottleneck at Ringwood and cause yet more problems for the people who live in New Forest hamlets such as Linwood, Brook and Burley as motorists try to find alternative routes. Can the New Forest take any more pressure from additional numbers of visitors? Has Dorset got enough sand and gravel in the landbank to meet the needs of the developers? Can you force Tarmac to start mining gravel by the Spur Road near Hurn? What will happen to the pollution levels close to the trunk roads e.g. at Ringwood, especially particulate pollution? Can Bournemouth Water meet the increased demands for water?			1394
535349	P Thomas		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		Option PC 5	Object		I think that this whole core strategy consultation needs a full review in light of the proposed changes being brought in under the new government. I particularly object to all the proposed Verwood development as the infrastructure is not in place to support the			1394

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						current population let alone adding even further to it by building a further 400 homes. Any EDDC councillor who has the affront to say that the infrastructure is in place to support this development does not know what they are talking about and obviously do not live in the town.			
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		Option PC 5	Object		The document correctly underlines the importance of the Dorset Heathlands. However it is essential to note that at this stage there is no evidence to support the theory that development of SANGs will actually sufficiently alleviate unacceptable pressure on the Dorset Heathlands. Indeed what evidence there is indicates that the approach is unlikely to be fully successful. Yet the Core Strategy is based on the assumption that the approach will work, and there is even a detectable implication that the Dorset Heathlands actually need income generated from further development to be protected and managed! This is a gross distortion of the concept of SANGs. Actually SE Dorset cannot continue to accept open ended growth without damage to heathland and the now apparently universal approach of tacking on an area of SANG to every new development on the basis that it protects, or even somehow enhances heathland biodiversity, is extremely worrying. Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously having damaging implications for heathlands, be they SSSIs or SNCIs, include KS3, KS4 (Coopers Lane south), VWM4 and VMW7. There is a commitment to restore and link heathland within south-east Dorset and areas most suitable for such restoration have been identified. There are options within the CS which would preclude such beneficial restoration including KS3/ PC7, PC4, and PC5.			1394
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		Option PC 5	Object		The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options.</p> <p>However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported.</p> <p>This site drains into an lies in very close proximity to the Moors River. The southern sector adjoins heathland and the northern is grassland of currently unknown interest. Again then this is a most unsuitable site for choice for employment expansion in that it poses a threat to the water quality of the Moors River and will permanently remove the opportunity for useful heathland restoration/expansion. There may also be a loss of grassland biodiversity since that potential interest is currently unknown.</p> <p>In summary all these three employment options are objectionable for similar biodiversity reasons – threat to the Moors River system, loss of opportunity for heathland restoration and actual or potential loss of grassland. It is also argued above that promotion of employment land is a key factor in our housing conundrum. The case is therefore made for the deletion of these 3 sites and if absolutely necessary, allocation of a more modest and more thoughtfully placed site.</p>			
360112	Mr Kenneth BROOKS	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	Option PC 5	Object		<p>The employment sites are adjacent to flood zones 2 and 3, which is a major constraint and would need to be overcome. There is a lack of accessibility from centres such as Poole, Bournemouth and Christchurch by public transport. There is already a problem with traffic on Horton Road through Ashley Heath and the width of Horton Road is too narrow for large HGVs and wide loads. When Woolsbridge Industrial Estate was created some 30 years ago it</p>			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						was proposed to make a direct link to the A31 at the Azalea Roundabout. This has never materialised, but the more recent plans to remove the Azalea Roundabout appear to have been shelved.			
360777	Cllr. Mrs A. Warman	St Leonards & St Ives East Ward East Dorset District Council	Option PC 5	Support		Support the proposal that Woolsbridge Industrial Estate be a location for new development in principle but object vociferously to any increase in traffic movements down the Horton Road. Both developed sides of the Horton Road have tolerated excessive transport from Ind. Est. and Car Boot sales. Also Moors Valley events and holiday makers at caravan parks. Horton Road is known as a rat run during rush hours.	I see no alternative due to very poor road conditions and no infrastructure.		1394
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		Option PC 5	Support					1394
498446	W A Murphy		Option PC 5	Support					1394
359286	Mr Andrew PATRICK	Pro Vision Planning and Design	Option PC 5	Object		<p>Pro Vision are instructed by Wessex Water to make representation in response to PC5 and PC6</p> <p>1.2 In essence we would like to suggest that although PC5 and PC6 put forward the potential for releasing green field green belt land for employment, priority should in fact be given to Previously Developed Land such as Little Canford Depot before green field land is released. Our impression is that the Core Strategy which incorporates PC5 or PC6 is unsound in this respect.</p> <p>1.3 Please read this representation in conjunction with parallel representations being made in response to KS1, KS3, KS4 and PC 8. Please also read the "Overview" document "Development Opportunities at Little Canford".</p> <p>Options PC5 and PC6</p> <p>1.4 Paragraph 4.61 explains that green field land is likely to have to be released to meet the employment needs of East Dorset. Although not "preferred" Options, PC5 and PC6 propose green field extensions. PC5 proposes extensions to Woolsbridge Industrial</p>	We would request that Previously Developed Land such as Little Canford Depot should be given priority over Options PC5 and PC6.		1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>Estate. PC6 proposes an extension to Baillie Gate Industrial Estate (Sturminster Marshall).                      Why PC5 and PC6 are unsound                      1.5                      We would suggest that Extensions to Woolsbridge would:                      a) Be Greenfield;                      b) Not be an urban extension;                      c) Be beyond walking distance of any bus service;                      d) Not be served by a shop;                      e) Be no further from Ashley Heath than Little Canford Depot is from Colehill (but much further by road from Verwood, West Moors or Ferndown);                      f) Reduce the green belt gap between Ashley Heath, Three Legged Cross and West Moors; and                      g) Not have direct access to the A31 (T) without passing through a built up area                      1.6                      Criticism b) also applies to Little Canford Depot. However, Little Canford Depot is Previously Developed Land, so a) does not apply. Little Canford Depot is within walking distance of a half-hourly bus and shops, so c) and d) do not apply. Little Canford Depot is closer to Colehill and Ferndown than Woolsbridge is to Verwood, West Moors and Ferndown, so e) does not apply. The site is already built up so f) does not apply. Nor does g).                      1.7                      An Extension to Baillie Gate would:                      i) be green field                      ii) be connected to Wimborne and Corfe Mullen by an infrequent bus service                      iii) be beyond walking (and convenient cycling distance) of most employees in East Dorset                      iv) reduce the Green Belt gap between Sturminster Marshall and Wimborne / Corfe Mullen, and                      v) not have direct access to the A31 (T) without passing through a built up area.                      1.8                      Again, of these criticisms, the only one which applies to Little Canford Depot is ii) insofar as that there is no bus to the site as such.                      1.9</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						Thus it can be seen that it may not be completely logical to allocate either PC5 or PC6, or both, in preference to redevelopment of Little Canford Depot. Such a proposal could be seen as not "justified" and therefore unsound.			
533834	Mr Tim Harris		Option PC 5	Support					1394
535387	Mr Brian Cox		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
535393	Jeremy Berg		Option PC 5	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			1394
535421	Mr Roland Andrews		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
535457	Mr Matthew Newman		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
535500	David Veevers		Option PC 5	Object					1394
535504	Mr Michael Beer		Option PC 5	Support					1394
535509	Mrs S Durant		Option PC 5	Support					1394
535517	Roy Rich		Option PC 5	Object					1394
535547	Mr M		Option PC 5	Object					1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Folland								
535550	Mrs D Mogg		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
535567	Ms Judy McMath		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		Option PC 5	Support					1394
535591	A Walker		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
535670	Dave Allen		Option PC 5	Object					1394
535678	Andrew Bryant		Option PC 5	Support					1394
535688	Susan Hobbs		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
535701	Mr Andy Skeats		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
535718	Richard Green		Option PC 5	Object					1394
535815	Mrs C M Davies		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535836	Peter Parsons		Option PC 5	Support					1394
535865	Darren Charles Bryson		Option PC 5	Support					1394
535875	John Kitchenside		Option PC 5	Support					1394
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		Option PC 5	Support					1394
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		Option PC 5	Support					1394
535940	Mrs Linda Medler		Option PC 5	Support					1394
536014	Mrs Dawn Tindall		Option PC 5	Support					1394
536046	L Appleton		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
536050	Mr Andrew Collin		Option PC 5	Support		It is important to have a policy of continuous improvement for housing and employment for the area. Many are concerned for our environment, sensitive and empathic development will take care of this, but to do nothing will benefit no one in the longer term. A mixture of traditional and affordable homes is desirable, backed by a development in industrial and business land and premises availability. It is important to maintain and improve all areas of housing and commercial opportunity to invest in the future of our area for all parts of the community, the young, the aspiring as well as the established and retired members. Establishing the right mix is essential for a sustainable future in our community.			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536096	Katie Lacey		Option PC 5	Object					1394
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
536169	Mr Tony Trewiss-Bell		Option PC 5	Support					1394
360714	Carol Morgan		Option PC 5	Support		Moving businesses already on industrial estates in or near towns out of the town is counter productive in terms of jobs and accessibility. 500+ houses and schools etc is in effect another village and will not connect easily with the town of Wimborne. Take a look at Poundbury, good idea but now far too big.			1394
360768	Cllr. Mr David Packer	Colehill West Ward East Dorset District Council	Option PC 5	Support					1394
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny PEARCE		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
475508	Mr and Mrs Marshall		Option PC 5	Support					1394
475530	Mr George Phillips		Option PC 5	Object		You need to have a plan on how the infrastructure will be improved to support these housing and commercial developments before we decide on any housing or commercial developments. Infrastructure includes roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, etc. And for roads, I don't mean links from the developments to the existing roads. Everything round here is already overloaded. We need more bridges over the Stour, and a motorway link from Poole to the M27. Motorways north to the M4 and west to the M5 should also be built. These will take the load off the local roads round here. I also think we should only build decent homes. Everyone has to live somewhere, and they should have somewhere decent. It's the cost of land that drives up the cost of accommodation, and building land			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						is expensive because it's in short supply.			
482494	Mrs Yvette Jones		Option PC 5	Object		Why would we want office buildings? Thousands lie empty. Expansion 'projects' smack of driven unnecessary waste and change for all the wrong reasons.			1394
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		Option PC 5	Support		I			1394
498211	Mrs J AUCKLAND		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
498402	Mrs T Hughes		Option PC 5	Object		Re: Employment Land Options Whilst employment is obviously needed in the area, before building new sites please take a look around the existing industrial estates and see just how many units are empty. For example on Cobham Road on the Ferndown Ind Estate there are currently lots of 'To Let' boards. The traffic problems of the A31 need to be addressed before numerous new homes/businesses are built, throughout the summer routes through Ringwood/Ferndown/Wimborne become totally gridlocked. Whilst we can hope and encourage local people to use buses or cycle to work or for shopping, many of the cars coming into and through the area are driven by holidaymakers. With more people taking their holidays in the UK this problem is likely to get worse.			1394
508735	Mr Peter Barham		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
514507	Mr and Mrs C Macy		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
536271	Mrs D Holt		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
536282	Mrs Doreen		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Kingaby								
536324	Paul Sumner		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
536332	Emmanuelle Hutton		Option PC 5	Object					1394
536341	Adrian Bowyer		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
536342	Lily Hutton		Option PC 5	Object					1394
536346	Mr Ben Richards		Option PC 5	Support					1394
536349	Mrs C Bowyer		Option PC 5	Support					1394
536351	Mr John Hutton		Option PC 5	Object					1394
536449	Dave Isaacs		Option PC 5	Object					1394
536543	Samantha Fysh		Option PC 5	Support		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD.. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!			1394
536572	Roger Fysh		Option PC 5	Support		I strongly object to the proposal to increase the housing in and around Verwood. Verwood has been extensively developed over the years and there is inadequate services to support the extra cars and people. Also having seen the housing density of the Ebblake housing estate it is clear that agreeing to more housing will only create 'no go' areas in the very near future. I also note that in and around Wimborne there are huge areas of open land, which could easily be developed, especially between Ferndown and Wimborne which also has excellent road networks in place as it			1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						could immediately open onto the A31			
536576	Mrs Valerie Green		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
536628	Mr C.A Wills		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		Option PC 5	Support					1394
536702	Mr Mark Hirst		Option PC 5	Support					1394
536790	David Steadman		Option PC 5	Support					1394
536808	Ms Yvette Allen		Option PC 5	Object					1394
536812	R H Barker		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
536848	Ola Steadman		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
536850	Mr Michael Hird		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
536866	Emma Huns		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501513	Mr O E BEVERLEY		Option PC 5	Support					1394
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		Option PC 5	Object		<p>PC5 Object Reasons Details of the ecological risk to both the heathland SSSI and Moors River SSSI are provided in the ETAG response. The flood risk problem is clearly identified in the Core Strategy Options consultation document. Were the proposal to be carried forward to the next stage of the consultation it would be essential to plan for the installation of oil interceptors and control measures to ensure that water soluble pollutants do not reach aquatic ecosystems. A mandatory planned and routinely monitored maintenance schedule for such protective mechanisms is essential.</p> <p>An industrial site such as this offers little on-site employment: because of the nature of businesses there, a large proportion of employees use it as a base. Using scarce and valuable land for warehousing (B8) is wasteful. The small proportion of employees on the Ebblake Estate who live in Verwood suggests that there is a mismatch between the type of work offered on such sites and the skills available locally.</p>			1394
536930	Mrs Susannah Spencer		Option PC 5	Support		I also support Employment Options KS13 and BA1-11. For further crucial comments please see the PDF File "Response to EDDC Options for Wimborne and Colehill" emailed to Judy Windwood on 13th January 2011.			1394
536932	Paul Bason		Option PC 5	Support					1394
537050	Diane Fletcher		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
537075	Mrs Elaine Holt		Option PC 5	Support					1394
537106	C		Option PC		No Opinion				1394

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Hebditch		5						
537362	Peter Constable		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
537435	Ms Pauline Burton		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
537529	Mrs C White		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
537571	Nick and Marion Leatherdale		Option PC 5		No Opinion				1394
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter Griffiths		Option PC 5	Support		Support all proposals subject to the prerequisites are fully implemented BEFORE development starts or substantial monies are deposited by developers before development. This will safeguard Council Tax payers against any future failure for whatever reason the developers fails to carry out the prerequisites.			1394
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	15.30	Object		Paragraph 15.30 - Bailie Gate, Sturminster Marshall, page 328 Flood Risk Option PC6 - Site (04) lies within Flood Zone 1. The 'Areas susceptible to surface water flooding map' shows that part of the site lies within an area which may be prone to surface water flooding.			1398
361111	Mr Raymond Brown		Option PC 6	Support					1399
491401	S Ost		Option PC 6	Support		The local roads, schools, hospitals would be unable to cope with extra movements of traffic and people coming into the area.			1399
495527	Miss Caroline Green	Planner Broadway Malyan	Option PC 6	Support		We support the allocation of 3.3 hectares of land at Bailie Gate in Sturminster Marshall for the provision of B1, B2 and B8 employment uses. This will act as an extension to the existing employment uses adjoining the site and will help reinforce			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						Sturminster Marshall's position as a Rural Service Centre as set out in the Settlement Hierarchy. The site is also well located in terms of public transport, being in close proximity to an hourly bus service. The site is accessible from the residential areas in the town. The site is very suitable for development for employment as it is sited away from immediate residential areas which avoids disturbance to existing residents.			
495562	Mr MJ Banting		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
495625	Mr Michael McMath		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
496188	Mr RE Vogel		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
496439	Mr and Mrs Gordon Third		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
496479	Charlotte Dixon		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
496564	JH Lockwood		Option PC 6	Object		No more development on the industrial estate in Sturminster Marshall. Lorry's through the village are a major hazard, noisy and dangerous. Station Road is a race track of cars going to and fro the industrial estate. None of them respect the speed limit.			1399
360037	Mr Dave BARNES		Option PC 6	Support					1399
361041	Mr & Mrs G K HAMPTON		Option PC 6	Support					1399
361170	Mr		Option PC	Support					1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	TR HARVEY		6						
484088	Mr David Price		Option PC 6	Support					1399
491311	Mr Kevin GILLING		Option PC 6	Support					1399
495971	T A Reith		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
496958	Mrs J Beech		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
497026	Doreen Smith		Option PC 6	Object		This amount of building will create extra traffic in Ferndown and Parley which already has a lot of road build up in the busy morning and evening travel. Also taking a lot of natural land for our wild life.			1399
497060	Mrs Mary Tuffrey		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
497184	Mr Hilling		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
497239	Martine Lewis		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
497343	Sharon Sutcliffe		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
497773	R		Option PC	Support		I am fully supportive of the employment options as local people			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Johnstone		6			would have a wider choice of work and travelling should be less for them.			
498044	Carolyne BANKS		Option PC 6	Support					1399
498047	CD Bradford		Option PC 6	Support					1399
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		Option PC 6	Support		Although I live in Ferndown i work and travel around a lot in the local area, so feel I can voice my opinion on developments around the area.			1399
498084	Mr P HARTLEY		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
498125	Mr and Mrs P DASHWOOD		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
498169	Mrs D WEAVER		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
498184	Mrs Angela BARKER		Option PC 6	Object		All the employment land options are currently in the Green Belt - this should be protected! Erode it and we'll have none left in the not too distant future.			1399
498261	ms jenny cure		Option PC 6	Object		Long term development is important and must be done according to the wishes of the local people Even more urgent is the need to get the 2012 strategy right for the next 15 years This erosion of the green belt is not needed and should not be allowed. We have now an industrial estate in an obviously inappropriate place, causing traffic problems and everyday dangers to our village population, it's children and everyday use of the village shop therefore it is absolutely wrong to increase this inappropriate use of village land This is not a village where anyone would move into expecting to gain employment in the village - nor should it be - it's a village with			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						good character not a village trying to be a town - except by the people wanting to profit by turning it into a messy, dangerous town-village, of course!!!			
498268	Mr and Mrs R Cullen		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
498271	Mandy CHEESEMAN		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
498335	Mr and Mrs Lester		Option PC 6	Support					1399
498711	Mr T CHANT		Option PC 6	Support					1399
498996	M E CLARKE		Option PC 6	Support					1399
499044	Mrs Carolyn MASKELL		Option PC 6	Object					1399
360685	Mr M.P HOSE		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
361106	Mr and Mrs Robin and Janet WALL		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
498495	Mr John Williams		Option PC 6	Support					1399
499231	Mrs A		Option PC 6	Support					1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lathbury								
499236	J PIPE		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
499245	Mr and Mrs N BUTLER		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
499261	Mrs Norma JACKSON		Option PC 6	Support					1399
499290	Mrs Lisa TURNBULL		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
499355	Mrs MEREDITH		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
499384	Mr A I ROSE		Option PC 6	Support					1399
499873	Mr Graham Holt		Option PC 6	Support					1399
500060	Mr Stuart PIDDOCK		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
500222	S Hartley		Option PC 6	Support					1399
500350	Mr P H BARTLETT		Option PC 6	Support					1399
500361	Mr and Miss N and A		Option PC 6	Support					1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Middleton and Turner								
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
500558	A Baker		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
500694	Mr and Mrs J R MANSBRIDGE		Option PC 6	Support		Homes and jobs increase movement of people. Therefore the roads must be able to cater for an increase in use. Public transport or company coaches to places of work - like J P Morgan at Littledown. Canford Bottom needs a FLYOVER - nothing less. Think of the flyover at Ringwood and what a bottleneck that was years ago. With a lot more homes in and around West Parley something should be done to alleviate traffic going down New Road. A second road and an additional bridge is the answer there.			1399
500697	Mr Thomas SMITH		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
500706	R & J Jeans		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
500720	Mrs VALLIER		Option PC 6	Object					1399
500748	Mrs Lauren MATTHEWS		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
500802	J Hayward		Option PC 6	Support					1399
500818	Mr J LADD		Option PC 6	Object		GREEN BELT LAND MUST BE PROTECTED, otherwise what is the point of having 'Green Belt'? Please listen to public opinion and don't just say 'we will listen and then disregard it'. I expect this will happen anyway.			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
500836	Mrs Sylvia Hines		Option PC 6	Object					1399
500903	Mr and Mrs S and R Harris		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501012	Louise ARNOLD		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		Option PC 6	Support					1399
501018	Mr Robert P Hand		Option PC 6	Support					1399
501106	Mr John Victor Rogers		Option PC 6	Support					1399
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501114	John Lee		Option PC 6	Object					1399
501118	Mr Ron Cook		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501135	Charlie Wassell		Option PC 6	Support					1399
359895	Mr Jeff REECE		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359908	Mr F.D.A REVILL		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
359927	Mrs Ann BISSEX		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501324	Julie Light		Option PC 6	Support					1399
501351	Mr and Mrs R D'Cruze		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501364	Mr M Devetta		Option PC 6	Support					1399
501485	Mrs J JACKSON		Option PC 6	Support					1399
501488	Chris LAMB		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501502	Mr Michael WAREHAM		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501520	Mrs Z MERRIFIELD		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501523	Rita Gilbert		Option PC 6	Support					1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501560	Mr Christopher CLARKE		Option PC 6	Support					1399
501565	Mr P Keeping		Option PC 6	Support					1399
501574	Mr & Mrs B S Nippard		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501607	Dr Fairchild		Option PC 6	Object		The road network will not support these developments. Long Lane & Colehill Lane have now become "rat runs" for traffic trying to access the A31 and more houses will increase this very big issue			1399
501616	R J Joyce		Option PC 6	Support					1399
501626	Mrs J A Russell		Option PC 6	Object					1399
501694	Mr R BRYAN		Option PC 6	Support					1399
501699	B THOMAS		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501720	Dr and Mrs D HARLOW		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501750	K G Holloway		Option PC 6	Support					1399
501751	Mr		Option PC	Support					1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	RG Birch		6						
501761	Mr D Curtis		Option PC 6		General Comment	The most urgent and critical limiting factors are the A31 single carriageways E and W and density of traffic using Canford Bottom roundabout - Encouraging increased commercial traffic re. PC 4 to PC 9 would only exacerbate the present traffic problems.			1399
501804	Mr Glyn Davies		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501823	Mr and Mrs E A Osgood		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501867	Mrs I M Marks		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501873	Mr and Mrs Harold A and D Joan Lilley		Option PC 6	Object		All proposals of this nature have a number of basic needs. One of the most important is infrastructure. Subject to finance being available Canford Bottom Roundabout is to be drastically amended for the Olympic Games. The reference to "Improvements to Canford Bottom therefore appear to have been superseded. Since I cannot find any intention to improve the road network all these proposals will only add to our present problems and cannot be supported.			1399
501876	J Long		Option PC 6	Support					1399
501881	B W Deverill		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502022	Mr		Option PC	Object		Dorset's villages and small towns should be preserved as such. So			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	HWR Stevens		6			called "developers" are only concerned with profits. There'll always be an England? Not when it has been built over and occupied by strangers.			
502029	Mr J MacArthur		Option PC 6	Object					1399
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502059	Mr R Seddon		Option PC 6	Object					1399
502076	Kay Stead		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502078	Mr R Marlow		Option PC 6	Object		Why waste more tax payers money!!! Too much now!!! These proposals are ridiculous, as any further work prospects in this are "zero". So why more homes and cars when the road/transport structure is obsolete for modern days need, let alone provision for the future 20/30 years. Just building more houses will not solve the long standing problems in Dorset i.e. jobs and road structures.			1399
502092	Mr and Mrs A Watkinson		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502099	Carolyn Lourens		Option PC 6	Object		As a resident of Sturminster Marshall the constant flow of industrial traffic through the village is already at an unacceptable level. It is always extremely busy around the Post Office area and parked cars and passing lorries make for an already over stressed area. Any improvements to transport issues would only increase costs via council tax.			1399
502110	Mrs Siobhan Myock		Option PC 6	Object	General Comment	It would seem that Sturminster Marshall is becoming a favourite target for numerous actions in which the residents have been treated with considerable disdain, due to the fact that their very reasonable objections have been utterly ignored. 1. Planning consent for 21 additional houses on an unsuitable site.			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>2. Instalment of a toxic waste facility adjacent to the village school. Important to note that residents were informed that it was a waste of time objecting, as the plan had already been okayed by the Environmental Health Authority!</p> <p>3. Application for Mineral Extraction which would blight the countryside and pose serious traffic problems in and around the area. Mineral Extraction has already been carried out in this village before and has left its mark.</p> <p>The employment land options in PC 6 are another unacceptable form of intrusion contributing to the destruction of the ethos of the village, by siting inappropriately an additional industrial complex (we already have the industrial estate just off the High Street), and adding to the already growing traffic problems in and around the village.</p>			
502114	Mr P Foster		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502138	Mrs E Mason		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
359598	Mr A KETCHLEY		Option PC 6		No Opinion	<p>Unfortunately whatever is finally decided on the following well known saying will occur:                      'You can please some of the people all the time,                      You can please all of the people some of the time,                      But you cannot please all of the people all of the time!'                      I wish you well in whatever is decided. Some will see it as inevitable due to the area's population increases, whereas others will see it as a necessary evil, and some will accept it without question</p>			1399
359977	Miss M.G. EARP		Option PC 6	Object					1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361113	Mr Alan Meade		Option PC 6	Support		.I like the rate of affordable housing to private homes. We all know that there is a shortage. Jobs will be created, money brought in, good for all in East Dorset, Christchurch			1399
361123	Mr Iain STEVENSON		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		Option PC 6	Support					1399
502224	Mr and Mrs Larcombe		Option PC 6	Support					1399
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502317	Cllr Peter Lucas		Option PC 6	Object					1399
502322	Mrs J C Critchell		Option PC 6	Object					1399
502326	Mr and Mrs T Bennett		Option PC 6	Object		With more homes will need more employment, a vicious circle. Our roads are too busy now. We surely have enough community areas and centres.			1399
502329	Mrs Rosemary Rooke		Option PC 6	Support					1399
502333	B M Andrews		Option PC 6	Object		Make parents walk their children to school. Stop parents 4x4s, etc. Spend more money on our area. Council tax far too high and what benefits do we receive from the Parish Council?			1399
502345	Mr and Mrs		Option PC		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Ray and Irene Coulson		6						
502347	Sarah Cobb		Option PC 6	Object					1399
502364	FD Peach		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502381	Mr Cyril Josey		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502387	Mr George Kilpatrick		Option PC 6	Support		I would like to see the justification for increased housing in East Dorset e.g., demographics, immigration, increased work opportunities etc. I would also like to understand how transport strategy (and infrastructure) is coordinated with this in such a way to make expansion sustainable.			1399
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		Option PC 6	Object					1399
502468	Robert Lambert		Option PC 6	Support					1399
502568	Sarah Morgan		Option PC 6	Object					1399
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502570	Mr Samways		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502579	Mr & Mrs R L		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Thorne								
502595	Mr Colin House		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502596	A C Hayter		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502610	John Jackson		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		Option PC 6	Support					1399
502673	Mrs A Powell		Option PC 6	Object		The infrastructure in this area needs to be sorted out before anymore building goes ahead. There are times you cannot move on the roads. The area is being ruined with all this building works that are already going on.			1399
502701	Mrs M Williams		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
502708	Ms Julia Owen		Option PC 6	Support					1399
502745	Mrs J.M Kenny		Option PC 6	Object		Traffic increase into the village of Sturminster Marshall is totally unacceptable. I object to any extraction of minerals (river gravel) in this area which would destroy the environment and cause traffic disruption and possible flooding.			1399
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		Option PC 6	Object					1399
502921	Mr and Mrs L Forinton		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502935	Mr Roger Parker		Option PC 6	Support					1399
502999	Mrs Marion E Lock		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503156	Richard and Jackie Blunderfield		Option PC 6	Support		Also supported in Options for Employment leaflet			1399
503171	Sally Cooke		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503183	B Chissell		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503233	F Parkes		Option PC 6	Object					1399
503250	Mrs Helen Poole		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503303	Mr Anthony Roberts		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		Option PC 6	Support					1399
503347	Ms Hardwick		Option PC 6	Object					1399
359873	Mrs M HUGHES		Option PC 6	Support					1399
359889	Mr and Mrs		Option PC	Support		With any developments we would need to be assured that			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	P CLARK		6			infrastructure improvements are in place BEFORE any development is consented to. This is particularly important with regard to public transport provisions. It is also important that feedback is forthcoming as an acknowledgement of our response to this survey.			
359920	S PARKER		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		Option PC 6	Support		1. I want to know the projected time scale for these options to start to become active. 2. It is most important that there is adequate employment to accommodate the houses to be built. 3. More attention must be made to supply of affordable housing. 4. The green belt must be respected where possible. 5. The estates around Wimborne must be consulted fully.			1399
360029	Mr David LANIGAN		Option PC 6	Support		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy Document, Managing Growth and Development up to the year 2027. I agree with the preamble stating that we need to meet local housing needs, with the emphasis on growing the main settlements where we have good access to facilities that people require. Some development of smaller communities should continue however, especially the provision of low cost housing. The community as a whole, needs the services of teachers, nurses, firemen, postmen, and policemen who are poorly paid because they commit to a vocation rather than a high salary job. We also need the services of skilled people such as builders, electricians, plumbers, gas fitters, and motor mechanics, the essentially blue collar professionals. They must not be priced out of the market in terms of being able to buy a starter home, in the community that they serve. Having bought my first home in 1963, a two bedroom bungalow for £2,200 I am aware that locally such a property is currently one hundred times as much. This makes things difficult for young couples with the ratio of house prices to wages being the highest in the country. Many struggle with getting mortgages that now require typically a 25% deposit on an already expensive property. I moved to West Moors 15 years ago and appreciate the planning decisions that have taken place affecting this village. We now have			1399

