

CS Options

Events: Core Strategy Options for Consideration – Chapter 4 The Key Strategy

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 089	4		General Comment	ETAG recommends that somewhere within this Section there should be a cross reference to the emerging Green Infrastructure policies.			202
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO27 3	4.2	Support					204
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO23 30	4.2	Object		In conflict with more housing.			204
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 110	4.2	Support		We strongly support the recognition that the need for some development should not spoil what already exists. This should apply to the built and natural environment of the District, to landscapes and ecosystems.			204
359350	Mr Jim Biggin	Chairman West Christchurch Residents Assoc & J.R.A.	CSO14 1	4.3	Object			You should address the problem created by Bournemouth having responsibility for Hengistbury Head whilst it is Christchurch that is at risk if the sea were to breach the back of the Head	Looks like comments relating to an objection.	205
483462	Mr Neil Rackley		CSO36 3	4.3		General Comment	Attractive place to live yes but to work - no jobs for me in east Dorset :-(!. "The strategy maintains and enhances these assets while meeting local needs and supporting			205

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							sustainable economic growth" Please explain how this strategy creates well paid jobs in East Dorset - most of us commute into Hampshire for these ! Employers such as Barclays have closed down Poole with the loss of 1000s of jobs.			
474971	Mr Peter Durant		CSO593	4.4	Object		Taken together, 4.3 and 4.4 illuminate the disconnect in this document between concerns expressed about the dangers of climate change, and the apparent acquiescence to what is clearly an expanding traffic problem, entailing as it does, yet more pollution, and more highway 'improvements'.	It would be helpful to have a reference to a desire to explore ways of encouraging travellers to use alternatives to the car.		206
483462	Mr Neil Rackley		CSO364	4.5	Support		Improve trains please - it's the key to long term green sustainable success. How much more prosperous would Verwood be if we had a fast train link to Southampton for example?			207
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSO18315	4.5	Object		Whilst Taylor Wimpey supports the need to review green field options around Corfe Mullen, they question the Council's decision to proceed with a consultation on options for growth, without first establishing a strategic housing requirement for the East Dorset plan area. This is at odds with the approach being consulted upon for the Christchurch plan area in the same document and is contrary to guidance within PPS12 (paragraph 4.1(2) in particular) and PPS3 (paragraph 32/33). This guidance encourages LPA's to determine such key strategic objectives before setting out how they will be delivered (PPS12, Para 4.1). The quantum of housing to be provided within the plan period is a key objective for the Core Strategy to monitor and should be 'determined taking a strategic, evidence based approach that takes into account relevant local, sub-regional, regional and national policies and strategies achieved through			207

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>widespread collaboration with stakeholders' (paragraph 32, PPS3).</p> <p>The absence of a strategic housing requirement makes it difficult for the reader to determine how the Council arrived at the conclusion that green belt land is required, why certain sites have been included, others discounted and more importantly whether these options are even sufficient to meet the plan areas requirements. Taylor Wimpey considers the provision of this evidence base is essential given the Council's own housing needs survey concluded in 2007 that the need for affordable homes alone in East Dorset was 440 dwellings per year (paragraph 2.40, Core Strategy Options Consultation – Oct 2010). This level far exceeds the affordable housing provisions that would be secured by adopting even the draft South West Plan requirement for East Dorset of 6,400 dwellings (2006-2026) or 320 per year. The Council are proposing to increase the percentage of affordable housing sought from suitable market housing sites to 40%. Even at 40% provision, the Council would need to provide around 1,100 dwellings per year to meet the affordable housing needs evident three years ago. This need was assessed before the current economic downturn, therefore there is every possibility that this need has increased and may continue to increase until a DPD is adopted to deliver suitable land for housing. This highlights the need to secure agreement and buy in to this critical issue right at the outset.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey will submit more detailed representations on these matters at subsequent consultation stages of this DPD. This will include a review of the strategic housing requirement for the East Dorset area once options and consequences are tabled by the Council. Taylor Wimpey will also be providing evidence</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							confirming the suitability of land under their control for development and SANG provision as part of the options being considered north/north west of Corfe Mullen. The following paragraph/policy specific comments are made on the current consultation document, having regard to the above context: The Council acknowledge that the 'significant housing needs of the area mean that we must consider some on greenfield land'. It is clear that a strategic housing requirement of some form has been used to arrive at this conclusion. This should be included in the previous chapters as a key objective, setting the scene for the delivery strategy that follows.			
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 456	4.8	Object		4.8 In here, DWT would like to see strategic improvements to the provision of Green Infrastructure – linked to the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Strategy.			210
360597	Mr Gordon Wheeler		CSO23 73	4.9		General Comment	Please change the order of priority to; Affordable housing Housing			211
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO23 31	4.9	Object		Should include Built Environment (heritage)			211
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 457	4.12	Object		4.12 We suggest reference to PPS9 – to protect and enhance the natural environment.			214
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO23 72	4.14	Object		70% of Christchurch is green belt, 24% is protected by nature conservation, so there are limits to growth in the Borough and thus no room for all the housing demands. Rivers and floodplains, heathland, harbour and coast all restrict space for growth. East Dorset had			216

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							railways once (Castlemain Corkscrew), road congestion shows need to reconsider rail-monorail-tram route.			
359615	Mr Burridge		CSO19 376	4.14		General Comment	I note that in the Key Strategy Chapter 4 in a box labelled Town Centre sub box Transport and Accessibility it states that "Christchurch has two main line railway stations." This is not so. Christchurch has only one main line railway station. The other is in Hampshire named Hinton Admiral but is close to the Highcliffe dormitory area. The train service at Hinton Admiral Station is less than that at Christchurch Station and the service is only local trains except at rush hours.			216
360749	Cllr. Mrs T. B. Coombs	Verwood Dewlands Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO19 403	4.14		General Comment	(Comment relates to the section on Transport and Accessibility under Key Facts) 1st bullet point in what context is ED one of only two districts - regionally/nationally?			216
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 458	4.15	Object		4.15 – 4.16 We would like to see reference to and presumption against development on sites of county importance (Sites of Nature Conservation Interest – SNCIs) also reflected in this paragraph.			218
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 459	4.16	Object		4.15 – 4.16 We would like to see reference to and presumption against development on sites of county importance (Sites of Nature Conservation Interest – SNCIs) also reflected in this paragraph.			219
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 628	4.16		General Comment	The Core Strategy must demonstrate that the level of housing supply can be accommodated without an adverse effect on the European sites. The absence of an overall target makes it currently impossible to assess with certainty possible impacts across the area and hence the			219

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							necessity for mitigation. Paragraph 4.16 recognizes the critical importance of mitigating the impact of new housing on the European sites, which is welcome. We recommend text is added highlighting the role and importance of the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework (IPF) and the forthcoming Dorset Heathlands Joint Development Plan Document (DHJDPD) here or after paragraph 4.42.			
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 535	4.17	Object		Paragraphs 4.17/4.18, page 42 - Climate Change. We consider water efficiency measures are also required to help mitigate climate change, and this should be reflected in these paragraphs. We welcome that flood risk issues are already included in this section.			220
360792	Miss Carol Evans	Planning Consultant Evans Traves	CSO18 575	4.18	Support		This paragraph states, 'Resisting development in flood risk areas reduces the risk from climate change, but could result in pressure for development in areas unaffected by flood risk...' This statement is strongly concurred with. So much of the land within Christchurch is subject to an element of flood risk that those areas outside flood risk zones will be under pressure to absorb further development possibly to the detriment of the character of the remaining urban areas. Provided that any new development can be made save and satisfy the exceptions tests of PPS25, then development in areas of flood risk should be permitted in principle.			221
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 536	4.18	Object		Paragraphs 4.17/4.18, page 42 - Climate Change. We consider water efficiency measures are also required to help mitigate climate change, and this should be reflected in these paragraphs. We welcome that flood risk issues are already included in this section.			221

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359477	Ms Natasha Mackenzie	Clerk Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council	CSO17707	4.20	Support		The key strategy to enhance modes of transport other than the car is applauded. Providing more facilities within towns like Verwood could mean more traffic staying within the town.			223
527733	Mr Richard Barnes	Chair Bournemouth Airport Transport Forum	CSO18881	4.21	Support		We absolutely support this point that sustainable access - in terms of public transport and cycling are needed to get to key employment sites out of the main conurbation - like the airport.			224
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO267	4.22	Support		It is very important for the Greenbelt to remain and prevent urban sprawl and stop individual settlements from merging into one another by the use of greenbelt separation.			225
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO2374	4.22	Object		It is silly to consider East Dorset and Christchurch together but exclude Bournemouth. Green Belt is essential for the nature of the area so housing demands will need to be met further away. This also means need for better roads and routes.			225
360597	Mr Gordon Wheeler		CSO2377	4.23	Support		There is a need for "Affordable housing" but the future building plans, if carried out will not alleviate the situation			226
496473	Mr Brian Morgan		CSO1686	4.23	Object		I disagree that there are 'substantial affordable housing needs' and / or 'great pressure to provide new houses' for the following reasons: 1. Currently I see few if any adverts for key workers (or even any) jobs, with little if any future prospect of that changing, having regard to the Coalition's recent austerity measures , taken to correct the deficit. 2. I see no analysis of your housing waiting list to show how many are key workers who need to be here – no one else needs to be here. 3. I have personal knowledge of at least one key	Deletion.		226

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							worker (teacher) who is very well qualified, and highly able, yet who has been unable to get a teaching post locally for many months now; she has a house anyway.			
497944	Mrs G Salway		CSO25 25	4.23	Object		Regarding substantial 'affordable housing needs' in West Parley. 1. Plenty of local housing stock IS available if owners were encouraged to rent out empty properties – full Council rates should be applied to empty properties. New houses not needed, also 2. No local jobs available for key workers in the area – Local Government, Teachers, Police etc all facing redundancies. Job market locally declining. 3. West Parley is several miles from local schools, Doctors etc and the community infrastructure for young families or those on benefits is not available. 4. 'Affordable housing' likely to bought up by people to rent out at high rent or as second homes. So 'housing needs' not xxx (unable to read). 5. The promised relaxation of Security of Tenure rules will further reduce need for new housing			226
498008	Mr John Salway		CSO25 48	4.23	Object		I disagree that there is a 'substantial affordable housing need and great pressure to provide new houses.' 1. I have seen few if any advertisements for key or well qualified workers in this area (e.g. newspapers, recruitment agencies, etc.) My own two sons, well qualified have moved from Dorset to obtain work and there is no expectation of them returning now or in the distant future. 2. Many large companies have withdrawn from this area, or are about to, with corresponding reduction in employment prospects, and there is little hope of this changing with the current			226

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>austerity measure, or even in the future. /this is now a large retirement area, as such most employment is in the service industries, not key workers.</p> <p>3. If council members study local estate agents list it can be seen that there is a large amount of affordable housing available at present, some empty.</p> <p>4. Where is the analysis of our housing waiting list to show how many key workers need to be here, or a shortage of such workers</p>			
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		CSO2546	4.24	Object		<p>This statement, particularly in respect of Verwood, is not supported by any data. Additionally, consultees have made comments in the section detailing proposals for Verwood and West Moors that vigorously disagree about the range and extent of ALL of the categories you list.</p>	Exclude Verwood from this paragraph or state that Verwood has much less well developed facilities.		227
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSO18423	4.25	Object		<p>The identification of Corfe Mullen as a suitable settlement to consider for additional housing development is fully supported. Corfe Mullen has wide range of services and facilities including schools, shops, supermarket, sports facilities, library, doctors surgery, dental practice, bus services and employment opportunities. Although these services and facilities are not concentrated in a single location, there are suitable locations for new housing development available in the area where a range of services and facilities are accessible to those without the use of a car.</p>	Amend the last sentence of paragraph 4.25 to read: There are a large array of facilities and services that are accessible, although it is recognised that these are not concentrated in a single location.		228
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO666	4.26	Object		<p>If we want to reduce travel to work, we must create jobs closer to where people live and they will have less need to drive to work.</p>	The economy of the two Districts is very much part of the wider South East Dorset economy. There is evidence that suggests we		229