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>a new build shopping centre on Station Road, complete with flats, good pavements, lighting, pelican crossing and trees. I am pleased to have seen built several small, three storey, blocks of retirement and two bed flats close to the village centre. I support the gradual expansion of the Village, current population around 7,500 as we have good schools, a large Memorial hall, Churches with halls, two public houses, doctors, dentists and good bus services to both Poole and Bournemouth. We have footpath access to open land such as Holt Heath, as well as being able to use the old railway line route through the village to Ringwood, - the Castleman Trail. Recently St Marys Church has had built a new Church Hall which will serve the community and thanks to the National Lottery grant we now have an excellent Bowling Club. I support the continued slow expansion of the village as currently we have many facilities for people of all ages to enjoy.</p> <p>My current house was built in the mid 70s, and has trebled in value since my wife and I moved here 15 years ago. In the 1970s West Moors doubled in size and acquired new schools and since then other infrastructure improvements. In recent years the Library was refurbished. The facilities for retirees in West Moors, with access to Ferndown and Verwood, are very good, and coupled with excellent hospitals at Poole, Bournemouth and Wimborne, and I have felt no need to move from East Dorset area in the conceivable future.</p> <p>I therefore support the proposals for additional housing as outlined in the Core Strategy Consultation, as well as the proposals for business sites for employment. I also support provisions for new schools particularly a new Secondary School at Verwood, and recreation areas to cater for the population increase. I understand that net immigration into Dorset is running at two thousand people a year so clearly we need to plan for housing, jobs, education, recreation, road improvements especially at busy junctions, and off road car parking in town centres and on new housing estates.</p> <p>There are many reasons why East Dorset and Christchurch, are attractive places for people to live, work and retire to. Long term planning that caters for the needs of a steady population increase is sensible and is to be welcomed.</p>			
360095	Mr & Mrs John &		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Barbara POLKINGHORN								
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		Option PC 6	Support					1399
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E HACK		Option PC 6	Support					1399
361105	Mr John GOOCH	Also member of Colehill Parish Council	Option PC 6	Support					1399
503024	Valerie Measey		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503355	Mr Robert Griffiths		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503358	H C Hoare		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503421	Mr Geof Haywood		Option PC 6	Support					1399
503444	R Hobbs		Option PC 6	Object					1399
503476	Mrs AM Hawkins		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503527	Claire Smith		Option PC 6		No Opinion	Apportion part of employment land options to housing of all categories for potential employees at these locations thereby reducing transport needs.			1399
503598	Mr John Turner		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503603	Mrs DJ Morley		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503621	A G Haines		Option PC 6	Support		As I'm sure you are perfectly aware, all developments I have ticked require serious consideration to the whole road network in the areas concerned.			1399
503624	Mr RT Jackson		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503635	Mr J Gough		Option PC 6	Support					1399
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503640	N J and S A White		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503644	Mr J Riley		Option PC 6	Object					1399
503687	Mr Nick		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Smith								
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		Option PC 6	Support					1399
503709	Mr and Mrs A Fairclough		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503759	Mr D.J. Middleton		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		Option PC 6	Support					1399
503861	Mr E Hawkins		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503878	Mr Peter Smith		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503879	Mr S Smithson		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
503943	Mr & Mrs Rumball		Option PC 6	Support					1399
504093	Mr & Mrs Vivian		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
504101	Mrs Mary Trevis-Bell		Option PC 6	Support					1399
504216	Mr		Option PC	Object					1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Mark Rich		6						
504285	Mr P Miller		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
504314	Ms Selina Roper		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
505273	Mrs Lorraine Hubbard		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
505288	Mrs S Cramer		Option PC 6	Support	General Comment	As a married mother of 3 children, 2 girls and 1 boy, living in a 2 bed Council flat (first floor), I welcome more housing to the Wimborne area for young families needing affordable housing / rented housing.			1399
505320	Mrs M Puttick		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
361037	Mr P STRATFORD		Option PC 6	Object		I expect that my objection to everything is not very practical. However, I have lived in the area for most of the last fifty years. In that time there has been a constant cycle of the council saying we need more housing, followed by we need more industrial areas to provide extra jobs for all the new homes. Then in turn the council says we require extra jobs for the new homes, then in turn the council says we require extra homes for the new workers. This process is never ending. During this time I've witnessed the creation and expansion of the industrial estates at Ferndown, Uddens, Ebblake and Wimborne. A whole new housing estate at Tricketts Cross, Glenmoor Rd Ferndown, the expansion of West Moors, Colehill, Verwood turned from sleepy village into a town. In this time I am not aware of any developed area being returned to its natural state from a developed one. Please let me know if you think differently. I hope you agree that my objection to development is rational and that the never ending cycle of expansion is stopped.			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
475526	Mr Geoffrey Dark		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary Hendy		Option PC 6	Object		The Green Belt should stay Green.			1399
498775	Mrs P L Buckler		Option PC 6	Object					1399
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		Option PC 6	Support					1399
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		Option PC 6	Object	General Comment	Building more houses has NOTHING to do with meeting the needs of (existing) local residents. We do not need or want more houses in our area. Planning to build more houses is driven by the 'need' to meet externally imposed quotas based on false assumptions on the desirability of further population and economic growth. Instead of wasting resources on building more housing which is ecologically unsustainable, we should be using them to make a transition to a low energy sustainable future for our children. Please listen to local residents and reject further development.			1399
505523	Mr & Mrs A Turner		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
505561	Mr. D. Calvert		Option PC 6	Object					1399
505590	M Spalding		Option PC 6	Support					1399
505656	Mr Dave Evans		Option PC 6	Support					1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
505760	J Evans		Option PC 6	Support					1399
505802	Mr RGH Chapman		Option PC 6	Object					1399
506116	Mr and Mrs P and SJ Simpson		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		Option PC 6	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			1399
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		Option PC 6	Object		<p>I object for the following reasons:</p> <p>This estate has unused land and premises already – why develop further into the green belt?</p> <p>The estate has seen expansion within its footprint in recent years and the number of vehicles illegally traversing the 6'6" width limit over the single lane White Mill Bridge is increasing month by month – with attendant risks to the grade 1 listed structure and increase in van and lorry traffic through the village centre.</p> <p>There is a huge space at the entrance to the site which is not developed, adjacent a mostly unused older building. I would suggest that the older buildings are demolished and that the area bordering Station Road is developed for housing, with the retail chemists and possibly one other new outlet unit being moved into the entrance area of the estate. Under these circumstances, limited expansion into PC6 to account for the lost unit space would be reasonable.</p> <p>Finally, I object to anything other than office use for any additional land – any operation which involves noise of any kind is not acceptable in this rural setting.</p> <p>This must not be used as providing some sort of back door access for the proposed mineral site.</p>			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
506754	Mr Derek E Marsh		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
507026	Mr David Craig		Option PC 6	Support	General Comment	I would like to see priority given to projects which have a higher concentration of social housing inclusion, and also include a higher green/renewable energy provision. Particular concentration on family areas, playgrounds and social/community facilities should be considered.			1399
507032	Mr David Oliver		Option PC 6	Support					1399
507033	A R Twaits		Option PC 6	Object	General Comment	Despite improvements to public transport, cycling and walking, the reality is that the vast majority of journeys will continue to be made by car. Local roads are already congested and the extent of development proposed is not acceptable without significant increases in the capacity of these roads for cars. In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.			1399
507070	Mr and Mrs Earwicker		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
507286	Mr N P Butler		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
507336	Mr John Page		Option PC 6	Support					1399
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507388	Mr David Huggins		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
507524	Mr C G Richardson		Option PC 6	Support					1399
507555	Mr and Mrs C Lamond		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
507572	GJ Pettifer		Option PC 6	Support					1399
507595	Mr D Johnson		Option PC 6	Support					1399
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
507693	Mrs P Carter		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
507760	Mr and Mrs R Gardner		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
507800	Mrs K M Platt		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
507908	Mr Philip H		Option PC 6	Support					1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	James								
507980	Sylvia Allen		Option PC 6	Support					1399
508383	Ms Emma Hayter		Option PC 6	Support					1399
508413	Mrs S Best		Option PC 6	Support					1399
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		Option PC 6	Object		The Council is always after land for housing or business development. Whatever is granted is never enough and a few years later they want more. This process has been going on for over 50 years and it is time it came to a stop. Enough is enough as it is ruining the area.			1399
508852	Mrs L.A. Chesshire		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		Option PC 6	Support					1399
508928	Mr D.W. Lonsdale		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
509065	Mrs B Burge		Option PC 6	Support					1399
360097	Mr John DOWLING		Option PC 6	Object					1399
361121	Mrs Elizabeth		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	JONES								
361161	Mr Douglas FORWARD		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
361184	Mr S MOON		Option PC 6	Object		In most situations I will object to the build of additional housing / business premises, as I do not believe that other options have first been considered or if not possible 'today' are being pursued for the longer term. For example, 1) There are many properties, particularly in Dorset, which are second homes and for most of the year are empty. Action needs to be taken to make these available for renting / purchase as even today, let alone the future, houses are unoccupied, for whatever reason, is not an option. (I would support legislation.) Empty properties also need to be addressed. 2) The development of "brownfield" sites, even if these may not be profitable as other options or as desirable to live or work. 3) Thinking outside the box or in this case outside the areas of this Strategy Consultation. Dorset is not alone in having to address these issues and we need to have some "joined up thinking" with other authorities to see if there are joint opportunities. In this respect Hamworthy Engineering buildings have been empty for many years but do not appear to be in anyone's options.			1399
510420	Mr Peter Stevens		Option PC 6	Object					1399
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		Option PC 6	Object					1399
510532	W.W. Chant		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
510623	Mr Douglas Priest		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
510798	Mr		Option PC	Support					1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	F Sullivan		6						
510844	Mr Michael Guilmany-Cush		Option PC 6	Support		It was rather cheeky of you not to provide mapping of the Employment land options sites. I had to consult an OS map.			1399
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R. Mayes		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
510974	Mr Jim Cullumbine		Option PC 6	Support					1399
510993	R.A. Cherrett		Option PC 6	Support					1399
511015	Mr Christopher White		Option PC 6	Object					1399
511076	Mr Ian Burden		Option PC 6	Object					1399
511219	Ms Kathleen Smith		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and Diana Froud		Option PC 6	Support					1399
511430	A.D. May		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
511489	Mr H G		Option PC 6	Support					1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Holden								
511571	Colin Alborough		Option PC 6	Support		We are in desperate need of more affordable housing in the East Dorset area. There is also a shortage of employment opportunities in the area. The provision of more houses should help to push house prices down to give young people a change of getting on the property ladder.			1399
511618	Mrs V Blunden		Option PC 6	Support					1399
511621	Ms Mary A Combe		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
511692	Ms Ruth Blaug		Option PC 6	Support		I			1399
511711	Coombes		Option PC 6	Support					1399
511747	Mr T W Tonge		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		Option PC 6	Support					1399
361196	Mr J.M BULLIVANT		Option PC 6	Support					1399
476264	Mr David Reddaway		Option PC 6	Support					1399
491252	Margaret Wareham		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507899	R J Potts		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
511639	Paul Hockey		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
512281	Graham Roberts		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
512326	Mr Ian Willis		Option PC 6	Support					1399
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A Kirby		Option PC 6	Object					1399
513692	Mrs A Willis		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
513881	Mrs S Bagg		Option PC 6	Object					1399
513900	Mr P Wall		Option PC 6	Support		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed e.g. road improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			1399
513937	A Boxshall		Option PC 6	Object		Re Bailie Gate. Sturminster Marshall's roads are not equipped to deal with more big lorries. The First School down the road, village life will all be affected. Again this is a village. What about all the empty ind. sites/units locally, shouldn't these be filled first.			1399
513954	Mr RW Heseltine		Option PC 6	Support					1399
513966	Mr and Mrs Howard		Option PC 6	Support					1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
513974	Mr A Moore		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
514039	Mrs R Doman		Option PC 6	Support					1399
514049	Mrs E Hellier		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
514091	Mr RJ Potts		Option PC 6	Support					1399
514099	Mr and Mrs T C Blakeley		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
514111	Penelope Webiery		Option PC 6	Object					1399
514136	Mrs J Crumb		Option PC 6	Support					1399
514225	Mr Simon Dixon	Secretary West Moors Traders Association	Option PC 6	Support					1399
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon Chaffey		Option PC 6	Object					1399
514274	Mr Showell		Option PC 6	Support		Instead of new housing there should be a new strategy of providing more public open space. The lessons of the Edwardians/Victorians should be learnt. New public parks like Poole Park, Queens Park and Kings Park save an			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						area from urban crowding. Perhaps all the land proposed for housing could be reallocated to public parks.			
514355	Mr T Gee		Option PC 6	Object					1399
514379	Mrs Denise Bannister		Option PC 6	Object					1399
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option PC 6	Support		DWT consider that this site should be subject to survey to inform decisions and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems required to protect the groundwater, adjacent watercourse and waterbodies.			1399
359916	JB Cossins		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
360626	Mr Frank Miller	Chair Person Sturminster Marshall Affordable Housing Self Build Homes Group	Option PC 6	Object		We have more than plenty sites empty which need filling so why build more factory units? Get the rates down which will allow empty units to be let. Alter the big units into smaller one / two type units. Drive out and look. Please stop doing desk top plans. I would love to help in putting forward real working plans instead of dreams. Please live in the real world.			1399
361014	Mr Peter Hammond		Option PC 6	Support					1399
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
476792	Mr and Mrs Lomas		Option PC 6	Support					1399
481604	Mr Gerald		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Toomer								
485695	Mr John Cornish		Option PC 6	Support		Please consider the provision of incubator offices and small workshops for businesses spawned out of the Bournemouth University and Executive Business Centre in Holdenhurst Road. Reference Site Chillworth Science Park. This could be sited off road in North Dorset, say Sixpenny Handley to improve local economy.			1399
496996	Mr Hayward		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
500746	Mrs J Lothian		Option PC 6	Support					1399
500817	Mr L Lothian		Option PC 6	Object		Already too much traffic on the roads which are in poor condition after 2 years of frosts.			1399
508562	K Clayson		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
508993	Mr A Samways		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
509795	Mr R Ridley		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
509814	Mr T M Trickett		Option PC 6	Object		Object to PC6 because if the mineral extraction was given the go ahead this could be the access the developers need to transport the minerals from the site and avoid the A31 road.			1399
511761	Mr G Burge		Option PC 6	Support					1399
513651	Mrs W		Option PC 6	Support		1. Improved public transport to these employment sites. 2. Business centres for starting business with full back office			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Pearsall					support. 3. Tax breaks to encourage businesses to move to our area. 4. Subsidised training for all age groups in starting up and running a business. 4. Part time apprenticeship training for all age groups.			
514467	Mrs Lesley Cripps		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
514482	C E T Gilbert		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		Option PC 6	Object					1399
514674	Mrs J Williams		Option PC 6	Object		Objections to PC6, PC8 and PC9 are mainly due to traffic. Ham Lane and Canford Bottom couldn't cope with any more. Likewise PC6 has too much traffic coming from it already - blocking up Station Road especially in the mornings outside the PO/shop and the flood plain and extra sewage have to be considered. the water lies very close to the surface in that area - in the land adjoining you only have to sink a pipe into the ground, put a hand pump on top and you have water as my parents used to own the adjoining ground when we lived in Bailie Leaze.			1399
514752	Claire Richardson & Jamie Shirley		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
514812	Mr C Sawyer		Option PC 6	Object					1399
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		Option PC 6	Object		Seeking the opinion of the general public on planning issues is all very commendable - but setting aside all political persuasion my feeling is that this is no more than a Public Relations exercise because in the end the final decisions are always to the advantage of the developers whoever they may be because of money, greed and looks good on paper.			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514913	Mr and Mrs M Clark		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
514939	D Porter		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		Option PC 6	Object		The area is already over-developed and congested - further development on the scales proposed would lead to deterioration of the environment and a reduction in the quality of life. I am particularly dismayed by continued threats to the Green Belt, especially as this Government pledged to protect it. I do not believe that such massive development is necessary or beneficial to the vast majority of inhabitants. Pressure on our area should be reduced by Government tackling such issues as population growth through immigration control and regeneration of brownfield sites in Midlands and North. There is a need for limited affordable and social housing locally, but not more executive homes. It is wrong to build new homes while second homes and investment properties continue to exist.			1399
515033	Mr T Crump		Option PC 6	Object		These proposals are typical of the failures contrived by Council and Consultants to address short term solutions to Government edict. Fundamental to any significant further development is the need for joined up thinking for transportation. All of these proposals further the burden on traffic flow through and around conurbation centres. These major roads are the responsibility of the government highways department. They should foot the bill for their improvements prior to further development. Some of these proposals virtually adjoin 100 instance flood lines. This is totally unacceptable. Any proposal to move allotments, away from the housing that uses them, increases road usage and has a negative impact on the community.			1399
515287	Mr L		Option PC 6	Support		The A31 trunk road from Ferndown by-pass should be widened to form a dual carriageway all the way through to Bere Regis.			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Jackson								
515367	Mr & Mrs J Pottinger		Option PC 6	Support					1399
515479	Mr D Lenehan		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
515763	Mr V S Harris		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
515788	J M May		Option PC 6	Support					1399
516313	Mr Julian Humphries		Option PC 6	Support		PC5, 6 and 7 are less obtrusive than PC4. 7 is ideal as it has good roads with roundabouts for directive changes. PC 5 and 6 are expansion of existing and appear appropriate.			1399
517528	Dr Susan Burton		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
517600	Mrs M Papadopulo		Option PC 6	Object					1399
517621	Ms Sonia Cade		Option PC 6	Object		I have highlighted an area in yellow on this map showing a one in one hundred year flood plain. This was copied from an Environment Agency map which was produced in 2001. I have a copy of this map. Part of the area (unmarked) used to be a bog, when the estate was owned by Unigate. Not free draining. If this land was built on, it could be detrimental to the environment.			1399
517835	Mr G D Rodrigues		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359482	Ms Helen POWELL	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	Option PC 6		No Opinion	Parts of this site may have Great Crested Newt present, given the locality of nearby populations. Our opinion on this option will depend on further information coming forward on European Protected Species issues here.			1399
359891	Mrs Susanne Parkin		Option PC 6	Support		There should be more places of employment nearer to existing housing - this should be small units and sites. To enlarge existing sites is not very sustainable in terms of traffic - it is foolish to exacerbate existing bad traffic conditions as we have at present e.g. the A31 at peak time from the Ferndown Industrial Estate. Villages surrounding the conurbation should all support a degree of employment and industry.			1399
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	Option PC 6	Support		The Core Strategy Options for Consideration identifies a number of major employment opportunities which are located close to the A31 corridor, including the largest at Ferndown (Option PC4). The Agency recognises the role of Ferndown as the leading employment centre in the district and confirms that further growth in this area, as envisaged under Option PC4, should be assessed at the strategic level through the SEDMMT model. Option PC7 at St Leonard's Hospital is of particular concern to the Agency due to its direct access on to the A31. Detailed Transport Assessments would also be required at the appropriate stage. The Agency endorses the identification of transport improvements required, given in respect of Ferndown and other locations, which include upgrading of the A31 Canford bottom junction and preparation of comprehensive travel plans including public transport measures. The Agency looks forward to contributing to the progression of the development briefs proposed for the major employment sites.			1399
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		Option PC 6	Support		Travel for Employment, Education, Shopping and Leisure. Where do the residents of Wimborne and Colehill seek Employment, Education, Shopping and Leisure activities? Travel for Employment Data for employment appears only to be available for 2001 in the Core Strategy Area Profile2, which is unlikely to reflect the			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>increased trend of out of town travelling for work. Since the turn of the Century greater mobility has been necessary more and more, not only to secure work, but also to achieve career progression. Travel distances are only available for about 60% of the working population of Wimborne and Colehill, and roughly half of these travel between 10 and 40 Kms to work and the others between 5 and 10 Kms.2 One wonders about the other 40%, are they perhaps beyond 40 Kms, as I was myself, or do they now work from home? EDDC options for Employment4 identify a negative effect on the availability of sites in Wimborne and Colehill. When considering the sites proposed at PC5 to PC9 inclusive, KS13, BA1-11, the relocation of Stone Lane Industrial Estate3, plus the inclusion of land released at Cobham Gate5, it would mean that greater use of the A31 will be necessary for people to travel to work in the future. The location of proposed employment sites will hardly encourage people to walk or cycle to work, and I doubt that they will find it convenient to travel to these proposed locations by public transport. In addition one can expect that many jobs will be filled by "Outsiders" who in turn will utilise private transportation on the A31 to get to their destinations of employment.</p> <p>Travel Issues</p> <p>Clearly then the A31 has a major impact on the mobility of people within the Wimborne and Colehill catchment areas. EDDC states that we have the highest level of car ownership in the country3 and we can see the reasons for this in the above analysis of people's needs. It suggests that these problems can be overcome by changing attitudes toward the use of public transport to relieve local congestion.</p> <p>I consider this to be a totally unrealistic approach in our highly pressurised, motivated, mobile, materialistic and ageing society. (see Theoretical Human Life Cycle Transportation Requirements attached19) We must solve the problem and not skirt round it. Take the issue of employment. All of the proposed Industrial Sites are out of area where travel on or crossing of, the A31 is necessary. The same applies to Higher Education, Shopping, Leisure, and to some extent Hospitalisation. We must recognise that where people's choice is limited they will travel great distances to ensure they get what they want.</p> <p>Take the issue of Housing Development. The development of Land to the East and West of the Cranborne Road appears to endorse</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>the unacceptable use of Burts Hill (a country lane) running into Long Lane (another country lane) in becoming a second bypass of the Town. This became evident during the repairs to Julian's Bridge and the Poole Road Bridge, where GPS's offer alternative routes. These roads have increasingly become busier and noisier as a result. People that used to use this route for cycling, walking and jogging are no longer safe to do this anymore.</p> <p>It is strange that the Core Strategy option containing the largest number of homes is considered best situated on the North side of Wimborne, i.e. at the farthest point from the out of area conduit. (the A31) What sense does this make? Its consequence will be that not only the A31 will be jammed up at peak times, but also Middlehill, Leigh Road, Burts Hill, and the Cranborne Road will all suffer greater congestion. Even after taking into consideration that Walford Bridge will need to be widened to accommodate additional traffic movement across town and an improvement in traffic flow through the Stone Lane junction will have to be addressed.</p> <p>I consider all of this could be avoided if the "undeveloped" land to the South of Leigh Road and East of WMC5 was allocated to satisfy only the required number of affordable and supportable homes.</p> <p>Take the issue of Climate Change. Do we really want to release more Carbon Dioxide into the atmosphere by creating more traffic jams and greater congestion, when with the appropriate amount of forethought we can reduce the effects of Climate Change?</p> <p>Further it is predicted that our ageing local population will increase which will to some extent increase the need for personal motorised transport. Since anyone who has graduated to private transportation is unlikely to relinquish it, even if this means being taxied to their destination at times convenient to themselves, they are highly unlikely to walk, cycle or travel on public transport unless it's becomes an absolute last resort.</p> <p>So what can be done to alleviate this issue?</p> <p>Well clearly the A31 has to be upgraded to a dual carriageway with fly overs or underpasses in the most congested spots. However this leads to the question of finance and timing.</p> <p>As a suggestion;</p> <p>Let's think laterally about the infrastructure of Transport, the uses of arterial roads, the polluting effect of vehicles and the funding for road improvements.</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>The A31, which bypasses our town, blocks frequently at peak times and in holiday periods. The primary bottleneck occurs at the Canford Bottom Roundabout, followed closely by the Merley House Lane Roundabout, the Julian's Road Roundabout and finally the Poole Road Roundabout at Bailey Gate. These bottlenecks bring frustration, high energy consumption and more importantly high pollution to our area. Clearly the A31 will have to undergo major improvement to allow through traffic to flow smoothly through our district. The solution can only be a dual carriageway with a series of flyovers, or under passes, that need to be built between the end of the existing dual carriageway at Cobham Road Roundabout all the way through to Bailey Gate, and perhaps beyond to the dual carriageway at Bere Regis.</p> <p>Local, District and County Councils must lobby Government for a greater say in the distribution of the funding for road improvements and take control of funding to support local transport infrastructure when resolving their housing and industrial needs. The projects are intertwined and have to support each other, it's all very well pushing the housing problem back to councils, but councils must be given allocation of the road improvement budget too.</p> <p>Wimborne's problem will not be resolved by a £6 million sticky plaster solution<sup>8</sup> applied to the Canford Bottom Roundabout which will only, if successful, move the bottleneck from one roundabout on the A31 along to another. IT IS TIME FOR MAJOR SURGERY. How else could the necessary road improvements be funded? Since the A31 is a holiday route and a route to an area of the country that boasts England's first natural World Heritage site "The Jurassic Coast", it can conceivably be funded by contributions to road improvements from the EU.</p> <p>But, neither is there anything stopping this section of the A31 becoming a toll road, and in time putting money back into the coffers of the Highways Agency, after all this is the case when travelling down the M6 and also crossing the River Seven when travelling to Wales. I am sure holiday makers and businesses will gladly factor such costs into their budgets.</p> <p>For the sake of the community, and for future generations, we need to bring pressure to bear on Ministers, MPs and local dignitaries to get the necessary funding in place to support this vital arterial improvement. Only then will the EDDC Core Strategy be capable of being successfully implemented.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						SEE ATTACHMENT			
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		Option PC 6	Support					1399
524495	Mr Stanley Jackson		Option PC 6	Support		Attention needs to be concentrated on keeping and ideally increasing the number of younger people in the area, through providing additional employment opportunities, affordable or low-cost housing to purchase and an increase in rented accommodation. I would therefore support all attempts PC4 -PC9 to locate more employment land options.			1399
524553	D M Williams		Option PC 6	Object		<p>I would like to object to the proposal for the following reasons. The Industrial Estate is located within the village close to residential property, an infants school and local amenities. There has been extensive expansion on the estate over the last few years which has increased traffic through the village, posing a safety hazard to people, and increased noise pollution.</p> <p>It is doubtful that any extension will benefit the village from an employment view point as most current employees are from outside the village. This industrial estate offers little to the village in fact it is an eyesore (perhaps they could be encouraged to provide some sort of camouflage to improve the view).</p> <p>Any further extension is yet another infringement on the lives of people who live in the village to the benefit of the operator, Birhmer LTD.</p> <p>Items for consideration in the Core Strategy Document.</p> <p>I consider that some of the following aspect should be considered a high priority rather than an expansion of the industrial estate which provides little or very limited service to the village.</p> <p>1) The land available could be turned into much needed allotments, furthermore greater consideration should be taken to providing this sort of amenity on any suitable available land rather than to hand over for development.</p> <p>2) The Cranborne Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty should be extended to over the whole of the Stour Valley. This would protect the area from exploitation and development which is constantly a threat. Footpaths and Bridleways need to be created to enable access for the public to enjoy this landscape to the full.</p>			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>3) A review of the local traffic routing arrangements to prevent HGV's and other large vehicles from using Sturminster Marshall as a rat run to avoid the restrictions on the A350. Heavy traffic on the narrow village roads is not only a danger to the public but is environmentally unfriendly, creating noise and exhaust pollution.</p> <p>4) The provision of additional facilities such as a park and playing fields, tennis courts and recreational attractions would be more advantageous rather than further industrial or commercial development. These could be incorporated within the extension to the area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (2above).</p> <p>5) An honest assessment of the possibility of flooding in the Sturminster Marshall and Shapwick area taking into consideration the development that has taken place and that that has already obtained planning consent. A complete ban on any further ban on any further development until the assessment is complete.</p>			
524723	Mr John Worth	Chair Wimborne Civic Society	Option PC 6	Support		Attention needs to be concentrated on keeping and ideally increasing the number of younger people in the area, through providing additional employment opportunities, affordable or low-cost housing to purchase and an increase in rented accommodation. We would therefore support all attempts (PC4 to PC6) to locate more employment land options.			1399
489765	Derek KEAREY		Option PC 6	Support					1399
490854	D MUTTON		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
507361	Mr Kenneth Archer		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
507737	Mrs S Philpot		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
523366	Mr Raymond Silverthorne		Option PC 6	Support	General Comment	It is desirable to attempt to encourage Businesses to the rural areas such as Sturminster Marshall, in our opinion this would work better for smaller more localised companies who may offer a more			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						niche product. Sites such as Bailie Gate should therefore be developed with a mix of small/medium units perhaps in a more "Courtyard" style approach.			
527661	W Barnes		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		Option PC 6	Support					1399
534820	Paul Batten		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
534833	Frederick Wall		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
534837	Mrs P Martin		Option PC 6		No Opinion	Horses need grazing land. No infrastructure in place for the total number of homes planned. I do not go out between 8.00 and 9.30 am and 3.00pm and 6.30pm because of the traffic on the roads now.			1399
534875	Brian Lane		Option PC 6	Support					1399
534914	Mrs P Froud		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535070	Mr Alan Reade		Option PC 6	Object					1399
535112	Mr Jack Tindall		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535167	Lynda Lake		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535209	Mr		Option PC	Object		Please liaise with NFDC and NPA, as the additional traffic			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	P Webster		6			generated by the extra housing and employment zones will increase the traffic problems at the already congested bottleneck at Ringwood and cause yet more problems for the people who live in New Forest hamlets such as Linwood, Brook and Burley as motorists try to find alternative routes. Can the New Forest take any more pressure from additional numbers of visitors? Has Dorset got enough sand and gravel in the landbank to meet the needs of the developers? Can you force Tarmac to start mining gravel by the Spur Road near Hurn? What will happen to the pollution levels close to the trunk roads e.g. at Ringwood, especially particulate pollution? Can Bournemouth Water meet the increased demands for water?			
535349	P Thomas		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		Option PC 6	Object		I think that this whole core strategy consultation needs a full review in light of the proposed changes being brought in under the new government. I particularly object to all the proposed Verwood development as the infrastructure is not in place to support the current population let alone adding even further to it by building a further 400 homes. Any EDDC councillor who has the affront to say that the infrastructure is in place to support this development does not know what they are talking about and obviously do not live in the town.			1399
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		Option PC 6	Object		The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of			1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options. However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported.			
360744	Cllr. Mr P. G. Bennett	Stour Ward East Dorset District Council	Option PC 6	Object		Concerns were expressed about possible additional traffic generation from any extension to the Bailey Gate Industrial Estate given the on-street parking and congestion which already occur in the High Street and Station road and that the landscaping/tree screen at the front of the site should in any event be deepened to improve visual amenity.(Reflecting views expressed at a public meeting in Sturminster Marshall about the Core Strategy Consultation)			1399
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
359286	Mr Andrew PATRICK	Pro Vision Planning and Design	Option PC 6	Object		Pro Vision are instructed by Wessex Water to make representation in response to PC5 and PC6 1.2 In essence we would like to suggest that although PC5 and PC6 put forward the potential for releasing green field green belt land for employment, priority should in fact be given to Previously Developed Land such as Little Canford Depot before green field land is released. Our impression is that the Core Strategy which incorporates PC5 or PC6 is unsound in this respect. 1.3 Please read this representation in conjunction with parallel representations being made in response to KS1, KS3, KS4 and PC 8. Please also read the "Overview" document "Development Opportunities at Little Canford".	We would request that Previously Developed Land such as Little Canford Depot should be given priority over Options PC5 and PC6.		1399

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>Options PC5 and PC6</p> <p>1.4 Paragraph 4.61 explains that green field land is likely to have to be released to meet the employment needs of East Dorset. Although not "preferred" Options, PC5 and PC6 propose green field extensions. PC5 proposes extensions to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. PC6 proposes an extension to Baillie Gate Industrial Estate (Sturminster Marshall). Why PC5 and PC6 are unsound</p> <p>1.5 We would suggest that Extensions to Woolsbridge would: a) Be Greenfield; b) Not be an urban extension; c) Be beyond walking distance of any bus service; d) Not be served by a shop; e) Be no further from Ashley Heath than Little Canford Depot is from Colehill (but much further by road from Verwood, West Moors or Ferndown); f) Reduce the green belt gap between Ashley Heath, Three Legged Cross and West Moors; and g) Not have direct access to the A31 (T) without passing through a built up area</p> <p>1.6 Criticism b) also applies to Little Canford Depot. However, Little Canford Depot is Previously Developed Land, so a) does not apply. Little Canford Depot is within walking distance of a half-hourly bus and shops, so c) and d) do not apply. Little Canford Depot is closer to Colehill and Ferndown than Woolsbridge is to Verwood, West Moors and Ferndown, so e) does not apply. The site is already built up so f) does not apply. Nor does g).</p> <p>1.7 An Extension to Baillie Gate would: i) be green field ii) be connected to Wimborne and Corfe Mullen by an infrequent bus service iii) be beyond walking (and convenient cycling distance) of most employees in East Dorset iv) reduce the Green Belt gap between Sturminster Marshall and Wimborne / Corfe Mullen, and v) not have direct access to the A31 (T) without passing through a</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						built up area. 1.8 Again, of these criticisms, the only one which applies to Little Canford Depot is ii) insofar as that there is no bus to the site as such. 1.9 Thus it can be seen that it may not be completely logical to allocate either PC5 or PC6, or both, in preference to redevelopment of Little Canford Depot. Such a proposal could be seen as not "justified" and therefore unsound.			
533834	Mr Tim Harris		Option PC 6	Support					1399
535387	Mr Brian Cox		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535393	Jeremy Berg		Option PC 6	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			1399
535421	Mr Roland Andrews		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535457	Mr Matthew Newman		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535500	David Veevers		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535504	Mr Michael Beer		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535509	Mrs S Durant		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535517	Roy Rich		Option PC 6	Object					1399
535547	Mr M Folland		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535550	Mrs D Mogg		Option PC 6	Support					1399
535567	Ms Judy McMath		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		Option PC 6	Support					1399
535591	A Walker		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535670	Dave Allen		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535678	Andrew Bryant		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535688	Susan Hobbs		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535701	Mr Andy Skeats		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535718	Richard Green		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535815	Mrs C M Davies		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535836	Peter Parsons		Option PC 6	Support					1399
535865	Darren Charles Bryson		Option PC 6	Support					1399
535875	John Kitchenside		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		Option PC 6	Support					1399
535940	Mrs Linda Medler		Option PC 6	Support					1399
536014	Mrs Dawn Tindall		Option PC 6	Support					1399
536050	Mr Andrew Collin		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
536169	Mr Tony Treviss-Bell		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360714	Carol Morgan		Option PC 6	Support		Moving businesses already on industrial estates in or near towns out of the town is counter productive in terms of jobs and accessibility. 500+ houses and schools etc is in effect another village and will not connect easily with the town of Wimborne. Take a look at Poundbury, good idea but now far too big.			1399
360768	Cllr. Mr David Packer	Colehill West Ward East Dorset District Council	Option PC 6	Support					1399
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny PEARCE		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
475508	Mr and Mrs Marshall		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
475530	Mr George Phillips		Option PC 6	Object		You need to have a plan on how the infrastructure will be improved to support these housing and commercial developments before we decide on any housing or commercial developments. Infrastructure includes roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, etc. And for roads, I don't mean links from the developments to the existing roads. Everything round here is already overloaded. We need more bridges over the Stour, and a motorway link from Poole to the M27. Motorways north to the M4 and west to the M5 should also be built. These will take the load off the local roads round here. I also think we should only build decent homes. Everyone has to live somewhere, and they should have somewhere decent. It's the cost of land that drives up the cost of accommodation, and building land is expensive because it's in short supply.			1399
482494	Mrs Yvette Jones		Option PC 6	Object		Why would we want office buildings? Thousands lie empty. Expansion 'projects' smack of driven unnecessary waste and change for all the wrong reasons.			1399
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		Option PC 6	Support		I			1399
498211	Mrs		Option PC		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	J AUCKLAND		6						
498402	Mrs T Hughes		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
508735	Mr Peter Barham		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
514507	Mr and Mrs C Macy		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
536271	Mrs D Holt		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
536282	Mrs Doreen Kingaby		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
536324	Paul Sumner		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
536332	Emmanuelle Hutton		Option PC 6	Object					1399
536341	Adrian Bowyer		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
536342	Lily Hutton		Option PC 6	Object					1399
536346	Mr Ben Richards		Option PC 6	Support					1399
536349	Mrs C		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Bowyer								
536351	Mr John Hutton		Option PC 6	Object					1399
536449	Dave Isaacs		Option PC 6	Object					1399
536543	Samantha Fysh		Option PC 6	Support		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD.. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!			1399
536572	Roger Fysh		Option PC 6	Support		I strongly object to the proposal to increase the housing in and around Verwood. Verwood has been extensively developed over the years and there is inadequate services to support the extra cars and people. Also having seen the housing density of the Ebblake housing estate it is clear that agreeing to more housing will only create 'no go' areas in the very near future. I also note that in and around Wimborne there are huge areas of open land, which could easily be developed, especially between Ferndown and Wimborne which also has excellent road networks in place as it could immediately open onto the A31			1399
536628	Mr C.A Wills		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		Option PC 6	Support					1399
536702	Mr Mark Hirst		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
536790	David Steadman		Option PC 6	Object					1399
536808	Ms Yvette Allen		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536812	R H Barker		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
536848	Ola Steadman		Option PC 6	Object					1399
536850	Mr Michael Hird		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
536866	Emma Huns		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
536930	Mrs Susannah Spencer		Option PC 6	Support		I also support Employment Options KS13 and BA1-11. For further crucial comments please see the PDF File "Response to EDDC Options for Wimborne and Colehill" emailed to Judy Windwood on 13th January 2011.			1399
536932	Paul Bason		Option PC 6	Support					1399
537050	Diane Fletcher		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
537075	Mrs Elaine Holt		Option PC 6	Support					1399
537106	C Hebditch		Option PC 6	Object					1399
537362	Peter Constable		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
537435	Ms Pauline Burton		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
537529	Mrs C White		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
537571	Nick and Marion Leatherdale		Option PC 6		No Opinion				1399
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter Griffiths		Option PC 6	Support		Support all proposals subject to the prerequisites are fully implemented BEFORE development starts or substantial monies are deposited by developers before development. This will safeguard Council Tax payers against any future failure for whatever reason the developers fails to carry out the prerequisites.			1399
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	15.31		General Comment	ARC would support the Care Home for this proposed area. We would object to any housing proposals as it would negatively impact upon the SNCI. ARC would consider plans for industrial use for this site.			1403
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	15.31	Object		Paragraph 15.31 - St Leonard's Hospital, Page 330 Flood Risk Option PC7 - Site (08) lies within Flood Zone 1. The 'Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding Map' shows that part of the site lies within an area which may be prone to surface water flooding.			1403
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		Option PC 7	Support		Yes good transport links, not greenbelt. Can we build higher here, get more in??			1404
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		Option PC 7	Support					1404
361055	Mr David OAKLEY		Option PC 7	Object		I find it very hard to understand how, after unanimous support for no development in the Green Belt this now goes directly against that decision. St Leonards Hospital land should be residential.			1404
361111	Mr Raymond		Option PC 7	Support					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Brown								
491401	S Ost		Option PC 7	Support		The local roads, schools, hospitals would be unable to cope with extra movements of traffic and people coming into the area.			1404
495200	Mr and Mrs J M B Webber		Option PC 7	Object		Canford Bottom Roundabout needs urgent improvements. A31 / Wimborne Road - pressures on these roads E / W. Reduction in industrial traffic through Ferndown.			1404
495562	Mr MJ Banting		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
495625	Mr Michael McMath		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
496188	Mr RE Vogel		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
496479	Charlotte Dixon		Option PC 7	Support					1404
496564	JH Lockwood		Option PC 7	Support					1404
496588	Mr and Mrs Richardson		Option PC 7	Object		The roads around Three Legged Cross are already congested with heavy goods vehicles coming off the A31 into Three Cross and Verwood via West Moors Road and Ringwood Road			1404
496612	Mr and Mrs JP Lovell		Option PC 7	Support					1404
359636	Mr Chris BARTLETT		Option PC 7	Support		This is the perfect 'brownfield' style site that should be used for development. It's currently unpleasant to look at and has 'good' transport options.	Development should include cycleway links and improvements.		1404
360037	Mr		Option PC		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Dave BARNES		7						
361041	Mr & Mrs G K HAMPTON		Option PC 7	Support					1404
361170	Mr TR HARVEY		Option PC 7	Support					1404
484088	Mr David Price		Option PC 7	Support					1404
491311	Mr Kevin GILLING		Option PC 7	Support					1404
495971	T A Reith		Option PC 7	Support					1404
496958	Mrs J Beech		Option PC 7	Support					1404
497026	Doreen Smith		Option PC 7	Object		This amount of building will create extra traffic in Ferndown and Parley which already has a lot of road build up in the busy morning and evening travel. Also taking a lot of natural land for our wild life.			1404
497060	Mrs Mary Tuffrey		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
497184	Mr Hilling		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
497239	Martine Lewis		Option PC 7	Support					1404
497343	Sharon Sutcliffe		Option PC 7	Support					1404
497773	R Johnstone		Option PC 7	Support		I am fully supportive of the employment options as local people would have a wider choice of work and travelling should be less for them.			1404
498044	Carolyne BANKS		Option PC 7	Object		Transport needs to be sorted out centrally - to get something that works properly - this is the biggest showstopper to all of these schemes - the current roads will not support any more traffic.			1404
498047	CD Bradford		Option PC 7	Support					1404
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		Option PC 7	Support		Although I live in Ferndown i work and travel around a lot in the local area, so feel I can voice my opinion on developments around the area.			1404
498084	Mr P HARTLEY		Option PC 7	Object					1404
498125	Mr and Mrs P DASHWOOD		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
498169	Mrs D WEAVER		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
498184	Mrs Angela BARKER		Option PC 7	Object		All the employment land options are currently in the Green Belt - this should be protected! Erode it and we'll have none left in the not too distant future.			1404
498268	Mr and Mrs R Cullen		Option PC 7	Support					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
498271	Mandy CHEESEMAN		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
498335	Mr and Mrs Lester		Option PC 7	Object					1404
498711	Mr T CHANT		Option PC 7	Support					1404
498996	M E CLARKE		Option PC 7	Object					1404
499044	Mrs Carolyn MASKELL		Option PC 7	Object					1404
360685	Mr M.P HOSE		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
361106	Mr and Mrs Robin and Janet WALL		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
361278	Mrs Nicola HOAR		Option PC 7	Support					1404
498495	Mr John Williams		Option PC 7	Support					1404
499231	Mrs A Lathbury		Option PC 7	Support					1404
499236	J PIPE		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
499245	Mr and Mrs N BUTLER		Option PC 7	Support					1404
499261	Mrs Norma JACKSON		Option PC 7	Support					1404
499290	Mrs Lisa TURNBULL		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
499355	Mrs MEREDITH		Option PC 7	Support		Employment development areas must have immediate access to main roads and classified roads. They should not draw commercial traffic through residential areas on inadequate un-classified roads.			1404
499384	Mr A I ROSE		Option PC 7	Support					1404
499683	S Crotch-Harvey		Option PC 7	Support					1404
499873	Mr Graham Holt		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
500060	Mr Stuart PIDDOCK		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
500222	S Hartley		Option PC 7	Support					1404
500350	Mr P H BARTLETT		Option PC 7	Support					1404
500361	Mr and Miss N and A		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Middleton and Turner								
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		Option PC 7	Object					1404
500558	A Baker		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
500694	Mr and Mrs J R MANSBRIDGE		Option PC 7	Support		Homes and jobs increase movement of people. Therefore the roads must be able to cater for an increase in use. Public transport or company coaches to places of work - like J P Morgan at Littledown. Canford Bottom needs a FLYOVER - nothing less. Think of the flyover at Ringwood and what a bottleneck that was years ago. With a lot more homes in and around West Parley something should be done to alleviate traffic going down New Road. A second road and an additional bridge is the answer there.			1404
500697	Mr Thomas SMITH		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
500706	R & J Jeans		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
500720	Mrs VALLIER		Option PC 7	Object					1404
500748	Mrs Lauren MATTHEWS		Option PC 7	Support					1404
500802	J Hayward		Option PC 7	Support					1404
500818	Mr J LADD		Option PC 7	Object		GREEN BELT LAND MUST BE PROTECTED, otherwise what is the point of having 'Green Belt'? Please listen to public opinion and don't just say 'we will listen and then disregard it'. I expect this will happen anyway.			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
500836	Mrs Sylvia Hines		Option PC 7	Object					1404
500903	Mr and Mrs S and R Harris		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
501012	Louise ARNOLD		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501018	Mr Robert P Hand		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501106	Mr John Victor Rogers		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
501114	John Lee		Option PC 7	Object					1404
501118	Mr Ron Cook		Option PC 7	Object					1404
501135	Charlie Wassell		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501194	Mrs Colton		Option PC 7	Support		Housing as well! Why only industrial for St Leonards Hosp? A lot of land there and further down road (where coaches etc parked) this should be better utilised.			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359895	Mr Jeff REECE		Option PC 7	Support		Road Infrastructure needs to be tackled before any development takes place.			1404
359908	Mr F.D.A REVILL		Option PC 7	Support					1404
359927	Mrs Ann BISSEX		Option PC 7	Support					1404
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
501324	Julie Light		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501351	Mr and Mrs R D'Cruze		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
501364	Mr M Devetta		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501485	Mrs J JACKSON		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501488	Chris LAMB		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501502	Mr Michael WAREHAM		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
501520	Mrs Z MERRIFIELD		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501523	Rita Gilbert		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501531	Mr Boyd Read		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
501560	Mr Christopher CLARKE		Option PC 7	Object					1404
501565	Mr P Keeping		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501574	Mr & Mrs B S Nippard		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501607	Dr Fairchild		Option PC 7	Object		The road network will not support these developments. Long Lane & Colehill Lane have now become "rat runs" for traffic trying to access the A31 and more houses will increase this very big issue			1404
501616	R J Joyce		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501626	Mrs J A Russell		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
501694	Mr R BRYAN		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501699	B THOMAS		Option PC 7	Object		St Leonards Hospital will only cause more traffic chaos down to access and speed and volume.			1404
501720	Dr and Mrs		Option PC		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	D HARLOW		7						
501750	K G Holloway		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501751	Mr RG Birch		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501761	Mr D Curtis		Option PC 7		General Comment	The most urgent and critical limiting factors are the A31 single carriageways E and W and density of traffic using Canford Bottom roundabout - Encouraging increased commercial traffic re. PC 4 to PC 9 would only exacerbate the present traffic problems.			1404
501804	Mr Glyn Davies		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501823	Mr and Mrs E A Osgood		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501867	Mrs I M Marks		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
501873	Mr and Mrs Harold A and D Joan Lilley		Option PC 7	Object		All proposals of this nature have a number of basic needs. One of the most important is infrastructure. Subject to finance being available Canford Bottom Roundabout is to be drastically amended for the Olympic Games. The reference to "Improvements to Canford Bottom therefore appear to have been superseded. Since I cannot find any intention to improve the road network all these proposals will only add to our present problems and cannot be supported.			1404
501876	J Long		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501881	B W		Option PC	Object		Will St Leonards Hospital still remain?			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Deverill		7						
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
501961	G Ginn		Option PC 7	Object		What happened to the plan to build bungalows for retired people?			1404
502022	Mr HWR Stevens		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502029	Mr J MacArthur		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		Option PC 7	Object		The whole area is congested, there is no real provision for new TRANSPORT OR services for new homes i.e. doctors, local shops or community centres. There are already MANY EMPTY industrial units. Building more industrial is only viable if a tax loss for developers. Verwood has lost its soul now, and does not need any more ad-hock development. Wimborne will follow if the development of this (at present) lovely Town is carried out in the same way as Verwood has been.			1404
502059	Mr R Seddon		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502076	Kay Stead		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
502092	Mr and Mrs A Watkinson		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502099	Carolyn Lourens		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502113	Mr A Garner		Option PC 7	Object					1404
502114	Mr P Foster		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
502117	Mr P A Beard		Option PC 7	Object					1404
502125	Mr Ivor R Passmore		Option PC 7	Object		As a resident of St Leonards, I object to the development of the area around St Leonards Hospital for light industrial use, apart from objections already put forward, a number of residents in the area have been waiting patiently for a retirement village to be developed on that site of two bedroom bungalows as previously planned. With the hospital nearby it would make an excellent development and enable some residents to downsize.			1404
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502138	Mrs E Mason		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
359598	Mr A KETCHLEY		Option PC 7		No Opinion	Unfortunately whatever is finally decided on the following well known saying will occur: 'You can please some of the people all the time, You can please all of the people some of the time, But you cannot please all of the people all of the time!' I wish you well in whatever is decided. Some will see it as inevitable due to the area's population increases, whereas others will see it as a necessary evil, and some will accept it without question			1404
359977	Miss M.G. EARP		Option PC 7	Object					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361113	Mr Alan Meade		Option PC 7	Support		.I like the rate of affordable housing to private homes. We all know that there is a shortage. Jobs will be created, money brought in, good for all in East Dorset, Christchurch			1404
361123	Mr Iain STEVENSON		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		Option PC 7	Support					1404
501940	Mr M J Godfrey		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502224	Mr and Mrs Larcombe		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502247	Mrs J Crowe		Option PC 7	Object		This site was supposed to be for housing and village type shopping for the elderly. Who wants storage? Another eyesore to compete with the one we already have near Boundary Lane-no thanks- The A31 should be made to look decent and fit into the Forest type area we are supposed to be living in. We look more like the industrial sites approaching Southampton, as we have an eye-sore on the opposite side of the road too. This proposal would include lots more traffic filtering onto the A31, it already causes problems in Boundary Lane. Please think again.			1404
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		Option PC 7	Support	General Comment	Hesitantly support - question mark in box. No new building should be anywhere near a floodplain with sea levels rising. Transport issues on and around the A31 are already over capacity - no development should proceed without that being sorted - including knock on effects of A31 issues. Has it actually been established that there is a need for all the homes and industrial development? Are we at risk of creating a need in order to service developers rather than establishing if there will be a real need in the first place?			1404
502317	Cllr		Option PC	Support					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Peter Lucas		7						
502322	Mrs J C Critchell		Option PC 7	Object					1404
502326	Mr and Mrs T Bennett		Option PC 7	Object		With more homes will need more employment, a vicious circle. Our roads are too busy now. We surely have enough community areas and centres.			1404
502329	Mrs Rosemary Rooke		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502332	Mr and Mrs D Blanch		Option PC 7	Object		Horton Road is very busy and it will be increasingly difficult to cope with extra traffic. Extra traffic on the A31 is not desirable at all. Noise levels to residential areas already too intrusive. If this does go ahead then additional noise reductions should (and must) be introduced, i.e. noise absorbing road surfaces and accounting fencing on the A31 adjacent to the residential areas of St Leonards and St Ives.			1404
502333	B M Andrews		Option PC 7	Support		Make parents walk their children to school. Stop parents 4x4s, etc. Spend more money on our area. Council tax far too high and what benefits do we receive from the Parish Council?			1404
502345	Mr and Mrs Ray and Irene Coulson		Option PC 7	Object		St Leonards Hospital should remain and services extended because of the pressure on NHS facilities.			1404
502347	Sarah Cobb		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502364	FD Peach		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
502381	Mr Cyril		Option PC 7	Support					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Josey								
502387	Mr George Kilpatrick		Option PC 7	Support		I would like to see the justification for increased housing in East Dorset e.g., demographics, immigration, increased work opportunities etc. I would also like to understand how transport strategy (and infrastructure) is coordinated with this in such a way to make expansion sustainable.			1404
502415	Mrs S Humphries		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
502417	A Read		Option PC 7	Object					1404
502435	Mr and Mrs P and S Sanderson		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502468	Robert Lambert		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502492	M L Portugal		Option PC 7	Support		It is vital with any development that the local infrastructure can handle the influx. Concerns over health-care, and social services, parking etc which are already struggling to cope! Also what constitutes affordable housing in East Dorset?!			1404
502568	Sarah Morgan		Option PC 7	Object					1404
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
502570	Mr		Option PC		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Samways		7						
502579	Mr & Mrs R L Thorne		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
502595	Mr Colin House		Option PC 7	Object		All these developments will cause an impact on the local heathland and the proposals in all areas will cause road chaos on the A31, Ferndown, Parley and Wimborne. A new road structure is required before any development takes place.			1404
502596	A C Hayter		Option PC 7	Object					1404
502610	John Jackson		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502635	Mrs JS Brough		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502673	Mrs A Powell		Option PC 7	Object		The infrastructure in this area needs to be sorted out before anymore building goes ahead. There are times you cannot move on the roads. The area is being ruined with all this building works that are already going on.			1404
502701	Mrs M Williams		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
502708	Ms Julia Owen		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502745	Mrs J.M Kenny		Option PC 7	Support					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
502921	Mr and Mrs L Forinton		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502935	Mr Roger Parker		Option PC 7	Object					1404
502987	Anne Griffiths		Option PC 7	Support					1404
502999	Mrs Marion E Lock		Option PC 7	Support					1404
503044	Mr and Mrs R Setchfield		Option PC 7	Support					1404
503156	Richard and Jackie Blunderfield		Option PC 7	Support		Preferred location is St Leonards as the A31 is 2 lanes and can cope with extra traffic. PC8 and PC9 are green belt areas and should not be built on. Also supported in Options for Employment leaflet			1404
503171	Sally Cooke		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
503183	B Chissell		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
503230	P Andrews		Option PC 7	Support					1404
503233	F Parkes		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
503250	Mrs		Option PC		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Helen Poole		7						
503303	Mr Anthony Roberts		Option PC 7	Support					1404
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		Option PC 7	Support					1404
503347	Ms Hardwick		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
359873	Mrs M HUGHES		Option PC 7	Support					1404
359889	Mr and Mrs P CLARK		Option PC 7	Support		With any developments we would need to be assured that infrastructure improvements are in place BEFORE any development is consented to. This is particularly important with regard to public transport provisions. It is also important that feedback is forthcoming as an acknowledgement of our response to this survey.			1404
359920	S PARKER		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		Option PC 7	Support		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I want to know the projected time scale for these options to start to become active.</li> <li>2. It is most important that there is adequate employment to accommodate the houses to be built.</li> <li>3. More attention must be made to supply of affordable housing.</li> <li>4. The green belt must be respected where possible.</li> <li>5. The estates around Wimborne must be consulted fully.</li> </ol>			1404
360029	Mr David LANIGAN		Option PC 7	Support		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy Document, Managing Growth and Development up to the year 2027. I agree with the preamble stating that we need to meet local housing needs, with the emphasis on growing the main settlements where we have good			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>access to facilities that people require. Some development of smaller communities should continue however, especially the provision of low cost housing. The community as a whole, needs the services of teachers, nurses, firemen, postmen, and policemen who are poorly paid because they commit to a vocation rather than a high salary job. We also need the services of skilled people such as builders, electricians, plumbers, gas fitters, and motor mechanics, the essentially blue collar professionals. They must not be priced out of the market in terms of being able to buy a starter home, in the community that they serve.</p> <p>Having bought my first home in 1963, a two bedroom bungalow for £2,200 I am aware that locally such a property is currently one hundred times as much. This makes things difficult for young couples with the ratio of house prices to wages being the highest in the country. Many struggle with getting mortgages that now require typically a 25% deposit on an already expensive property.</p> <p>I moved to West Moors 15 years ago and appreciate the planning decisions that have taken place affecting this village. We now have a new build shopping centre on Station Road, complete with flats, good pavements, lighting, pelican crossing and trees. I am pleased to have seen built several small, three storey, blocks of retirement and two bed flats close to the village centre. I support the gradual expansion of the</p> <p>Village, current population around 7,500 as we have good schools, a large Memorial hall, Churches with halls, two public houses, doctors, dentists and good bus services to both Poole and Bournemouth. We have footpath access to open land such as Holt Heath, as well as being able to use the old railway line route through the village to Ringwood, - the Castleman Trail. Recently St Marys Church has had built a new Church Hall which will serve the community and thanks to the National Lottery grant we now have an excellent Bowling Club. I support the continued slow expansion of the village as currently we have many facilities for people of all ages to enjoy.</p> <p>My current house was built in the mid 70s, and has trebled in value since my wife and I moved here 15 years ago. In the 1970s West Moors doubled in size and acquired new schools and since then other infrastructure improvements. In recent years the Library was refurbished. The facilities for retirees in West Moors, with access to Ferndown and Verwood, are very good, and coupled with excellent</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						hospitals at Poole, Bournemouth and Wimborne, and I have felt no need to move from East Dorset area in the conceivable future. I therefore support the proposals for additional housing as outlined in the Core Strategy Consultation, as well as the proposals for business sites for employment. I also support provisions for new schools particularly a new Secondary School at Verwood, and recreation areas to cater for the population increase. I understand that net immigration into Dorset is running at two thousand people a year so clearly we need to plan for housing, jobs, education, recreation, road improvements especially at busy junctions, and off road car parking in town centres and on new housing estates. There are many reasons why East Dorset and Christchurch, are attractive places for people to live, work and retire to. Long term planning that caters for the needs of a steady population increase is sensible and is to be welcomed.			
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		Option PC 7	Support					1404
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		Option PC 7	Object					1404
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E HACK		Option PC 7	Support					1404
361105	Mr John GOOCH	Also member of Colehill Parish Council	Option PC 7	Support					1404
499748	Ms Soozie Cooper		Option PC 7	Support					1404
503024	Valerie Measey		Option PC 7	Support					1404
503355	Mr Robert		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Griffiths								
503358	H C Hoare		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
503421	Mr Geof Haywood		Option PC 7	Support					1404
503444	R Hobbs		Option PC 7	Object					1404
503476	Mrs AM Hawkins		Option PC 7	Object					1404
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
503527	Claire Smith		Option PC 7		No Opinion	Apportion part of employment land options to housing of all categories for potential employees at these locations thereby reducing transport needs.			1404
503598	Mr John Turner		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
503603	Mrs DJ Morley		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
503621	A G Haines		Option PC 7	Support		As I'm sure you are perfectly aware, all developments I have ticked require serious consideration to the whole road network in the areas concerned.			1404
503624	Mr RT Jackson		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
503635	Mr		Option PC	Support					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	J Gough		7						
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		Option PC 7	Object		The A31 is already over-saturated with regular gridlock on Friday/Saturday without major redevelopment (min 2 lane dual carriageway from Ferndown industrial estate to Tolpuddle) it is incapable of taking any more traffic. Wimborne, Ferndown and Parley cross- we object to more building on green field sites Parley Cross area is already over-saturated with traffic and is incapable of taking any more. The entire East Dorset area already been over-developed versus other areas of the country. It does not have the transport, social, educational. etc resources for any more.			1404
503640	N J and S A White		Option PC 7	Support					1404
503644	Mr J Riley		Option PC 7	Object					1404
503687	Mr Nick Smith		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		Option PC 7	Support					1404
503709	Mr and Mrs A Fairclough		Option PC 7	Object					1404
503759	Mr D.J. Middleton		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		Option PC 7	Support					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503878	Mr Peter Smith		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
503879	Mr S Smithson		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
503943	Mr & Mrs Rumball		Option PC 7	Support					1404
504093	Mr & Mrs Vivian		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
504101	Mrs Mary Trevis-Bell		Option PC 7	Support					1404
504285	Mr P Miller		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
504314	Ms Selina Roper		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
505273	Mrs Lorraine Hubbard		Option PC 7	Support					1404
505288	Mrs S Cramer		Option PC 7	Support	General Comment	As a married mother of 3 children, 2 girls and 1 boy, living in a 2 bed Council flat (first floor), I welcome more housing to the Wimborne area for young families needing affordable housing / rented housing.			1404
505320	Mrs M Puttick		Option PC 7	Object		PC 7/8 - The A31 really cannot take any more traffic unless there are plans to upgrade/widen.			1404
361037	Mr P		Option PC 7	Object		I expect that my objection to everything is not very practical. However, I have lived in the area for most of the last fifty years. In			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	STRATFORD					that time there has been a constant cycle of the council saying we need more housing, followed by we need more industrial areas to provide extra jobs for all the new homes. Then in turn the council says we require extra jobs for the new homes, then in turn the council says we require extra homes for the new workers. This process is never ending. During this time I've witnessed the creation and expansion of the industrial estates at Ferndown, Uddens, Ebblake and Wimborne. A whole new housing estate at Tricketts Cross, Glenmoor Rd Ferndown, the expansion of West Moors, Colehill, Verwood turned from sleepy village into a town. In this time I am not aware of any developed area being returned to its natural state from a developed one. Please let me know if you think differently. I hope you agree that my objection to development is rational and that the never ending cycle of expansion is stopped.			
475526	Mr Geoffrey Dark		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary Hendy		Option PC 7	Support					1404
498775	Mrs P L Buckler		Option PC 7	Support					1404
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		Option PC 7	Support					1404
505369	J Young		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		Option PC 7	Object	General Comment	Building more houses has NOTHING to do with meeting the needs of (existing) local residents. We do not need or want more houses in our area. Planning to build more houses is driven by the 'need' to meet externally imposed quotas based on false assumptions on the desirability of further population and economic growth. Instead of wasting resources on building more housing which is			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						ecologically unsustainable, we should be using them to make a transition to a low energy sustainable future for our children. Please listen to local residents and reject further development.			
505523	Mr & Mrs A Turner		Option PC 7	Support					1404
505561	Mr. D. Calvert		Option PC 7	Support					1404
505572	Mr and Mrs LJ Hinton		Option PC 7	Object		From our perspective a proposed development of new industrial units between Three Legged Cross and St Leonards and St Ives would mean a major increase of heavy duty lorries driving down Horton Road, thus making for further noise, environmentally unfriendly, highly dangerous for walking pedestrians, either with children or dog walking. Constant damage to the already heavily used tarmac road, which would need constant repairs, paid for by us all. The Horton Road need protecting not worn out!!!			1404
505590	M Spalding		Option PC 7	Support					1404
505656	Mr Dave Evans		Option PC 7	Support					1404
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		Option PC 7	Object					1404
505760	J Evans		Option PC 7	Object					1404
505802	Mr RGH Chapman		Option PC 7	Support					1404
506116	Mr and Mrs P and SJ		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Simpson								
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		Option PC 7	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			1404
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		Option PC 7	Support					1404
506754	Mr Derek E Marsh		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
506989	Mrs Barbara Harris		Option PC 7	Object					1404
507026	Mr David Craig		Option PC 7	Support	General Comment	I would like to see priority given to projects which have a higher concentration of social housing inclusion, and also include a higher green/renewable energy provision. Particular concentration on family areas, playgrounds and social/community facilities should be considered.			1404
507032	Mr David Oliver		Option PC 7	Object					1404
507033	A R Twaits		Option PC 7	Support	General Comment	Despite improvements to public transport, cycling and walking, the reality is that the vast majority of journeys will continue to be made by car. Local roads are already congested and the extent of development proposed is not acceptable without significant increases in the capacity of these roads for cars. In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.			1404
507070	Mr and Mrs Earwicker		Option PC 7	Support		The 3 sites we support have good main road access although Horton Road/Ringwood Road would need updating for Woolsbridge. The A31 behind Blunts Farm needs to be dual carriageway all the way from the Lidl roundabout to Canford			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						Bottom roundabout. Access to any industrial estate in Blunts Farm should be from the A31 not via Uddens Estate.			
507132	Ms L Joyce		Option PC 7	Object					1404
507286	Mr N P Butler		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
507336	Mr John Page		Option PC 7	Support					1404
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		Option PC 7	Object					1404
507388	Mr David Huggins		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
507474	Mark and Jean Cording		Option PC 7	Object		<p>1) We are still due a correctment in housing prices, housing benefits have artificially underpinned the bubble. The so called shortage of housing is also caused by breaking up of the family unit (teenagers and young people do not need their own homes)</p> <p>2) The Green Belt must be protected, a temporary supposed need would and could not be reversed. There are hundreds of brown sites which could be utilised, without the need for more disruptive and expensive infrastructures.</p> <p>3) Green Belt land was created to protect open land between and around developments. We anticipated development and councils saying they need more land, it was and is vital so please do not change the policy. Times change, needs change, populations (immi and emigration) demands disappear but green land cannot be replaced.</p>			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507524	Mr C G Richardson		Option PC 7	Support					1404
507555	Mr and Mrs C Lamond		Option PC 7	Support					1404
507572	GJ Pettifer		Option PC 7	Object					1404
507595	Mr D Johnson		Option PC 7	Support					1404
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
507693	Mrs P Carter		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
507760	Mr and Mrs R Gardner		Option PC 7	Support					1404
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
507800	Mrs K M Platt		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
507908	Mr Philip H James		Option PC 7	Support					1404
507980	Sylvia Allen		Option PC 7	Object		What happened to the proposed care village on the St Leonard's hospital site?			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508383	Ms Emma Hayter		Option PC 7	Object					1404
508413	Mrs S Best		Option PC 7	Support					1404
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		Option PC 7	Object		The Council is always after land for housing or business development. Whatever is granted is never enough and a few years later they want more. This process has been going on for over 50 years and it is time it came to a stop. Enough is enough as it is ruining the area.			1404
508852	Mrs L.A. Chesshire		Option PC 7	Support					1404
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		Option PC 7	Support					1404
508928	Mr D.W. Lonsdale		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
509065	Mrs B Burge		Option PC 7	Support					1404
360097	Mr John DOWLING		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
361121	Mrs Elizabeth JONES		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
361161	Mr Douglas FORWARD		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361184	Mr S MOON		Option PC 7	Object		In most situations I will object to the build of additional housing / business premises, as I do not believe that other options have first been considered or if not possible 'today' are being pursued for the longer term. For example, 1) There are many properties, particularly in Dorset, which are second homes and for most of the year are empty. Action needs to be taken to make these available for renting / purchase as even today, let alone the future, houses are unoccupied, for whatever reason, is not an option. (I would support legislation.) Empty properties also need to be addressed. 2) The development of "brownfield" sites, even if these may not be profitable as other options or as desirable to live or work. 3) Thinking outside the box or in this case outside the areas of this Strategy Consultation. Dorset is not alone in having to address these issues and we need to have some "joined up thinking" with other authorities to see if there are joint opportunities. In this respect Hamworthy Engineering buildings have been empty for many years but do not appear to be in anyone's options.			1404
510420	Mr Peter Stevens		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		Option PC 7	Support					1404
510532	W.W. Chant		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
510623	Mr Douglas Priest		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
510798	Mr F Sullivan		Option PC 7	Support					1404
510844	Mr Michael		Option PC 7	Support		It was rather cheeky of you not to provide mapping of the Employment land options sites. I had to consult an OS map.			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Guilmany-Cush								
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R. Mayes		Option PC 7	Support					1404
510974	Mr Jim Cullumbine		Option PC 7	Support					1404
510993	R.A. Cherrett		Option PC 7	Support					1404
511015	Mr Christopher White		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
511076	Mr Ian Burden		Option PC 7	Support					1404
511219	Ms Kathleen Smith		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and Diana Froud		Option PC 7	Support					1404
511430	A.D. May		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
511489	Mr H G Holden		Option PC 7	Support					1404
511571	Colin Alborough		Option PC 7	Support		We are in desperate need of more affordable housing in the East Dorset area. There is also a shortage of employment opportunities in the area. The provision of more houses should help to push			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						house prices down to give young people a change of getting on the property ladder.			
511618	Mrs V Blunden		Option PC 7	Support					1404
511621	Ms Mary A Combe		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
511692	Ms Ruth Blaug		Option PC 7	Object		If the population continues to rise we may need this land for extensions to the hospital. Also industrial just next to hospital could be very disturbing and unpleasant (noisy, dusty, smelly) for the patients and staff.			1404
511711	Coombes		Option PC 7	Support					1404
511747	Mr T W Tonge		Option PC 7	Support					1404
360002	Mr Mike BARTLETT		Option PC 7	Support		Very well set out in booklet and well thought out proposals. Speed is the essence - I have 3 children in need!			1404
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		Option PC 7	Support					1404
361196	Mr J.M BULLIVANT		Option PC 7	Support					1404
476264	Mr David Reddaway		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
491252	Margaret Wareham		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511639	Paul Hockey		Option PC 7	Object					1404
512281	Graham Roberts		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
512326	Mr Ian Willis		Option PC 7	Support					1404
512703	Rita Sweatland		Option PC 7	Support					1404
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A Kirby		Option PC 7	Object					1404
513692	Mrs A Willis		Option PC 7	Support					1404
513881	Mrs S Bagg		Option PC 7	Support		By ticking 'SUPPORT BOXES' I am not actively supporting the locations but, if we must have so much development, making the best of a bad job. We must not spoil the area by over development. More houses only bring more people to our already over crowded area. Local houses for local people, yes, but how can that be ensured?			1404
513900	Mr P Wall		Option PC 7	Object		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed e.g. road improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			1404
513954	Mr RW Heseltine		Option PC 7	Support					1404
513966	Mr and Mrs Howard		Option PC 7	Support					1404
513974	Mr A		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Moore								
514039	Mrs R Doman		Option PC 7	Support					1404
514049	Mrs E Hellier		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
514091	Mr RJ Potts		Option PC 7	Support					1404
514099	Mr and Mrs T C Blakeley		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
514111	Penelope Webiery		Option PC 7	Object					1404
514136	Mrs J Crumb		Option PC 7	Support					1404
514225	Mr Simon Dixon	Secretary West Moors Traders Association	Option PC 7	Support					1404
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon Chaffey		Option PC 7	Object					1404
514274	Mr Showell		Option PC 7	Support		Instead of new housing there should be a new strategy of providing more public open space. The lessons of the Edwardians/Victorians should be learnt. New public parks like Poole Park, Queens Park and Kings Park save an area from urban crowding. Perhaps all the land proposed for housing could be reallocated to			1404