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								should be protecting and supporting the economy by preventing the loss of existing large sites for non-employment uses, and providing a choice of new space to allow firms to expand and establish. The Bournemouth Airport Business Park and the estates within East Dorset already provide a substantial contribution to the South East Dorset Economy. It is proposed that these established locations should remain the focus for future growth as this will allow for effective business interaction, the implementation of travel plans, the capacity to provide ancillary support services and are in locations that generally will be close to residential area.		
360597	Mr Gordon Wheeler		CSO23 90	4.26	Object		Surely there is space for expansion at the present business parks dotted around Christchurch Borough without building more. Can the length of the runway at Hurn be extended? If so this would allow larger aircraft to operate and have one advantage over Southampton Airport, this would create more jobs.			229
519114	Mr Malcolm	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 870	4.26	Support		The developers of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate have, over the past 30 years,			229

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Brown						demonstrated their commitment to supporting the economy, delivering employment development, much of which has been retained as an investment. They are responsible for development at most of the established locations. One of the established locations with potential for future growth is Woolsbridge. In addition to the evidence collected by the Planning Authority, further evidence from commercial agents is that the demand for and supply of development land has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority in response to Option PC5.			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO268	4.31	Support		The Council should listen to the majority of its residents who value highly the protection of Greenbelt and who do not want land released from the Greenbelt for housing or employment purposes.			234
360597	Mr Gordon Wheeler		CSO2391	4.31	Support		The green belt needs to be guarded.			234
474426	Mr Phillip Barnes		CSO1572	4.31	Support					234
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO269	4.32	Support		Identity and separation of settlements is very important to residents and their sense of belonging to the settlement in which they live. There is also an historical reason for keeping settlements separate.			235
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17460	4.33	Object		4.33 We would have considerable concerns over proposals to undertake significant employment development at Woolsbridge due to potential impacts on the Moors River system and therefore seek a change in wording to recognise the environmental constraints.			236