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						public parks.			
514355	Mr T Gee		Option PC 7	Support					1404
514379	Mrs Denise Bannister		Option PC 7	Object					1404
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option PC 7	Object		<p>Pre-requisites of the site should be protection and enhancement of biodiversity interests.</p> <p>A large proportion of the land at St Leonards Hospital is identified as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (St Leonards Hospital SNCI SU10/024) and includes an extensive mixture of habitat types, most notably rare U1 Festuca ovina-Agrostis capillaris-Rumex acetosella grassland. Other habitats include dry dwarf shrub heathland with acid grassland mosaics, marshy grassland, birch dominated woodland, pine plantation and areas of seemingly semi-natural woodland. The site supports 23 Dorset Notable Species within the acid grassland and heath areas.</p> <p>Dorset Wildlife Trust has provided considerable input into planning applications for this site previously and has concerns that a change in use of the land could lead to considerable impacts on the SNCI, especially as the most important habitats lie close to or within the currently developed area.</p> <p>Previous negotiations led to a planning obligation attached to the care village proposal for nature conservation mitigation, to include translocation of some areas of the SNCI grassland, management of the SNCI areas within the care village and management of the wider SNCI surrounding the site through scrub and tree removal and heathland restoration. DWT would expect any future proposal to secure future conservation and management of the SNCI to the same or enhanced standards as in the Section 106 agreement for the care village.</p> <p>Additionally, this site lies within a corridor of potential heathland restoration linking heathland and grassland sites to the south and north therefore, to keep an option for such a corridor to be improved in future, some open habitat would need to be retained on the St Leonards site.</p>			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						As drainage from this site is to the Moors River SSSI, employment use here could also have considerable consequences for the Moors River the state of which is already of concern with respect to water quality. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems would be required. DWT objects to this option due to its likely impacts on biodiversity. We consider that the impacts on the natural environment must be fully explored to inform the assessment of this option.			
359477	Ms Natasha Mackenzie	Clerk Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council	Option PC 7	Object	General Comment	The proposed additional housing and employment areas will therefore only increase the traffic problems at Ringwood and thus on the roads in our Parish, especially on the B3081, A338 and Linwood Road if the A31 is blocked. The junction at Bakers Hanging will also become even more saturated. The Parish Council agree that these developments should only go ahead if road improvements at Bakers Hanging and the junction of the A338 and A31 are carried out.			1404
359916	JB Cossins		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
360626	Mr Frank Miller	Chair Person Sturminster Marshall Affordable Housing Self Build Homes Group	Option PC 7	Object		We have more than plenty sites empty which need filling so why build more factory units? Get the rates down which will allow empty units to be let. Alter the big units into smaller one / two type units. Drive out and look. Please stop doing desk top plans. I would love to help in putting forward real working plans instead of dreams. Please live in the real world.			1404
361014	Mr Peter Hammond		Option PC 7	Support					1404
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
476792	Mr and Mrs Lomas		Option PC 7	Object		As there seems adequate areas for industrial estate extension for the proposed increase in population could this be residential?			1404
481604	Mr		Option PC	Support					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Gerald Toomer		7						
496996	Mr Hayward		Option PC 7	Support					1404
500746	Mrs J Lothian		Option PC 7	Support					1404
500817	Mr L Lothian		Option PC 7	Object		Already too much traffic on the roads which are in poor condition after 2 years of frosts.			1404
508562	K Clayson		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
508993	Mr A Samways		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
509795	Mr R Ridley		Option PC 7	Support					1404
511761	Mr G Burge		Option PC 7	Support					1404
513651	Mrs W Pearsall		Option PC 7	Support		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improved public transport to these employment sites.</li> <li>2. Business centres for starting business with full back office support.</li> <li>3. Tax breaks to encourage businesses to move to our area.</li> <li>4. Subsidised training for all age groups in starting up and running a business.</li> <li>4. Part time apprenticeship training for all age groups.</li> </ol>			1404
514467	Mrs Lesley Cripps		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514482	C E T Gilbert		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		Option PC 7	Object					1404
514674	Mrs J Williams		Option PC 7	Support					1404
514752	Claire Richardson & Jamie Shirley		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
514812	Mr C Sawyer		Option PC 7	Object					1404
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		Option PC 7	Object		Seeking the opinion of the general public on planning issues is all very commendable - but setting aside all political persuasion my feeling is that this is no more than a Public Relations exercise because in the end the final decisions are always to the advantage of the developers whoever they may be because of money, greed and looks good on paper. The St Leonards Hospital area may have potential but again, because of the possible increase in traffic along a very busy main road, I think there should be more in-depth assessment of the long term effect it would have in that region.			1404
514913	Mr and Mrs M Clark		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
514939	D Porter		Option PC 7	Support					1404
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		Option PC 7	Object		The ever increasing volume of traffic on the A31 and the failure to adhere to the speed limit is a cause for concern. This is aggravated by unsuitable road surface and lack of sound screening. I understand that this is within the remit of the Highways Agency but			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						before any further development there should be some holistic approach to resolve these issues. With reference to Woolsbridge Road it is somewhat surprising that there should be development on a flood plain area.			
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		Option PC 7	Object		The area is already over-developed and congested - further development on the scales proposed would lead to deterioration of the environment and a reduction in the quality of life. I am particularly dismayed by continued threats to the Green Belt, especially as this Government pledged to protect it. I do not believe that such massive development is necessary or beneficial to the vast majority of inhabitants. Pressure on our area should be reduced by Government tackling such issues as population growth through immigration control and regeneration of brownfield sites in Midlands and North. There is a need for limited affordable and social housing locally, but not more executive homes. It is wrong to build new homes while second homes and investment properties continue to exist.			1404
515033	Mr T Crump		Option PC 7	Support					1404
515287	Mr L Jackson		Option PC 7	Support		The A31 trunk road from Ferndown by-pass should be widened to form a dual carriageway all the way through to Bere Regis.			1404
515367	Mr & Mrs J Pottinger		Option PC 7	Support					1404
515479	Mr D Lenehan		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
515763	Mr V S Harris		Option PC 7	Support					1404
515788	J M May		Option PC 7	Support					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
516313	Mr Julian Humphries		Option PC 7	Support		PC5, 6 and 7 are less obtrusive than PC4. 7 is ideal as it has good roads with roundabouts for directive changes. PC 5 and 6 are expansion of existing and appear appropriate.			1404
517528	Dr Susan Burton		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
517835	Mr G D Rodrigues		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
518027	Mr J Talbot		Option PC 7	Object					1404
359482	Ms Helen POWELL	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	Option PC 7		No Opinion	Large parts of this site have a significant nature conservation importance and drainage is to the Moors Valley River System SSSI which is vulnerable to impacts on its water environment. This context has a strong bearing on any appropriate configuration and form of re-development in the site and this should be recognised as part of any option taken forward into the Draft Submission Core Strategy (i.e. similar to the environmental option considerations that will act to shape development Bournemouth Airport.)			1404
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	Option PC 7	Object		Given that most of the proposed employment-related development will be in close proximity to the designated sites, the Core Strategy must demonstrate that this development can be accommodated without adverse effects on the European sites. There is uncertainty as to where this deployment will be exactly focused, however given the broad locations identified, scrutiny for possible adverse effects on European sites will be necessary. We object to option KS13 and options PC4, PC5, PC7, PC8, PC9, PC13 and PC14 pending resolution of outstanding issues identified in the HRA in relation to the European sites.			1404
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		Option PC 7	Object		The Moors River system, including the River Crane, Ebblake Stream and Uddens Water has already been subject to excessive development within its catchment including the establishment of a			1404

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						number of very ill advised employment/industrial estates. It has suffered severely from all the above impacts resulting in temporary or permanent losses to biodiversity. Continued development within the catchment, especially in close proximity to its water courses, and particularly of employment/industrial development, is wholly inappropriate. Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously impinging on the Moors River system and its corridor include KS3/ PC7 (St Leonards Hospital), KS4 (Woodland Walk), VM 1,2,3 and 4 (Verwood), PC4 (Blunts Farm), and PC 5 (Woolsbridge).			
359891	Mrs Susanne Parkin		Option PC 7		No Opinion	There should be more places of employment nearer to existing housing - this should be small units and sites. To enlarge existing sites is not very sustainable in terms of traffic - it is foolish to exacerbate existing bad traffic conditions as we have at present e.g. the A31 at peak time from the Ferndown Industrial Estate. Villages surrounding the conurbation should all support a degree of employment and industry.			1404
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	Option PC 7	Object		<p>Comments made under KS3 are repeated here for ease of reference.</p> <p>The St Leonards Hospital site has significant biodiversity interest including important neutral grassland with Green Winged Orchids, and heathland. The extensive potential for heathland restoration and habitat linkages from this site have been mapped by the RSPB. They should be mapped in more detail than the indicative maps prepared by the RSPB and any development of the site planned to safeguard such habitat restoration. Normal residential development would be extremely damaging.</p> <p>Employment development here would comprise an entirely new employment site in the Moors River catchment introducing a new and additional source of potential pollution.</p> <p>The potential for damaging light pollution to both heathland and aquatic ecosystems is high.</p> <p>Please note: there is currently long distance light pollution from poorly directed lights; they can be seen 12 miles away in the New Forest. This should be corrected as soon as possible and not await the outcome of this consultation.</p> <p>In respect of the Green Winged Orchids, Martin Jenkinson the author of the book "Wild Orchids of Dorset" (1991) states "At one</p>			1404

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						site at St Leonards it grows in spectacular profusion, in all imaginable shades, including pure white albinos, and with many exceptionally robust plants, on the old lawns around a complex of buildings, where it is tended with loving care by the proprietary interest of gardeners and other staff. This site, the newly notified site at Corfe Mullen [Corfe Mullen Meadows SSSI], and a large population at Alderney near Poole (10,000+) are probably the finest sites in the country for the species, and the Autumn Ladies' Tresses is equally abundant at the St Leonards site later in the year".			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	Option PC 7	Support		The Core Strategy Options for Consideration identifies a number of major employment opportunities which are located close to the A31 corridor, including the largest at Ferndown (Option PC4). The Agency recognises the role of Ferndown as the leading employment centre in the district and confirms that further growth in this area, as envisaged under Option PC4, should be assessed at the strategic level through the SEDMMT model. Option PC7 at St Leonard's Hospital is of particular concern to the Agency due to its direct access on to the A31. Detailed Transport Assessments would also be required at the appropriate stage. The Agency endorses the identification of transport improvements required, given in respect of Ferndown and other locations, which include upgrading of the A31 Canford bottom junction and preparation of comprehensive travel plans including public transport measures. The Agency looks forward to contributing to the progression of the development briefs proposed for the major employment sites.			1404
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		Option PC 7	Support		Travel for Employment, Education, Shopping and Leisure. Where do the residents of Wimborne and Colehill seek Employment, Education, Shopping and Leisure activities? Travel for Employment Data for employment appears only to be available for 2001 in the Core Strategy Area Profile2, which is unlikely to reflect the increased trend of out of town travelling for work. Since the turn of the Century greater mobility has been necessary more and more, not only to secure work, but also to achieve career progression. Travel distances are only available for about 60% of the working population of Wimborne and Colehill, and roughly half of these			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>travel between 10 and 40 Kms to work and the others between 5 and 10 Kms.<sup>2</sup> One wonders about the other 40%, are they perhaps beyond 40 Kms, as I was myself, or do they now work from home? EDDC options for Employment<sup>4</sup> identify a negative effect on the availability of sites in Wimborne and Colehill. When considering the sites proposed at PC5 to PC9 inclusive, KS13, BA1-11, the relocation of Stone Lane Industrial Estate<sup>3</sup>, plus the inclusion of land released at Cobham Gate<sup>5</sup>, it would mean that greater use of the A31 will be necessary for people to travel to work in the future. The location of proposed employment sites will hardly encourage people to walk or cycle to work, and I doubt that they will find it convenient to travel to these proposed locations by public transport. In addition one can expect that many jobs will be filled by "Outsiders" who in turn will utilise private transportation on the A31 to get to their destinations of employment.</p> <p>Travel Issues</p> <p>Clearly then the A31 has a major impact on the mobility of people within the Wimborne and Colehill catchment areas. EDDC states that we have the highest level of car ownership in the country<sup>3</sup> and we can see the reasons for this in the above analysis of people's needs. It suggests that these problems can be overcome by changing attitudes toward the use of public transport to relieve local congestion.</p> <p>I consider this to be a totally unrealistic approach in our highly pressurised, motivated, mobile, materialistic and ageing society. (see Theoretical Human Life Cycle Transportation Requirements attached<sup>19</sup>) We must solve the problem and not skirt round it. Take the issue of employment. All of the proposed Industrial Sites are out of area where travel on or crossing of, the A31 is necessary. The same applies to Higher Education, Shopping, Leisure, and to some extent Hospitalisation. We must recognise that where people's choice is limited they will travel great distances to ensure they get what they want.</p> <p>Take the issue of Housing Development. The development of Land to the East and West of the Cranborne Road appears to endorse the unacceptable use of Burts Hill (a country lane) running into Long Lane (another country lane) in becoming a second bypass of the Town. This became evident during the repairs to Julian's Bridge and the Poole Road Bridge, where GPS's offer alternative routes. These roads have increasingly become busier and noisier as a</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>result. People that used to use this route for cycling, walking and jogging are no longer safe to do this anymore.</p> <p>It is strange that the Core Strategy option containing the largest number of homes is considered best situated on the North side of Wimborne, i.e. at the farthest point from the out of area conduit. (the A31) What sense does this make? Its consequence will be that not only the A31 will be jammed up at peak times, but also Middlehill, Leigh Road, Burts Hill, and the Cranborne Road will all suffer greater congestion. Even after taking into consideration that Walford Bridge will need to be widened to accommodate additional traffic movement across town and an improvement in traffic flow through the Stone Lane junction will have to be addressed.</p> <p>I consider all of this could be avoided if the "undeveloped" land to the South of Leigh Road and East of WMC5 was allocated to satisfy only the required number of affordable and supportable homes.</p> <p>Take the issue of Climate Change. Do we really want to release more Carbon Dioxide into the atmosphere by creating more traffic jams and greater congestion, when with the appropriate amount of forethought we can reduce the effects of Climate Change?</p> <p>Further it is predicted that our ageing local population will increase which will to some extent increase the need for personal motorised transport. Since anyone who has graduated to private transportation is unlikely to relinquish it, even if this means being taxied to their destination at times convenient to themselves, they are highly unlikely to walk, cycle or travel on public transport unless it's becomes an absolute last resort.</p> <p>So what can be done to alleviate this issue?</p> <p>Well clearly the A31 has to be upgraded to a dual carriageway with fly overs or underpasses in the most congested spots. However this leads to the question of finance and timing.</p> <p>As a suggestion;</p> <p>Let's think laterally about the infrastructure of Transport, the uses of arterial roads, the polluting effect of vehicles and the funding for road improvements.</p> <p>The A31, which bypasses our town, blocks frequently at peak times and in holiday periods. The primary bottleneck occurs at the Canford Bottom Roundabout, followed closely by the Merley House Lane Roundabout, the Julian's Road Roundabout and finally the Poole Road Roundabout at Bailey Gate. These bottlenecks bring</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>frustration, high energy consumption and more importantly high pollution to our area. Clearly the A31 will have to undergo major improvement to allow through traffic to flow smoothly through our district. The solution can only be a dual carriageway with a series of flyovers, or under passes, that need to be built between the end of the existing dual carriageway at Cobham Road Roundabout all the way through to Bailey Gate, and perhaps beyond to the dual carriageway at Bere Regis.</p> <p>Local, District and County Councils must lobby Government for a greater say in the distribution of the funding for road improvements and take control of funding to support local transport infrastructure when resolving their housing and industrial needs. The projects are intertwined and have to support each other, it's all very well pushing the housing problem back to councils, but councils must be given allocation of the road improvement budget too.</p> <p>Wimborne's problem will not be resolved by a £6 million sticky plaster solution<sup>8</sup> applied to the Canford Bottom Roundabout which will only, if successful, move the bottleneck from one roundabout on the A31 along to another. IT IS TIME FOR MAJOR SURGERY. How else could the necessary road improvements be funded? Since the A31 is a holiday route and a route to an area of the country that boasts England's first natural World Heritage site "The Jurassic Coast", it can conceivably be funded by contributions to road improvements from the EU.</p> <p>But, neither is there anything stopping this section of the A31 becoming a toll road, and in time putting money back into the coffers of the Highways Agency, after all this is the case when travelling down the M6 and also crossing the River Seven when travelling to Wales. I am sure holiday makers and businesses will gladly factor such costs into their budgets.</p> <p>For the sake of the community, and for future generations, we need to bring pressure to bear on Ministers, MPs and local dignitaries to get the necessary funding in place to support this vital arterial improvement. Only then will the EDDC Core Strategy be capable of being successfully implemented.</p> <p>SEE ATTACHMENT</p>			
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		Option PC 7	Support					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
524495	Mr Stanley Jackson		Option PC 7	Support		Attention needs to be concentrated on keeping and ideally increasing the number of younger people in the area, through providing additional employment opportunities, affordable or low-cost housing to purchase and an increase in rented accommodation. I would therefore support all attempts PC4 -PC9 to locate more employment land options.			1404
360112	Mr Kenneth BROOKS	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	Option PC 7	Object		Preferred Option KS3 states:- "Land at St Leonards Hospital should be a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt." As pointed out in this section, this site was granted planning permission in January 2002 for a retirement care village, with a condition attached that all residents must be 55 or over, which may be holding back potential developers. Changes to the conditions, amendments to numbers and design and a "reserve matters" application has kept this planning approval alive, but most of the original facilities needed for a retirement care village have been progressively deleted. Nevertheless, residential development on the St Leonards Hospital site is preferable to the newly introduced general proposal for developing the site for unspecified employment proposals - see Option PC7.			1404
489765	Derek KEAREY		Option PC 7	Object					1404
490854	D MUTTON		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
507361	Mr Kenneth Archer		Option PC 7	Object					1404
507737	Mrs S Philpot		Option PC 7	Object					1404
527661	W Barnes		Option PC 7	Support					1404
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		Option PC 7	Support					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
527863	A Barratt		Option PC 7	Support					1404
534820	Paul Batten		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
534833	Frederick Wall		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
534837	Mrs P Martin		Option PC 7	Object		Horses need grazing land. No infrastructure in place for the total number of homes planned. I do not go out between 8.00 and 9.30 am and 3.00pm and 6.30pm because of the traffic on the roads now.			1404
534875	Brian Lane		Option PC 7	Support					1404
534914	Mrs P Froud		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
535070	Mr Alan Reade		Option PC 7	Object					1404
535112	Mr Jack Tindall		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
535167	Lynda Lake		Option PC 7	Support					1404
535209	Mr P Webster		Option PC 7	Object		Please liaise with NFDC and NPA, as the additional traffic generated by the extra housing and employment zones will increase the traffic problems at the already congested bottleneck at Ringwood and cause yet more problems for the people who live in New Forest hamlets such as Linwood, Brook and Burley as motorists try to find alternative routes. Can the New Forest take any more pressure from additional numbers of visitors? Has Dorset got enough sand and gravel in the landbank to meet the needs of the developers? Can you force Tarmac to start mining gravel by the			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						Spur Road near Hurn? What will happen to the pollution levels close to the trunk roads e.g. at Ringwood, especially particulate pollution? Can Bournemouth Water meet the increased demands for water?			
535349	P Thomas		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		Option PC 7	Object		I think that this whole core strategy consultation needs a full review in light of the proposed changes being brought in under the new government. I particularly object to all the proposed Verwood development as the infrastructure is not in place to support the current population let alone adding even further to it by building a further 400 homes. Any EDDC councillor who has the affront to say that the infrastructure is in place to support this development does not know what they are talking about and obviously do not live in the town.			1404
359540	Mrs Anne JACOBS	Clerk St Leonards & St Ives Parish Council	Option PC 7		General Comment	PC7 Housing and Employment Options St Leonards - The Parish Council of St Leonards & St Ives would like to make the following comment on the Core Strategy document. We value development constraints in St Leonards and St Ives due to conservation and a lack of sustainable infrastructure, but we regret that an opportunity may have been lost to consider future use of the St Leonards Hospital site for affordable homes.			1404
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		Option PC 7	Object		The document correctly underlines the importance of the Dorset Heathlands. However it is essential to note that at this stage there is no evidence to support the theory that development of SANGs will actually sufficiently alleviate unacceptable pressure on the Dorset Heathlands. Indeed what evidence there is indicates that the approach is unlikely to be fully successful. Yet the Core Strategy is based on the assumption that the approach will work, and there is even a detectable implication that the Dorset Heathlands actually need income generated from further development to be protected and managed! This is a gross distortion of the concept of SANGs. Actually SE Dorset cannot continue to accept open ended growth without damage to heathland and the now apparently universal approach of tacking on an area of SANG to every new development on the basis that it			1404

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						protects, or even somehow enhances heathland biodiversity, is extremely worrying. Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously having damaging implications for heathlands, be they SSSIs or SNCIs, include KS3, KS4 (Coopers Lane south), VWM4 and VMW7. There is a commitment to restore and link heathland within south-east Dorset and areas most suitable for such restoration have been identified. There are options within the CS which would preclude such beneficial restoration including KS3/ PC7, PC4, and PC5.			
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		Option PC 7	Object		The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options. However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported. In summary all these three employment options are objectionable for similar biodiversity reasons – threat to the Moors River system, loss of opportunity for heathland restoration and actual or potential loss of grassland. It is also argued above that promotion of			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						employment land is a key factor in our housing conundrum. The case is therefore made for the deletion of these 3 sites and if absolutely necessary, allocation of a more modest and more thoughtfully placed site.			
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		Option PC 7	Object		<p>The grounds of St. Leonards Hospital include heathland and biodiverse grassland with strong populations of Green Winged Orchid. These important open habitats are located around the outer parts of the site and penetrate quite deeply into it. The site also lies close to the Moors River and to more extensive areas of heathland - to which it is linked through land of high potential for heathland restoration.</p> <p>KS3 Use of the site for residential purposes would almost inevitably result in the loss of some of the important grassland habitat. There will be challenges for protection and management of any remaining grassland and, depending on the extent and type of residential use, possible loss of and adverse pressure upon, the heathland within and beyond the site. The opportunity to restore a continuous heathland and grassland habitat from Barnsfield Heath to the A 31 will be lost. Any prospect of using this site for any ordinary residential purpose is not acceptable.</p> <p>PC7 Use for employment purposes might be less damaging in terms of public pressure, but would still inevitably cause direct habitat loss especially since the creation of 'landscape buffers', most likely to feature substantial screening with trees, would be in direct conflict with the preservation of the important open habitats. Further, employment use here would create an entirely new location for an ever present risk of significant pollution for the Moors River. As with KS3 the opportunity to restore a continuous heathland and grassland habitat from Barnsfield Heath to the A31 will be lost. Use of this site for employment purposes is not acceptable.</p>			1404
360112	Mr Kenneth BROOKS	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	Option PC 7	Object		As already indicated, this is a Major Development Site in the Green Belt already approved for development as a 'retirement care village.' The original planning application included provision of doctors surgery, shops and a specific bus service, but these conditions have been gradually dropped, but the stipulation that residents must be over 55 remains. This document infers that any change of use from a care village may not satisfy the current status			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						of a Major Development Site in the Green Belt. So why are we now suddenly considering this site for employment services? There appears to have been no consultation of any kind before proposing this change to non specific employment purposes. Have firm employment proposals been discussed with East Dorset District Council? Clearly, we need more specific employment purposes that the general B1, B2, B8 categorisation. If the need for 'affordable homes' is as high as suggested in this Core Strategy Document then this site should continue to be considered for some type of residential development.			
360777	Cllr. Mrs A. Warman	St Leonards & St Ives East Ward East Dorset District Council	Option PC 7	Support		Support with reservations. I would still like to see the planning permission on the site implemented, but if no developer comes forward we will have to reconsider. However, developing the site would give us very much needed affordable (25 -30) housing units.			1404
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		Option PC 7	Support					1404
485695	Mr John Cornish		Option PC 7	Support					1404
533834	Mr Tim Harris		Option PC 7	Support					1404
535387	Mr Brian Cox		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
535393	Jeremy Berg		Option PC 7	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			1404
535421	Mr Roland Andrews		Option PC 7	Support					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535457	Mr Matthew Newman		Option PC 7	Support					1404
535500	David Veevers		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
535504	Mr Michael Beer		Option PC 7	Object					1404
535509	Mrs S Durant		Option PC 7	Support					1404
535517	Roy Rich		Option PC 7	Object					1404
535547	Mr M Folland		Option PC 7	Object					1404
535550	Mrs D Mogg		Option PC 7	Support					1404
535567	Ms Judy McMath		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		Option PC 7	Support					1404
535591	A Walker		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535670	Dave Allen		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
535678	Andrew Bryant		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
535688	Susan Hobbs		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
535701	Mr Andy Skeats		Option PC 7	Object		PC7 & TA1 SSSI site, proposal would have detrimental effect on the site. Transportation, a31 is already insufficient to carry peak traffic this would make this situation worse. Wrong Area for this type of scale of development.			1404
535718	Richard Green		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
535815	Mrs C M Davies		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
535836	Peter Parsons		Option PC 7	Support					1404
535865	Darren Charles Bryson		Option PC 7	Support					1404
535875	John Kitchenside		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		Option PC 7	Support					1404
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		Option PC 7	Object		The majority of residents in this area relocated because of the permanent despoiling of their places of birth by elected local and national 'representatives' who would not listen or care about the needs of the people that voted for them. Do you want to be remembered as the people who finally ruined this area or the people who saved it. Do not forget that people still visit this area as			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						tourists and we welcome them and accept their contribution to the local economy. They will stop coming if the developments continue. How many tourists visit the outer London sprawl? Can I quote p227 from the Core Strategy Options paper - para 11.28 The Government's key housing policy is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. This is an impossible dream that can never and will never, be fulfilled. If the developments did go ahead what would be the effect of another 5000 cars on our local roads be ? If Morrisons developments go ahead where are the customers going to park? The parking within Verwood is just about adequate at the moment.			
536014	Mrs Dawn Tindall		Option PC 7	Support					1404
536050	Mr Andrew Collin		Option PC 7	Support		It is important to have a policy of continuous improvement for housing and employment for the area. Many are concerned for our environment, sensitive and empathic development will take care of this, but to do nothing will benefit no one in the longer term. A mixture of traditional and affordable homes is desirable, backed by a development in industrial and business land and premises availability. It is important to maintain and improve all areas of housing and commercial opportunity to invest in the future of our area for all parts of the community, the young, the aspiring as well as the established and retired members. Establishing the right mix is essential for a sustainable future in our community.			1404
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
536169	Mr Tony Trevis-Bell		Option PC 7	Support					1404
360714	Carol Morgan		Option PC 7	Object		Moving businesses already on industrial estates in or near towns out of the town is counter productive in terms of jobs and accessibility. 500+ houses and schools etc is in effect another			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						village and will not connect easily with the town of Wimborne. Take a look at Poundbury, good idea but now far too big.			
360768	Cllr. Mr David Packer	Colehill West Ward East Dorset District Council	Option PC 7	Support					1404
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny PEARCE		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
475508	Mr and Mrs Marshall		Option PC 7	Support					1404
475530	Mr George Phillips		Option PC 7	Support		You need to have a plan on how the infrastructure will be improved to support these housing and commercial developments before we decide on any housing or commercial developments. Infrastructure includes roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, etc. And for roads, I don't mean links from the developments to the existing roads. Everything round here is already overloaded. We need more bridges over the Stour, and a motorway link from Poole to the M27. Motorways north to the M4 and west to the M5 should also be built. These will take the load off the local roads round here. I also think we should only build decent homes. Everyone has to live somewhere, and they should have somewhere decent. It's the cost of land that drives up the cost of accommodation, and building land is expensive because it's in short supply.			1404
482494	Mrs Yvette Jones		Option PC 7	Object		Why would we want office buildings? Thousands lie empty. Expansion 'projects' smack of driven unnecessary waste and change for all the wrong reasons.			1404
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		Option PC 7	Support		I			1404
498211	Mrs J AUCKLAND		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
498402	Mrs T Hughes		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
508735	Mr Peter Barham		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
514507	Mr and Mrs C Macy		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
536271	Mrs D Holt		Option PC 7	Object		No development should be supported within Green belt areas at all.			1404
536282	Mrs Doreen Kingaby		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
536324	Paul Sumner		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
536332	Emmanuelle Hutton		Option PC 7	Object					1404
536341	Adrian Bowyer		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
536342	Lily Hutton		Option PC 7	Object					1404
536346	Mr Ben Richards		Option PC 7	Support					1404
536349	Mrs C Bowyer		Option PC 7	Support					1404
536351	Mr		Option PC	Object					1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	John Hutton		7						
536449	Dave Isaacs		Option PC 7	Object					1404
536543	Samantha Fysh		Option PC 7	Support		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD.. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!			1404
536572	Roger Fysh		Option PC 7	Support		I strongly object to the proposal to increase the housing in and around Verwood. Verwood has been extensively developed over the years and there is inadequate services to support the extra cars and people. Also having seen the housing density of the Ebblake housing estate it is clear that agreeing to more housing will only create 'no go' areas in the very near future. I also note that in and around Wimborne there are huge areas of open land, which could easily be developed, especially between Ferndown and Wimborne which also has excellent road networks in place as it could immediately open onto the A31			1404
536628	Mr C.A Wills		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		Option PC 7	Support					1404
536702	Mr Mark Hirst		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
536790	David Steadman		Option PC 7	Object					1404
536808	Ms Yvette Allen		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
536812	R H Barker		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
536848	Ola Steadman		Option PC 7	Object					1404
536850	Mr Michael Hird		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
536866	Emma Huns		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
501513	Mr O E BEVERLEY		Option PC 7	Support					1404
503861	Mr E Hawkins		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
482481	Mr Colin Molton	Director - South West Homes and Communities Agency	Option PC 7	Object		Suitability of proposed employment on Green Belt Land The HCA (Homes and Communities Agency) appreciate the need to allocate land for employment growth in suitable locations within the District. However, the HCA object to the allocation of the St Leonards Hospital site for B1 (office and light industrial), B2 (general industrial) and B8 (Storage) employment uses on the basis that significant employment uses in this location would significantly increase the traffic movement and would result in adverse visual intrusion in the Green Belt. In the granting of outline planning permission for residential development on the St Leonards hospital site the Council has accepted the principle of residential development in the Green Belt. The HCA consider that pursuing the delivery of a residential scheme, with an element of commercial floorspace, combined with measures to improve pedestrian connectivity and reduce car dependency, presents a development more appropriate to the location of the site.			1404
536930	Mrs		Option PC	Support		I also support Employment Options KS13 and BA1-11. For further			1404

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Susannah Spencer		7			crucial comments please see the PDF File "Response to EDDC Options for Wimborne and Colehill" emailed to Judy Windwood on 13th January 2011.			
536932	Paul Bason		Option PC 7	Support					1404
537050	Diane Fletcher		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
537075	Mrs Elaine Holt		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
537106	C Hebditch		Option PC 7	Support					1404
537362	Peter Constable		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
537435	Ms Pauline Burton		Option PC 7	Object					1404
537529	Mrs C White		Option PC 7	Support					1404
537571	Nick and Marion Leatherdale		Option PC 7		No Opinion				1404
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter Griffiths		Option PC 7	Support		Support all proposals subject to the prerequisites are fully implemented BEFORE development starts or substantial monies are deposited by developers before development. This will safeguard Council Tax payers against any future failure for whatever reason the developers fails to carry out the prerequisites.			1404
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment	15.32	Object		Paragraph 15.32 Stourbank Nurseries and Little Canford Depot, Hampreston, page 331 Option PC8 & PC9 - Majority of both sites (02 & 03) lie within Flood			1408