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 111	4.33	Object		Object ETAG does not support the blanket proposals here for employment growth at Woolsbridge. We argue elsewhere (please see comments on Section 15 and Key Issue paper 11) that while the numbers of people employed at that site could be increased the actual development area should not be extended because of the potential for ecological damage. Any changes introduced here (and indeed any other employment sites within the Moors River system) should be directed at making improvements to the present pollution control measures.			236
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 867	4.33	Support		The potential for significant additional employment development at Woolsbridge was highlighted at the Issues and Options Consultation stage. In response to Option PC5, we are now submitting a bundle of evidence which not only shows the potential development, but also the ability of the stakeholders to deliver actual employment at this location and that the constraints initially identified have been taken into consideration and can be dealt with in a positive manner for the benefit of the economy, local residents and the environment. The opportunity would also be taken to minimise reliance on renewable energy. ".	Add in reference to Woolsbridge "the stakeholders have demonstrated an ability to deliver economic development at this significant location whilst encouraging initiatives to create sustainable development		236
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO27 4	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		I object to the final sentence on "Main Settlements" which would include options for some greenfield development. As previously stated I consider that greenfield and greenbelt areas should not be developed even on a small scale because once the precedent has been set to remove some land from greenbelt then it can happen again and again thus "chipping" away at this important land designation. One of the most important aspects			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							of greenbelt has always been their permanence.			
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO667	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		Burton and in particular Hurn should be developed into District Centres due to their closer proximity to the new employment opportunities than say land at Roeshot which cannot be developed round any existing community as it will be cut off by the A35 and railway line.			239
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO957	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		Corfe Mullen should not be classed as a main settlement. Whilst the parish has schools and a health centre, other facilities such as shops and employment are limited, and would seem to be more on a par with Colehill. Although it is near to facilities in Poole and Wimborne road links exist, public transport is very minimal in Corfe Mullen which reduces accessibility. As main settlements are to give the focus for additional development, it is not realistic to include Corfe Mullen, which with its many environmental constraints, is unlikely to be able to offer significant development. Indeed, this is reflected in Preferred Option KS 16 which appears to contradict KS1 in relation to Corfe Mullen.			239
474426	Mr Phillip Barnes		CSO1573	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		In my opinion Wimborne is already overdeveloped and the quality of life for the existing residents will suffer immensely if further large numbers of houses and other developments are built. Apart from the loss of green fields the roads in the area will not cope with any more traffic. The area around Wimborne town centre already becomes gridlocked if even one of the main roads is restricted in any way. It is very easy to equate houses and employment opportunities but in reality it doesn't work like that and people living in Wimborne will commute to other centres and vice versa leading to large			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							increases in traffic on an already overburdened infrastructure.			
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO25 53	Preferred Option KS 1	Support	General Comment	Support the identification of Verwood as a main settlement because its current population is already so large that it is one (second largest town in East Dorset). It does not yet have the vibrancy or retail space of Wimborne and Ferndown (see retail provision in 4.14). Although I would like Three Legged Cross to be a rural service centre, I do not believe that it is yet, partly because it is close to Verwood and West Moors rather than being the hub of adjacent communities in a rural area. It is hard to see how further housing development could improve its role as a provider of facilities to support the village and adjacent communities.			239
495527	Miss Caroline Green	Planner Broadway Malyan	CSO14 76	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		We support the inclusion of Sturminster Marshall within the category of Rural Service Centres – as one of the main providers for the rural areas where residential development will be allowed of a scale that reinforces their role as providers of community, leisure and retail facilities to support the village and adjacent communities. The provision of employment in these Rural Service Centres will enhance this role by supporting local villages and adjacent communities and ensure a sustainable long term future for these settlements.			239
496612	Mr and Mrs JP Lovell		CSO19 17	Preferred Option KS 1		General Comment	Using locations such as St Leonards Hospital site are ideal to build new housing estates as they already have existing roads and are covered in cement and means you don't have to use green fields.			239
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	CSO19 09	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		We agree that Hurn is listed under the category 'Village'	None		239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359295	Mrs Maria Humby	Alderholt Parish Council	CSO3123	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		Support limited development in Alderholt. The village envelope should not be extended as Alderholt does not have the infrastructure to support larger scale development.			239
360246	Mr Gavin Fauvel	Cranborne Estate	CSO17390	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		Support strongly Cranborne being identified as a provider of rural services.			239
511668	Mr Philip Chissell		CSO14380	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		<p>My first thought is that we need new housing in the country as a whole and in particular in East Dorset due to strong demand and the unaffordability for younger buyers. I believe that Wimborne is clearly the best place for this in East Dorset as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it has good facilities including a superb hospital, schools, shops, churches, doctors, cinema, public houses, sporting facilities etc - good infrastructure particularly in relation to employment facilities locally, at Ferndown and Hurn industrial areas, and Bournemouth/Poole - it is more sustainable to have concerted development within walking/cycling distance of the town centre reducing car use - it keeps housing away from more sensitive sites in East Dorset in particular heathland - it brings vitality to the town (as opposed to dormant suburbs) and may reverse the ageing demographics. 			239
359478	Mr Rohan TORKILDSEN	West Territory Planner English Heritage	CSO18560	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		<p>This is clearly an important and sensitive historic location and the impact on the significance of the historic environment appears to have been underestimated. Certainly the East Dorset Housing Options Masterplan Report (Stage 2- site specific constraints) ignores the heritage assets off Julian's Road giving a misleading impression to the reader.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the C15 Grade 1 Listed Julian's Bridge and falls partly within the</p>			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Wimborne Minster Conservation Area. The Stour valley water meadows form an important transitional characteristic feature of the town's setting and the adjacent Leaze earthworks and mound are nationally important scheduled monuments where their setting and integrity within the wider historic landscape are important considerations.</p> <p>The aforementioned Masterplan and the Housing Options document and its historic environment section provides a degree of appraisal however a more detailed assessment of the significance of the historic landscape should be undertaken to inform the capacity of this very sensitive location. We appreciate there may be an opportunity to enhance heritage assets but a convincing case for the scale and extent of development suggested has yet to be made.</p> <p>There is no consideration of the impact or suitability of a new access off Julian's Road nor the continuation of the built up frontage. No mention is made of the impact on key views to and from Julian's Bridge or the Leaze. There is a lack of consideration of either the significance of the visual transitional role (rural) to the urban fringe of the allotments or an assessment of the consequence of their relocation (to the south of Julian's road on the site of the scheduled monument?).</p> <p>At present the extent of the proposed developable area in the Core Strategy main document (WMC1 and KS1) appears rather excessive.</p>			
359529	Mrs Gill Martin	Clerk to the Council Sixpenny	CSO17969	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		Sixpenny Handley is very content with being designated as a Rural Service Centre (RSC) under the new Settlement Hierarchy (Para 4.35).			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Handley with Pentridge Parish Council					Such a designation reinforces the village's already established role of being a provider of community, leisure, cultural, retail and other service facilities that provide support for both the village and adjacent communities within the parish - and beyond. However, that said, there is nothing of significance within the content of the paper as a whole as to how this role is to be maintained and developed. This can only give the impression that it is merely a token gesture, because in reality the necessary funding is not and will not be available in the foreseeable future. Although there is a genuine need for affordable housing for local people there is also a need for balanced housing development to encourage potential business owners and contributors into the rural domain. A modest growth in population is necessary to ensure the continued functioning of services notably shops and school.			
359547	Mrs V Bright	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17 927	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		KS 1 We support the identification of Verwood as a main settlement because its current population is already so large that it is one (second largest town in East Dorset). It does not yet have the vibrancy or retail space of Wimborne and Ferndown (see retail provision in 4.14). Although we would like Three Legged Cross to be a rural service centre, we do not believe that it is yet, partly because it is close to Verwood and West Moors rather than being the hub of adjacent communities in a rural area. It is hard to see how further housing development could improve its role as a provider of facilities to support the village and adjacent communities.			239
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager	CSO17 628	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		The Agency supports a strategy which focuses development in the main settlements, with more limited development in district, suburban and			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Highways Agency					rural service centres to support local needs. This strategy is considered sound and we therefore support Preferred Option KS1.			
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19131	Preferred Option KS 1		No Opinion	Preferred option KS1 very generally identifies the focal points for development but provides absolutely no details. Consequently it is impossible to support or reject.			239
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17870	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		<p>The settlement hierarchy is flawed. It is inconsistent between the two authorities. As a result, it gives greater status in East Dorset and lower status in Christchurch. The primary concern is that Burton should be recognised as a third tier settlement after Christchurch and Highcliffe. Burton has facilities and services that already provide a sustainable solution to the village and the rural area to prevent journeys to Christchurch and beyond. This could be further reinforced if this was recognised and developed. A more detailed response on the inclusion of Burton as part of the spatial solution for the Borough is included at Appendix A.</p> <p>Appendix A reproduced below and attached:- Appendix A Burton – Core Strategy Options Representations Introduction</p> <p>Meyrick Estate Management Ltd (MEM) own and control large areas of land to the immediate south and east of Burton village and as such are a key stakeholder in any future development of the village. MEM have opened a dialogue with Burton Parish Council with a view to working with them positively to bring about development that consolidates and supports the village. They wish to engender a spirit of co operative working with the local community and help improve outcomes for the villagers. This approach is consistent with the new emphasis on community involvement in the Localism Bill.</p>			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Core Strategy Opportunity The purpose of the Core Strategy is to identify and shape the spatial strategy for the Borough. PPS12 advises that core strategies may allocate strategic sites for development. These should be those sites considered central to achievement of the strategy. MEM believe that a strategy for the future of Burton is an essential part of the spatial strategy for the Borough. In the current options the key spatial requirements for Burton are not adequately addressed. The allocation of a site [for new housing] at Burton is central to achieving the Core Strategy vision if Burton is properly recognised in the settlement hierarchy and acknowledged for a moderate amount of development commensurate with the village size and needs.</p> <p>In addition Burton is likely to be affected by the adjacent site for sand and gravel extraction. This is a significant part of the spatial planning for the Borough and should be acknowledged despite the fact that Minerals Planning is dealt with by a separate authority. The purpose of Core Strategies is to deal comprehensively with all plans and programmes for an area. The post extraction restoration could play an important part in the green infrastructure strategy for the Borough.</p> <p>MEM are at an early stage in their thinking on how the village requirements might be met and are considering what technical evidence is required. It is suggested that this is produced in partnership with the local community and the Borough Council to underpin the broad concept and understand the capacity considerations with regard to issues of transport, flooding, ecology and biodiversity, landscape impact and viability.</p> <p>Burton Profile Burton is a free standing village that enjoys a degree of physical separation and a separate</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>identity from the Christchurch urban area despite its relative proximity. This is reinforced by the railway embankment carrying the main railway line service to Bournemouth which creates a strong physical barrier between the town and the village. This is acknowledged in the 2003 Borough –wide landscape strategy: “The area is visually enclosed by the dominant railway embankment to the south and the rising ground and woodland to the east.” Unlike other green belt designations where small settlements are washed over by green belt Burton village is excluded from the green belt designation. This has served to concentrate redevelopment of existing plots within the village and created pockets of dense development that have begun to alter the existing rural character and quality of the village. The village has a linear form constrained by the River Avon to the west and open farmland to the east. To the north lies the village of Winkton which remains (and should remain) physically separate from Burton. To the south of the village the boundary is less well defined and it is in this area that MEM believes there is scope for a moderate amount of development. Parish Concerns It is understood that Burton Parish Council have made representations to Christchurch Borough Core Strategy Options. The initial contact with the Parish Council has flagged up the following concerns. These are in no particular order but represent those issues felt to be of major concern. Current</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of Village Hall – no venue to contain village functions, leads to unsustainable use of remote facilities • Difficulty of achieving affordable housing secured in perpetuity for Burton residents as an 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>exception site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redevelopment of existing dwellings within the village at higher densities and subsequent reduction in environmental quality • Revenue costs for maintaining existing open spaces cannot be met through Parish precept, equipped play areas are in need of investment <p>Future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over traffic associated with potential Minerals working • Concern over traffic impact from Roeshot Hill urban extension • Concern that all services will be stretched as a result of Roeshot Hill Urban Extension • Opposition to incursion into the Green Belt • Wish to retain policy L11 from the Local Plan – which relates to public open space <p>Settlement Hierarchy</p> <p>Burton is the third largest settlement in the Borough after Christchurch and in this respect it should be described as a third tier settlement in the hierarchy.</p> <p>It has a range of services including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • primary school • pre-school playgroup • day nursery • a medical practice • two shops • two pubs • St Luke's Church Hall • United Reform Church and Hall. <p>These all help the village to enjoy a degree of self containment, although most residents will travel out of the village for employment and major services, but this is also the case with the main settlement Christchurch.</p> <p>Planning for Change</p> <p>MEM believe a comprehensive approach to the future of Burton is required to sustain the village to 2027. The village is likely to be affected by the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>following significant changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing housing affordability issues • Increasing pressure on revenue availability for maintenance of open spaces • Viability of local services for example schools, village shop, pubs due to increasing competition in less sustainable forms elsewhere • Visual and physical effects from sand and gravel working adjacent to the east • Increased pressure on recreation routes and areas as a result of new populations at Roeshot Hill • Increased demand and supply of local renewable energy production • New employment patterns that do not exist today • New travel patterns and journey demands <p>The Core Strategy and subsequent more detailed plans provide the opportunity to address the above issues and create viability to become a more self –sustaining centre.</p> <p>Opportunities</p> <p>Development of housing of a moderately sized site will help to facilitate the following potential solutions to issues raised by the Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site for a Village Hall • Affordable Housing to meet some of the increasing demand • Reduce pressure on existing developed area of village – designate character/ density zones? • Comprehensive open space, green infrastructure and possibility for countryside access and recreation • Comprehensive solution for relocated and new allotments • Renewable Energy Provision • Comprehensive post extraction solution to sand and gravel working <p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>The Parish Council have not been able to</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>progress a rural exception site for affordable housing for a considerable period. It is not clear what the barrier to delivery is.</p> <p>Affordable housing need within the Borough is acute, and this situation masks the hidden need of those not on the housing register. The recent tightening of availability of mortgage finance from the banks and building societies has meant that demand for intermediate housing is increasingly significantly and is outstripping supply.</p> <p>It is understood that the Borough Council are to refresh housing needs information throughout the life of the Core Strategy and will also update the SHLAA. The changed circumstances in mortgage finance needs to be factored in to affordable need considerations. Likewise the resistance to further intensification within the existing village will need to be reflected in the consideration of available sites within the SHLAA. What is clear is that rural exceptions sites alone will not meet demand in the village; further work is required to establish both need and capacity, once complete the quantum of development appropriate to the village can be established.</p> <p>Sustainability</p> <p>Burton is an inherently sustainable settlement. With a population of over 4000 in the parish the services of Burton for most daily needs are met within the village. Primarily this is met by the Preschool and day nursery, primary school, medical centre and village shops. Higher order facilities and employment will normally require travel to a larger centre but with changing work and shopping patterns facilitated by the internet, this is becoming increasingly less so and will continue to change for the period to 2027. There will be acceleration in new technologies that reduce travel demand.</p> <p>Flooding</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Parts of the village are subject to Flood Zone 2 and 3a but the Parish Council have not recognised flooding events as a particular problem. The development of a moderate sized site as indicated would need to deal with flooding issues through a flood risk assessment. There are opportunities to reduce flood risk potential as a result of improved drainage systems to existing residents as well as new residents. This opportunity is not likely to be available without development due to funding constraints.</p> <p>Green Belt</p> <p>The Core Strategy Options document has recognised that the extent of constraints on the urban area must be addressed by green belt change to facilitate development. This view is supported.</p> <p>In considering green belt change at Burton it is worth considering the fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy which is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The most important attribute of green belts is their openness.</p> <p>MEM believe that in order to achieve long term solutions that retain the character and quality and viability of Burton it is necessary to remove some land from the green belt. Subject to further more detailed assessment of landscape impact the development of an area south of Burton village to the rear of Medlar Close, Alder Close, Gordon Way, Burton Close, and Sandy Plot would not harm the open character of the green belt in this location given the exposed nature and urbanising effect of the current development.</p> <p>The area here could be more effectively 'rounded off' and with a well planned comprehensive scheme offer a much better landscape buffer than the currently exposed urban sprawl. The open land between this area and the railway embankment is the critical parcel</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>of land that creates the feeling of openness. This area gives a distinct open buffer and coupled with the railway embankment this prevents the coalescence with the urban area of Christchurch and allows Burton to remain as a free standing settlement.</p> <p>The revision by the Secretary of State to the 1980 South East Dorset Structure Plan to the green belt policy set out its purposes as being:</p> <p>a. To protect the separate physical identity of individual settlements in the area by maintaining wedges and corridors of open land between them</p> <p>b. To maintain an area of open land around the conurbation</p> <p>Both of these purposes would remain intact with the moderate level of development and green belt change envisaged.</p> <p>What has not occurred that the 1980 Structure Plan envisaged was that the Green Belt would provide for suitable forms of countryside recreation easily accessible to large numbers of people. Formal designation and laying out of open space as the result of development will give better access to countryside recreation. This would be secured through the necessary SANG provision and open space requirements to support development. Green Belt designation alone has not achieved this.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <p>As part of the preparation of a Core Strategy advice in PPS12 suggests that a comprehensive approach to green infrastructure is an integral part of the spatial planning of the area.</p> <p>There are a number of issues that should be addressed as part of the spatial planning of the Borough but of particular relevance to Burton and its rural setting are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to countryside recreation through open space networks –opportunities to link to the New 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Forest along old Lyndhurst Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing pressure on Burton Common SSSI • SANG provision to mitigate harm to heathland habitats as a result of development • Mitigation during extraction and post extraction restoration of sand and gravel workings to the east of the village • Opportunities to link to wider networks – Avon Valley, Mude Valley, the Chewton Vision area and coastal footpaths <p>Suggested Revisions to Core Strategy Review KS1 to reconsider Burton's place in the settlement hierarchy. Burton should become a third tier settlement. As the Borough is looking at housing allocation independent of East Dorset the hierarchy should equally be independent of East Dorset. As currently presented the lower order East Dorset settlements take on a higher status.</p> <p>Suggested new policy to set out spatial strategy that seeks major development in and adjacent to Christchurch urban area and moderate development within Burton to support viability of village and create a more self sustained settlement.</p> <p>Suggested Core Strategy Policy Burton is identified as a third tier settlement and as such should accommodate a moderate amount of development commensurate with the village size and needs in order to support the viability of the existing village services and support additional facilities to allow it to become more self sufficient for day to day needs. This will be achieved through a limited green belt release for residential development, located so as not to harm the rural setting of the village. Any development in the village should support the following: provision of a new village hall, affordable housing for local residents, and improvements to green infrastructure and</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>recreation opportunities (possibly including SANG and allotments), improvements to drainage and renewable energy supply and improved travel planning to serve the needs of new residents.</p> <p>Village Character Zones</p> <p>The problem identified by the Parish Council with regard to inappropriate intensification of development is reiterated in the area Profile (CBC October 2010)</p> <p>"Infilling or other further intensification of the housing within Burton would continue to erode the basic village character of the settlement to the general detriment of the existing residential amenity."</p> <p>Given one of the key of purposes of planning control is to protect residential amenity it must fall on the Borough to seek a solution to this issue. If sufficient land is allocated for development to meet the needs and aspirations of the community this can be avoided.</p> <p>Furthermore, the designation of character zones identified within the village can be used to protect character and maintain development at appropriate densities. This more detailed level of control is beyond the scope of the core strategy; however the means to providing the solution by allocating sufficient land for development is appropriately within the scope of the Core Strategy and must be addressed.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The Borough Council need to consider if the Core Strategy as currently drafted is allowing sufficient support for development of the village community to meets its aspirations to 2027 to increase its viability as a self-sustaining settlement and adapt to changes to life patterns which are accelerating. The currently worded options for the Core Strategy do not sufficiently recognise the spatial needs of this settlement.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>PPS12, which guides the development of the Core Strategy, is clear that it should provide a robust basis for making bids for funds and assembling land for projects. It also needs to be realistic in accepting the changes that will result from mineral working and the development of the urban extension at Roeshot Hill that must be positively managed for the community.</p> <p>MEM believe that Burton can accept a moderate amount of development which will help sustain and deliver significant benefits to the village. A well designed and sensitively located development will not harm the purpose of the green belt designation, and can provide an exemplar of sustainable development practice whilst providing significant benefits for the local community including meeting local affordable housing need which might otherwise not be met.</p> <p>MEM consider a moderate development at Burton as complementary to Roeshot urban extension and a necessary part of housing delivery given the pressures on land supply set out in the MEM representations with regard to policies KS7-11.</p>			
533620	Ms Carolyn Wilson	Senior Planner Mono Consultants Limited	CSO19151	Preferred Option KS 1		General Comment	<p>We have no comments to make in respect of the issues and options for the Core Strategy as we understand that this is a strategic document. We would take this opportunity however to comment that we consider it important that there remains in place a telecommunications policy within the emerging Local Development Framework. It is recognised that telecommunications plays a vital role in both the economic and social fabric of communities. National guidance recognises this through PPG8, which provides clear guidance as to the main issues surrounding telecommunications development. These include the legislative framework, siting and design issues, levels of consultation and issues</p>			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>surrounding electromagnetic fields (EMFs). Clear guidance is also given regarding what should be included within local plan (now LDD) policy. This guidance states that local plans (LDDs) should set out criteria based policies to guide telecommunications development and that whilst regard should be had to siting and design considerations, operational efficiency should not be inhibited. PPG8 also makes clear that "Criteria should be flexible enough to allow for the efficient development of the network and the demands imposed by the technology". Since the revision of PPG8 in 2001, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) has produced, in conjunction with the industry, a Code of Best Practice. This builds on the Ten Commitments to ensure that the industry is alive to the concerns of local communities and consultation is built into the development process.</p> <p>As indicated above the formulation of policy does not exist in isolation and there are numerous documents which will affect the formulation of any telecommunications policy, the most important of these being PPG8. On this basis we would suggest that within the Local Development Framework there should be a concise and flexible telecommunications policy contained within one of the Council's statutory Local Development Document. We recognise that this is likely to be contained in a Development Control/Management DPD rather than the Core Strategy which is of a strategic nature. Such a policy should give all stakeholders a clear indication of the issues which development will be assessed against. We would suggest a policy which reads;</p> <p>Proposals for telecommunications development will be permitted provided that the following criteria are met: -</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>(i) the siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area;</p> <p>(ii) if on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and designed in order to seek to minimise impact to the external appearance of the host building;</p> <p>(iii) if proposing a new mast, it should be demonstrated that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other structures. Such evidence should accompany any application made to the (local) planning authority.</p> <p>(iv) If proposing development in a sensitive area, the development should not have an unacceptable effect on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest.</p> <p>When considering applications for telecommunications development, the (local) planning authority will have regard to the operational requirements of telecommunications networks and the technical limitations of the technology.</p> <p>It will of course depend on your Local Development Scheme as to which documents are produced, which documents have a statutory role in development control and which would be considered as material considerations. We would suggest that this policy be a stand alone policy within one of the main LDDs, with any back ground information, such as electromagnetic fields (EMFs) and public health, being contained within a separate LDD or what is currently termed Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). This could then be read with PPG8, the Code of Best Practice to give a comprehensive</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>background to any proposed development. We would consider it appropriate to introduce the policy and we would suggest the following; Modern telecommunications systems have grown rapidly in recent years with more than two thirds of the population now owning a mobile phone. Mobile communications are now considered an integral part of the success of most business operations and individual lifestyles. With new services such as the advanced third generation (3G) services, demand for new telecommunications infrastructure is continuing to grow. The Council are keen to facilitate this expansion whilst at the same time minimising any environmental impacts. It is our policy to reduce the proliferation of new masts by encouraging mast sharing and location on existing tall structures and buildings. Further information on telecommunications can be found in Local Development Document.....</p> <p>In summary, we recognise the early stage of LDFs and the early stage of the consultation process at which we are being asked for comment. We are suggesting that a clear and flexible telecommunications policy be introduced in one of the main LDDs. This should be introduced by a short paragraph outlining the development pressures and the Councils policy aims. We have suggested text for both above. In keeping with the aims and objectives of the new legislation any background information should be contained within a separate LDD which would not need to go through the same consultation process.</p>			
360744	Cllr. Mr P. G. Bennett	Stour Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO19 385	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		There was general support for the promotion of local shops and facilities in the village but provide that development in the text is confined in its meaning to the provision of shops and			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							similar facilities appropriate to a village environment.(Reflecting views expressed at a public meeting in Sturminster Marshall about the Core Strategy Consultation)			
361211	Miss Rachael Bust	Deputy Head of Planning The Coal Authority	CSO19 412	Preferred Option KS 1	Support	General Comment	Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above. Having reviewed the document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.			239
507525	Mr David Lander	Boyer Planning Ltd	CSO19 042	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		3.1.1 The preferred option settlement hierarchy is supported. It will ensure that the main settlements will be the focus for the majority of new development. Because there are four settlements targeted for growth, the ability to spread development will reduce the risks to delivery. This is consistent with the thrust of national policy outlined in Section Two. Under this approach smaller settlements will receive lesser development at an appropriate level for the size of the settlement. 3.1.2 It is considered that the chosen approach will best enable the Councils to achieve the Government's objective as set out in PPS3 of ensuring 'that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live' (Para. 9).			239
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	CSO18 341	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		Preferred Option KS1 – Settlement Hierarchy We are supportive of Christchurch being identified as a main settlement within the settlement hierarchy which, if the Core Strategy is adopted, will be used to guide the form and location of development. However, and for this reason, given the reliance on the release of land at Roeshot Hill for housing development as a principal component part of the overall spatial approach to meeting housing needs should be recognised in a Core Strategy policy which			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							acknowledges the plan for this strategic site as an integral part of the proposals for Christchurch Borough alongside the other strands of strategic development delivery.			
519096	Mr Damien Holdstock	Entec UK Ltd	CSO19134	Preferred Option KS 1		General Comment	<p>Overview – National Grid</p> <p>National Grid is a leading international energy infrastructure business. In the UK National Grid's business includes electricity and gas transmission networks and gas distribution networks as described below.</p> <p>Electricity Transmission</p> <p>National Grid, as the holder of a licence to transmit electricity under the Electricity Act 1989, has a statutory duty to develop and maintain an efficient, co-ordinated and economical transmission system of electricity and to facilitate competition in the supply and generation of electricity.</p> <p>National Grid operates the national electricity transmission network across Great Britain and owns and maintains the network in England and Wales, providing electricity supplies from generating stations to local distribution companies. We do not distribute electricity to individual premises ourselves, but our role in the wholesale market is key to ensuring a reliable and quality supply to all. National Grid's high voltage electricity system, which operates at 400,000 and 275,000 volts, is made up of approximately 22,000 pylons with an overhead line route length of 4,500 miles, 420 miles of underground cable and 337 substations.</p> <p>Separate regional companies own and operate the electricity distribution networks that comprise overhead lines and cables at 132,000 volts and below. It is the role of these local distribution companies to distribute electricity to homes and businesses.</p> <p>To facilitate competition in the supply and</p>			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>generation of electricity, National Grid must offer a connection to any proposed generator, major industry or distribution network operator who wishes to generate electricity or requires a high voltage electricity supply. Often proposals for new electricity projects involve transmission reinforcements remote from the generating site, such as new overhead lines or new development at substations. If there are significant demand increases across a local distribution electricity network area then the local network distribution operator may seek reinforcements at an existing substation or a new grid supply point. In addition National Grid may undertake development works at its existing substations to meet changing patterns of generation and supply.</p> <p>Gas Transmission</p> <p>National Grid owns and operates the high pressure gas transmission system in England, Scotland and Wales that consists of approximately 4,300 miles of pipelines and 26 compressor stations connecting to 8 distribution networks. National Grid has a duty to develop and maintain an efficient co-ordinated and economical transmission system for the conveyance of gas and respond to requests for new gas supplies in certain circumstances.</p> <p>New gas transmission infrastructure developments (pipelines and associated installations) are periodically required to meet increases in demand and changes in patterns of supply. Developments to our network are as a result of specific connection requests e.g. power stations, and requests for additional capacity on our network from gas shippers. Generally network developments to provide supplies to the local gas distribution network are as a result of overall demand growth in a region rather than site specific developments.</p> <p>Gas Distribution</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>National Grid also owns and operates approximately 82,000 miles of lower-pressure distribution gas mains in the north west of England, the west Midlands, east of England and north London – almost half of Britain's gas distribution network, delivering gas to around 11 million homes, offices and factories. National Grid does not supply gas, but provides the networks through which it flows. Reinforcements and developments of our local distribution network generally are as a result of overall demand growth in a region rather than site specific developments. A competitive market operates for the connection of new developments.</p> <p>National Grid and Local Development Plan Documents</p> <p>The Energy White Paper makes clear that UK energy systems will undergo a significant change over the next 20 years. To meet the goals of the white paper it will be necessary to revise and update much of the UK's energy infrastructure during this period. There will be a requirement for:</p> <p>An expansion of national infrastructure (e.g. overhead power lines, underground cables, extending substations, new gas pipelines and associated installations).</p> <p>New forms of infrastructure (e.g. smaller scale distributed generation, gas storage sites).</p> <p>Our gas and electricity infrastructure is sited across the country and many stakeholders and communities have an interest in our activities. We believe our long-term success is based on having a constructive and sustainable relationship with our stakeholders. Our transmission pipelines and overhead lines were originally routed in consultation with local planning authorities and designed to avoid major development areas but since installation much</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>development may have taken place near our routes.</p> <p>We therefore wish to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of Development Plan Documents (DPDs) which may affect our assets including policies and plans relating to the following issues:</p> <p>Any policies relating to overhead transmission lines, underground cables or gas pipeline installations♣</p> <p>Site specific allocations/land use policies affecting sites crossed by overhead lines, underground cables or gas transmission♣ pipelines</p> <p>Land use policies/development proposed adjacent to existing high voltage electricity substation sites and gas above ground♣ installations</p> <p>Any policies relating to the diverting or undergrounding of overhead transmission lines♣</p> <p>Other policies relating to infrastructure or utility provision♣</p> <p>Policies relating to development in the countryside♣</p> <p>Landscape policies♣</p> <p>Waste and mineral plans♣</p> <p>In addition, we also want to be consulted by developers and local authorities on planning applications, which may affect our assets and are happy to provide pre-application advice. Our aim in this is to ensure that the safe and secure transportation of electricity and gas is not compromised.</p> <p>National Grid infrastructure within East Dorset District Council's administrative area Electricity Transmission National Grid's high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines / underground cables within East Dorset District Council's administrative area</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>that form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales include the following:</p> <p>4VN line – 400kV route from Chickerell substation in West Dorset to Mannington substation in East Dorset♣</p> <p>4YB line – 400kV route from Mannington substation in East Dorset to Nursling substation in Test Valley♣</p> <p>The following substations are also located within the administrative area of East Dorset District Council:</p> <p>Mannington substation – 400kV♣</p> <p>National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity transmission assets via the following internet link: http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/GasElectricNW Gas Transmission</p> <p>National Grid has the following gas transmission assets located within the administrative area of East Dorset District Council: Pipeline Feeder Detail 2308 7 Feeder Barton Stacey / Mappowder</p> <p>National Grid has provided information in relation to gas transmission assets via the following internet link: http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/GasElectricNW Gas Distribution</p> <p>Southern Gas Networks owns and operates the local gas distribution network in the East Dorset area. Contact details for Southern Gas Networks can be found on the Energy Networks website at www.energynetworks.org</p> <p>National Grid infrastructure within Christchurch Borough Council's administrative area National Grid has no electricity or gas transmission assets within Christchurch Borough Council's administrative area.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Southern Gas Networks owns and operates the local gas distribution network in the Christchurch Borough Council area. Contact details for Southern Gas Networks can be found on the Energy Networks website at www.energynetworks.org</p> <p>Further Advice National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us. In addition the following publications are available from the National Grid website or by contacting us at the address below:</p> <p>National Grid's commitments when undertaking works in the UK – Our stakeholder, community and amenity policy♣</p> <p>Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure Gas Pipelines and Associated Installations♣ – Requirements for Third Parties</p> <p>A sense of place – Design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines♣</p>			
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		CSO17702	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		<p>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</p>			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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?</p> <p>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 for Education</p> <p>Whilst all of the First and Middle School requirements can be accommodated within Wimborne and Colehill, 40% of the Upper School requirements require travel along or over the A31. (i.e. Ferndown or Corfe Hills)</p> <p>All of the Colleges of Further Education, or Universities, are situated in Poole, Bournemouth, or outside of area necessitating travel either along or over the A31.</p> <p>Most or all of these Institutions can be accessed via public, or private hire transport, but in the case of travel time to Bournemouth and Poole journey times are long and convoluted, and many require bus changes to get to appropriate destinations. Journeys are far quicker and much more convenient using personal transport. (see</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Seats of Learning attached 20) Travel for Shopping Most daily shopping requirements can be fulfilled within Wimborne and Colehill, but weekly shopping requirements vary dependent on ones loyalty to a particular Supermarket Brand. Therefore travel to Ferndown, Poole or Bournemouth by accessing or crossing the A31 is highly likely. It should also be recognised that many residents have their groceries delivered from Poole or Ferndown, where it is necessary for delivery transport to access or cross the A31. For larger purchases and greater choice of items such as Branded Clothing, Furniture, Electrical Goods, Computers, Mobile Phones, DIY requirements etc, people generally shop in the larger Retail Centres in Poole and Bournemouth, and perhaps as wide afield as Southampton, all of which requires access to or crossing of the A31. Wimborne and Colehill only have one garden Centre, others being located at Stapehill, Longham and Merley, they also require access to, or crossing of, the A31 Travel for Hospital Minor health ailments can be addressed and treated locally in Wimborne, but more serious cases are dealt with in Bournemouth, Poole or Southampton Hospitals. Again these require access to, or over, the A31, by both patients and visitors alike. Travel for Leisure Most sedentary leisure pursuits can be accomplished in Wimborne or Colehill, but more active past times such as Sailing, Camping, Bathing, Surfing, Canoeing, Safe Cycling, Concerts, Shows, Exhibitions, Rambling, Holidays, Motor Sports, Tourist Attractions etc, are out of area and require travel either East,</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>West or South and most engage the A31 in one way or another.</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 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.</p> <p>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>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<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? 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</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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 solution⁸ 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	ID	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?</p> <p>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>			
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	CSO17961	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		<p>LOCATION, SCALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>The proposed urban extensions are located at the main settlements identified in Preferred Option KS1. In this respect it is accepted that Christchurch, Ferndown, Wimborne and Verwood are the principal settlements within the CS plan area and that Corfe Mullen is a settlement that is physically attached to the main south east Dorset conurbation.</p> <p>However, West Parley appears to be a much smaller settlement; more akin to a suburban area such as Colehill, St. Leonard's and St. Ives. Preferred Option KS1 should therefore be amended, with West Parley re-classified. This may have consequences for any potential development allocation at that location.</p>	Re-classify West Parley within KS1 as a suburban centre.		239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359284	Miss Lynne Evans	Consultant Southern Planning Practice	CSO18 403	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		Objection is raised to the omission of Longham in the settlement hierarchy. In the existing Local Plan it has a settlement boundary and the discussion with your officers confirmed that its exclusion from the settlement hierarchy under KS1 is in fact an omission and it is intended that the settlement should continue to be included as a village. We would support and request its re-inclusion in the hierarchy - there is no valid reason to exclude it. With regard to the form of development permitted in villages the policy should make it clear that residential and other forms of development will be permitted which are of a scale appropriate to the size of the village and which will assist in supporting the function of the settlement. The current wording is not sufficiently clear.	a) Inclusion of Longham in the list of villages. b) Reword the policy wording in respect of villages to make it clear that residential development and other development will be permitted which is appropriate in scale to the settlement and which will assist in supporting the function of the settlement.		239
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSO18 317	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		Taylor Wimpey supports the inclusion of Corfe Mullen in the list of 'Main Settlements' within this hierarchy. This builds upon the evidence base that led the draft South West Plan including a search area for growth north/west of Corfe Mullen.			239
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSO18 428	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		The identification of Corfe Mullen as a main settlement within the settlement hierarchy set out in Preferred Option KS1 is fully supported. Corfe Mullen has wide range of services and facilities including schools, shops, supermarket, sports facilities, library, doctors surgery, dental practice, bus services and employment opportunities.			239
523627	Rachel Robinson	WYG Planning & Design	CSO18 437	Preferred Option KS 1	Support	General Comment	We support your Preferred Option KS 1 relating to the overall spatial strategy for development in Christchurch and East Dorset and in particular the major focus for development within the identified main settlements of Christchurch,			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Wimborne Minster, Ferndown and West Parley, Verwood and Corfe Mullen.			
523893	Lindsay Thompson	Terence O'Rourke Ltd	CSO18 443	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		We support the key strategy where it identifies suitable settlements to accommodate residential growth. In particularly the identification of Wimborne which has suitable facilities and services to accommodate further growth. However, we believe that the key strategy needs to be realistic in regard to the green belt and note that the green belt boundaries around these identified settlements will need to be reviewed to accommodate growth.			239
359286	Mr Andrew PATRICK	Pro Vision Planning and Design	CSO19 414	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		<p>In essence our concern is that KS1 does not allow for the development of a new "Eco Village" on Previously Developed land at Little Canford Depot, if the community were to decide that such an idea should be pursued. If that were to be the case, then a Core Strategy which incorporates KS1 would prove to be unsound in this respect, for reasons which we outline below.</p> <p>Option KS1 1.5 Option KS1 identifies a settlement hierarchy comprising, in order of priority, Main Settlements, District Centres, Suburban Centres, Rural Service Villages, Villages, and Hamlets. Little Canford is not identified as a Rural Service Village or Village, and is thus identified as a hamlet. Hamlets are described by KS1 as "Settlements where development would not be allowed unless it was functionally required to be in the rural area." Why KS1 is "unsound" in respect of Little Canford 1.6 PPS12 advises that to be sound a Core Strategy must, amongst other criteria, be the most appropriate strategy when considered against</p>	If, following further consultation, the community decided that an Eco-Village at Little Canford would positively help achieve community aims and aspirations, then this Previously Developed site would need to be Allocated for such.		239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the reasonable alternatives. We would like to suggest that KS1 is not the most appropriate strategy for Little Canford, for two reasons.</p> <p>1.7 Firstly, in general terms, by focussing entirely on the existing settlement pattern, it misses any opportunities to identify any potential for new and creative settlement ideas, particularly with regard to large sites comprising Previously Developed Land in the open countryside / Green Belt.</p> <p>1.8 Paragraphs 3.17 – 3.19 of the Core Strategy Options document identify and explain that the top key issues emerging from the previous round of community consultation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing and safeguarding the natural and built environment and heritage • Creating sustainable economic growth, and • Providing appropriate homes for all. <p>The community should thus be given the opportunity to consider creative new ideas which may help further those aims and objectives.</p> <p>1.9 Secondly, in particular, we do not consider that on balance KS1 is the most appropriate strategy for Little Canford Depot. The attached document "Development Opportunities at Little Canford" explains that this large Previously Developed site will have to be redeveloped in one form or another during the plan period. In the light of reasonable alternatives, leaving it washed over by the Green Belt is not the most appropriate strategy to enable such redevelopment to make the best contribution towards community aims and objects. Thus it would appear to us that KS 1 is unsound in respect of Little Canford Depot.</p>			
524088	Mr Ken	Ken Parke Planning	CSO18 454	Preferred Option KS	Object		The principles of the key strategy are supported in terms of establishing a settlement hierarchy			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Parke	Consultants		1			<p>and determining the broad locations for future housing development.</p> <p>7.2.1.2 The major concern with this element of the strategy is that preferred option KS1 defines Colehill as a suburban centre with no existing centre where only limited residential development will be permitted along with community, leisure and retail facilities to meet the day to day needs of the existing urban area.</p> <p>7.2.1.3 The strategy acknowledges that Colehill has limited facilities and it is accepted that the residents rely on Wimborne town centre to meet their needs. It is highly unlikely that additional community, leisure or retail facilities will be provided in isolation within this suburban area. Also, the Wimborne and Colehill overview document sets out a range of issues and problems which Colehill is experiencing, similar to those of Wimborne, which will not be able to be addressed by the current definition in the hierarchy attributed to Colehill.</p> <p>7.2.1.4 The opportunity arises, through the promotion of the subject land, to provide additional housing immediately contiguous to Colehill which will allow for the provision of additional community facilities in the form of a village square and centre to provide both for the needs of the additional households and also for the existing community.</p> <p>7.2.1.5 The purpose of the Key Strategy is stated as 'establishing a settlement hierarchy to help direct the type and scale of development throughout the area in a manner appropriate to the size and function of the settlement'. It seems that the identification of Colehill as a suburban centre, even though it is of a certain size, will not enable development of a scale appropriate to its size. It seems inappropriate to me that those areas identified as rural service centres will be able to have development to support the village</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							and adjacent communities whereas the identification of Colehill as a suburban centre limits its ability to provide for its identified need. 7.2.1.6 This problem can easily be rectified by including Colehill within the definition of major settlements as part of Wimborne Minster. There is no need to change the title or reference of the settlement throughout the plan to 'Wimborne and Colehill' but simply to identify these as one settlement referred to as Wimborne. It is commonplace and usual for many towns to consist of an historic centre and a number of suburban areas, each of which may still be readily recognised and have its own identity, local area centre and name, but yet is still within the umbrella name of the larger or key settlement.			
524495	Mr Stanley Jackson		CSO18 607	Preferred Option KS 1		General Comment	If money were no object I feel that a new town would be the best solution to housing needs in East Dorset but realistically we will probably have to settle for Key Strategy 1.			239
524723	Mr John Worth	Chair Wimborne Civic Society	CSO18 728	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		If money were no object we feel that a new town might be the best solution to housing needs in East Dorset, but realistically we will have to settle for Key Strategy 1 (4.35, the settlement hierarchy). One of the cardinal benefits of living in East Dorset is ready access to beautiful and largely unspoilt landscape.			239
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 834	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		We do not object to the principle of a settlement hierarchy. However, the Local Authority's consideration seems to be confined to those settlements where certain facilities already exist and fails to have regard to the potential for enhancing existing settlements, in particular Longham. Longham is considered in the Options for Ferndown and West Parley Chapter of the Plan. Preferred Option FWP1 shows an area of	Longham should be moved from the Green Belt and included as a rural service centre within this Option.		239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							land to the south of Parley Common. The document considers land further to the south west, up to the junction of the A348 Ringwood Road with Christchurch Road. It ignores the obvious potential of land to the west of Ringwood Road, which is under-used and which has recently seen infrastructure enhanced by the provision of additional foul sewerage, including a pumping station. It ignores the potential for creating a more sustainable community to the west of Ringwood Road. Haskins Garden Centre already provides a significant retail facility and there are other community facilities. I therefore propose that Longham be added to the list of villages as a rural service centre. Suggested Amendment to the Option, Paragraph or Table Longham should be moved from the Green Belt and included as a rural service centre within this Option.			
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18865	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		Whilst the principle of Option KS1 is supported, there are circumstances which make it imperative that there are exceptions to this policy. The principal exception relates to the location of employment development, which in some cases will be fairly significant. There are few opportunities for providing new employment development within or on the fringes of the settlements listed in Preferred Option KS1. The clearest example of course is Bournemouth Airport. Here is the largest single allocation of employment land in the County, outside of any settlement. I feel therefore that there needs to be a paragraph within the policy, similar to that at the end of Preferred Option KS2. This could be quite specific in referring to the expansion of high quality sites offering the necessary locational attributes to attract higher order uses. This would be consistent with Preferred Option PC1.	Amend the first line of the Preferred Option to inset after "should" and before "conform" the words "for the most part". This amendment would provide greater certainty with regard to the delivery of economic development and increasing prosperity. It would also provide clarity. Add a paragraph to the effect that exceptionally employment development shall now be permitted adjoining existing major developed employment sites at Bournemouth		239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								Airport and Woolsbridge.		
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 918	Preferred Option KS 1	Object		<p>This is a qualified objection. We do not object to the principle of a settlement hierarchy. However, the Local Authority's consideration seems to have been confined to those settlements where a certain range of facilities already exist and fails to have regard to the potential for improving the sustainability of other settlements in the District. In this context, the settlement of Furzehill is unique in the District, having a limited number of houses but a substantial employer in terms of the District Council. A settlement extension to include residential development would redress the current imbalance between employment and homes.</p> <p>It is noted that the Areas of Search for housing at Wimborne fall just short of Furzehill and pay no regard to the proximity of a substantial employer. In our view, the boundary of the Area of Search was arbitrary and has resulted in looking at sites which abut the existing urban area of Wimborne rather than looking at sustainability in the round.</p>	When the Local Planning Authority have determined the amount of housing land required over the Plan period, consideration should be given to distributing those allocations in such a way as not only to build upon existing large settlements but also to enhance the sustainability of smaller settlements, in particular Furzehill. Since Furzehill already acts as a district wide service centre, consideration should be given to including Furzehill within the rural services centre in Option KS1.		239
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO18 983	Preferred Option KS 1	Support		<p>Chapter 4 The Key Strategy Preferred Option KS 1 Settlement hierarchy</p> <p>The suggested settlement hierarchy is supported. Development should be focussed in sustainable locations where it can improve the self containment of a settlement and reduce the need to travel by car.</p>			239
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22 866	Preferred Option KS 1		General Comment	<p>Option KS1 Comment In the Joint Retail Assessment (Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners) under the heading Hierarchy of Centres, the consultants identified recommended that Verwood (like West Moors) becomes a District Centre, rather than a town centre due to its size, function and number of units. Verwood (and indeed West Parley and</p>			239