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Agency				Zone 1. The 'Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding' map shows that both sites include areas which may be prone to surface water flooding.			
484171	Miss Karen Houghton		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Because it means my home being destroyed. Shocking and appalling to find out about this from a neighbour who happened to hand out a leaflet about potential employment in this area. Why on earth should this happen? When it is clear that a persons home will be destroyed to enable this planning to take place should they not at least be told. I would never have found out about this without the employment leaflet and I think that is shocking. This area houses much wildlife and is one of the few relatively quiet places left. It is home to owls, badgers, foxes, and numerous species of wild birds to name but a few			1409
360714	Carol Morgan		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion	Moving businesses already on industrial estates in or near towns out of the town is counter productive in terms of jobs and accessibility. 500+ houses and schools etc is in effect another village and will not connect easily with the town of Wimborne. Take a look at Poundbury, good idea but now far too big.			1409
361055	Mr David OAKLEY		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		I find it very hard to understand how, after unanimous support for no development in the Green Belt this now goes directly against that decision.			1409
361099	Mrs Lynette PAYNE		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		A good number of these options, especially in Wimborne and Parley, are on the edges of the urban areas. Building in these locations changes the whole ethos of the area. When you leave Wimborne you see fields, trees and rivers dotted with thatched cottages. Even along Leigh Road, there is a definite rural feel, with true separation between Wimborne and Colehill. Developing along here, or Cranborne Road will dramatically change the area, for the worst. This in turn reduces people's quality of life, as we see our area creep closer to urbanisation, field by field. Why can't some of the brownfield sites be used instead?			1409
361111	Mr Raymond Brown		Non Preferred Option PC	Object					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			8						
490823	Ferndown Town Council Paul Falconbridge	Deputy Town Clerk Ferndown Town Council	Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The proposal to change this area of Green Belt over to a commercial industrial use would have a detrimental effect on the highways infrastructure and turn the Stapehill ward into a mix of Green Belt and Industry which are not at all compatible. The Town Council are aware that the development could potentially bring further employment opportunities to the area but this should not be at a cost to the natural environment and resident's quality of life.			1409
491401	S Ost		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The local roads, schools, hospitals would be unable to cope with extra movements of traffic and people coming into the area.			1409
495562	Mr MJ Banting		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
495625	Mr Michael McMath		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
495858	Mr P W Coupe		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Lack of service infrastructure. Interference with proposed cycle track between Hampreston and Canford Bottom. Increased congestion on Canford Bottom roundabout, which would require significant enhancement to manage the increased traffic flows. Impact on existing green belt provision: the development would be visible from the local Hampreston conservation area. Difficulty of access by potential employees - no public transport provision. Lack of local residents who would take up positions in the proposed development. Light industry and storage facilities are best situated near to areas where the potential workforce lives, or is within easy and short bus journey. Proximity to flood plain boundary.	Remove the development as an option. PC8 is currently described as "non-preferred".		1409
496188	Mr RE Vogel		Non Preferred Option PC		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			8						
496439	Mr and Mrs Gordon Third		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
496479	Charlotte Dixon		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
496564	JH Lockwood		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
496612	Mr and Mrs JP Lovell		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
359636	Mr Chris BARTLETT		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Unsuitable site from a traffic perspective			1409
360037	Mr Dave BARNES		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object	General Comment	What alternative locations, if any, have been considered? There is mention of heathland development.....where would this be?			1409
361041	Mr & Mrs G K HAMPTON		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion	Feel more information and maps needed on PC 8 and PC 9 as these are large sites.			1409
361170	Mr TR HARVEY		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
491311	Mr Kevin GILLING		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
495971	T A Reith		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
496958	Mrs J Beech		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
497026	Doreen Smith		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		This amount of building will create extra traffic in Ferndown and Parley which already has a lot of road build up in the busy morning and evening travel. Also taking a lot of natural land for our wild life.			1409
497060	Mrs Mary Tuffrey		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
497054	Mr RO Moore		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		I am glad to see this is a non preferred option. When Stourbank Nursery changed hands in 1984 the cost of relocation would have been in excess of £750,000 and finding a suitable site which was level, with good drainage and with no obstruction to light, would have been very difficult.			1409
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
497184	Mr Hilling		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
497239	Martine Lewis		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
497343	Sharon Sutcliffe		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
497773	R Johnstone		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		I am fully supportive of the employment options as local people would have a wider choice of work and travelling should be less for them.			1409
498044	Carolyne BANKS		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Transport needs to be sorted out centrally - to get something that works properly - this is the biggest showstopper to all of these schemes - the current roads will not support any more traffic.			1409
498047	CD Bradford		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Although I live in Ferndown i work and travel around a lot in the local area, so feel I can voice my opinion on developments around the area.			1409
498084	Mr P HARTLEY		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
498125	Mr and Mrs P DASHWOOD		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
498169	Mrs		Non		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	D WEAVER		Preferred Option PC 8						
498184	Mrs Angela BARKER		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		All the employment land options are currently in the Green Belt - this should be protected! Erode it and we'll have none left in the not too distant future.			1409
498268	Mr and Mrs R Cullen		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
498271	Mandy CHEESEMAN		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
498335	Mr and Mrs Lester		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
498711	Mr T CHANT		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
498996	M E CLARKE		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
499044	Mrs Carolyn MASKELL		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
360685	Mr M.P		Non Preferred		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	HOSE		Option PC 8						
361106	Mr and Mrs Robin and Janet WALL		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
498495	Mr John Williams		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
499231	Mrs A Lathbury		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
499236	J PIPE		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
499245	Mr and Mrs N BUTLER		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
499261	Mrs Norma JACKSON		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
499290	Mrs Lisa TURNBULL		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
499355	Mrs MEREDITH		Non Preferred Option PC	Support		Employment development areas must have immediate access to main roads and classified roads. They should not draw commercial traffic through residential areas on inadequate un-classified roads.			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			8						
499384	Mr A I ROSE		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
499683	S Crotch-Harvey		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
499873	Mr Graham Holt		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
500060	Mr Stuart PIDDOCK		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
500222	S Hartley		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
500350	Mr P H BARTLETT		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
500361	Mr and Miss N and A Middleton and Turner		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
500558	A Baker		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
500694	Mr and Mrs J R MANSBRIDGE		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
500697	Mr Thomas SMITH		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
500706	R & J Jeans		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
500720	Mrs VALLIER		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
500748	Mrs Lauren MATTHEWS		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Any development in the Little Canford / Hampreston area would be an eyesore and defeat the purpose of living in a traditional village area, it would compromise the quality of life.			1409
500802	J Hayward		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
500818	Mr J LADD		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		GREEN BELT LAND MUST BE PROTECTED, otherwise what is the point of having 'Green Belt'? Please listen to public opinion and don't just say 'we will listen and then disregard it'. I expect this will happen anyway.			1409
500836	Mrs		Non	Object					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Sylvia Hines		Preferred Option PC 8						
500903	Mr and Mrs S and R Harris		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
501012	Louise ARNOLD		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
501018	Mr Robert P Hand		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501106	Mr John Victor Rogers		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501114	John Lee		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
501118	Mr Ron		Non Preferred		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Cook		Option PC 8						
501135	Charlie Wassell		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
501194	Mrs Colton		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
359856	Mrs B Breeze		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		Planners should look again at PC4 and PC8 for mixed development. Clearly many are travelling to work in that area and there is the scope to create further local jobs easily.			1409
359895	Mr Jeff REECE		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
359908	Mr F.D.A REVILL		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
359927	Mrs Ann BISSEX		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The green belt should not be encroached on any further. No building should be allowed on flood plains. Much more serious effort needs to be put into reducing necessity of relying on car travel.			1409
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		I object to the commercial sites due to their impact on Canford Bottom. Already a nightmare. Bone of contention with Highways Agency.			1409
501324	Julie Light		Non Preferred Option PC	Support					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			8						
501351	Mr and Mrs R D'Cruze		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501364	Mr M Devetta		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
501485	Mrs J JACKSON		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
501488	Chris LAMB		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501502	Mr Michael WAREHAM		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501520	Mrs Z MERRIFIELD		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501523	Rita Gilbert		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501531	Mr Boyd Read		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501560	Mr Christopher CLARKE		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
501574	Mr & Mrs B S Nippard		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
501607	Dr Fairchild		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The road network will not support these developments. Long Lane & Colehill Lane have now become "rat runs" for traffic trying to access the A31 and more houses will increase this very big issue			1409
501616	R J Joyce		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
501626	Mrs J A Russell		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
501694	Mr R BRYAN		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
501699	B THOMAS		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501720	Dr and Mrs		Non		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	D HARLOW		Preferred Option PC 8						
501751	Mr RG Birch		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
501761	Mr D Curtis		Non Preferred Option PC 8		General Comment	The most urgent and critical limiting factors are the A31 single carriageways E and W and density of traffic using Canford Bottom roundabout - Encouraging increased commercial traffic re. PC 4 to PC 9 would only exacerbate the present traffic problems.			1409
501804	Mr Glyn Davies		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501823	Mr and Mrs E A Osgood		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501867	Mrs I M Marks		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501873	Mr and Mrs Harold A and D Joan Lilley		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		All proposals of this nature have a number of basic needs. One of the most important is infrastructure. Subject to finance being available Canford Bottom Roundabout is to be drastically amended for the Olympic Games. The reference to "Improvements to Canford Bottom therefore appear to have been superseded. Since I cannot find any intention to improve the road network all these proposals will only add to our present problems and cannot be supported.			1409
501876	J Long		Non Preferred	Support					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			Option PC 8						
501881	B W Deverill		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502022	Mr HWR Stevens		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Dorset's villages and small towns should be preserved as such. So called "developers" are only concerned with profits. There'll always be an England? Not when it has been built over and occupied by strangers.			1409
502029	Mr J MacArthur		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The whole area is congested, there is no real provision for new TRANSPORT OR services for new homes i.e. doctors, local shops or community centres. There are already MANY EMPTY industrial units. Building more industrial is only viable if a tax loss for developers. Verwood has lost its soul now, and does not need any more ad-hock development. Wimborne will follow if the development of this (at present) lovely Town is carried out in the same way as Verwood has been.			1409
502059	Mr R Seddon		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
502076	Kay Stead		Non Preferred Option PC		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			8						
502092	Mr and Mrs A Watkinson		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502099	Carolyn Lourens		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502114	Mr P Foster		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502138	Mrs E Mason		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
359598	Mr A KETCHLEY		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion	Unfortunately whatever is finally decided on the following well known saying will occur: 'You can please some of the people all the time, You can please all of the people some of the time, But you cannot please all of the people all of the time!' I wish you well in whatever is decided. Some will see it as inevitable due to the area's population increases, whereas others will see it as a necessary evil, and some will accept it without question			1409
359977	Miss M.G. EARP		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361113	Mr Alan Meade		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		.I like the rate of affordable housing to private homes. We all know that there is a shortage. Jobs will be created, money brought in, good for all in East Dorset, Christchurch			1409
361123	Mr Iain STEVENSON		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
501940	Mr M J Godfrey		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
502224	Mr and Mrs Larcombe		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support	General Comment	Hesitantly support - question mark in box. No new building should be anywhere near a floodplain with sea levels rising. Transport issues on and around the A31 are already over capacity - no development should proceed without that being sorted - including knock on effects of A31 issues. Has it actually been established that there is a need for all the homes and industrial development? Are we at risk of creating a need in order to service developers rather than establishing if there will be a real need in the first place?			1409
502317	Cllr Peter Lucas		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Blunts Farm and other development may be possible off a flyover if built at Canford Bottom roundabout area, otherwise, even with improvements to the roundabout traffic problems resulting from the development may be insurmountable.			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502322	Mrs J C Critchell		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
502326	Mr and Mrs T Bennett		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		With more homes will need more employment, a vicious circle. Our roads are too busy now. We surely have enough community areas and centres.			1409
502329	Mrs Rosemary Rooke		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
502333	B M Andrews		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Make parents walk their children to school. Stop parents 4x4s, etc. Spend more money on our area. Council tax far too high and what benefits do we receive from the Parish Council?			1409
502345	Mr and Mrs Ray and Irene Coulson		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502347	Sarah Cobb		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
502364	FD Peach		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502381	Mr Cyril Josey		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
502387	Mr		Non	Support		I would like to see the justification for increased housing in East			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	George Kilpatrick		Preferred Option PC 8			Dorset e.g., demographics, immigration, increased work opportunities etc. I would also like to understand how transport strategy (and infrastructure) is coordinated with this in such a way to make expansion sustainable.			
502415	Mrs S Humphries		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
502468	Robert Lambert		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
502492	M L Portugal		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
502568	Sarah Morgan		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
502570	Mr Samways		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502579	Mr & Mrs R L Thorne		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502595	Mr Colin House		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		All these developments will cause an impact on the local heathland and the proposals in all areas will cause road chaos on the A31, Ferndown, Parley and Wimborne. A new road structure is required before any development takes place.			1409
502596	A C Hayter		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
502610	John Jackson		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
502673	Mrs A Powell		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The infrastructure in this area needs to be sorted out before anymore building goes ahead. There are times you cannot move on the roads. The area is being ruined with all this building works that are already going on.			1409
502701	Mrs M Williams		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502708	Ms Julia Owen		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502745	Mrs		Non	Object		No building on green belt land. No increase of traffic along A31,			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	J.M Kenny		Preferred Option PC 8			A350, A35			
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
502921	Mr and Mrs L Forinton		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
502935	Mr Roger Parker		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
502999	Mrs Marion E Lock		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
503044	Mr and Mrs R Setchfield		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
503085	Mr P.A. Scott		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		More development - more people - more work - more cars - more roads - more noise - more pollution - more laws - more control - less quality of life. A sacrifice to the God of Economic Growth.			1409
503156	Richard and Jackie Blunderfield		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Preferred location is St Leonards as the A31 is 2 lanes and can cope with extra traffic. PC8 and PC9 are green belt areas and should not be built on. Also objected to in Options for Employment leaflet			1409
503171	Sally Cooke		Non Preferred		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			Option PC 8						
503183	B Chissell		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
503233	F Parkes		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
503250	Mrs Helen Poole		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
503303	Mr Anthony Roberts		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
503347	Ms Hardwick		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
359873	Mrs M HUGHES		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
359889	Mr and Mrs P CLARK		Non Preferred Option PC	Object		With any developments we would need to be assured that infrastructure improvements are in place BEFORE any development is consented to. This is particularly important with			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			8			regard to public transport provisions. It is also important that feedback is forthcoming as an acknowledgement of our response to this survey.			
359920	S PARKER		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		1. I want to know the projected time scale for these options to start to become active. 2. It is most important that there is adequate employment to accommodate the houses to be built. 3. More attention must be made to supply of affordable housing. 4. The green belt must be respected where possible. 5. The estates around Wimborne must be consulted fully.			1409
360029	Mr David LANIGAN		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy Document, Managing Growth and Development up to the year 2027. I agree with the preamble stating that we need to meet local housing needs, with the emphasis on growing the main settlements where we have good access to facilities that people require. Some development of smaller communities should continue however, especially the provision of low cost housing. The community as a whole, needs the services of teachers, nurses, firemen, postmen, and policemen who are poorly paid because they commit to a vocation rather than a high salary job. We also need the services of skilled people such as builders, electricians, plumbers, gas fitters, and motor mechanics, the essentially blue collar professionals. They must not be priced out of the market in terms of being able to buy a starter home, in the community that they serve. Having bought my first home in 1963, a two bedroom bungalow for £2,200 I am aware that locally such a property is currently one hundred times as much. This makes things difficult for young couples with the ratio of house prices to wages being the highest in the country. Many struggle with getting mortgages that now require typically a 25% deposit on an already expensive property. I moved to West Moors 15 years ago and appreciate the planning decisions that have taken place affecting this village. We now have			1409

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>a new build shopping centre on Station Road, complete with flats, good pavements, lighting, pelican crossing and trees. I am pleased to have seen built several small, three storey, blocks of retirement and two bed flats close to the village centre. I support the gradual expansion of the Village, current population around 7,500 as we have good schools, a large Memorial hall, Churches with halls, two public houses, doctors, dentists and good bus services to both Poole and Bournemouth. We have footpath access to open land such as Holt Heath, as well as being able to use the old railway line route through the village to Ringwood, - the Castleman Trail. Recently St Marys Church has had built a new Church Hall which will serve the community and thanks to the National Lottery grant we now have an excellent Bowling Club. I support the continued slow expansion of the village as currently we have many facilities for people of all ages to enjoy.</p> <p>My current house was built in the mid 70s, and has trebled in value since my wife and I moved here 15 years ago. In the 1970s West Moors doubled in size and acquired new schools and since then other infrastructure improvements. In recent years the Library was refurbished. The facilities for retirees in West Moors, with access to Ferndown and Verwood, are very good, and coupled with excellent hospitals at Poole, Bournemouth and Wimborne, and I have felt no need to move from East Dorset area in the conceivable future.</p> <p>I therefore support the proposals for additional housing as outlined in the Core Strategy Consultation, as well as the proposals for business sites for employment. I also support provisions for new schools particularly a new Secondary School at Verwood, and recreation areas to cater for the population increase. I understand that net immigration into Dorset is running at two thousand people a year so clearly we need to plan for housing, jobs, education, recreation, road improvements especially at busy junctions, and off road car parking in town centres and on new housing estates.</p> <p>There are many reasons why East Dorset and Christchurch, are attractive places for people to live, work and retire to. Long term planning that caters for the needs of a steady population increase is sensible and is to be welcomed.</p>			
360095	Mr & Mrs John &		Non Preferred	Object					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Barbara POLKINGHORN		Option PC 8						
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E HACK		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
361105	Mr John GOOCH	Also member of Colehill Parish Council	Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
503024	Valerie Measey		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
503306	Ian and Freda Hancock		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
503355	Mr Robert Griffiths		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
503358	H C Hoare		Non Preferred		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			Option PC 8						
503421	Mr Geof Haywood		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
503444	R Hobbs		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
503476	Mrs AM Hawkins		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
503527	Claire Smith		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion	Apportion part of employment land options to housing of all categories for potential employees at these locations thereby reducing transport needs.			1409
503554	Mr D Verguson		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		I see that with regards to PC8 and PC9 concerns are expressed that these sites lie in an important Green Belt gap. Yet no such concerns have been expressed regarding the development off Leigh Road WMC5 which have a far greater impact on an equally important Green Belt gap. Who decides which parts of the Green Belt are more important than others and why!			1409
503598	Mr John Turner		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
503603	Mrs		Non		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	DJ Morley		Preferred Option PC 8						
503621	A G Haines		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		As I'm sure you are perfectly aware, all developments I have ticked require serious consideration to the whole road network in the areas concerned.			1409
503624	Mr RT Jackson		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
503635	Mr J Gough		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The A31 is already over-saturated with regular gridlock on Friday/Saturday without major redevelopment (min 2 lane dual carriageway from Ferndown industrial estate to Tolpuddle) it is incapable of taking any more traffic. Wimborne, Ferndown and Parley cross- we object to more building on green field sites Parley Cross area is already over-saturated with traffic and is incapable of taking any more. The entire East Dorset area already been over-developed versus other areas of the country. It does not have the transport, social, educational. etc resources for any more.			1409
503640	N J and S A White		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
503644	Mr J Riley		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503659	Mr JD Jenkins		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
503687	Mr Nick Smith		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
503709	Mr and Mrs A Fairclough		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
503759	Mr D.J. Middleton		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
503878	Mr Peter Smith		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
503879	Mr S Smithson		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
504093	Mr & Mrs		Non		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Vivian		Preferred Option PC 8						
504101	Mrs Mary Trewiss-Bell		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
504216	Mr Mark Rich		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
504285	Mr P Miller		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
504314	Ms Selina Roper		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
505273	Mrs Lorraine Hubbard		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
505288	Mrs S Cramer		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support	General Comment	As a married mother of 3 children, 2 girls and 1 boy, living in a 2 bed Council flat (first floor), I welcome more housing to the Wimborne area for young families needing affordable housing / rented housing.			1409
361037	Mr P STRATFORD		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		I expect that my objection to everything is not very practical. However, I have lived in the area for most of the last fifty years. In that time there has been a constant cycle of the council saying we need more housing, followed by we need more industrial areas to provide extra jobs for all the new homes. Then in turn the council says we require extra jobs for the new homes, then in turn the council says we require extra homes for the new workers. This			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						process is never ending. During this time I've witnessed the creation and expansion of the industrial estates at Ferndown, Uddens, Ebblake and Wimborne. A whole new housing estate at Tricketts Cross, Glenmoor Rd Ferndown, the expansion of West Moors, Colehill, Verwood turned from sleepy village into a town. In this time I am not aware of any developed area being returned to its natural state from a developed one. Please let me know if you think differently. I hope you agree that my objection to development is rational and that the never ending cycle of expansion is stopped.			
475526	Mr Geoffrey Dark		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary Hendy		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The Green Belt should stay Green.			1409
498034	Mr Richard Cutler		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		<p>STOURBANK PARK</p> <p>We wish to OBJECT to the residential and employment options identified to date by East Dorset. Our objections are founded on a fundamental omission (i.e. the failure to allocate Non-preferred Option PC8 for development) and therefore apply to the overall approach to the emerging policy, the proposed sites, and the 'soundness' of the justification and evidence base in each case. We consider that there is a compelling case for a mixed use allocation of Stourbank Nurseries (part of Non-preferred Option PC8). This site has the added advantage of being able to link to Wessex Water's proposals for the Little Canford Depot, Hampreston, delivering approximately 12 hectares of employment and residential development land; the latter to supplement the existing residential on site. There is perhaps also further potential to include a modest amount of the adjoining land to the east owned by the Canford Estate. We have had constructive discussions with both adjoining landowners.</p> <p>Our arguments for the allocation of Stourbank Nurseries are set out in the attached document: A Compelling Case – Part 1. This has previously been made available to East Dorset District Council, in</p>	We support and therefore recommend the inclusion of Option PC8 as a preferred option.		1409

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>May 2010, and therefore already forms part of the evidence base for the emerging Core Strategy. In summary:</p> <p>1. There is a widely-accepted policy-based consensus that exceptional circumstances exist to necessitate and justify a review of the Green Belt west of Ferndown. Given that the Green Belt restriction applies to the other options proposed by East Dorset, the Green Belt cannot be used as a reason in itself not to progress Option PC8. The development potential of Stourbank Nurseries needs to be considered on its merits.</p> <p>2. Having regard for these merits, the most important aspect of Option PC8 is that it comprises previously developed land. It is therefore sequentially preferable to any other greenfield site. This point is drawn into stark contrast when considered alongside, for example, Blunts Farm (PC4) that appears to require the removal of established woodland, PC6 (Sturminster Marshall) which is small scale (3.3 hectares) and damaging to the open countryside, and Sites FWP3, FWP4 and FWP5 which fill in existing landscape gaps.</p> <p>3. The previously developed nature of Option PC8 is a particularly relevant and influential criterion in relation to housing land supply.</p> <p>4. In addition, we believe that modest dispersal of employment development, as proposed at Stourbank Nurseries, is more sustainable, more deliverable, creates less traffic congestion (owing to the dispersal of traffic), and provides for a higher quality business environment than a simple extension of the 'large sheds' at Uddens and Ferndown. In our view, it is very difficult to see how any extension of the large industrial estates can deliver anything other than more of the same; which, though valuable as an employment asset, does not help to diversify the East Dorset economy or create a 'step change' towards a knowledge economy. In a similar vein, we do not accept that all knowledge economy (or Use Class B1) jobs should be located in the Bournemouth-Poole-Christchurch conurbation. This can only lead to longer than necessary commuting within an urban form that has limited opportunities for rail-based travel to work. Moreover, whilst Bournemouth Airport offers some useful, out of town business space potential, this is likely to be (or, from a planning policy point of view, should be of) a scale to suit large to medium-sized enterprises linked to an 'aviation cluster'. Choice and flexibility are key criteria for employment development – this needs to be</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>reflected on the site allocations (i.e. a selection of large and small sites, catering for industrial, office and R&amp;D occupiers). East Dorset's Employment Land Review needs to provide for a segmented and target approach to employment development.</p> <p>5. There is, in short, a very strong need and demand-based case for a Use Class B1 allocation at Stourbank Nurseries to accommodate the demand for growing small to medium sized enterprises (SMEs) from East Dorset. This can be combined with residential (and other uses) to create a mixed-use, sustainable development.</p> <p>Four further, site specific points:</p> <p>6. We question how East Dorset's Option paper can come to the conclusion that visual intrusion may be a factor against allocating Option PC8 for development. The glasshouses on site already provide a substantial visual envelope and, with careful landscape master planning (in addition to the existing landscape buffer) any replacement development can be carefully screened – thus providing a planning opportunity, not a constraint. For the same reason, i.e. the previously developed nature of the site and the substantial visual envelope, further development or redevelopment of Stourbank Nurseries cannot have any material impact on the Green Belt Gap.</p> <p>7. With regard to deliverability, Stourbank Nurseries has an acceptable, all-ways access on to the B3073 (a County Distributor Road). This is not currently available at, for example, St Leonards Hospital (which is also remote and peripheral). From a residential point of view, Stourbank is, in addition, well located with regard to amenities and, for example, local schools. In short, the off-site and upfront infrastructure required to deliver development at Stourbank is limited, certainly, relative to other sites; thus reinforcing its deliverability credentials and availability in the early part of the plan period (when other sites are unlikely to be available).</p> <p>8. There may also be a case for a hotel on site, thus providing a useful amenity for new and existing residents and employees.</p> <p>9. Irrespective of the case for a mixed-use redevelopment, it is evident that the glass houses (and for that matter the Wessex Water depot) are nearing the end of their operational life. It would make sense to provide for their redevelopment (in any form) by removing the land from the Green Belt. Mindful of this redevelopment need, it would be wrong for East Dorset to ignore,</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						and not positively plan for, development over the next 20 years. A mixed use allocation for development or, at the very least, a 'safeguarded allocation' is entirely appropriate. The Core Strategy is the time to address these issues, in particular the case for a Green Belt review.			
498775	Mrs P L Buckler		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
505369	J Young		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object	General Comment	Building more houses has NOTHING to do with meeting the needs of (existing) local residents. We do not need or want more houses in our area. Planning to build more houses is driven by the 'need' to meet externally imposed quotas based on false assumptions on the desirability of further population and economic growth. Instead of wasting resources on building more housing which is ecologically unsustainable, we should be using them to make a transition to a low energy sustainable future for our children. Please listen to local residents and reject further development.			1409
505523	Mr & Mrs A Turner		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
505561	Mr. D. Calvert		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
505590	M Spalding		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
505656	Mr Dave Evans		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
505760	J Evans		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
505802	Mr RGH Chapman		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
506116	Mr and Mrs P and SJ Simpson		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			1409
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		I object because both are in an area currently not significantly developed.			1409
506754	Mr		Non		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Derek E Marsh		Preferred Option PC 8						
506989	Mrs Barbara Harris		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
507026	Mr David Craig		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support	General Comment	I would like to see priority given to projects which have a higher concentration of social housing inclusion, and also include a higher green/renewable energy provision. Particular concentration on family areas, playgrounds and social/community facilities should be considered.			1409
507032	Mr David Oliver		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
507033	A R Twaits		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object	General Comment	Despite improvements to public transport, cycling and walking, the reality is that the vast majority of journeys will continue to be made by car. Local roads are already congested and the extent of development proposed is not acceptable without significant increases in the capacity of these roads for cars. In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.			1409
507070	Mr and Mrs Earwicker		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The 3 sites we support have good main road access although Horton Road/Ringwood Road would need updating for Woolsbridge. The A31 behind Blunts Farm needs to be dual carriageway all the way from the Lidl roundabout to Canford Bottom roundabout. Access to any industrial estate in Blunts Farm should be from the A31 not via Uddens Estate.			1409
507286	Mr N P Butler		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507336	Mr John Page		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
507388	Mr David Huggins		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
507474	Mark and Jean Cording		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		<p>1) We are still due a correctment in housing prices, housing benefits have artificially underpinned the bubble. The so called shortage of housing is also caused by breaking up of the family unit (teenagers and young people do not need their own homes)</p> <p>2) The Green Belt must be protected, a temporary supposed need would and could not be reversed. There are hundreds of brown sites which could be utilised, without the need for more disruptive and expensive infrastructures.</p> <p>3) Green Belt land was created to protect open land between and around developments. We anticipated development and councils saying they need more land, it was and is vital so please do not change the policy. Times change, needs change, populations (immi and emigration) demands disappear but green land cannot be replaced.</p>			1409
507524	Mr C G Richardson		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507555	Mr and Mrs C Lamond		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
507572	GJ Pettifer		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
507595	Mr D Johnson		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
507652	Mrs Isabel Brooks		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		My objections to the grey area (employment land options) above are because enough land, brownfield sites, on existing industrial estates will suffice for more businesses! Again, the green belt is under stress for biodiversity.			1409
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
507693	Mrs P Carter		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
507760	Mr and Mrs R Gardner		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
507800	Mrs		Non		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	K M Platt		Preferred Option PC 8						
507908	Mr Philip H James		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
507980	Sylvia Allen		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
508383	Ms Emma Hayter		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
508413	Mrs S Best		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The Council is always after land for housing or business development. Whatever is granted is never enough and a few years later they want more. This process has been going on for over 50 years and it is time it came to a stop. Enough is enough as it is ruining the area.			1409
508852	Mrs L.A. Chesshire		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
508928	Mr		Non		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	D.W. Lonsdale		Preferred Option PC 8						
509065	Mrs B Burge		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
360097	Mr John DOWLING		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
361121	Mrs Elizabeth JONES		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
361161	Mr Douglas FORWARD		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
361184	Mr S MOON		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		In most situations I will object to the build of additional housing / business premises, as I do not believe that other options have first been considered or if not possible 'today' are being pursued for the longer term. For example, 1) There are many properties, particularly in Dorset, which are second homes and for most of the year are empty. Action needs to be taken to make these available for renting / purchase as even today, let alone the future, houses are unoccupied, for whatever reason, is not an option. (I would support legislation.) Empty properties also need to be addressed. 2) The development of "brownfield" sites, even if these may not be profitable as other options or as desirable to live or work. 3) Thinking outside the box or in this case outside the areas of this Strategy Consultation. Dorset is not alone in having to address these issues and we need to have some "joined up thinking" with other authorities to see if there are joint opportunities. In this			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						respect Hamworthy Engineering buildings have been empty for many years but do not appear to be in anyone's options.			
510420	Mr Peter Stevens		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
510532	W.W. Chant		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
510623	Mr Douglas Priest		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
510798	Mr F Sullivan		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
510844	Mr Michael Guilmany-Cush		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		It was rather cheeky of you not to provide mapping of the Employment land options sites. I had to consult an OS map.			1409
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R. Mayes		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
510974	Mr Jim Cullumbine		Non Preferred Option PC	Support					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			8						
510993	R.A. Cherrett		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
511015	Mr Christopher White		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
511076	Mr Ian Burden		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
511219	Ms Kathleen Smith		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and Diana Froud		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
511430	A.D. May		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
511489	Mr H G Holden		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
511571	Colin Alborough		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511618	Mrs V Blunden		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
511621	Ms Mary A Combe		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
511711	Coombes		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
511747	Mr T W Tonge		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
361196	Mr J.M BULLIVANT		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
476264	Mr David Reddaway		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
491252	Margaret Wareham		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
507899	R J		Non		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Potts		Preferred Option PC 8						
511639	Paul Hockey		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
512281	Graham Roberts		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
512326	Mr Ian Willis		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
512703	Rita Sweatland		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A Kirby		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
513692	Mrs A Willis		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
513881	Mrs S Bagg		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
513900	Mr P		Non Preferred	Object		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed e.g. road			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Wall		Option PC 8			improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			
513954	Mr RW Heseltine		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
513966	Mr and Mrs Howard		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
513974	Mr A Moore		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
514039	Mrs R Doman		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
514049	Mrs E Hellier		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
514091	Mr RJ Potts		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
514099	Mr and Mrs T C Blakeley		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
514111	Penelope Webiery		Non Preferred Option PC	Object					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			8						
514136	Mrs J Crumb		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
514225	Mr Simon Dixon	Secretary West Moors Traders Association	Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon Chaffey		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
514274	Mr Showell		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Instead of new housing there should be a new strategy of providing more public open space. The lessons of the Edwardians/Victorians should be learnt. New public parks like Poole Park, Queens Park and Kings Park save an area from urban crowding. Perhaps all the land proposed for housing could be reallocated to public parks.			1409
514355	Mr T Gee		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
514379	Mrs Denise Bannister		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		DWT would object to this option if it came forward due to the close proximity of the area to SNCIs (Big Burles SZ09/15, Little Canford Ponds SZ09/50), unless adequate protection, mitigation and compensation were agreed. We consider that, should these options be brought forward, a pre-requisite for development should be protection and enhancement of the SNCIs with retention of			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						corridors of open natural green space to retain connectivity. These proposals should also be considered alongside the Green Infrastructure Strategy proposals for the Stour Valley. In particular, with respect to PC 8 the SNCI could become bounded on 3 sides by development and enclosed by the road. We consider these options should be informed by a biological survey.			
359916	JB Cossins		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
360626	Mr Frank Miller	Chair Person Sturminster Marshall Affordable Housing Self Build Homes Group	Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		We have more than plenty sites empty which need filling so why build more factory units? Get the rates down which will allow empty units to be let. Alter the big units into smaller one / two type units. Drive out and look. Please stop doing desk top plans. I would love to help in putting forward real working plans instead of dreams. Please live in the real world.			1409
361014	Mr Peter Hammond		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		I object to any development especially commercial development at these locations as it would seriously affect the Green Belt which separates villages in this part of East Dorset. Therefore support the team's non-preference for these options. Does West Parley really need a 3,000sq.m supermarket? There are more than enough supermarkets in the Ferndown area to serve the whole of Dorset. Two last paragraphs from my letter of 29th April 2008. To return to my original point, I do not believe that this level of development is necessary, justified, sustainable, or desirable for this part of East Dorset and I feel EDDC is being railroaded into accepting the strategy simply in order to satisfy Government broad housing targets irrespective of their relevance to the locality. I have felt for some years now that East Dorset is continually being sacrificed in order to preserve what may be seen by some as more open countryside further west in the county and which has greater			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						protection from conservation laws and the National Trust. Wimborne, Colehill, West Parley , and Corfe Mullen are still separately identifiable villages surrounded by agricultural land; they are not part of the big conurbations such as Poole and Bournemouth and they should be respected as being different and treated differently. I understand the difficulty EDDC might well have with these strategy documents and I'm sure they will do their best for the area. However i would like to see the council standing up and really challenging the basic premises of this plan and propose much less development in the area based on real local need and not a notional level set essentially by Central Government.			
476792	Mr and Mrs Lomas		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
481604	Mr Gerald Toomer		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
485695	Mr John Cornish		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		Please consider the provision of incubator offices and small workshops for businesses spawned out of the Bournemouth University and Executive Business Centre in Holdenhurst Road. Reference Site Chillworth Science Park. This could be sited off road in North Dorset, say Sixpenny Handley to improve local economy.			1409
496996	Mr Hayward		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Concerned how many residents living in the areas of proposed developments have knowledge of this, as it appears that the only way the residents of Hampreston were informed was due to my wife knocking door to door. Strongly oppose developments at Stourbank Nursery as I am a resident of the nursery. Being born in Hampreston and over the years seeing the increased volume of traffic to Ham Lane and Canford Bottom, any change to this site will have a significant impact on these areas with increased volumes. Greenbelt land always appears irrelevant when large			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						developments are considered, but a major issue when small changes are put forward. Is there a reason for this, or like most things these days just down to money.			
500746	Mrs J Lothian		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		Make better use of site, without taking over green land PC9 at Manor Farm			1409
500817	Mr L Lothian		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
508562	K Clayson		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
508993	Mr A Samways		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
509795	Mr R Ridley		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
511761	Mr G Burge		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
513651	Mrs W Pearsall		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
514467	Mrs Lesley		Non Preferred		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Cripps		Option PC 8						
514482	C E T Gilbert		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
514674	Mrs J Williams		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Objections to PC6, PC8 and PC9 are mainly due to traffic. Ham Lane and Canford Bottom couldn't cope with any more.			1409
514752	Claire Richardson & Jamie Shirley		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
514812	Mr C Sawyer		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Seeking the opinion of the general public on planning issues is all very commendable - but setting aside all political persuasion my feeling is that this is no more than a Public Relations exercise because in the end the final decisions are always to the advantage of the developers whoever they may be because of money, greed and looks good on paper.			1409
514913	Mr and Mrs M Clark		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
514939	D		Non		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Porter		Preferred Option PC 8						
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The area is already over-developed and congested - further development on the scales proposed would lead to deterioration of the environment and a reduction in the quality of life. I am particularly dismayed by continued threats to the Green Belt, especially as this Government pledged to protect it. I do not believe that such massive development is necessary or beneficial to the vast majority of inhabitants. Pressure on our area should be reduced by Government tackling such issues as population growth through immigration control and regeneration of brownfield sites in Midlands and North. There is a need for limited affordable and social housing locally, but not more executive homes. It is wrong to build new homes while second homes and investment properties continue to exist.			1409
515033	Mr T Crump		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		These proposals are typical of the failures contrived by Council and Consultants to address short term solutions to Government edict. Fundamental to any significant further development is the need for joined up thinking for transportation. All of these proposals further the burden on traffic flow through and around conurbation centres. These major roads are the responsibility of the government highways department. They should foot the bill for their improvements prior to further development. Some of these proposals virtually adjoin 100 instance flood lines. This is totally unacceptable. Any proposal to move allotments, away from the housing that uses them, increases road usage and has a negative impact on the community.			1409
515287	Mr L Jackson		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The A31 trunk road from Ferndown by-pass should be widened to form a dual carriageway all the way through to Bere Regis.			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
515367	Mr & Mrs J Pottinger		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Please save the Green Belt			1409
515479	Mr D Lenehan		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		There is no need for any more industrial units in Hampreston. In fact the area is awash with them.			1409
515763	Mr V S Harris		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
515788	J M May		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
516298	Mrs Monica Hoare		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Strongly object. Having resided on this site for 54 years I find this kind of suggestion ridiculous. The access road is very narrow and unmade. If the nursery is non-productive I will be very surprised. It is a thriving business and I strongly object to any change of use.			1409
516313	Mr Julian Humphries		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		PC 8 and 9 are both unacceptable for their isolation and impact.			1409
517528	Dr Susan Burton		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		As residents of Stourbank Nurseries we were shocked to learn that this site was being considered as one of the possible locations for employment in the core strategy. We had no personal formal consultation over this matter and it was simply by chance that we discovered that this site was being considered. This option excludes ours and our neighbour's property (3 and 4 Stourbank Nursery) We would like written confirmation that this is an omission and that there has been no consideration to include our property and our neighbours as part of any proposed development. We object to options PC8 and PC9 being considered as options for			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>employment and have the following comments to make.                      Nature Conservation Interests (PC 8)                      River Stour                      The area goes up to the River Stour with no exclusion buffer. It would be unacceptable to have a development this close to the river with the loss of a river corridor connecting wildlife (a beech woodland) as well as the risk of pollution caused by surface water run-off from the development.                      As Policy NENV4 in the ED Local Plan states                      "Development should be sited and designed to protect or enhance the visual and physical quality and natural history interest of rivers or their tributaries and their landscape settings.                      This development would therefore be contrary to this policy and to reiterate would certainly not protect or enhance the visual and physical quality and natural history interest of the River Stour and its landscape setting.                      SNCI (B, D and Poole Structure Plan Environment Policy C)                      In addition to the nature conservation value of the River Stour and its river corridor, the site is next to Little Canford Ponds SNCI (a pond and wet woodland site). As with option for employment PC4 a prerequisite for development would include protection of the SNCI.                      As a water body that directly borders the access route to Stourbank Nurseries (note the boundary of the SNCI mapped does not correctly show how closely this waterbody now actually comes to the track) it is difficult to see how sufficient width of a buffer could be achieved between the development and the SNCI while still providing a wide enough access between residential development (2 Stourbank Nurseries) and the SNCI.                      Protected Species                      There are active badger sets between 4 Stourbank Nurseries and the River Stour. Otters have been sighted on the River Stour and in the vegetation between the track and the SNCI.                      To summarise the development is likely to have an adverse effect on the protected species and the wildlife of the River Stour, the river corridor and the SNCI through noise, light and water pollution.                      Green Belt (PC8 &amp; PC9)                      The site lies in an important Green Belt gap. Hampreston Conservation Area lies to the south of the development. There is potential visual intrusion of the development and a change of character of the area.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>To remove this land from the Green Belt would be contrary to the aims set out in PPG2. It would spoil the setting of the Hampreston Conservation Area and the open countryside running either side of the River Stour (Stour Valley).</p> <p>Traffic (PC8 &amp; PC9)</p> <p>Ham Lane traffic movements will increase as a result of the development to the detriment of the character of Hampreston Conservation Area.</p> <p>Increased traffic movements will cause tailbacks along Ham Lane onto the Canford Bottom roundabout.</p> <p>In addition access to and from Hampreston First School will be made more difficult. The busier road will also make the walk to and from this First School more dangerous for those in the local community who go by foot.</p> <p>With the increased traffic on Ham Lane it is hard to imagine how 'safe and efficient' bus routes (see Policy Trans9 below) could be maintained at this location.</p> <p>Policy TRANS9 'Where new residential, commercial or industrial estate distributor roads are proposed, these will only be permitted where they are designed or incorporate measures that allow for the safe and efficient movement of bus services.</p> <p>Employment (PC 8)</p> <p>The area is currently used as a garden nursery and as such already provides employment without increasing the sprawl of the built up areas within the green belt.</p>			
517835	Mr G D Rodrigues		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		<p>Stourbank Nurseries and Canford Depot, Hampreston. I would object to this development for a number of reasons. I also note that for your own planning officers it is not a preferred option. The site does not adjoin an existing urban area and lies within an important Green Belt gap. Its development would compromise this gap.</p> <p>Existing agricultural/horticultural are appropriate for this Green Belt area, further development beyond this would not be in keeping with this. The site is visible from other areas of green belt and conservation zones. A key negative aspect of this site is a lack of accessibility to nearby services and public transport. The local roads network would be unable to cope with any increased traffic requirements that would come from developing this site - both directly onto the B3073 Ham Lane and also the consequent impact on the Canford Bottom roundabout. A key negative would also be</p>			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						that any increased development of this site would have a negative impact on the local residents of the adjoining hamlet of Little Canford, both in terms of the increased road and traffic noise and also the increased noise due to the development of the site and its later planned business activities.			
359482	Ms Helen POWELL	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion	This option gives no consideration to the potential for accommodating and integrating access to the Stour Valley. Our opinion on this option will depend on whether opportunities for access to the Stour Valley are either compromised by the development or integrated into the development.			1409
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Given that most of the proposed employment-related development will be in close proximity to the designated sites, the Core Strategy must demonstrate that this development can be accommodated without adverse effects on the European sites. There is uncertainty as to where this deployment will be exactly focused, however given the broad locations identified, scrutiny for possible adverse effects on European sites will be necessary. We object to option KS13 and options PC4, PC5, PC7, PC8, PC9, PC13 and PC14 pending resolution of outstanding issues identified in the HRA in relation to the European sites.			1409
359891	Mrs Susanne Parkin		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion	There should be more places of employment nearer to existing housing - this should be small units and sites. To enlarge existing sites is not very sustainable in terms of traffic - it is foolish to exacerbate existing bad traffic conditions as we have at present e.g. the A31 at peak time from the Ferndown Industrial Estate. Villages surrounding the conurbation should all support a degree of employment and industry.			1409
360331	Mr Richard CUTLER	Green Park Land Company	Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object	General Comment	STOURBANK PARK We wish to OBJECT to the residential and employment options identified to date by East Dorset. Our objections are founded on a fundamental omission (i.e. the failure to allocate Non-preferred Option PC8 for development) and therefore apply to the overall approach to the emerging policy, the proposed sites, and the 'soundness' of the justification and evidence base in each case.			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>We consider that there is a compelling case for a mixed use allocation of Stourbank Nurseries (part of Non-preferred Option PC8). This site has the added advantage of being able to link to Wessex Water’s proposals for the Little Canford Depot, Hampreston, delivering approximately 12 hectares of employment and residential development land; the latter to supplement the existing residential on site. There is perhaps also further potential to include a modest amount of the adjoining land to the east owned by the Canford Estate. We have had constructive discussions with both adjoining landowners.</p> <p>Our arguments for the allocation of Stourbank Nurseries are set out in the attached document: A Compelling Case – Part 1. This has previously been made available to East Dorset District Council, in May 2010, and therefore already forms part of the evidence base for the emerging Core Strategy. In summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is a widely-accepted policy-based consensus that exceptional circumstances exist to necessitate and justify a review of the Green Belt west of Ferndown. Given that the Green Belt restriction applies to the other options proposed by East Dorset, the Green Belt cannot be used as a reason in itself not to progress Option PC8. The development potential of Stourbank Nurseries needs to be considered on its merits.</li> <li>2. Having regard for these merits, the most important aspect of Option PC8 is that it comprises previously developed land. It is therefore sequentially preferable to any other greenfield site. This point is drawn into stark contrast when considered alongside, for example, Blunts Farm (PC4) that appears to require the removal of established woodland, PC6 (Sturminster Marshall) which is small scale (3.3 hectares) and damaging to the open countryside, and Sites FWP3, FWP4 and FWP5 which fill in existing landscape gaps.</li> <li>3. The previously developed nature of Option PC8 is a particularly relevant and influential criterion in relation to housing land supply.</li> <li>4. In addition, we believe that modest dispersal of employment development, as proposed at Stourbank Nurseries, is more sustainable, more deliverable, creates less traffic congestion (owing to the dispersal of traffic), and provides for a higher quality business environment than a simple extension of the ‘large sheds’ at Uddens and Ferndown. In our view, it is very difficult to see how any extension of the large industrial estates can deliver anything</li> </ol>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>other than more of the same; which, though valuable as an employment asset, does not help to diversify the East Dorset economy or create a 'step change' towards a knowledge economy. In a similar vein, we do not accept that all knowledge economy (or Use Class B1) jobs should be located in the Bournemouth-Poole-Christchurch conurbation. This can only lead to longer than necessary commuting within an urban form that has limited opportunities for rail-based travel to work. Moreover, whilst Bournemouth Airport offers some useful, out of town business space potential, this is likely to be (or, from a planning policy point of view, should be of) a scale to suit large to medium-sized enterprises linked to an 'aviation cluster'. Choice and flexibility are key criteria for employment development – this needs to be reflected on the site allocations (i.e. a selection of large and small sites, catering for industrial, office and R&amp;D occupiers). East Dorset's Employment Land Review needs to provide for a segmented and target approach to employment development.</p> <p>5. There is, in short, a very strong need and demand-based case for a Use Class B1 allocation at Stourbank Nurseries to accommodate the demand for growing small to medium sized enterprises (SMEs) from East Dorset. This can be combined with residential (and other uses) to create a mixed-use, sustainable development.</p> <p>Four further, site specific points:</p> <p>6. We question how East Dorset's Option paper can come to the conclusion that visual intrusion may be a factor against allocating Option PC8 for development. The glasshouses on site already provide a substantial visual envelope and, with careful landscape master planning (in addition to the existing landscape buffer) any replacement development can be carefully screened – thus providing a planning opportunity, not a constraint. For the same reason, i.e. the previously developed nature of the site and the substantial visual envelope, further development or redevelopment of Stourbank Nurseries cannot have any material impact on the Green Belt Gap.</p> <p>7. With regard to deliverability, Stourbank Nurseries has an acceptable, all-ways access on to the B3073 (a County Distributor Road). This is not currently available at, for example, St Leonards Hospital (which is also remote and peripheral). From a residential point of view, Stourbank is, in addition, well located with regard to</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>amenities and, for example, local schools. In short, the off-site and upfront infrastructure required to deliver development at Stourbank is limited, certainly, relative to other sites; thus reinforcing its deliverability credentials and availability in the early part of the plan period (when other sites are unlikely to be available).</p> <p>8. There may also be a case for a hotel on site, thus providing a useful amenity for new and existing residents and employees.</p> <p>9. Irrespective of the case for a mixed-use redevelopment, it is evident that the glass houses (and for that matter the Wessex Water depot) are nearing the end of their operational life. It would make sense to provide for their redevelopment (in any form) by removing the land from the Green Belt. Mindful of this redevelopment need, it would be wrong for East Dorset to ignore, and not positively plan for, development over the next 20 years. A mixed use allocation for development or, at the very least, a 'safeguarded allocation' is entirely appropriate. The Core Strategy is the time to address these issues, in particular the case for a Green Belt review.</p>			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		The Agency agrees with the 'non preferred' designations of the new employment land allocated in Non Preferred Options PC8 and PC9. This is because of the transport constraints identified in the CS and specifically the very close proximity of the sites to the heavily constrained Canford bottom junction.			1409
497372	Mr and Mrs Finlay Love		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		<p>As a resident and home owner that actually resides within the Proposed (Non Preferred) development in "Stourbank Nurseries", I would strongly like to object to any development plans.</p> <p>The reasons why my wife and family (3 children) object to such a proposal include:</p> <p>Destruction of green belt land that surrounds our property.</p> <p>Intrusion and loss of privacy that we currently enjoy.</p> <p>Impact on local wildlife including Otters, Badgers, Deer, Birds to name just a few.</p> <p>Increased levels of pollution, including light and noise.</p> <p>The loss of existing employment currently employed by the nurseries (i.e. Why name this proposed development " Options for employment "when clearly existing employment will be lost a result of this development.</p> <p>Increase to the carbon footprint.</p>			1409