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Corfe Mullen) cannot aspire to the main settlement functions provided by Christchurch, Wimborne and Ferndown.			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO275	4.36		General Comment	I neither support or object but with regard to Greenbelt Policy it should also be noted from PPG2 (2.12) that any proposals affecting greenbelts should be related to a time scale longer than that normally adopted for other aspects of the plan. They should satisfy themselves (local planning authorities) that greenbelt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period. My concern is, as stated before, that so called "exceptional circumstances" could be cited again and again by the planning authorities in the future this taking away the permanence of greenbelts			242
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSO18318	4.38	Object		Taylor Wimpey note, 'The green belt boundaries have not significantly changed since they were first drawn in 1982.' These were drawn having regard to the housing and economic growth forecast for the area at that time. These requirements have obviously changed and will need to be assessed in the context of the growth and challenges now facing the area to 2027 and beyond. PPG2 (Para 2.12) encourages LPAs in reviewing their plans to take account of forecast growth up to and beyond the plan period and safeguard lands required to meet such needs. Taylor Wimpey therefore recommends the Council take the opportunity to safeguard land from the green belt for longer term growth envisaged up to and beyond the plan period, in accordance with PPG2 (paragraph 2.12). This would avoid the green belt boundaries being reviewed more regularly and would be consistent with the last review in 1982. Paragraph 4.40 of the Core Strategy Options (Oct 2010) document			244

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							should be revised to confirm this pro-active planned approach. References to the need for 'limited alternations to allow for some housing and employment development to meet the needs of the local communities' does not adequately set the scene for the chapters that follow in Taylor Wimpey's opinion. The fact that specific green field sites are included within this document implies they are sufficiently strategic to warrant inclusion in a Core Strategy, rather than 'limited' revisions that would normally be addressed through a subsequent Site Allocations DPD. Taylor Wimpey recommends this is clarified for avoidance of doubt at the outset of the document.			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO276	4.39	Support		It is very important to continue protection separate individual settlements by maintaining wedges of open land between them and to maintain open land beyond the conurbation.			246
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSO18319	4.39	Object		Taylor Wimpey note, 'The green belt boundaries have not significantly changed since they were first drawn in 1982.' These were drawn having regard to the housing and economic growth forecast for the area at that time. These requirements have obviously changed and will need to be assessed in the context of the growth and challenges now facing the area to 2027 and beyond. PPG2 (Para 2.12) encourages LPAs in reviewing their plans to take account of forecast growth up to and beyond the plan period and safeguard lands required to meet such needs. Taylor Wimpey therefore recommends the Council take the opportunity to safeguard land from the green belt for longer term growth envisaged up to and beyond the plan period, in accordance with PPG2 (paragraph 2.12). This would avoid the green belt boundaries being			246