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>That unless all the businesses on the industrial estate are for Agricultural purposes, it would be a breach of the covenant on this land which clearly states that only businesses run this land are for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>Increased traffic, not only within the proposed site but surrounding roads including Ham Lane and the A31.</p> <p>Lastly but by no means least the impact this development would have during construction and afterwards to the "Well Being" of us all.</p>			
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		<p>Travel for Employment, Education, Shopping and Leisure. Where do the residents of Wimborne and Colehill seek Employment, Education, Shopping and Leisure activities?</p> <p>Travel for Employment</p> <p>Data for employment appears only to be available for 2001 in the Core Strategy Area Profile<sup>2</sup>, which is unlikely to reflect the increased trend of out of town travelling for work. Since the turn of the Century greater mobility has been necessary more and more, not only to secure work, but also to achieve career progression. Travel distances are only available for about 60% of the working population of Wimborne and Colehill, and roughly half of these travel between 10 and 40 Kms to work and the others between 5 and 10 Kms.<sup>2</sup> One wonders about the other 40%, are they perhaps beyond 40 Kms, as I was myself, or do they now work from home?</p> <p>EDDC options for Employment<sup>4</sup> identify a negative effect on the availability of sites in Wimborne and Colehill. When considering the sites proposed at PC5 to PC9 inclusive, KS13, BA1-11, the relocation of Stone Lane Industrial Estate<sup>3</sup>, plus the inclusion of land released at Cobham Gate<sup>5</sup>, it would mean that greater use of the A31 will be necessary for people to travel to work in the future. The location of proposed employment sites will hardly encourage people to walk or cycle to work, and I doubt that they will find it convenient to travel to these proposed locations by public transport. In addition one can expect that many jobs will be filled by "Outsiders" who in turn will utilise private transportation on the A31 to get to their destinations of employment.</p> <p>Travel Issues</p> <p>Clearly then the A31 has a major impact on the mobility of people within the Wimborne and Colehill catchment areas.</p> <p>EDDC states that we have the highest level of car ownership in the</p>			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>country3 and we can see the reasons for this in the above analysis of people's needs. It suggests that these problems can be overcome by changing attitudes toward the use of public transport to relieve local congestion.</p> <p>I consider this to be a totally unrealistic approach in our highly pressurised, motivated, mobile, materialistic and ageing society. (see Theoretical Human Life Cycle Transportation Requirements attached19) We must solve the problem and not skirt round it. Take the issue of employment. All of the proposed Industrial Sites are out of area where travel on or crossing of, the A31 is necessary. The same applies to Higher Education, Shopping, Leisure, and to some extent Hospitalisation. We must recognise that where people's choice is limited they will travel great distances to ensure they get what they want.</p> <p>Take the issue of Housing Development. The development of Land to the East and West of the Cranborne Road appears to endorse the unacceptable use of Burts Hill (a country lane) running into Long Lane (another country lane) in becoming a second bypass of the Town. This became evident during the repairs to Julian's Bridge and the Poole Road Bridge, where GPS's offer alternative routes. These roads have increasingly become busier and noisier as a result. People that used to use this route for cycling, walking and jogging are no longer safe to do this anymore.</p> <p>It is strange that the Core Strategy option containing the largest number of homes is considered best situated on the North side of Wimborne, i.e. at the farthest point from the out of area conduit. (the A31) What sense does this make? Its consequence will be that not only the A31 will be jammed up at peak times, but also Middlehill, Leigh Road, Burts Hill, and the Cranborne Road will all suffer greater congestion. Even after taking into consideration that Walford Bridge will need to be widened to accommodate additional traffic movement across town and an improvement in traffic flow through the Stone Lane junction will have to be addressed.</p> <p>I consider all of this could be avoided if the "undeveloped" land to the South of Leigh Road and East of WMC5 was allocated to satisfy only the required number of affordable and supportable homes.</p> <p>Take the issue of Climate Change. Do we really want to release more Carbon Dioxide into the atmosphere by creating more traffic jams and greater congestion, when with the appropriate amount of</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>forethought we can reduce the effects of Climate Change?                      Further it is predicted that our ageing local population will increase which will to some extent increase the need for personal motorised transport. Since anyone who has graduated to private transportation is unlikely to relinquish it, even if this means being taxied to their destination at times convenient to themselves, they are highly unlikely to walk, cycle or travel on public transport unless it's becomes an absolute last resort.                      So what can be done to alleviate this issue?                      Well clearly the A31 has to be upgraded to a dual carriageway with fly overs or underpasses in the most congested spots. However this leads to the question of finance and timing.                      As a suggestion;                      Let's think laterally about the infrastructure of Transport, the uses of arterial roads, the polluting effect of vehicles and the funding for road improvements.                      The A31, which bypasses our town, blocks frequently at peak times and in holiday periods. The primary bottleneck occurs at the Canford Bottom Roundabout, followed closely by the Merley House Lane Roundabout, the Julian's Road Roundabout and finally the Poole Road Roundabout at Bailey Gate. These bottlenecks bring frustration, high energy consumption and more importantly high pollution to our area. Clearly the A31 will have to undergo major improvement to allow through traffic to flow smoothly through our district. The solution can only be a dual carriageway with a series of flyovers, or under passes, that need to be built between the end of the existing dual carriageway at Cobham Road Roundabout all the way through to Bailey Gate, and perhaps beyond to the dual carriageway at Bere Regis.                      Local, District and County Councils must lobby Government for a greater say in the distribution of the funding for road improvements and take control of funding to support local transport infrastructure when resolving their housing and industrial needs. The projects are intertwined and have to support each other, it's all very well pushing the housing problem back to councils, but councils must be given allocation of the road improvement budget too.                      Wimborne's problem will not be resolved by a £6 million sticky plaster solution<sup>8</sup> applied to the Canford Bottom Roundabout which will only, if successful, move the bottleneck from one roundabout on the A31 along to another. IT IS TIME FOR MAJOR SURGERY.</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>How else could the necessary road improvements be funded? Since the A31 is a holiday route and a route to an area of the country that boasts England's first natural World Heritage site "The Jurassic Coast", it can conceivably be funded by contributions to road improvements from the EU.</p> <p>But, neither is there anything stopping this section of the A31 becoming a toll road, and in time putting money back into the coffers of the Highways Agency, after all this is the case when travelling down the M6 and also crossing the River Seven when travelling to Wales. I am sure holiday makers and businesses will gladly factor such costs into their budgets.</p> <p>For the sake of the community, and for future generations, we need to bring pressure to bear on Ministers, MPs and local dignitaries to get the necessary funding in place to support this vital arterial improvement. Only then will the EDDC Core Strategy be capable of being successfully implemented.</p> <p>SEE ATTACHMENT</p>			
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		being non-preferred options due to their impact on the openness of the Green Belt. We would object to any development on these sites.			1409
524495	Mr Stanley Jackson		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		Attention needs to be concentrated on keeping and ideally increasing the number of younger people in the area, through providing additional employment opportunities, affordable or low-cost housing to purchase and an increase in rented accommodation. I would therefore support all attempts PC4 -PC9 to locate more employment land options.			1409
489765	Derek KEAREY		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
490854	D MUTTON		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507361	Mr Kenneth Archer		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
507737	Mrs S Philpot		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
527642	Chris Morle		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The consequences of development along Ham Lane towards and including Parley Cross will cut off the present relatively safe cycle route from Wimborne into the New Forest. The increase in traffic volume and speeds will make this route much more dangerous and will isolate Wimborne from the New Forest for cycle access which is safe. How does this fit with the cycle track plans?			1409
527661	W Barnes		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
527863	A Barratt		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
534820	Paul Batten		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
534833	Frederick Wall		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
534837	Mrs P Martin		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Horses need grazing land. No infrastructure in place for the total number of homes planned. I do not go out between 8.00 and 9.30 am and 3.00pm and 6.30pm because of the traffic on the roads now.			1409
534875	Brian Lane		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
534914	Mrs P Froud		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535070	Mr Alan Reade		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
535094	MS Tracey Tucker		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		I am very concerned about increased housing in W Parley, the traffic is horrendous around here so much that at weekends and bank holidays I try not to go out and to travel into work at the wrong time is just a nightmare. Additional traffic is just not needed. With regards the industrial development at Blunts Farm, there is no much empty office and factory space on Ferndown Ind estate, why is more needed at Uddens? I keep my horse in Uddens Drive and entrance to the ind estate is so dangerous with the size of the lorries coming into Uddens drive both for drivers and horse riders. I am surprised there has not been a serious accident or death there. The A31 does not need any additional traffic, any proposed ind development should be subject to access being made through Ferndown ind estate and not Uddens drive			1409
535112	Mr		Non		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Jack Tindall		Preferred Option PC 8						
535167	Lynda Lake		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
535209	Mr P Webster		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Please liaise with NFDC and NPA, as the additional traffic generated by the extra housing and employment zones will increase the traffic problems at the already congested bottleneck at Ringwood and cause yet more problems for the people who live in New Forest hamlets such as Linwood, Brook and Burley as motorists try to find alternative routes. Can the New Forest take any more pressure from additional numbers of visitors? Has Dorset got enough sand and gravel in the landbank to meet the needs of the developers? Can you force Tarmac to start mining gravel by the Spur Road near Hurn? What will happen to the pollution levels close to the trunk roads e.g. at Ringwood, especially particulate pollution? Can Bournemouth Water meet the increased demands for water?			1409
535349	P Thomas		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		I think that this whole core strategy consultation needs a full review in light of the proposed changes being brought in under the new government. I particularly object to all the proposed Verwood development as the infrastructure is not in place to support the current population let alone adding even further to it by building a further 400 homes. Any EDDC councillor who has the affront to say that the infrastructure is in place to support this development does not know what they are talking about and obviously do not live in the town.			1409
359875	Dr Lesley		Non Preferred	Object		The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	HASKINS		Option PC 8			<p>some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options.</p> <p>However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported.</p>			
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
359286	Mr Andrew PATRICK	Pro Vision Planning and Design	Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		<p>1.1 Pro Vision are instructed by Wessex Water to make representation in response to "Non Preferred" Option PC8 which considers the potential for allocating Little Canford Depot and Stourbank Nurseries for employment, but rejects this. Please read this representation in conjunction with parallel representations in response to KS1, KS3, KS4 and PC5 &amp; 6, and the overview document "Development Opportunities at Little Canford".</p> <p>1.2 In essence our concerns are that the reasons for rejecting PC8</p>	We would request that the site is either: a. allocated principally for employment in accord with PC8 together with other mixed residential development as appropriate or,		1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>may not be entirely logical and are not correctly based on evidence, and are thus unsound. A Core Strategy which does not incorporate PC8 would therefore be unsound.                      Why the rejection of PC8 may be "Unsound"</p> <p>1.3                      The Core Strategy Options document sets out a number of reasons why PC8 is not a preferred option. Below, we set out each in turn, and explain why (in terms of the tests of "soundness" set out by the Government) each may be unjustified, illogical or both.                      "The Site does not adjoining an existing urban area."</p> <p>1.4                      Neither does the Airport or Woolsbridge, Baillie Gate only adjoins a village. Furthermore, extensions to Woolsbridge and Baillie Gate would be Greenfield, unlike Little Canford Depot. This criticism may not therefore be logical. We would suggest that priority should be given to Previously Developed Land.                      "The site ... lies within an important Green Belt gap. Its development would compromise this gap."</p> <p>1.5                      Redevelopment of the site would not prejudice the Green Belt because both Little Canford Depot and Stour Bank Nurseries are substantially developed. In contrast, green field extensions to Woolsbridge and Baillie Gate would reduce Green Belt gaps. This criticism therefore seems to us to be incorrectly based on evidence in the first respect, and illogical in the second.                      "The land does have substantial structures on it, although being for agricultural / horticultural purposes makes them appropriate in the Green Belt".</p> <p>1.6                      Even if technically correct with regard to the glasshouses, this criticism is factually incorrect with regard to Little Canford Depot and the five residential dwellings on the Stour Bank Nurseries. It is therefore not correctly based on evidence.                      "None of the physical constraints identified are considered insurmountable in principle"</p> <p>1.7                      Agreed. The only material constraints are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mains foul sewerage : Wessex Water are confident this can be readily and viably provided;</li> <li>• SINC designation of lakes: these can and should be incorporated</li> </ul>	<p>b. community consideration given to the site's potential as an Eco-Village development site.                      In any event and in order to enable and encourage a comprehensive approach, the site boundary should incorporate the EA Depot, the dwellings, and the lakes. The policy would need to emphasise the need to protect the environment and amenity of the dwellings, and to preserve and enhance - and make the most of - the lakes.</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>in, and made most of, in any development.                      The site is not in the flood plain and the Depot lakes and dwellings are not agricultural land.                      "There is some screening of the site, but it can be viewed from the nearby Conservation Area so appropriate landscaping would be required if the site were to be developed."                      1.8                      Little Canford Depot is fully screened and cannot be seen from the Hampreston Conservation Area. Therefore this aspect of this criticism does not appear to us to be correctly based on evidence. Redevelopment of Stour Bank Nurseries for high quality employment is likely to incorporate high quality landscaping which would enhance the view from the Conservation Area. We are therefore not sure this aspect of this criticism is logical.                      "A key negative aspect of this site is lack of accessibility to nearby services and public transport. The site is not large enough to support these."                      1.9                      We are concerned that this fundamental criticism may be both illogical and not correctly based on evidence. It may not be logical because the same criticisms apply to the potential green field extensions to Woolsbridge (PC5) and Baillie Gate (PC6). Our parallel objection to PC5 and PC6 makes the point that they are no better (in fact, worse) located than Little Canford Depot. As such, and as Previously Developed Land, redevelopment of sites such as Little Canford Depot should take priority.                      1.10                      The attached document "Development Opportunities at Little Canford" makes it clear that in fact the following are within walking distance (as measured from the entrance gates to Little Canford Depot):                      • Pub (Little Canford) 700 m                      • Half Hourly Bus (Stapehill) 900 m                      • Shop (Leigh Road x 2) 1000 m                      We do feel therefore that this criticism is not correctly based on the evidence.                      1.11                      We would also like to suggest that:                      a) substantial redevelopment might be able to support a shop which would not only be of benefit to employees but also to existing</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						residents of Little Canford and Hampreston; b) the site is no further from an existing bus route than, for example, some of the housing proposed at North Wimborne; c) the criticisms are not weighed against the fact that the site is Previously Developed Land, to which priority should be given.			
533834	Mr Tim Harris		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
535387	Mr Brian Cox		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535393	Jeremy Berg		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			1409
535421	Mr Roland Andrews		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535457	Mr Matthew Newman		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
535500	David Veevers		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535504	Mr Michael Beer		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535509	Mrs S Durant		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535517	Roy Rich		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
535547	Mr M Folland		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
535550	Mrs D Mogg		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
535567	Ms Judy McMath		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
535591	A Walker		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
535670	Dave		Non	Object					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Allen		Preferred Option PC 8						
535678	Andrew Bryant		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535688	Susan Hobbs		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535701	Mr Andy Skeats		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535718	Richard Green		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535815	Mrs C M Davies		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535836	Peter Parsons		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
535865	Darren Charles Bryson		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
535875	John Kitchenside		Non Preferred		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			Option PC 8						
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		The majority of residents in this area relocated because of the permanent despoiling of their places of birth by elected local and national 'representatives' who would not listen or care about the needs of the people that voted for them. Do you want to be remembered as the people who finally ruined this area or the people who saved it. Do not forget that people still visit this area as tourists and we welcome them and accept their contribution to the local economy. They will stop coming if the developments continue. How many tourists visit the outer London sprawl? Can I quote p227 from the Core Strategy Options paper - para 11.28 The Government's key housing policy is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. This is an impossible dream that can never and will never, be fulfilled. If the developments did go ahead what would be the effect of another 5000 cars on our local roads be ? If Morrisons developments go ahead where are the customers going to park? The parking within Verwood is just about adequate at the moment.			1409
536014	Mrs Dawn Tindall		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
536050	Mr Andrew Collin		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		Non Preferred Option PC		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			8						
536169	Mr Tony Trevis-Bell		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
360768	Cllr. Mr David Packer	Colehill West Ward East Dorset District Council	Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny PEARCE		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
475508	Mr and Mrs Marshall		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		We live in West Parley and the transport infrastructure (especially along Hurn Road, Christchurch Road, Ringwood Road and New Road) is already struggling to support the volume of daily traffic. There are always hold-ups along Hurn Road (by the airport), which will become more frequent once the traffic lights are installed at the junction into the airport (being done at present). Longham Bridge and the bends through Longham along Ringwood Road is a notoriously dangerous stretch of road, which is not helped by the ever increasing amount of heavy lorries which use it as a 'short cut' to Poole Ferry Terminal instead of using the Wimborne by-pass because that is also not up to the task, being single carriageway and having both Merley & Canford Bottom roundabouts unable to cope with the shear volume of traffic coming onto them. New Road (which is the main route in & out of Bournemouth for local people) also struggles with traffic, especially during the rush hour periods. When absurd? We do not need developers trying to 'sweeten the pill' with new facilities at West Parley, which are not needed or wanted. I would much rather see the present shopping facilities at Parley Cross and the Children's park by the Memorial Hall improved for the benefit of the local community. Small offices are not required - there are lots of such offices / industrial units in Ferndown which remain empty. We believe the impact of any development would detrimentally change the character of the			1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						village of West Parley and therefore do not support the proposed developments.			
475530	Mr George Phillips		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		You need to have a plan on how the infrastructure will be improved to support these housing and commercial developments before we decide on any housing or commercial developments. Infrastructure includes roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, etc. And for roads, I don't mean links from the developments to the existing roads. Everything round here is already overloaded. We need more bridges over the Stour, and a motorway link from Poole to the M27. Motorways north to the M4 and west to the M5 should also be built. These will take the load off the local roads round here. I also think we should only build decent homes. Everyone has to live somewhere, and they should have somewhere decent. It's the cost of land that drives up the cost of accommodation, and building land is expensive because it's in short supply.			1409
482494	Mrs Yvette Jones		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object		Why would we want office buildings? Thousands lie empty. Expansion 'projects' smack of driven unnecessary waste and change for all the wrong reasons.			1409
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		I			1409
498211	Mrs J AUCKLAND		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
498402	Mrs T Hughes		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
508735	Mr Peter Barham		Non Preferred Option PC		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			8						
514507	Mr and Mrs C Macy		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
536271	Mrs D Holt		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
536282	Mrs Doreen Kingaby		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
536324	Paul Sumner		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
536332	Emmanuelle Hutton		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
536341	Adrian Bowyer		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
536342	Lily Hutton		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
536346	Mr Ben Richards		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536349	Mrs C Bowyer		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
536351	Mr John Hutton		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
536449	Dave Isaacs		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
536543	Samantha Fysh		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD.. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!			1409
536572	Roger Fysh		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		I strongly object to the proposal to increase the housing in and around Verwood. Verwood has been extensively developed over the years and there is inadequate services to support the extra cars and people. Also having seen the housing density of the Ebblake housing estate it is clear that agreeing to more housing will only create 'no go' areas in the very near future. I also note that in and around Wimborne there are huge areas of open land, which could easily be developed, especially between Ferndown and Wimborne which also has excellent road networks in place as it could immediately open onto the A31			1409
536628	Mr C.A Wills		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536702	Mr Mark Hirst		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
536790	David Steadman		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
536808	Ms Yvette Allen		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
536812	R H Barker		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
536848	Ola Steadman		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
536850	Mr Michael Hird		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
536866	Emma Huns		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
501513	Mr		Non	Support					1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	O E BEVERLEY		Preferred Option PC 8						
503861	Mr E Hawkins		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
536930	Mrs Susannah Spencer		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		I also support Employment Options KS13 and BA1-11. For further crucial comments please see the PDF File "Response to EDDC Options for Wimborne and Colehill" emailed to Judy Windwood on 13th January 2011.			1409
536932	Paul Bason		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support					1409
537050	Diane Fletcher		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
537075	Mrs Elaine Holt		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
537106	C Hebditch		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
537362	Peter Constable		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
537435	Ms Pauline		Non Preferred		No Opinion				1409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Burton		Option PC 8						
537529	Mrs C White		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Object					1409
537571	Nick and Marion Leatherdale		Non Preferred Option PC 8		No Opinion				1409
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter Griffiths		Non Preferred Option PC 8	Support		Support all proposals subject to the prerequisites are fully implemented BEFORE development starts or substantial monies are deposited by developers before development. This will safeguard Council Tax payers against any future failure for whatever reason the developers fails to carry out the prerequisites.			1409
360714	Carol Morgan		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion	Moving businesses already on industrial estates in or near towns out of the town is counter productive in terms of jobs and accessibility. 500+ houses and schools etc is in effect another village and will not connect easily with the town of Wimborne. Take a look at Poundbury, good idea but now far too big.			1414
361055	Mr David OAKLEY		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		I find it very hard to understand how, after unanimous support for no development in the Green Belt this now goes directly against that decision.			1414
361099	Mrs Lynette PAYNE		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		A good number of these options, especially in Wimborne and Parley, are on the edges of the urban areas. Building in these locations changes the whole ethos of the area. When you leave Wimborne you see fields, trees and rivers dotted with thatched cottages. Even along Leigh Road, there is a definite rural feel, with true separation between Wimborne and Colehill. Developing along here, or Cranborne Road will dramatically change the area, for the worst. This in turn reduces people's quality of life, as we see our area creep closer to urbanisation, field by field. Why can't some of the brownfield sites be used instead?			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361111	Mr Raymond Brown		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
491401	S Ost		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		The local roads, schools, hospitals would be unable to cope with extra movements of traffic and people coming into the area.			1414
495562	Mr MJ Banting		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
495625	Mr Michael McMath		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
495858	Mr P W Coupe		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Lack of service infrastructure. Increased congestion on Canford Bottom roundabout, which would require significant enhancement to manage the increased traffic flows. Impact on existing green belt provision: the development would be visible from the local Hampreston conservation area, Ham Lane, Wimborne road and contiguous SNCI areas. Difficulty of access by potential employees - no public transport provision. Lack of local residents who would take up positions in the proposed development. Light industry and storage facilities are best situated near to areas where the potential workforce lives, or is within easy and short bus journey.	This proposed development is presently described as "Non-preferred". Our suggestion is that the proposal should be deleted.		1414
496188	Mr RE Vogel		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
496439	Mr and Mrs Gordon Third		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
496479	Charlotte Dixon		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
496564	JH Lockwood		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
496612	Mr and Mrs JP Lovell		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
359636	Mr Chris BARTLETT		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Unsuitable site from traffic perspective.			1414
360037	Mr Dave BARNES		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object	General Comment	What alternative locations, if any, have been considered? There is mention of heathland development.....where would this be?			1414
361041	Mr & Mrs G K HAMPTON		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion	Feel more information and maps needed on PC 8 and PC 9 as these are large sites.			1414
361170	Mr TR HARVEY		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
491311	Mr Kevin GILLING		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
495971	T A		Non	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Reith		Preferred Option PC 9						
496958	Mrs J Beech		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
497026	Doreen Smith		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		This amount of building will create extra traffic in Ferndown and Parley which already has a lot of road build up in the busy morning and evening travel. Also taking a lot of natural land for our wild life.			1414
497060	Mrs Mary Tuffrey		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
497184	Mr Hilling		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
497239	Martine Lewis		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
497343	Sharon Sutcliffe		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
497773	R Johnstone		Non Preferred	Support		I am fully supportive of the employment options as local people would have a wider choice of work and travelling should be less for			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			Option PC 9			them.			
498044	Carolyn Banks		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Transport needs to be sorted out centrally - to get something that works properly - this is the biggest showstopper to all of these schemes - the current roads will not support any more traffic.			1414
498047	CD Bradford		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Although I live in Ferndown i work and travel around a lot in the local area, so feel I can voice my opinion on developments around the area.			1414
498084	Mr P HARTLEY		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
498125	Mr and Mrs P DASHWOOD		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
498169	Mrs D WEAVER		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
498184	Mrs Angela BARKER		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		All the employment land options are currently in the Green Belt - this should be protected! Erode it and we'll have none left in the not too distant future.			1414
498268	Mr and Mrs R Cullen		Non Preferred Option PC	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			9						
498271	Mandy CHEESEMAN		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
498335	Mr and Mrs Lester		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
498711	Mr T CHANT		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
498996	M E CLARKE		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
499044	Mrs Carolyn MASKELL		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
360685	Mr M.P HOSE		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
361106	Mr and Mrs Robin and Janet WALL		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
498495	Mr John Williams		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
499231	Mrs A Lathbury		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
499236	J PIPE		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
499245	Mr and Mrs N BUTLER		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
499261	Mrs Norma JACKSON		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
499290	Mrs Lisa TURNBULL		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
499355	Mrs MEREDITH		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		Employment development areas must have immediate access to main roads and classified roads. They should not draw commercial traffic through residential areas on inadequate un-classified roads.			1414
499384	Mr A I ROSE		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
499683	S Crotch-Harvey		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
499873	Mr		Non	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Graham Holt		Preferred Option PC 9						
500060	Mr Stuart PIDDOCK		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
500222	S Hartley		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
500350	Mr P H BARTLETT		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
500361	Mr and Miss N and A Middleton and Turner		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
500558	A Baker		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
500694	Mr and Mrs J R MANSBRIDGE		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
500697	Mr Thomas		Non Preferred		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	SMITH		Option PC 9						
500706	R & J Jeans		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
500720	Mrs VALLIER		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
500748	Mrs Lauren MATTHEWS		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Any development in the Little Canford / Hampreston area would be an eyesore and defeat the purpose of living in a traditional village area, it would compromise the quality of life.			1414
500802	J Hayward		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
500818	Mr J LADD		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		GREEN BELT LAND MUST BE PROTECTED, otherwise what is the point of having 'Green Belt'? Please listen to public opinion and don't just say 'we will listen and then disregard it'. I expect this will happen anyway.			1414
500836	Mrs Sylvia Hines		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
500903	Mr and Mrs S and R Harris		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
501012	Louise ARNOLD		Non Preferred Option PC		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			9						
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
501018	Mr Robert P Hand		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
501106	Mr John Victor Rogers		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
501114	John Lee		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
501118	Mr Ron Cook		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
501135	Charlie Wassell		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
359895	Mr Jeff REECE		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359908	Mr F.D.A REVILL		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
359927	Mrs Ann BISSEX		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		The green belt should not be encroached on any further. No building should be allowed on flood plains. Much more serious effort needs to be put into reducing necessity of relying on car travel.			1414
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		I object to the commercial sites due to their impact on Canford Bottom. Already a nightmare. Bone of contention with Highways Agency.			1414
501324	Julie Light		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
501351	Mr and Mrs R D'Cruze		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
501364	Mr M Devetta		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
501485	Mrs J JACKSON		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
501488	Chris LAMB		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
501502	Mr		Non		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Michael WAREHAM		Preferred Option PC 9						
501520	Mrs Z MERRIFIELD		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
501523	Rita Gilbert		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
501531	Mr Boyd Read		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
501560	Mr Christopher CLARKE		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
501574	Mr & Mrs B S Nippard		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
501607	Dr Fairchild		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		The road network will not support these developments. Long Lane & Colehill Lane have now become "rat runs" for traffic trying to access the A31 and more houses will increase this very big issue			1414
501616	R J Joyce		Non Preferred	Support					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			Option PC 9						
501626	Mrs J A Russell		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
501694	Mr R BRYAN		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
501699	B THOMAS		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
501720	Dr and Mrs D HARLOW		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
501751	Mr RG Birch		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
501761	Mr D Curtis		Non Preferred Option PC 9		General Comment	The most urgent and critical limiting factors are the A31 single carriageways E and W and density of traffic using Canford Bottom roundabout - Encouraging increased commercial traffic re. PC 4 to PC 9 would only exacerbate the present traffic problems.			1414
501804	Mr Glyn Davies		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
501823	Mr and Mrs E A Osgood		Non Preferred Option PC		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			9						
501867	Mrs I M Marks		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
501873	Mr and Mrs Harold A and D Joan Lilley		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		All proposals of this nature have a number of basic needs. One of the most important is infrastructure. Subject to finance being available Canford Bottom Roundabout is to be drastically amended for the Olympic Games. The reference to "Improvements to Canford Bottom therefore appear to have been superseded. Since I cannot find any intention to improve the road network all these proposals will only add to our present problems and cannot be supported.			1414
501876	J Long		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
501881	B W Deverill		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
502022	Mr HWR Stevens		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Dorset's villages and small towns should be preserved as such. So called "developers" are only concerned with profits. There'll always be an England? Not when it has been built over and occupied by strangers.			1414
502029	Mr J MacArthur		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		The whole area is congested, there is no real provision for new TRANSPORT OR services for new homes i.e. doctors, local shops or community centres. There are already MANY EMPTY industrial units. Building more industrial is only viable if a tax loss for developers. Verwood has lost its soul now, and does not need any more ad-hock development. Wimborne will follow if the development of this (at present) lovely Town is carried out in the same way as Verwood has been.			1414
502059	Mr R Seddon		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
502076	Kay Stead		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
502078	Mr R Marlow		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Why waste more tax payers money!!! Too much now!!! These proposals are ridiculous, as any further work prospects in this are "zero". So why more homes and cars when the road/transport structure is obsolete for modern days need, let alone provision for the future 20/30 years. Just building more houses will not solve the long standing problems in Dorset i.e. jobs and road structures.			1414
502092	Mr and Mrs A Watkinson		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
502099	Carolyn Lourens		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
502114	Mr P Foster		Non Preferred Option PC		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			9						
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
502138	Mrs E Mason		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
359598	Mr A KETCHLEY		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion	Unfortunately whatever is finally decided on the following well known saying will occur: 'You can please some of the people all the time, You can please all of the people some of the time, But you cannot please all of the people all of the time!' I wish you well in whatever is decided. Some will see it as inevitable due to the area's population increases, whereas others will see it as a necessary evil, and some will accept it without question			1414
359977	Miss M.G. EARP		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
361113	Mr Alan Meade		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		.I like the rate of affordable housing to private homes. We all know that there is a shortage. Jobs will be created, money brought in, good for all in East Dorset, Christchurch			1414
361123	Mr Iain STEVENSON		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501940	Mr M J Godfrey		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
502224	Mr and Mrs Larcombe		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
502317	Cllr Peter Lucas		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Blunts Farm and other development may be possible off a flyover if built at Canford Bottom roundabout area, otherwise, even with improvements to the roundabout traffic problems resulting from the development may be insurmountable.			1414
502322	Mrs J C Critchell		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
502326	Mr and Mrs T Bennett		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		With more homes will need more employment, a vicious circle. Our roads are too busy now. We surely have enough community areas and centres.			1414
502329	Mrs Rosemary Rooke		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
502333	B M Andrews		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Make parents walk their children to school. Stop parents 4x4s, etc. Spend more money on our area. Council tax far too high and what benefits do we receive from the Parish Council?			1414
502345	Mr and Mrs		Non	Support					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Ray and Irene Coulson		Preferred Option PC 9						
502347	Sarah Cobb		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
502364	FD Peach		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
502381	Mr Cyril Josey		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
502387	Mr George Kilpatrick		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		I would like to see the justification for increased housing in East Dorset e.g., demographics, immigration, increased work opportunities etc. I would also like to understand how transport strategy (and infrastructure) is coordinated with this in such a way to make expansion sustainable.			1414
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
502468	Robert Lambert		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
502492	M L Portugal		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502568	Sarah Morgan		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
502570	Mr Samways		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
502579	Mr & Mrs R L Thorne		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
502595	Mr Colin House		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		All these developments will cause an impact on the local heathland and the proposals in all areas will cause road chaos on the A31, Ferndown, Parley and Wimborne. A new road structure is required before any development takes place.			1414
502596	A C Hayter		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
502610	John Jackson		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
502635	Mrs		Non	Support					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	JS Brough		Preferred Option PC 9						
502673	Mrs A Powell		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		The infrastructure in this area needs to be sorted out before anymore building goes ahead. There are times you cannot move on the roads. The area is being ruined with all this building works that are already going on.			1414
502701	Mrs M Williams		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
502708	Ms Julia Owen		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
502745	Mrs J.M Kenny		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		No building on green belt land. No increase of traffic along A31, A350, A35			1414
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
502921	Mr and Mrs L Forinton		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
502935	Mr Roger Parker		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
502999	Mrs Marion E		Non Preferred	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lock		Option PC 9						
503022	Mr and Mrs D Money		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
503044	Mr and Mrs R Setchfield		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
503085	Mr P.A. Scott		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		More development - more people - more work - more cars - more roads - more noise - more pollution - more laws - more control - less quality of life. A sacrifice to the God of Economic Growth.			1414
503156	Richard and Jackie Blunderfield		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Preferred location is St Leonards as the A31 is 2 lanes and can cope with extra traffic. PC8 and PC9 are green belt areas and should not be built on. Also objected to in Options for Employment leaflet.			1414
503171	Sally Cooke		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
503183	B Chissell		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
503233	F Parkes		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
503250	Mrs Helen Poole		Non Preferred Option PC		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			9						
503303	Mr Anthony Roberts		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
503347	Ms Hardwick		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
359873	Mrs M HUGHES		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
359889	Mr and Mrs P CLARK		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		With any developments we would need to be assured that infrastructure improvements are in place BEFORE any development is consented to. This is particularly important with regard to public transport provisions. It is also important that feedback is forthcoming as an acknowledgement of our response to this survey.			1414
359920	S PARKER		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I want to know the projected time scale for these options to start to become active.</li> <li>2. It is most important that there is adequate employment to accommodate the houses to be built.</li> <li>3. More attention must be made to supply of affordable housing.</li> <li>4. The green belt must be respected where possible.</li> <li>5. The estates around Wimborne must be consulted fully.</li> </ol>			1414

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360029	Mr David LANIGAN		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Christchurch &amp; East Dorset Core Strategy Document, Managing Growth and Development up to the year 2027. I agree with the preamble stating that we need to meet local housing needs, with the emphasis on growing the main settlements where we have good access to facilities that people require. Some development of smaller communities should continue however, especially the provision of low cost housing. The community as a whole, needs the services of teachers, nurses, firemen, postmen, and policemen who are poorly paid because they commit to a vocation rather than a high salary job. We also need the services of skilled people such as builders, electricians, plumbers, gas fitters, and motor mechanics, the essentially blue collar professionals. They must not be priced out of the market in terms of being able to buy a starter home, in the community that they serve.</p> <p>Having bought my first home in 1963, a two bedroom bungalow for £2,200 I am aware that locally such a property is currently one hundred times as much. This makes things difficult for young couples with the ratio of house prices to wages being the highest in the country. Many struggle with getting mortgages that now require typically a 25% deposit on an already expensive property.</p> <p>I moved to West Moors 15 years ago and appreciate the planning decisions that have taken place affecting this village. We now have a new build shopping centre on Station Road, complete with flats, good pavements, lighting, pelican crossing and trees. I am pleased to have seen built several small, three storey, blocks of retirement and two bed flats close to the village centre. I support the gradual expansion of the</p> <p>Village, current population around 7,500 as we have good schools, a large Memorial hall, Churches with halls, two public houses, doctors, dentists and good bus services to both Poole and Bournemouth. We have footpath access to open land such as Holt Heath, as well as being able to use the old railway line route through the village to Ringwood, - the Castleman Trail. Recently St Marys Church has had built a new Church Hall which will serve the community and thanks to the National Lottery grant we now have an excellent Bowling Club. I support the continued slow expansion of the village as currently we have many facilities for people of all ages to enjoy.</p> <p>My current house was built in the mid 70s, and has trebled in value</p>			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>since my wife and I moved here 15 years ago. In the 1970s West Moors doubled in size and acquired new schools and since then other infrastructure improvements. In recent years the Library was refurbished. The facilities for retirees in West Moors, with access to Ferndown and Verwood, are very good, and coupled with excellent hospitals at Poole, Bournemouth and Wimborne, and I have felt no need to move from East Dorset area in the conceivable future. I therefore support the proposals for additional housing as outlined in the Core Strategy Consultation, as well as the proposals for business sites for employment. I also support provisions for new schools particularly a new Secondary School at Verwood, and recreation areas to cater for the population increase. I understand that net immigration into Dorset is running at two thousand people a year so clearly we need to plan for housing, jobs, education, recreation, road improvements especially at busy junctions, and off road car parking in town centres and on new housing estates. There are many reasons why East Dorset and Christchurch, are attractive places for people to live, work and retire to. Long term planning that caters for the needs of a steady population increase is sensible and is to be welcomed.</p>			
360095	Mr & Mrs John & Barbara POLKINGHORN		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E HACK		Non Preferred Option PC	Support					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			9						
361105	Mr John GOOCH	Also member of Colehill Parish Council	Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
499748	Ms Soozie Cooper		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
503024	Valerie Measey		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
503306	Ian and Freda Hancock		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
503355	Mr Robert Griffiths		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
503358	H C Hoare		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
503421	Mr Geof Haywood		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
503444	R Hobbs		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503476	Mrs AM Hawkins		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
503527	Claire Smith		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion	Apportion part of employment land options to housing of all categories for potential employees at these locations thereby reducing transport needs.			1414
503533	Mr N Payne		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
503554	Mr D Verguson		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		I see that with regards to PC8 and PC9 concerns are expressed that these sites lie in an important Green Belt gap. Yet no such concerns have been expressed regarding the development off Leigh Road WMC5 which have a far greater impact on an equally important Green Belt gap. Who decides which parts of the Green Belt are more important than others and why!			1414
503598	Mr John Turner		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
503603	Mrs DJ Morley		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
503621	A G Haines		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503624	Mr RT Jackson		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
503635	Mr J Gough		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		The A31 is already over-saturated with regular gridlock on Friday/Saturday without major redevelopment (min 2 lane dual carriageway from Ferndown industrial estate to Tolpuddle) it is incapable of taking any more traffic. Wimborne, Ferndown and Parley cross- we object to more building on green field sites Parley Cross area is already over-saturated with traffic and is incapable of taking any more. The entire East Dorset area already been over-developed versus other areas of the country. It does not have the transport, social, educational. etc resources for any more.			1414
503640	N J and S A White		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
503644	Mr J Riley		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
503659	Mr JD Jenkins		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
503687	Mr Nick Smith		Non Preferred Option PC		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			9						
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
503709	Mr and Mrs A Fairclough		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
503759	Mr D.J. Middleton		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
503861	Mr E Hawkins		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
503878	Mr Peter Smith		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
503879	Mr S Smithson		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
503943	Mr & Mrs Rumball		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
504093	Mr & Mrs Vivian		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
504101	Mrs Mary Treviss-Bell		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
504216	Mr Mark Rich		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
504314	Ms Selina Roper		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
505273	Mrs Lorraine Hubbard		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
505288	Mrs S Cramer		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support	General Comment	As a married mother of 3 children, 2 girls and 1 boy, living in a 2 bed Council flat (first floor), I welcome more housing to the Wimborne area for young families needing affordable housing / rented housing.			1414
361037	Mr P STRATFORD		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		I expect that my objection to everything is not very practical. However, I have lived in the area for most of the last fifty years. In that time there has been a constant cycle of the council saying we need more housing, followed by we need more industrial areas to provide extra jobs for all the new homes. Then in turn the council says we require extra jobs for the new homes, then in turn the council says we require extra homes for the new workers. This process is never ending. During this time I've witnessed the creation and expansion of the industrial estates at Ferndown, Uddens, Ebblake and Wimborne. A whole new housing estate at			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						Tricketts Cross, Glenmoor Rd Ferndown, the expansion of West Moors, Colehill, Verwood turned from sleepy village into a town. In this time I am not aware of any developed area being returned to its natural state from a developed one. Please let me know if you think differently. I hope you agree that my objection to development is rational and that the never ending cycle of expansion is stopped.			
475526	Mr Geoffrey Dark		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary Hendy		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		The Green Belt should stay Green.			1414
498775	Mrs P L Buckler		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
505369	J Young		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object	General Comment	Building more houses has NOTHING to do with meeting the needs of (existing) local residents. We do not need or want more houses in our area. Planning to build more houses is driven by the 'need' to meet externally imposed quotas based on false assumptions on the desirability of further population and economic growth. Instead of wasting resources on building more housing which is ecologically unsustainable, we should be using them to make a transition to a low energy sustainable future for our children.			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						Please listen to local residents and reject further development.			
505523	Mr & Mrs A Turner		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
505561	Mr. D. Calvert		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
505590	M Spalding		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
505656	Mr Dave Evans		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
505760	J Evans		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
505802	Mr RGH Chapman		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
506116	Mr and Mrs P and SJ Simpson		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			1414
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		I object because both are in an area currently not significantly developed.			1414
506754	Mr Derek E Marsh		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
506989	Mrs Barbara Harris		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
507026	Mr David Craig		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support	General Comment	I would like to see priority given to projects which have a higher concentration of social housing inclusion, and also include a higher green/renewable energy provision. Particular concentration on family areas, playgrounds and social/community facilities should be considered.			1414
507032	Mr David Oliver		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
507033	A R Twaits		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object	General Comment	Despite improvements to public transport, cycling and walking, the reality is that the vast majority of journeys will continue to be made by car. Local roads are already congested and the extent of development proposed is not acceptable without significant increases in the capacity of these roads for cars. In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.			1414
507070	Mr and Mrs		Non	Object		The 3 sites we support have good main road access although			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Earwicker		Preferred Option PC 9			Horton Road/Ringwood Road would need updating for Woolsbridge. The A31 behind Blunts Farm needs to be dual carriageway all the way from the Lidl roundabout to Canford Bottom roundabout. Access to any industrial estate in Blunts Farm should be from the A31 not via Uddens Estate.			
507218	Mr and Mrs J Smith		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
507286	Mr N P Butler		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
507336	Mr John Page		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
507388	Mr David Huggins		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
507474	Mark and Jean Cording		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		1) We are still due a correctment in housing prices, housing benefits have artificially underpinned the bubble. The so called shortage of housing is also caused by breaking up of the family unit (teenagers and young people do not need their own homes) 2) The Green Belt must be protected, a temporary supposed need			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						would and could not be reversed. There are hundreds of brown sites which could be utilised, without the need for more disruptive and expensive infrastructures. 3) Green Belt land was created to protect open land between and around developments. We anticipated development and councils saying they need more land, it was and is vital so please do not change the policy. Times change, needs change, populations (immi and emigration) demands disappear but green land cannot be replaced.			
507524	Mr C G Richardson		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
507555	Mr and Mrs C Lamond		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
507572	GJ Pettifer		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
507595	Mr D Johnson		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
507652	Mrs Isabel Brooks		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		My objections to the grey area (employment land options) above are because enough land, brownfield sites, on existing industrial estates will suffice for more businesses! Again, the green belt is under stress for biodiversity.			1414
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
507693	Mrs		Non		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	P Carter		Preferred Option PC 9						
507760	Mr and Mrs R Gardner		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
507800	Mrs K M Platt		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
507980	Sylvia Allen		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
508383	Ms Emma Hayter		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
508413	Mrs S Best		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		The Council is always after land for housing or business development. Whatever is granted is never enough and a few years later they want more. This process has been going on for over 50 years and it is time it came to a stop. Enough is enough as it is ruining the area.			1414
508852	Mrs		Non		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	L.A. Cheshire		Preferred Option PC 9						
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
508928	Mr D.W. Lonsdale		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
509065	Mrs B Burge		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
360097	Mr John DOWLING		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
361121	Mrs Elizabeth JONES		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
361161	Mr Douglas FORWARD		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
361184	Mr S MOON		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		In most situations I will object to the build of additional housing / business premises, as I do not believe that other options have first been considered or if not possible 'today' are being pursued for the longer term. For example, 1) There are many properties, particularly in Dorset, which are second homes and for most of the year are empty. Action needs to be taken to make these available for renting / purchase as even			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						today, let alone the future, houses are unoccupied, for whatever reason, is not an option. (I would support legislation.) Empty properties also need to be addressed. 2) The development of "brownfield" sites, even if these may not be profitable as other options or as desirable to live or work. 3) Thinking outside the box or in this case outside the areas of this Strategy Consultation. Dorset is not alone in having to address these issues and we need to have some "joined up thinking" with other authorities to see if there are joint opportunities. In this respect Hamworthy Engineering buildings have been empty for many years but do not appear to be in anyone's options.			
510420	Mr Peter Stevens		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
510532	W.W. Chant		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
510623	Mr Douglas Priest		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
510798	Mr F Sullivan		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
510844	Mr Michael Guilmany-		Non Preferred Option PC	Object		It was rather cheeky of you not to provide mapping of the Employment land options sites. I had to consult an OS map.			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Cush		9						
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R. Mayes		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
510974	Mr Jim Cullumbine		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
510993	R.A. Cherrett		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
511015	Mr Christopher White		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
511076	Mr Ian Burden		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
511219	Ms Kathleen Smith		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and Diana Froud		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
511430	A.D. May		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511489	Mr H G Holden		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
511571	Colin Alborough		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
511618	Mrs V Blunden		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
511621	Ms Mary A Combe		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
511711	Coombes		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
511747	Mr T W Tonge		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
360002	Mr Mike BARTLETT		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		Very well set out in booklet and well thought out proposals. Speed is the essence - I have 3 children in need!			1414
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
361196	Mr		Non	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	J.M BULLIVANT		Preferred Option PC 9						
476264	Mr David Reddaway		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
491252	Margaret Wareham		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
507899	R J Potts		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
511639	Paul Hockey		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
512281	Graham Roberts		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
512326	Mr Ian Willis		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
512703	Rita Sweatland		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A		Non Preferred	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Kirby		Option PC 9						
513692	Mrs A Willis		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
513881	Mrs S Bagg		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
513900	Mr P Wall		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed e.g. road improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			1414
513954	Mr RW Heseltine		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
513966	Mr and Mrs Howard		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
513974	Mr A Moore		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
514039	Mrs R Doman		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
514049	Mrs E Hellier		Non Preferred Option PC		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			9						
514091	Mr RJ Potts		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
514099	Mr and Mrs T C Blakeley		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
514111	Penelope Webiery		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
514136	Mrs J Crumb		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
514225	Mr Simon Dixon	Secretary West Moors Traders Association	Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon Chaffey		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
514274	Mr Showell		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Instead of new housing there should be a new strategy of providing more public open space. The lessons of the Edwardians/Victorians should be learnt. New public parks like Poole Park, Queens Park and Kings Park save an area from urban crowding. Perhaps all the land proposed for housing could be reallocated to public parks.			1414
514355	Mr		Non	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	T Gee		Preferred Option PC 9						
514379	Mrs Denise Bannister		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		DWT would object to this option if it came forward due to the close proximity of the area to SNCIs (Big Burles SZ09/15, Little Canford Ponds SZ09/50), unless adequate protection, mitigation and compensation were agreed. We consider that, should these options be brought forward, a pre-requisite for development should be protection and enhancement of the SNCIs with retention of corridors of open natural green space to retain connectivity. These proposals should also be considered alongside the Green Infrastructure Strategy proposals for the Stour Valley. In particular, with respect to PC 8 the SNCI could become bounded on 3 sides by development and enclosed by the road. We consider these options should be informed by a biological survey.			1414
359916	JB Cossins		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
360626	Mr Frank Miller	Chair Person Sturminster Marshall Affordable Housing Self Build Homes Group	Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		We have more than plenty sites empty which need filling so why build more factory units? Get the rates down which will allow empty units to be let. Alter the big units into smaller one / two type units. Drive out and look. Please stop doing desk top plans. I would love to help in putting forward real working plans instead of dreams. Please live in the real world.			1414
361014	Mr Peter Hammond		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		<p>I object to any development especially commercial development at these locations as it would seriously affect the Green Belt which separates villages in this part of East Dorset. Therefore support the team's non-preference for these options. Does West Parley really need a 3,000sq.m supermarket? There are more than enough supermarkets in the Ferndown area to serve the whole of Dorset. Two last paragraphs from my letter of 29th April 2008.</p> <p>To return to my original point, I do not believe that this level of development is necessary, justified, sustainable, or desirable for this part of East Dorset and I feel EDDC is being railroaded into accepting the strategy simply in order to satisfy Government broad housing targets irrespective of their relevance to the locality. I have felt for some years now that East Dorset is continually being sacrificed in order to preserve what may be seen by some as more open countryside further west in the county and which has greater protection from conservation laws and the National Trust. Wimborne, Colehill, West Parley , and Corfe Mullen are still separately identifiable villages surrounded by agricultural land; they are not part of the big conurbations such as Poole and Bournemouth and they should be respected as being different and treated differently. I understand the difficulty EDDC might well have with these strategy documents and I'm sure they will do their best for the area. However i would like to see the council standing up and really challenging the basic premises of this plan and propose much less development in the area based on real local need and not a notional level set essentially by Central Government.</p>			1414
476792	Mr and Mrs Lomas		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
481604	Mr Gerald Toomer		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
485695	Mr John Cornish		Non Preferred Option PC	Support		Please consider the provision of incubator offices and small workshops for businesses spawned out of the Bournemouth University and Executive Business Centre in Holdenhurst Road.			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			9			Reference Site Chillworth Science Park. This could be sited off road in North Dorset, say Sixpenny Handley to improve local economy.			
496996	Mr Hayward		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Concerned how many residents living in the areas of proposed developments have knowledge of this, as it appears that the only way the residents of Hampreston were informed was due to my wife knocking door to door. Strongly oppose developments at Stourbank Nursery as I am a resident of the nursery. Being born in Hampreston and over the years seeing the increased volume of traffic to Ham Lane and Canford Bottom, any change to this site will have a significant impact on these areas with increased volumes. Greenbelt land always appears irrelevant when large developments are considered, but a major issue when small changes are put forward. Is there a reason for this, or like most things these days just down to money.			1414
500746	Mrs J Lothian		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Not at this time.			1414
500817	Mr L Lothian		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Already too much traffic on the roads which are in poor condition after 2 years of frosts.			1414
508562	K Clayson		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
508993	Mr A Samways		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
509795	Mr		Non	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	R Ridley		Preferred Option PC 9						
511761	Mr G Burge		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
513651	Mrs W Pearsall		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		1. Improved public transport to these employment sites. 2. Business centres for starting business with full back office support. 3. Tax breaks to encourage businesses to move to our area. 4. Subsidised training for all age groups in starting up and running a business. 4. Part time apprenticeship training for all age groups.			1414
514467	Mrs Lesley Cripps		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
514482	C E T Gilbert		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
514674	Mrs J Williams		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Objections to PC6, PC8 and PC9 are mainly due to traffic. Ham Lane and Canford Bottom couldn't cope with any more.			1414
514752	Claire Richardson & Jamie Shirley		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514812	Mr C Sawyer		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Seeking the opinion of the general public on planning issues is all very commendable - but setting aside all political persuasion my feeling is that this is no more than a Public Relations exercise because in the end the final decisions are always to the advantage of the developers whoever they may be because of money, greed and looks good on paper.			1414
514913	Mr and Mrs M Clark		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
514939	D Porter		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Many industrial units are empty why do need more?			1414
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		The area is already over-developed and congested - further development on the scales proposed would lead to deterioration of the environment and a reduction in the quality of life. I am particularly dismayed by continued threats to the Green Belt, especially as this Government pledged to protect it. I do not believe that such massive development is necessary or beneficial to the vast majority of inhabitants. Pressure on our area should be reduced by Government tackling such issues as population growth through immigration control and regeneration of brownfield sites in Midlands and North. There is a need for limited affordable and social housing locally, but not more executive homes. It is wrong to build new homes while second homes and investment properties continue to exist.			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
515033	Mr T Crump		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		These proposals are typical of the failures contrived by Council and Consultants to address short term solutions to Government edict. Fundamental to any significant further development is the need for joined up thinking for transportation. All of these proposals further the burden on traffic flow through and around conurbation centres. These major roads are the responsibility of the government highways department. They should foot the bill for their improvements prior to further development. Some of these proposals virtually adjoin 100 instance flood lines. This is totally unacceptable. Any proposal to move allotments, away from the housing that uses them, increases road usage and has a negative impact on the community.			1414
515287	Mr L Jackson		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		The A31 trunk road from Ferndown by-pass should be widened to form a dual carriageway all the way through to Bere Regis.			1414
515367	Mr & Mrs J Pottinger		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Please save the Green Belt			1414
515479	Mr D Lenehan		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
515763	Mr V S Harris		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
515788	J M May		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
516313	Mr Julian		Non Preferred	Object		PC 8 and 9 are both unacceptable for their isolation and impact.			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Humphries		Option PC 9						
517528	Dr Susan Burton		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		<p>As residents of Stourbank Nurseries we were shocked to learn that this site was being considered as one of the possible locations for employment in the core strategy. We had no personal formal consultation over this matter and it was simply by chance that we discovered that this site was being considered. This option excludes ours and our neighbour's property (3 and 4 Stourbank Nursery) We would like written confirmation that this is an omission and that there has been no consideration to include our property and our neighbours as part of any proposed development. We object to options PC8 and PC9 being considered as options for employment and have the following comments to make.</p> <p>Green Belt (PC8 &amp; PC9)</p> <p>The site lies in an important Green Belt gap. Hampreston Conservation Area lies to the south of the development. There is potential visual intrusion of the development and a change of character of the area.</p> <p>To remove this land from the Green Belt would be contrary to the aims set out in PPG2. It would spoil the setting of the Hampreston Conservation Area and the open countryside running either side of the River Stour (Stour Valley).</p> <p>Traffic (PC8 &amp; PC9)</p> <p>Ham Lane traffic movements will increase as a result of the development to the detriment of the character of Hampreston Conservation Area.</p> <p>Increased traffic movements will cause tailbacks along Ham Lane onto the Canford Bottom roundabout.</p> <p>In addition access to and from Hampreston First School will be made more difficult. The busier road will also make the walk to and from this First School more dangerous for those in the local community who go by foot.</p> <p>With the increased traffic on Ham Lane it is hard to imagine how 'safe and efficient' bus routes (see Policy Trans9 below) could be maintained at this location.</p> <p>Policy TRANS9 'Where new residential, commercial or industrial estate distributor roads are proposed, these will only be permitted where they are designed or incorporate measures that allow for the safe and efficient movement of bus services.</p>			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
517590	Mr & Mrs Pitman		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		This is farm land in a green belt area and I feel it should remain as green belt area.			1414
517835	Mr G D Rodrigues		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		I would object to this development for a number of reasons. I also note that for your own planning officers it is not a preferred option. The site does not adjoin an existing urban area and lies within an important Green Belt gap and its development would compromise this gap. The site is isolated from local facilities. Key negative impacts relate to the openness of the Green Belt and its position within the countryside in relation to existing employment and urban areas. A key negative aspect of this site is a lack of accessibility to nearby services and public transport. The local roads network would be unable to cope with any increased traffic requirements that would come from developing this site - both directly onto the B3073 Ham Lane and also the consequent impact on the Canford Bottom roundabout. A key negative would also be that any increased development of this site would have a negative impact on the local residents of the adjoining hamlet of Little Canford, both in terms of the increased road and traffic noise and also the increased noise due to the development of the site and its later planned business activities which would impact this rural local community.			1414
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Given that most of the proposed employment-related development will be in close proximity to the designated sites, the Core Strategy must demonstrate that this development can be accommodated without adverse effects on the European sites. There is uncertainty as to where this deployment will be exactly focused, however given the broad locations identified, scrutiny for possible adverse effects on European sites will be necessary. We object to option KS13 and options PC4, PC5, PC7, PC8, PC9, PC13 and PC14 pending resolution of outstanding issues identified in the HRA in relation to the European sites.			1414
359891	Mrs Susanne Parkin		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		There should be more places of employment nearer to existing housing - this should be small units and sites. To enlarge existing sites is not very sustainable in terms of traffic - it is foolish to exacerbate existing bad traffic conditions as we have at present			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						e.g. the A31 at peak time from the Ferndown Industrial Estate. Villages surrounding the conurbation should all support a degree of employment and industry.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		The Agency agrees with the 'non preferred' designations of the new employment land allocated in Non Preferred Options PC8 and PC9. This is because of the transport constraints identified in the CS and specifically the very close proximity of the sites to the heavily constrained Canford bottom junction.			1414
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		<p>Travel for Employment, Education, Shopping and Leisure. Where do the residents of Wimborne and Colehill seek Employment, Education, Shopping and Leisure activities?</p> <p>Travel for Employment</p> <p>Data for employment appears only to be available for 2001 in the Core Strategy Area Profile<sup>2</sup>, which is unlikely to reflect the increased trend of out of town travelling for work. Since the turn of the Century greater mobility has been necessary more and more, not only to secure work, but also to achieve career progression. Travel distances are only available for about 60% of the working population of Wimborne and Colehill, and roughly half of these travel between 10 and 40 Kms to work and the others between 5 and 10 Kms.<sup>2</sup> One wonders about the other 40%, are they perhaps beyond 40 Kms, as I was myself, or do they now work from home?</p> <p>EDDC options for Employment<sup>4</sup> identify a negative effect on the availability of sites in Wimborne and Colehill. When considering the sites proposed at PC5 to PC9 inclusive, KS13, BA1-11, the relocation of Stone Lane Industrial Estate<sup>3</sup>, plus the inclusion of land released at Cobham Gate<sup>5</sup>, it would mean that greater use of the A31 will be necessary for people to travel to work in the future. The location of proposed employment sites will hardly encourage people to walk or cycle to work, and I doubt that they will find it convenient to travel to these proposed locations by public transport. In addition one can expect that many jobs will be filled by "Outsiders" who in turn will utilise private transportation on the A31 to get to their destinations of employment.</p> <p>Travel Issues</p> <p>Clearly then the A31 has a major impact on the mobility of people within the Wimborne and Colehill catchment areas.</p> <p>EDDC states that we have the highest level of car ownership in the</p>			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>country3 and we can see the reasons for this in the above analysis of people's needs. It suggests that these problems can be overcome by changing attitudes toward the use of public transport to relieve local congestion.</p> <p>I consider this to be a totally unrealistic approach in our highly pressurised, motivated, mobile, materialistic and ageing society. (see Theoretical Human Life Cycle Transportation Requirements attached19) We must solve the problem and not skirt round it. Take the issue of employment. All of the proposed Industrial Sites are out of area where travel on or crossing of, the A31 is necessary. The same applies to Higher Education, Shopping, Leisure, and to some extent Hospitalisation. We must recognise that where people's choice is limited they will travel great distances to ensure they get what they want.</p> <p>Take the issue of Housing Development. The development of Land to the East and West of the Cranborne Road appears to endorse the unacceptable use of Burts Hill (a country lane) running into Long Lane (another country lane) in becoming a second bypass of the Town. This became evident during the repairs to Julian's Bridge and the Poole Road Bridge, where GPS's offer alternative routes. These roads have increasingly become busier and noisier as a result. People that used to use this route for cycling, walking and jogging are no longer safe to do this anymore.</p> <p>It is strange that the Core Strategy option containing the largest number of homes is considered best situated on the North side of Wimborne, i.e. at the farthest point from the out of area conduit. (the A31) What sense does this make? Its consequence will be that not only the A31 will be jammed up at peak times, but also Middlehill, Leigh Road, Burts Hill, and the Cranborne Road will all suffer greater congestion. Even after taking into consideration that Walford Bridge will need to be widened to accommodate additional traffic movement across town and an improvement in traffic flow through the Stone Lane junction will have to be addressed.</p> <p>I consider all of this could be avoided if the "undeveloped" land to the South of Leigh Road and East of WMC5 was allocated to satisfy only the required number of affordable and supportable homes.</p> <p>Take the issue of Climate Change. Do we really want to release more Carbon Dioxide into the atmosphere by creating more traffic jams and greater congestion, when with the appropriate amount of</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>forethought we can reduce the effects of Climate Change?                      Further it is predicted that our ageing local population will increase which will to some extent increase the need for personal motorised transport. Since anyone who has graduated to private transportation is unlikely to relinquish it, even if this means being taxied to their destination at times convenient to themselves, they are highly unlikely to walk, cycle or travel on public transport unless it's becomes an absolute last resort.                      So what can be done to alleviate this issue?                      Well clearly the A31 has to be upgraded to a dual carriageway with fly overs or underpasses in the most congested spots. However this leads to the question of finance and timing.                      As a suggestion;                      Let's think laterally about the infrastructure of Transport, the uses of arterial roads, the polluting effect of vehicles and the funding for road improvements.                      The A31, which bypasses our town, blocks frequently at peak times and in holiday periods. The primary bottleneck occurs at the Canford Bottom Roundabout, followed closely by the Merley House Lane Roundabout, the Julian's Road Roundabout and finally the Poole Road Roundabout at Bailey Gate. These bottlenecks bring frustration, high energy consumption and more importantly high pollution to our area. Clearly the A31 will have to undergo major improvement to allow through traffic to flow smoothly through our district. The solution can only be a dual carriageway with a series of flyovers, or under passes, that need to be built between the end of the existing dual carriageway at Cobham Road Roundabout all the way through to Bailey Gate, and perhaps beyond to the dual carriageway at Bere Regis.                      Local, District and County Councils must lobby Government for a greater say in the distribution of the funding for road improvements and take control of funding to support local transport infrastructure when resolving their housing and industrial needs. The projects are intertwined and have to support each other, it's all very well pushing the housing problem back to councils, but councils must be given allocation of the road improvement budget too.                      Wimborne's problem will not be resolved by a £6 million sticky plaster solution<sup>8</sup> applied to the Canford Bottom Roundabout which will only, if successful, move the bottleneck from one roundabout on the A31 along to another. IT IS TIME FOR MAJOR SURGERY.</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						<p>How else could the necessary road improvements be funded? Since the A31 is a holiday route and a route to an area of the country that boasts England's first natural World Heritage site "The Jurassic Coast", it can conceivably be funded by contributions to road improvements from the EU.</p> <p>But, neither is there anything stopping this section of the A31 becoming a toll road, and in time putting money back into the coffers of the Highways Agency, after all this is the case when travelling down the M6 and also crossing the River Seven when travelling to Wales. I am sure holiday makers and businesses will gladly factor such costs into their budgets.</p> <p>For the sake of the community, and for future generations, we need to bring pressure to bear on Ministers, MPs and local dignitaries to get the necessary funding in place to support this vital arterial improvement. Only then will the EDDC Core Strategy be capable of being successfully implemented.</p> <p>SEE ATTACHMENT</p>			
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		being non-preferred options due to their impact on the openness of the Green Belt. We would object to any development on these sites.			1414
524495	Mr Stanley Jackson		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		Attention needs to be concentrated on keeping and ideally increasing the number of younger people in the area, through providing additional employment opportunities, affordable or low-cost housing to purchase and an increase in rented accommodation. I would therefore support all attempts PC4 -PC9 to locate more employment land options.			1414
489765	Derek KEAREY		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
490854	D MUTTON		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507361	Mr Kenneth Archer		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
507737	Mrs S Philpot		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
527642	Chris Morle		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		The consequences of development along Ham Lane towards and including Parley Cross will cut off the present relatively safe cycle route from Wimborne into the New Forest. The increase in traffic volume and speeds will make this route much more dangerous and will isolate Wimborne from the New Forest for cycle access which is safe. How does this fit with the cycle track plans?			1414
527661	W Barnes		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
527863	A Barratt		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
534820	Paul Batten		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
534833	Frederick Wall		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
534837	Mrs P Martin		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Horses need grazing land. No infrastructure in place for the total number of homes planned. I do not go out between 8.00 and 9.30 am and 3.00pm and 6.30pm because of the traffic on the roads now.			1414
534875	Brian Lane		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
534914	Mrs P Froud		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535070	Mr Alan Reade		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
535094	MS Tracey Tucker		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		I am very concerned about increased housing in W Parley, the traffic is horrendous around here so much that at weekends and bank holidays I try not to go out and to travel into work at the wrong time is just a nightmare. Additional traffic is just not needed. With regards the industrial development at Blunts Farm, there is no much empty office and factory space on Ferndown Ind estate, why is more needed at Uddens? I keep my horse in Uddens Drive and entrance to the ind estate is so dangerous with the size of the lorries coming into Uddens drive both for drivers and horse riders. I am surprised there has not been a serious accident or death there. The A31 does not need any additional traffic, any proposed ind development should be subject to access being made through Ferndown ind estate and not Uddens drive			1414
535112	Mr		Non		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Jack Tindall		Preferred Option PC 9						
535167	Lynda Lake		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
535209	Mr P Webster		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Please liaise with NFDC and NPA, as the additional traffic generated by the extra housing and employment zones will increase the traffic problems at the already congested bottleneck at Ringwood and cause yet more problems for the people who live in New Forest hamlets such as Linwood, Brook and Burley as motorists try to find alternative routes. Can the New Forest take any more pressure from additional numbers of visitors? Has Dorset got enough sand and gravel in the landbank to meet the needs of the developers? Can you force Tarmac to start mining gravel by the Spur Road near Hurn? What will happen to the pollution levels close to the trunk roads e.g. at Ringwood, especially particulate pollution? Can Bournemouth Water meet the increased demands for water?			1414
535349	P Thomas		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		I think that this whole core strategy consultation needs a full review in light of the proposed changes being brought in under the new government. I particularly object to all the proposed Verwood development as the infrastructure is not in place to support the current population let alone adding even further to it by building a further 400 homes. Any EDDC councillor who has the affront to say that the infrastructure is in place to support this development does not know what they are talking about and obviously do not live in the town.			1414
359875	Dr Lesley		Non Preferred	Object		The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	HASKINS		Option PC 9			<p>some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options.</p> <p>However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported.</p>			
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
498446	W A Murphy		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
533834	Mr Tim Harris		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535387	Mr Brian Cox		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535393	Jeremy Berg		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			1414
535457	Mr Matthew Newman		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
535500	David Veevers		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535504	Mr Michael Beer		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
535509	Mrs S Durant		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535517	Roy Rich		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
535547	Mr M Folland		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
535550	Mrs		Non		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	D Mogg		Preferred Option PC 9						
535567	Ms Judy McMath		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
535591	A Walker		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535670	Dave Allen		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
535678	Andrew Bryant		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535688	Susan Hobbs		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535701	Mr Andy		Non Preferred		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Skeats		Option PC 9						
535718	Richard Green		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535815	Mrs C M Davies		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535836	Peter Parsons		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
535865	Darren Charles Bryson		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
535875	John Kitchenside		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		The majority of residents in this area relocated because of the permanent despoiling of their places of birth by elected local and national 'representatives' who would not listen or care about the needs of the people that voted for them. Do you want to be remembered as the people who finally ruined this area or the people who saved it. Do not forget that people still visit this area as tourists and we welcome them and accept their contribution to the local economy. They will stop coming if the developments continue.			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						How many tourists visit the outer London sprawl? Can I quote p227 from the Core Strategy Options paper - para 11.28 The Government's key housing policy is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. This is an impossible dream that can never and will never, be fulfilled. If the developments did go ahead what would be the effect of another 5000 cars on our local roads be ? If Morrisons developments go ahead where are the customers going to park? The parking within Verwood is just about adequate at the moment.			
536014	Mrs Dawn Tindall		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
536050	Mr Andrew Collin		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		It is important to have a policy of continuous improvement for housing and employment for the area. Many are concerned for our environment, sensitive and empathic development will take care of this, but to do nothing will benefit no one in the longer term. A mixture of traditional and affordable homes is desirable, backed by a development in industrial and business land and premises availability. It is important to maintain and improve all areas of housing and commercial opportunity to invest in the future of our area for all parts of the community, the young, the aspiring as well as the established and retired members. Establishing the right mix is essential for a sustainable future in our community.			1414
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
536169	Mr Tony Trevis-Bell		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
360768	Cllr. Mr David	Colehill West Ward	Non Preferred		No Opinion				1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Packer	East Dorset District Council	Option PC 9						
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny PEARCE		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
475508	Mr and Mrs Marshall		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		We live in West Parley and the transport infrastructure (especially along Hurn Road, Christchurch Road, Ringwood Road and New Road) is already struggling to support the volume of daily traffic. There are always hold-ups along Hurn Road (by the airport), which will become more frequent once the traffic lights are installed at the junction into the airport (being done at present). Longham Bridge and the bends through Longham along Ringwood Road is a notoriously dangerous stretch of road, which is not helped by the ever increasing amount of heavy lorries which use it as a 'short cut' to Poole Ferry Terminal instead of using the Wimborne by-pass because that is also not up to the task, being single carriageway and having both Merley & Canford Bottom roundabouts unable to cope with the shear volume of traffic coming onto them. New Road (which is the main route in & out of Bournemouth for local people) also struggles with traffic, especially during the rush hour periods. When absurd? We do not need developers trying to 'sweeten the pill' with new facilities at West Parley, which are not needed or wanted. I would much rather see the present shopping facilities at Parley Cross and the Children's park by the Memorial Hall improved for the benefit of the local community. Small offices are not required - there are lots of such offices / industrial units in Ferndown which remain empty. We believe the impact of any development would detrimentally change the character of the village of West Parley and therefore do not support the proposed developments.			1414
475530	Mr George Phillips		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		You need to have a plan on how the infrastructure will be improved to support these housing and commercial developments before we decide on any housing or commercial developments. Infrastructure includes roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, etc. And for roads, I don't mean links from the developments to the existing roads. Everything round here is already overloaded. We need more			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						bridges over the Stour, and a motorway link from Poole to the M27. Motorways north to the M4 and west to the M5 should also be built. These will take the load off the local roads round here. I also think we should only build decent homes. Everyone has to live somewhere, and they should have somewhere decent. It's the cost of land that drives up the cost of accommodation, and building land is expensive because it's in short supply.			
482494	Mrs Yvette Jones		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object		Why would we want office buildings? Thousands lie empty. Expansion 'projects' smack of driven unnecessary waste and change for all the wrong reasons.			1414
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		I			1414
498211	Mrs J AUCKLAND		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
498402	Mrs T Hughes		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
508735	Mr Peter Barham		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
514507	Mr and Mrs C Macy		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
536271	Mrs D Holt		Non Preferred Option PC	Object		No development should be supported within Green belt areas at all.			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			9						
536282	Mrs Doreen Kingaby		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
536324	Paul Sumner		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
536332	Emmanuelle Hutton		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
536341	Adrian Bowyer		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
536342	Lily Hutton		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
536346	Mr Ben Richards		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
536349	Mrs C Bowyer		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
536351	Mr John Hutton		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536449	Dave Isaacs		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
536543	Samantha Fysh		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD.. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!			1414
536572	Roger Fysh		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		I strongly object to the proposal to increase the housing in and around Verwood. Verwood has been extensively developed over the years and there is inadequate services to support the extra cars and people. Also having seen the housing density of the Ebblake housing estate it is clear that agreeing to more housing will only create 'no go' areas in the very near future. I also note that in and around Wimborne there are huge areas of open land, which could easily be developed, especially between Ferndown and Wimborne which also has excellent road networks in place as it could immediately open onto the A31			1414
536628	Mr C.A Wills		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support					1414
536702	Mr Mark Hirst		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
536790	David Steadman		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536808	Ms Yvette Allen		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
536812	R H Barker		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
536848	Ola Steadman		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
536850	Mr Michael Hird		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
536866	Emma Huns		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
504285	Mr P Miller		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
536930	Mrs Susannah Spencer		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Support		I also support Employment Options KS13 and BA1-11. For further crucial comments please see the PDF File "Response to EDDC Options for Wimborne and Colehill" emailed to Judy Windwood on 13th January 2011.			1414
536932	Paul		Non	Support					1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Bason		Preferred Option PC 9						
537050	Diane Fletcher		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
537075	Mrs Elaine Holt		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
537106	C Hebditch		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
537362	Peter Constable		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
537435	Ms Pauline Burton		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
537529	Mrs C White		Non Preferred Option PC 9	Object					1414
537571	Nick and Marion Leatherdale		Non Preferred Option PC 9		No Opinion				1414
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter		Non Preferred	Support		Support all proposals subject to the prerequisites are fully implemented BEFORE development starts or substantial monies			1414