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>reviewed more regularly and would be consistent with the last review in 1982. Paragraph 4.40 of the Core Strategy Options (Oct 2010) document should be revised to confirm this pro-active planned approach.</p> <p>References to the need for 'limited alternations to allow for some housing and employment development to meet the needs of the local communities' does not adequately set the scene for the chapters that follow in Taylor Wimpey's opinion. The fact that specific green field sites are included within this document implies they are sufficiently strategic to warrant inclusion in a Core Strategy, rather than 'limited' revisions that would normally be addressed through a subsequent Site Allocations DPD. Taylor Wimpey recommends this is clarified for avoidance of doubt at the outset of the document.</p>			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO278	4.40	Object		<p>This paragraph is contradictory, stating that the greenbelt policy should be maintained and then suggesting "limited alterations of boundaries to allow for some housing and employment..."</p> <p>The concept of greenbelt permanence is eroded if exceptions are made to allow development. Also the Council should take note of what the majority of their residents said in the last "Issues & Options" exercise in 2008 and that was that they did not want to see greenbelt land released for housing or employment development.</p>			247
359350	Mr Jim Biggin	Chairman West Christchurch Residents Assoc & J.R.A.	CSO157	4.40	Object			<p>You should not be considering the removal of any green belt land. Nor should you be changing the status of greenbelt land contained within the airport facilities. You have incorrect objectives</p>	<p>Clearly a comment relating to an objection to Para 4.40</p>	247

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								because you refuse to consider the population centres of East Dorset as suburbs of Bournemouth-Poole, which in reality is what they actually are.		
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSO18 320	4.40	Object		<p>Taylor Wimpey note, 'The green belt boundaries have not significantly changed since they were first drawn in 1982.' These were drawn having regard to the housing and economic growth forecast for the area at that time. These requirements have obviously changed and will need to be assessed in the context of the growth and challenges now facing the area to 2027 and beyond. PPG2 (Para 2.12) encourages LPAs in reviewing their plans to take account of forecast growth up to and beyond the plan period and safeguard lands required to meet such needs. Taylor Wimpey therefore recommends the Council take the opportunity to safeguard land from the green belt for longer term growth envisaged up to and beyond the plan period, in accordance with PPG2 (paragraph 2.12). This would avoid the green belt boundaries being reviewed more regularly and would be consistent with the last review in 1982. Paragraph 4.40 of the Core Strategy Options (Oct 2010) document should be revised to confirm this pro-active planned approach.</p> <p>References to the need for 'limited alternations to allow for some housing and employment development to meet the needs of the local communities' does not adequately set the scene for the chapters that follow in Taylor Wimpey's opinion. The fact that specific green field sites are included within this document implies they are sufficiently strategic to warrant inclusion in a Core Strategy, rather than 'limited' revisions that would normally be addressed through a</p>			247