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Griffiths		Option PC 9			are deposited by developers before development. This will safeguard Council Tax payers against any future failure for whatever reason the developers fails to carry out the prerequisites.			
359636	Mr Chris BARTLETT		Preferred Option PC 10	Support					1419
507462	Mr Chris Cox	Senior Consultant DTZ	Preferred Option PC 10	Object		We object to this options which seeks to deliver particular types of employment premises on different sites in Christchurch. The policy is too specific and does not afford the flexibility that other proposed policies seek to retain. National planning policy advises a more flexible approach to allocations in order to encourage development and in recognition of the high proportion of jobs outside the traditional B use class. The policy is therefore contrary to national planning guidance. We consider that to define particular uses within use classes for sites is unrealistic and inflexible. Have the uses been market tested? What constitutes a small purpose built office or incubator units and how can they be secured? Will 'moderate demand' be enough to realise office development in a location that has a very small office market and which faces competition from land at Bournemouth Airport?			1419
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	Preferred Option PC 10	Support		We support Preferred Option PC10 which seeks to meet individually distinct employment needs within the existing Christchurch urban area.			1419
521395	D2 Planning	D2 Planning Limited	Preferred Option PC 10	Object		Support is given to this option which identifies the former BAE site for employment purposes. However reference is made to the objections made in respect of Preferred Option PC1. It is considered that the range of uses should be extended to include the potential for health care employment on the site. The evidence bases indicates that in the period up to 2016 this will be one of the growth employment sectors, yet the draft Core Strategy makes no provision for this growth.			1419
361026	Mr	Network	Non	Support		We support Preferred Option PC10 which seeks to meet			1421

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Steve Hellier	Planning Manager Highways Agency	Preferred Option PC 11			individually distinct employment needs within the existing Christchurch urban area.			
495527	Miss Caroline Green	Planner Broadway Malyan	Preferred Option PC 12	Support		We support meeting the requirement for B1, B2 and B8 uses through allocated and established sites in the plan area, we also support the flexibility allowed by supporting non B uses (other employment generating uses) on established and allocated sites, currently being consulted on as employment options for East Dorset such as the Bailie Gate Site in Sturminster Marshall.			1424
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		Preferred Option PC 12	Support		Support use of employment sites to maximise appropriate employment opportunities and strengthen local economy			1424
499532	Bournemouth Borough Council	Bournemouth Borough Council	Preferred Option PC 12		General Comment	<p>We have concerns about the proposed strategy for the airport northern business parks in particular as the strategy appears to be promoting significant office development. Clarification is sought whether the Economic Study of Development Land at Bournemouth Airport undertaken by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners considered the economic impact on Bournemouth Town Centre, in particular as the Core Strategy is promoting office uses at the airport, including in the 'financial and business services sectors and ICT sector'. Major office schemes should be resisted at the airport as such development, in particular in the uses specified, could adversely impact on the vitality and viability of office development in Bournemouth town centre. The identification of financial and business services sectors and the ICT sector as appropriate uses at the airport is objected to as these uses will be more appropriately and sustainability located in Bournemouth town centre.</p> <p>Hotel accommodation at the airport should be of a scale and function that does not impact on the viability and vitality of the existing and proposed hotel stock in Bournemouth. It is presumed such a hotel use will be purely ancillary to the airport operation. Likewise we have concerns about the scale of the proposed conference and leisure facilities at the airport. Such facilities should be solely for, and be ancillary to, companies at the airport, the scale of these uses should reflect this. Many such facilities already</p>			1424

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						exist in Bournemouth, we have concerns that the viability and vitality of similar uses in Bournemouth could be compromised. It is a more sustainable approach to concentrate uses such as these in the existing urban area.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	Preferred Option PC 12	Support		The Agency supports Preferred Option PC12 which seeks to meet employment requirements on allocated and established employment sites, however the Agency's previous comments should be applied (notably PC7 at St Leonard's Hospital).			1424
521395	D2 Planning	D2 Planning Limited	Preferred Option PC 12	Object		Objections are made to this policy as it does not provide a flexible approach to providing non b uses on allocated and established employment sites in Christchurch such as the former BAE site. Essentially, whilst the policy purports to allow such uses, if it prejudices the ability to meet projected B class employment requirements then it will be refused. Nowhere does the Core Strategy provide a clear strategy for the provision of non B employment uses e.g. education and health care uses. Given that there is significant growth planned in these sectors in the local economy during the Core Strategy period, a clear strategy should be provided for this growth. At present the Core Strategy is deficient.			1424
533867	Ms Emma Woodhouse	SW Food & Farming Adviser NFU	15.36		General Comment	Sustainable Development Planning policy should not prohibit development in the countryside. The Taylor Review of Rural Economy and Affordable Housing considered in detail the sustainable development in rural areas. "Planning must not determine the future development of rural communities against a narrow tick-box approach to sustainable development, assessing communities as they are now and not what they could be. In too many places this approach writes off rural communities in a 'sustainability trap' where development can only occur in places already considered to be in narrow terms 'sustainable'. "The question planners must address is 'how will development add to or diminish the sustainability of this community?' taking a better balance of social, economic and environmental factors together to form a long term vision for all scales of communities. A mix of housing and employment opportunities are essential for the			1426

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						sustainability of rural communities" Farm Diversification Government planning guidance PPS 7 recognises that diversification into non-agricultural activities is vital to the continuing viability of many farm enterprises and suggests that local planning authorities should be supportive of well-conceived farm diversification schemes for business purposes that help to sustain the agricultural enterprise.			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		Preferred Option PC 13	Object		Storage and haulage business particularly around Wimborne and Colehill would generate even more traffic on our already congested roads particularly if the proposed new housing developments take place; the same could be said for light manufacturing businesses and leisure centres			1427
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Preferred Option PC 13	Support					1427
359636	Mr Chris BARTLETT		Preferred Option PC 13	Object		Prefer additional constraints of PC14			1427
360653	Mr M A Hodges		Preferred Option PC 13		General Comment	Guided walks and talks are available to support tourism			1427
360246	Mr Gavin FAUVEL	Cranborne Estate	Preferred Option PC 13	Support		Support in part. This is considered to be a key policy consideration for this Estate's objectives in sustaining a continuing and sustainable economic use of its buildings and assets. It is a concern that access to alternative transport is a genuine issue and support for this policy is conditional on a reduction in the weighting for the transport criteria. Many projects would not get off the ground if access to alternative modes of transport were the key considerations. Fully support the live/work and a mixture of such uses in small farm building settlements close to large settlements as independent satellites serviced locally. Significant concern expressed by the lack of any agricultural economy commentary throughout the document. Support for			1427

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						agricultural building use conversion for agricultural purposes indeed planning applications for further augment existing legislation on competitive access to markets and modernisation of agriculture should be recognised. Agriculture is seen as increasingly important to the local economy, particularly as food and fuel security becomes an ever more important agenda item.			
359529	Mrs Gill Martin	Clerk to the Council Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council	Preferred Option PC 13	Object		Agriculture may only comprise 2% of the business sector (para 2.49) but it embraces the major share of the area and almost certainly the largest single activity in financial terms. As farms struggle to function within the existing legislative framework there has been a tendency for diversification and in so doing they can provide very suitable locations for new businesses in redundant buildings. This trend should be acknowledged and encouraged in order to assist in meeting some of the various objectives of the Core Strategy. Although these are understandable mitigating circumstances for the urban focus of the draft Core Strategy paper - population, service provision and associated costs - the relegation of the rural area and community to an also ran status is most disappointing and needs to be rectified. The countryside is the core asset that makes East Dorset what it is and it requires nurturing and resourcing if it is to develop in a healthy and sustainable way over the next 15 years - the time frame for this strategy. There is concern that the rural are and its people will remain the poor cousins in which event there will be further migration to the major town centres, especially by the younger generations, and decline into a retreat for those who can afford the cost of rural life and a recreational amenity for the urban conurbations.			1427
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	Preferred Option PC 13	Object		Given that most of the proposed employment-related development will be in close proximity to the designated sites, the Core Strategy must demonstrate that this development can be accommodated without adverse effects on the European sites. There is uncertainty as to where this deployment will be exactly focused, however given the broad locations identified, scrutiny for possible adverse effects on European sites will be necessary. We object to option KS13 and options PC4, PC5, PC7, PC8, PC9, PC13 and PC14 pending resolution of outstanding issues identified in the HRA in relation to the European sites.	The re-use of rural buildings can threaten the breeding and roosting sites of a number of species (e.g. barn owls, swallows, etc.), some of which are European Protected Species (e.g. bats).		1427

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						We note the environmental safeguards contained in option PC13. The HRA identifies that this policy may have a potential impact on European sites. As with renewable energy developments, it is important to give clear guidance on the constraints so that they can be built into the consideration of development at an early stage.	We recommend the inclusion of "species" added after "sensitive habitats" in the first bullet point of option PC13.		
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	Preferred Option PC 13	Support		We welcome the requirement that rural diversification does not result in increased traffic, minimises additional trips on the highway network and should be accessible by sustainable modes of transport.			1427
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		Preferred Option PC 13	Support					1427
360245	Mr Richard BURDEN	Landscape and Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB	Preferred Option PC 13	Support	General Comment	<p>The AONB welcomes the criteria set out in PC 13 about the scope of acceptable uses for rural diversification. Nevertheless the AONB has been closely involved with other planning authorities opposing storage and haulage activities in other parts of the AONB and would not, therefore, be at all happy to see a different policy being applied in the East Dorset part of the AONB. We are also concerned about the scale of renewable energy as domestic and single farm / business operations would comply with the AONB Management Plan but larger scale, commercial, focused, proposals would be unlikely to comply with AONB policies and objectives. We are also concerned about the inclusion of light manufacturing within rural diversification as this is very much open to interpretation and could lead not just to inappropriate activities but all of the associated transport movements. Just for information, one of the concerns that the AONB has with a storage and distribution operation in another part of the AONB is the large number of workers (50 plus) that drive to the farm on a daily basis. Clearly this is not a sustainable form of employment and is not providing jobs primarily for inhabitants of the village.</p> <p>The AONB has considerable sympathy with the reuse of buildings in rural areas however our concerns in connection with PC 13 also apply to PC 14. You will, I am sure, be aware of the AONB's activities to support the provision of facilities such as shops, pubs,</p>			1427

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						and post offices (as set out in the AONB Management Plan) and therefore the AONB would give considerable support to PC 16. The AONB suggests that supporting the aims and objectives of the AONB would be an appropriate addition to PC 17.			
533867	Ms Emma Woodhouse	SW Food & Farming Adviser NFU	Preferred Option PC 13		General Comment	Farm Diversification Government planning guidance PPS 7 recognises that diversification into non-agricultural activities is vital to the continuing viability of many farm enterprises and suggests that local planning authorities should be supportive of well-conceived farm diversification schemes for business purposes that help to sustain the agricultural enterprise.			1427
359636	Mr Chris BARTLETT		Alternative Preferred Option PC 14	Support		Prefer the additional planning conditions to be in keeping with surroundings.			1429
360653	Mr M A Hodges		Alternative Preferred Option PC 14		General Comment	The Constables Hall at Castle Street could be roofed and put to use (this would also support the walls from risk of falling as has been done at Ludlow).			1429
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		Alternative Preferred Option PC 14	Support					1429
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	Alternative Preferred Option PC 14	Object		Given that most of the proposed employment-related development will be in close proximity to the designated sites, the Core Strategy must demonstrate that this development can be accommodated without adverse effects on the European sites. There is uncertainty as to where this deployment will be exactly focused, however given the broad locations identified, scrutiny for possible adverse effects on European sites will be necessary. We object to option KS13 and options PC4, PC5, PC7, PC8, PC9, PC13 and PC14 pending resolution of outstanding issues identified			1429

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
						in the HRA in relation to the European sites.			
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		Alternative Preferred Option PC 14	Support					1429
360245	Mr Richard BURDEN	Landscape and Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB	Alternative Preferred Option PC 14	Support	General Comment	<p>The AONB welcomes the criteria set out in PC 13 about the scope of acceptable uses for rural diversification. Nevertheless the AONB has been closely involved with other planning authorities opposing storage and haulage activities in other parts of the AONB and would not, therefore, be at all happy to see a different policy being applied in the East Dorset part of the AONB. We are also concerned about the scale of renewable energy as domestic and single farm / business operations would comply with the AONB Management Plan but larger scale, commercial, focused, proposals would be unlikely to comply with AONB policies and objectives. We are also concerned about the inclusion of light manufacturing within rural diversification as this is very much open to interpretation and could lead not just to inappropriate activities but all of the associated transport movements. Just for information, one of the concerns that the AONB has with a storage and distribution operation in another part of the AONB is the large number of workers (50 plus) that drive to the farm on a daily basis. Clearly this is not a sustainable form of employment and is not providing jobs primarily for inhabitants of the village.</p> <p>The AONB has considerable sympathy with the reuse of buildings in rural areas however our concerns in connection with PC 13 also apply to PC 14. You will, I am sure, be aware of the AONB's activities to support the provision of facilities such as shops, pubs, and post offices (as set out in the AONB Management Plan) and therefore the AONB would give considerable support to PC 16. The AONB suggests that supporting the aims and objectives of the AONB would be an appropriate addition to PC 17.</p>			1429
533867	Ms Emma Woodhouse	SW Food & Farming Adviser NFU	Alternative Preferred Option PC		General Comment	<p>Farm Diversification Government planning guidance PPS 7 recognises that diversification into non-agricultural activities is vital to the continuing viability of many farm enterprises and suggests that</p>			1429

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
			14			local planning authorities should be supportive of well-conceived farm diversification schemes for business purposes that help to sustain the agricultural enterprise.			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		15.37	Support					1431
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		15.39	Support					1433
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		15.41	Support					1435
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		Preferred Option PC 15	Support					1437
359636	Mr Chris BARTLETT		Preferred Option PC 15	Support					1437
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		Preferred Option PC 15	Support					1437
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		Preferred Option PC 15	Support					1437
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		Preferred Option PC 16	Support					1440
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Preferred Option PC 16	Support					1440
359636	Mr		Preferred	Support					1440

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Chris BARTLETT		Option PC 16						
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		Preferred Option PC 16	Support					1440
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	Preferred Option PC 16	Support		Hurn Parish Council fully support this Option. The Hurn Parish Plan notes that in a survey of Hurn residents in 2010, 99% said that Hurn Post Office and Village Shop is an essential facility in Hurn and should be kept.	None		1440
360246	Mr Gavin FAUVEL	Cranborne Estate	Preferred Option PC 16	Support		Support. However the ongoing provision of rural rate relief, including the discretionary element, is key to ensuring such shops continue.			1440
359529	Mrs Gill Martin	Clerk to the Council Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council	Preferred Option PC 16		General Comment	Under Connectivity and Accessibility (para 15.12) there is a contradiction between the requirement to maintain and expand existing employment, shops and facilities in order to reduce the number of car journeys to the nearest town centre locations which can also be achieved by the use of deliveries resulting from internet shopping. Too much of the latter will undermine the former and cause the closure of local amenities as has happened over the border in neighbouring Wiltshire communities. The local services and workforce are considerably enhanced as a result of the relatively high proportion of retired people, many of whom carry out a wide range of voluntary work. However, it is felt that the current belief, especially on the part of Central Government, that there is an army of potential volunteers just waiting to leap out of the wood work is misplaced. A study by Salisbury District Council some years ago revealed that there were far more people doing voluntary work than was thought and that significantly, many of them did not see their labours as 'voluntary' per se but merely getting on with living a life in a rural community.			1440
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		Preferred Option PC 16	Support					1440
360245	Mr	Landscape and	Preferred	Support	General	The AONB has considerable sympathy with the reuse of buildings			1440

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Richard BURDEN	Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB	Option PC 16		Comment	in rural areas however our concerns in connection with PC 13 also apply to PC 14. You will, I am sure, be aware of the AONB's activities to support the provision of facilities such as shops, pubs, and post offices (as set out in the AONB Management Plan) and therefore the AONB would give considerable support to PC 16. The AONB suggests that supporting the aims and objectives of the AONB would be an appropriate addition to PC 17.			
359284	Miss Lynne Evans	Consultant Southern Planning Practice	Preferred Option PC 16	Object		Whilst support to local facilities is welcomed, it needs to be recognised that not all of existing facilities can necessarily be sustained and it is therefore unreasonable as well as unhelpful to seek to apply a 'blanket' presumption against their loss. The policy needs to recognise that there may be examples where there is insufficient demand or use to support the continued existence of a local community facility. The retention of underused or even closed facilities makes no contribution to the function and health of a settlement. The policy need to take into account the current and recent use of the facility by the community; as well as alternative provision and the demand for the facility, as shown through marketing exercises.	Policy approach needs to be reconsidered.		1440
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		15.48	Support					1446
359546	Mrs K. BRADBURY	Clerk Vale of Allen Parish Council	15.50		General Comment	Why is Wimborne Minster not included as a key attraction? Surely comparable with Christchurch Priory and more prominent than the Wimborne Model Town?			1449
359636	Mr Chris BARTLETT		Preferred Option PC 17	Support					1451
360653	Mr M A Hodges		Preferred Option PC 17		General Comment	There is a need for a proper surfaced and labelled car park at St Catherines Hill Lane			1451
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society	Preferred Option PC 17		General Comment	We note the recognition of the importance of unique natural features underpinning tourism and inward investment in option PC17. We would re-iterate that this could be usefully expressed			1451

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	Number	Support /Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		for the Protection of Birds				within the Core Strategy's Vision. Growth in tourism presents a particular threat to environmental assets, not only through footfall or traffic, but through the development of facilities. There is a need to ensure that any new tourism facilities do not increase recreational pressures on European sites in option PC17. The Core Strategy must demonstrate how this will be achieved. Note that the current IPF is concerned with pressures stemming from residential development alone. Mechanisms for avoiding harm linked to tourism-related development need to be established.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	Preferred Option PC 17	Support		The Agency supports Preferred Option PC17 which seeks to encourage sustainable transport to tourist and cultural sites. Major new tourist attractions should be located in locations well served by public transport.			1451
360245	Mr Richard BURDEN	Landscape and Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB	Preferred Option PC 17	Support	General Comment	The AONB has considerable sympathy with the reuse of buildings in rural areas however our concerns in connection with PC 13 also apply to PC 14. You will, I am sure, be aware of the AONB's activities to support the provision of facilities such as shops, pubs, and post offices (as set out in the AONB Management Plan) and therefore the AONB would give considerable support to PC 16. The AONB suggests that supporting the aims and objectives of the AONB would be an appropriate addition to PC 17.			1451
361003	Mr M A Hodges	Planning Executive Highcliffe Residents Association	Preferred Option PC 17	Support		Christchurch Borough is a heritage area which lives largely by tourism, hence there must be adequate support for this vital economic activity. This includes: roads, traffic management, hospitality, heritage and environment protection. As a tourism area Christchurch has 12 Conservation Areas, 12 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 287 Listed buildings; it includes prehistoric sites like barrows, a Roman fort, Saxon burgh, Norman Castle and ancient buildings as well as more modern scheduled and listed sites including important historical defences. These heritage sites area supported by several museums and societies, as well as tourist guides walks and books and DVDs. These all add to the quality of life for residents as well as tourists. People have come to live in the area because of its beauty and lifestyle.			1451