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							subsequent Site Allocations DPD. Taylor Wimpey recommends this is clarified for avoidance of doubt at the outset of the document.			
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO2375	4.41		General Comment	Continue to protect Green Belt (not as in 4.61)			248
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO280	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		I support the main objectives i.e. Development of East Dorset & Christchurch will be contained by the South East Dorset Greenbelt and also I support the protection of the physical identity of individual settlements by maintaining wedges of open land between them and also maintaining an area of open land around the conurbation BUT I OBJECT to altering greenbelt boundaries (taking land out of greenbelt) for housing and employment development.			249
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO958	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		Agree that some limited realignment of the green belt may be acceptable in some cases.			249
474426	Mr Phillip Barnes		CSO1574	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		No changes to the green belt should be carried out, not even minor ones except for, as the legislation states, exceptional circumstances. If you can consider building large numbers of houses as "Exceptional Circumstances" then there is absolutely no point to having the legislation.			249
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2554	Preferred Option KS 2	Support					249
495527	Miss Caroline Green	Planner Broadway Malyan	CSO1477	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		We support the preferred option KS2 which would allow for limited changes to be made to the green belt boundaries to allow for			249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							employment growth to meet the needs of the district, by taking sites such as Bailie Gate, Sturminster Marshall out of the current Green belt. This policy will act to both protect important areas of landscape designation and allow for employment growth where necessary.			
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	CSO19 11	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		This Option refers to limited changes to existing green belt boundaries for housing and employment. The Hurn Parish Plan, published in 2010, is written around a survey of Hurn residents, where 93% agreed "It is important that the Green Belt is preserved around the Village of Hurn". As a result of this survey, the 'Action' agreed in the Parish Plan (page 22) is as follows – "The Parish Council to reflect residents' overwhelming view of preserving the green belt and wooded environment, in any consultation, on any issue". The Parish Council therefore reflect the residents' opinion on changes to the green belt in this Core Strategy Consultation, and object to Option KS2.	The Option should acknowledge the overwhelming view of local people and omit any changes to the green belt in Hurn and its environs.		249
360962	Mrs V Hurst		CSO38 66	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		Option KS2 states that "limited changes to the existing boundaries are proposed to enable some new housing and employment to meet local needs...." but the sites identified appear to be only larger developments on the edge of existing boundaries of major urban areas. This option should be expanded to allow for minor development in the Green Belt in highly accessible locations providing that the development: a) was on the edge of existing boundaries, and b) did not impact on the protection of open land around conurbations used to separate the physical identities of individual settlements, and c) did not change the characteristics of the area. It would allow for a limited number of well planned houses on larger plots, that are close to	Development in East Dorset and Christchurch Districts will be contained by the South East Dorset Green Belt. The purposes of the Green Belt are to: - Protect the separate physical identity of individual settlements in the area by maintaining wedges and corridors of open land between them - To maintain an area of open land around the conurbation. Limited changes to the existing boundaries are		249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							all existing amenities, suitable for families and those wishing to engage in more sustainable living.	proposed to enable some new housing and employment to meet local needs. Minor development on limited sites that adjoin existing boundaries will be considered for well planned and sustainable housing which do not impact on the purposes of the Green Belt. Include areas in the Green Belt that are no longer capable of providing for these needs.		
360167	Mrs Pippa WHEATLEY		CSO17 443	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		<p>This approach is too casual. It does not stress the importance of the following:</p> <p>Sustainability Green Belt PPG2 states clearly the need to consider the consequences for sustainability including effects of car travel if channelling development towards areas of green belt.</p> <p>Purposes of Green Belt It is also important to consider other purposes, especially to check unrestricted sprawl and safeguard our countryside PPG 2 Para 1.5</p> <p>Permanence In 06 Green Belt Key Issue Paper Para 2.24 you include PPG guidance and say 'The fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open (your underlining).</p> <p>Local needs Also in 06 Green Belt Key Issue Paper Para 2.14 you tell us the Core Strategy will only propose the alteration to the existing inner Green Belt boundary to accommodate recognised local needs in sustainable locations. These go hand in hand. It is inappropriate to address needs in one</p>	<p>Second bullet point change to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To maintain and safeguard our countryside around the conurbation <p>Last Paragraph pretext with The Green Belt will not be changed in response to opportunistic offers of building land. The exceptional circumstances must be explained Any change to the Green Belt must be shown to be truly a need for that locality. It must adhere to Green Belt policy and be accompanied by a sustainability appraisal.</p>		249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							part of the district that are needed by another as there are immediately sustainability problems. Exceptional Circumstances PPG 2 Para 2.6 tells us Green Belt should be altered only in exceptional circumstances			
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 461	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		DWT supports the continuation of the existing Green Belt policy, subject to comments on the limited proposed changes detailed below. However, we wish to see here wording that encompasses the full meaning of PPG2 that links to Green Belt objectives of providing opportunities for access to open countryside and securing nature conservation interests.	We wish to see here wording that encompasses the full meaning of PPG2 that links to Green Belt objectives of providing opportunities for access to open countryside and securing nature conservation interests.		249
359478	Mr Rohan TORKILDSE N	West Territory Planner English Heritage	CSO18 561	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		It should be noted that an explicit function of Green Belt is to protect the setting of historic rural settlements.			249
359547	Mrs V Bright	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17 931	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		We support the continuing use of the SE Dorset Green Belt to contain development. We also support changes to the existing boundaries to include additional areas in the Green Belt that are no longer capable of providing housing and employment for local needs.			249
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 112	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		Object to wording While accepting that some boundary changes may be necessary to accommodate some affordable housing, we consider that the listing of the purposes of the Green Belt should be as specified in PPG2 and not restricted to the two summary points as proposed. The setting and special character of historic towns should be taken into consideration and acknowledged in this policy as it will shape other aspects of the LDF. Similarly safeguarding			249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the countryside from encroachment is particularly important where it has</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • significant biodiversity interest and ecosystem services function, • potential for important BAP habitat restoration, and/or • significant landscape value. <p>While it may be argued that these issues are covered in part by subsequent policies, KS2 sets the scene.</p>			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 634	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		<p>The Agency supports the protection of the Green Belt. If changes are made to the boundaries of the Green Belt, mixed use development is preferred to isolated housing or employment sites. Land at St Leonard's Hospital is accessed directly from the A31; therefore we have concerns over the proposed development under Preferred Option KS3.</p> <p>Woodland Walk, Ferdown is located close to the SRN and the site's inclusion within the urban area under Preferred Option KS4 and Non Preferred Option KS5 could have a detrimental impact on the SRN.</p>			249
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19 132	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		<p>Preferred option KS2 restates the purposes of the Green Belt designation, which has largely been lost due to inappropriate development such as Bournemouth Airport. There are many locations in this area which are not designated Green Belt which are more worthy of protection than locations within the Green Belt.</p>			249
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17 871	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		<p>The recognition that there must be Green Belt revision to accommodate the needs of the two authorities is welcomed and supported. The key diagram should include where changes to Green Belt status are envisaged to support sustainable development. The Green Belt revisions should take the opportunity to relate to the Green</p>			249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Infrastructure Strategy recognising that development can help to secure better access to open land in a way that Green Belt designation alone does not.			
507525	Mr David Lander	Boyer Planning Ltd	CSO19044	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		<p>Whilst the approach is supported in principle, limited changes are felt to be needed. Please see section 3.2 of the accompanying statement.</p> <p>3.2 Preferred Option KS2</p> <p>3.2.1 Preferred Option KS2 states that development in East Dorset will be contained by the South East Dorset Green Belt. However, consistent with the national guidance in PPG2 the option proposes limited changes to the Green Belt boundary to enable some new housing and employment. Para 4.40 explains that the current green belt boundary has now been in place for some 30 years and that few opportunities for development remain. It is also proposed to add some areas to the Green Belt that are no longer capable of providing for these needs.</p> <p>3.2.2 We support this approach in principle. It is considered that limited changes to the Green Belt boundaries are appropriate and will help to achieve the key green belt purposes set out in PPG2 Para 1.5. Specifically in the case of East Dorset this relates to the twin objectives of protecting the physical identity of individual settlements and maintaining an area of open land around the conurbation.</p> <p>3.2.3 Given the extent of the green belt in East Dorset relative to the principal settlements, and the limited alternative sources of housing land, it is clear that greenbelt releases will play a key part in accommodating required development. The amount of land needed cannot be determined until the scale of new development has been determined. Since at this stage East Dorset DC have not done this, the boundary</p>			249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							change proposals in this document, without prejudice to their individual suitability, cannot be said to be more than provisional. Indeed we consider that further changes are likely to be necessary to enable sufficient development at key settlements.			
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	CSO18 342	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		Preferred Option KS2 – Green Belt We support the justification and need for the release of land to the north of Christchurch from the Green Belt in order to provide for a sustainable urban extension in helping to meet identified housing needs. The wording of the proposal should be amended to include reference to the allocation of land at Roeshot Hill for development as a strategic housing site. This should also be shown on the Core Strategy diagram.			249
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO17 761	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		Please see KS12 as we have used this for a very full and balanced response to the whole housing numbers and associated themes, including the Green Belt. HOUSING We do not believe that our current local policy is promoting sustainable communities. East Dorset is a highly desirable location for those living in areas with higher buying power. The buying power of these in-migrants is keeping our house prices too high. The more market housing is built, the more of these older in-migrants move in, the less balanced our communities become as younger people are priced out. The following figures from the Dorset Data Book 2008 illustrate this. Year Age Group Age Group 20-29 50-59 1996 41,178 45,124 2006 30,735 57,303 Change - 10,443 + 12,179			249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>We are only agreeing the changes in the Green Belt boundaries to enable East Dorset District to increase the number of affordable housing. We do not need any Green Belt market housing as this just seems to add to the ageing population. What we need is affordable housing for those that do not earn enough to get on the housing ladder as the latest ratio of housing to earnings is 13.0 (National Housing Federation, 2010 Home Truths).</p> <p>We do find some of the Green Belt sites quite unacceptable as they would initiate a very visible sprawl across our open countryside, and those we have objected to. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • either side of Cranborne Road (WMC4) • to the south of Christchurch Road (FWP3) • land to the east of Parley Cross (FWP4) • west of Trinity School (VWM1) • west of eastworth (VWM2) <p>The following sites we are reluctant to agree to, but for the sake of affordable housing, and an opportunity for EDDC to try and get a sustainable demographic balance, we will support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land south of Leigh Road (WMC5) • all the Corfe Mullen sites but very little housing on CM3 so the bulk of the land remains as recreational. • Holmwood (FWP1) • Coppins Nursery (FWP2) • land to the south of Manor Road (VWM4) <p>This latter site we would have preferred to object to for environmental reasons but felt we could not object to all the sites in Verwood. This is why we will only support building on the Green Belt if it generates 40% affordable housing. None less.</p> <p>EMPLOYMENT LAND</p> <p>The UK Sustainable Development Strategy: Securing The Future (2006): 'We need a major shift to deliver new products and services with</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>lower environmental impacts across their lifecycle, and new business models which meet the challenge while boosting competitiveness.' There is a need in East Dorset to save land. It is our most valuable commodity. We need to encourage high value added employment. We have good schools and a university but still seem to be losing our young people to other areas. If more high tech or IT industry moved into Dorset then maybe less 20-29 year olds would leave. Less warehouses please, we will not support a wasteful use of land. Low wages and a vast acreage of Green Belt is a waste of a non-renewable resource. More small units for those that now work from home. Less vast car parks so you encourage alternate means of transport other than the private car. For example, the large new complex up Brook Road has the most enormous car park, so too have the offices on the corner of Cobham and Wimborne Road West. If they had less parking space we could save some Green Belt. Encourage high tech industries using less space and employing our students at a good wage. Please conserve our Green Belt, do not waste it. NO more out of town shopping centres, go upwards in our town centres and industrial estates, not outwards.</p>			
522240	Association Verwood Residents	Chairman Association Verwood Residents	CSO18 088	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		<p>4. EROSION OF GREEN BELT LAND When Verwood was still a rural village, the boundary line contained substantial areas of green land, albeit mostly privately owned. This has over time been eroded such that the only substantial green areas left in public ownership are the Recreation Ground and Bugdens Copse with a few smaller areas such as Springfield Copse, donated to the people of Verwood by Lord Cranborne. Now that all of the substantial inner areas have</p>			249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>been exploited this Core Strategy aims to redefine the Verwood Town Boundary to include large areas of GREEN BELT LAND, privately owned by landowners that wish to exploit their land for capital gain. This does not seem to fit the requirements for building on GREEN BELT LAND for which the circumstances have to be exceptional.</p> <p>Where will it end? If this proposed erosion is allowed to happen then the District Council will find it difficult to refuse further erosion by other landowners wishing to capitalise on the development potential of their GREEN BELT LAND.</p> <p>The effect on the resident wildlife and their habitat will be catastrophic which will be lost forever.</p> <p>The District Council should not allow any further erosion of the existing GREEN BELT LAND.</p>			
523419	HLF Planning	HLF Planning	CSO18 395	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		<p>Alternatives to Green Belt development not satisfactorily assessed</p> <p>2.18 The fundamental concept of the Masterplan Report appears to be to find large Green Belt sites that are capable of providing the required new increase in households at the expense of locating more development within the towns and villages for fear of 'town cramming'. Right from the start of the Report it is conceded by the authors that Green Belt development is almost inevitable and that there are no other solutions.</p> <p>2.19 One alternative that is not explored in the Masterplan Report is to find smaller scale developments throughout East Dorset and not just restricted to the search areas identified. The authors of the Masterplan have backed themselves into a corner by rigidly identifying the search areas that they have and therefore discounting smaller parcels of land throughout the district which added together would meet the</p>			249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>housing requirements.</p> <p>2.20 Surely to propose large swathes of Green Belt development sites numbering over 100 new houses in each one will have more of a detrimental impact upon the character and special quality of East Dorset than more piecemeal developments which can be more accurately managed throughout the planning process? The primary objectives of the Green Belt, whilst outlined in the Report, are not afforded as significant weight as should be the case.</p> <p>2.21 Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS 12 - Local Spatial Planning) states that in order to be considered 'sound' a core strategy should be justified, effective and consistent with national policy (Para 4.52). The latter can certainly not be the case as the vast majority of all proposals are located within the Green Belt.</p> <p>2.22 There are five purposes of including land in the Green Belt (Para 1.5 PPG2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; • To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>2.23 Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of the land in them has a positive role to play in fulfilling the following objectives (Para 1.6 PPG2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population; • To provide opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas; 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To retain attractive landscapes, and enhance landscapes, near to where people live; • To improve damaged and derelict land around towns; • To secure nature conservation interest; and • To retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses. <p>2.24 Green Belt designations have been set in stone for some time and paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 comments that 'once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt'.</p> <p>2.25 This advice is re-enforced in PPS12 (Para 4.38) concerning alternative sites and those sites being progressed within a Core Strategy. There is a requirement for local authorities to 'seek out and evaluate reasonable alternatives promoted by themselves and others'. It is quite clear that the Masterplan Report does not give sufficient detail to all alternatives within each search area in order to avoid large scale loss of the Green Belt. To simply state that 'town cramming' would be the alternative if the Green Belt was built upon is no more than window dressing and shows a poor evidence base which the Inspector would surely question at a later date in the adoption process.</p>			
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSO18 429	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		.Preferred Option KS 2 is supported. The need for release of land from the Green Belt in appropriate locations to provide for new housing development in East Dorset is the most appropriate approach for the area taking into account the evidence base in relation to housing need, the availability of housing land, and			249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							planning policy guidance in PPG2			
523893	Lindsay Thompson	Terence O'Rourke Ltd	CSO18 445	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		Bloor Homes Limited supports the inclusion of a green belt policy, however this policy needs to be clearly linked to the settlement extensions and revised green belt boundary proposed. The preferred option currently states that "limited changes to the existing boundaries are proposed". This policy should be clear and defines the 'new' extent of the Green Belt. We would suggest the following policy wording: "The extent of the South East Dorset Green Belt within East Dorset and Christchurch Borough is defined by the map XX. This follows the settlement boundaries of the main towns but allows for settlement extensions at Christchurch, Wimborne Minster, Ferndown, West Parley, Verwood and Corfe Mullen as defined in policy LD."	The extent of the South East Dorset Green Belt within East Dorset and Christchurch Borough is defined by the map XX. This follows the settlement boundaries of the main towns but allows for settlement extensions at Christchurch, Wimborne Minster, Ferndown, West Parley, Verwood and Corfe Mullen as defined in policy LD."		249
524088	Mr Ken Parke	Ken Parke Planning Consultants	CSO18 451	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		Government guidance 4.1 There are many relevant elements of Government guidance including PPS1, PPS3 and PPS12, all of which are referenced within the Options document and which the LPA will have a full working knowledge of. 4.2 The main relevant piece of national policy relevant to these submissions is PPG2 which provides Government guidance in relation to Green Belt. Paragraph 1.4 of PPG2 states that: 'The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.' 4.3 The guidance sets out the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt as being:- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built areas;♣ To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;♣ To assist in safeguarding the countryside from			249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>encroachment;✦ To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;✦ To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.✦ 4.4 The Core Strategy makes reference to these purposes throughout in providing a justification for its preferred options in respect of urban expansion around Wimborne. It is however considered that the LPA are making fundamental errors in their interpretation of the guidance. For example, the LPA are actively promoting extensions to Wimborne, which is essentially promoting sprawl and encroachment into the countryside and the erosion of attractive elements of Green Belt land. At the same time, the LPA are ruling out the development of land to the north of Leigh Road, referred to as the northern sub area, on the basis that it would lead to coalescence of Wimborne and Colehill. In essence, the LPA are ranking the five purposes and concluding that coalescence within an existing urban area, i.e. infilling between the areas of Wimborne and Colehill, is harmful to the Green Belt whereas sprawl and encroachment into open countryside to the west into the Stour Valley and to the north is seen as being acceptable, or less harmful. 4.5 Within PPG2, the purposes of including land within the Green Belt are not ranked in order of importance. In discussing the various preferred options, the Core Strategy document appears to rank coalescence as less acceptable than encroachment in the open countryside. In discussing the acceptability of the central sub area for example, this area is mostly discounted due to potential coalescence with the small settlement of Dogdean, which is identified as a major factor. In discussing the western sub area, the document refers to coalescence as not being</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>an issue and therefore development is acceptable. One of the purposes of Green Belt policy is to prevent separate towns from merging into each other. Colehill however cannot be regarded as a town and indeed the Core Strategy seeks to define it as a suburban centre. Development on the western side of Colehill therefore would not result in a coalescence of towns as such.</p> <p>4.6 It is also possible to allow some expansion towards other built up areas while still maintaining the green wedges and corridors considered to be of importance. For example, the Core Strategy is advocating expansion to the south of West Parley towards the fringes of Bournemouth but there will still be a corridor remaining.</p> <p>4.7 It is therefore considered that a more balanced view should be taken between the weight attached to coalescence and urban sprawl and encroachment. These matters are discussed in further detail below.</p> <p>5.0 Overview of the issues</p> <p>5.1 The fundamental matter at issue is that the subject land was included within an area identified as a potential area of search for new housing development referenced as the northern sub-area. The sub-area included all undeveloped land to the north of Leigh Road. The LPA have ruled out this land for development on the basis that it would result in a coalescence of the settlements of Wimborne with Colehill. However, the LPA have not explored whether part of the land may be developed in a manner which will not result in coalescence or a level of coalescence which would be deemed acceptable bearing in mind that green wedges and corridors would remain and that greater benefits may arise from such an approach. A fundamental point of this representation however is the view that</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Wimborne and Colehill are not two separate towns but that Colehill in its entirety is a suburban extension to, and is reliant upon, Wimborne. Over the past 25 years, the strategic policy framework for the area has encouraged policies of containment and infilling towards protecting the openness of the countryside. The development of the subject land as suggested further below would be a form of containment rather than a further urban expansion which would extend the urban area further outwards into existing countryside, including into areas in close proximity to the AONB and AGLV.</p> <p>5.2 The position therefore is that the LPA should be looking at the area of Wimborne and Colehill as one entire settlement and not as two separate towns. The purposes of including land within the Green Belt would not therefore be harmed by the development of the subject land. That is to say, there would not actually be a coalescence of towns or separate settlements. Regardless of one's view on whether Colehill and Wimborne are one or two settlements, the development of the subject land would not result in coalescence because a substantial amount of open land would still remain. The preferred options however do result in further sprawl and further encroachment and, while such sprawl may be restricted, it does still enlarge the settlement to the extent that the Green Belt would be more harmed than if the subject land was developed.</p> <p>5.3 A further point is that the subject land is contained wholly within the parish of Colehill and is contiguous to the built up areas within Colehill. If the subject land were developed, the green wedges and corridors to the west of the Vineries would still retain a degree of separation between Wimborne and Colehill.</p> <p>5.4 The second element of the submission is that the development of the subject land would bring</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>benefits over and above those of developing the other sites and in manner which better meets the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy and does not displace existing uses further into the Green Belt. The site is also instantly deliverable and does not involve any relocation or complicated assembly or conveyance. The site is also easily serviced. Furthermore, the development of the subject land does not have any impact upon the historic setting of Wimborne Minster, Burts Hill, the Stour Valley or the AONB. The land is also separated from the main thoroughfares and therefore the perception of encroachment and sprawl will be significantly less than with the preferred choices which bring development much closer to primary routes.</p> <p>5.5 Development of the subject land would also bring the required benefits to the entire settlement of Wimborne and Colehill rather than to the north and west of Wimborne which would result in little benefit to Colehill.</p> <p>5.6 Development of the subject land would include a village square or centre which will be by design longer and more broad ranging than any neighbourhood centre. The Core Strategy document recognises throughout the deficiencies that currently exist in Colehill. The development of the subject land will bring a mixed use commercial centre including public open space to serve the entire community of Colehill and eastern Wimborne.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preferred option KS2 - Support in principle subject to other recommendations within this submission <p>7.2.2.1 Preferred Option KS2 seeks to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect the separate physical identity of individual settlements in the area by maintaining wedges and corridors of open land between them; • Maintain an area of open land around the 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>conurbation.</p> <p>7.2.2.2 The policy allows limited changes to the existing boundaries to provide for housing and employment needs.</p> <p>7.2.2.3 The existing Green Belt boundaries have been identified as being successful in achieving these aims. That is to say, the Green Belt boundaries already established have prevented coalescence and sprawl.</p> <p>7.2.2.4 Again, there is support for the principle of this policy approach, but the specifics are not accepted in their entirety as set out in detail below. The preferred options of the Core Strategy in relation to Wimborne and Colehill are considered to result in further and unnecessary sprawl and encroachment which does not appear as a logical continuation of the settlement. However, the promotion of the subject land would result in a more contained form of development while still maintaining wedges and corridors of open land between and within the existing settlement of Wimborne and Colehill and in a manner which does not harm the wider objectives of Green Belt policy.</p>			
524495	Mr Stanley Jackson		CSO18 610	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		<p>One of the cardinal benefits of living in East Dorset is ready access to beautiful and largely unspoilt landscape. I would therefore not like to see significant erosion of the green belt and AONB areas, although I would support limited changes as proposed in KS2. In judging the various development options I have concentrated on Wimborne and Colehill. It seems to me the best strategy would be to start nearer to Wimborne town centre and only after these options have been exhausted should consideration be given to developing green sites on the town fringes. Further these latter development should not be activated unless there is demonstrable need for housing and a</p>			249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							sustainable educational, medical and transport infrastructure for the areas concerned. I understand that there are developers interested in all the WMC options including one definite sale subject to planning permission.			
524723	Mr John Worth	Chair Wimborne Civic Society	CSO18730	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		One of the cardinal benefits of living in East Dorset is ready access to beautiful and largely unspoilt landscape. We would therefore not like to see significant erosion of the Green Belt and AONB areas, although we would support some of the limited changes as proposed in KS2 (4.41). In judging the various development options we are focusing on the Society's area of benefit, principally Wimborne Minster and Colehill. It seems to us that the best strategy would be to start at the areas nearer to Wimborne Town Centre and, only after these options have been exhausted, should consideration be given to developing green sites on the town fringes. Further these latter developments should not be activated unless there is a demonstrable need for housing and a sustainable educational, medical, employment and transport infrastructure for the areas concerned.			249
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18833	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		This is a qualified objection. The principle of what is contained in Option KS2 is accepted. However, it is felt that Longham is wrongly washed over as part of the Green Belt, particularly in the light of recent developments, including a very large Care Home. There are areas of wasteland in Longham which could usefully be developed to the benefit of the community. There is an existing level of services which also suggest that this area is one which should be developed to improve sustainability. The Preferred Option KS2 is incompatible with the Areas of Search which are looked at later in	Amend Option KS2 to make reference further housing allocations to result from an examination of Areas of Search for housing.		249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							the Document.			
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 864	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		There is a good case for releasing land to extend the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, one of the most successful of all employment areas in East Dorset. More readily available employment land is much needed in the area. This is supported by the evidence gathered by East Dorset District Council and in the letters which I have appended to our Representations in respect of Policy PC5.			249
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 917	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		This is a qualified objection. The principle of what is contained in Option KS2 is accepted. However, Green Belt boundaries should be defined to endure for a longer period than that of the Core Strategy, see Planning Policy Guidance Note No. 2. The Option should include reference to carrying out a review of Green Belt boundaries once the overall level of housing provision and likely allocations has been established. Looking at the Plan in the round it seems to me that the Areas of Search are incompatible with Preferred Option KS2 and that therefore the Options at this stage are not soundly based.	Amend Option KS2 to make reference to further housing allocations resulting from an examination of housing land requirements and Areas of Search for housing.		249
527744	Mr Steve Fidgett	Alliance Planning	CSO18 904	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		The preferred option policy promotes the protection of green belt while making allowance for limited boundary changes to provide for additional housing and employment provision. While we support the overall approach to green belt, we consider that in the case of Christchurch there needs to be a recognition that the development of renewable sources of energy will be likely to require development in green belt locations. We would note that the character of the Borough is such that it is either urban area or wholly within the Green Belt and that further significant areas are constrained by flood risk and by international nature conservation designations. Hence the opportunities for the			249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>development of renewable energy sources other than at a very small, micro scale on existing buildings and as part of new developments are limited.</p> <p>In the case of solar energy, other than domestic scale development, the large footprint of solar power installations cannot be accommodated within the urban area. However, in the right locations and if designed appropriately they need not be incompatible with the objectives of green belt policy and need not be inappropriate development. Appropriately designed they can preserve the openness of the green belt and be consistent with its objectives.</p> <p>The proposed policy should therefore, also make provision for the development of low carbon renewable energy proposals as part of the Council's commitment to meeting the requirements of PPS1 and PPS22 in respect of climate change (see separate comments in respect of ME13 and Climate Change).</p> <p>As an addition to or in the alternative to recognition within policy KS2, it is further proposed that land shown on the accompanying plan at Eco Sustainable Solutions, at Chapel Lane, Parley, be identified for the potential development of renewable energy in the form of a Solar Energy Farm (Area A) and as an existing developed facility dealing with renewable energy (Area B).</p> <p>Under the terms of green belt policy set out in PPS2, Area B would conform with the definition of a major developed site, since it provides existing sustainable waste management treatment facility that is of major significance in meeting the needs of the areas waste recycling and which has the potential to provide associated renewable heat and power.</p> <p>The facility has the potential to be developed further as part of a district heat and power</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							scheme related to the residential and associated development of Ferndown FWP1 to FWP4. It also has the potential to contribute to the heat and power needs of any future development of employment uses at Bournemouth Airport complementing the renewable obligations for the airport development. These developments should be served by potential heat and power from the development of renewable energy sources at the existing Eco Sustainable Solutions site, where the feedstock for the process is currently processed. Such development would not result in the loss of any additional green belt land and could be accommodated within the footprint of the existing developed site.			
359288	Mr Steve Molnar	Terence O'Rourke	CSO18 974	Preferred Option KS 2	Support		Banner Homes supports KS2 which proposes limited changes to the existing green belt boundaries to enable some new housing and employment to meet local needs. It is important that local housing needs are met and that a range of house types and tenures is provided, including family housing and affordable housing. To ensure that the right type and amount of housing is provided it will be necessary to have a range of sites including greenfield sites as well as previously developed sites. There are very few greenfield sites left in the district that are not in the green belt. The selective review of green belt boundaries to assist in the provision of housing to meet local needs is therefore essential to the proper planning of the district, and the plan would not be sound without this.			249
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22 868	Preferred Option KS 2	Object		Object to the wording. Reasons All 5 purposes for including land in the Green Belt should be included as identified in PPG 2.			249

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO23 32	Preferred Option KS 3	Object		Although ARC agreed with the proposal for a Care Village we would object to new housing and major development as it would have a serious and ongoing negative impact upon the SSSI and SNCI.			251
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 462	Preferred Option KS 3	Object		<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 previously provided considerable input into planning applications for this site 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.</p> <p>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. Of particular concern on this site would be a change to housing provision, which could lead to</p>			251

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>loss of, or pressure onto, the open SNCI habitats. With reference to the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework, consideration would also need to be given to housing provision within 5km of nearby heathland sites and the need to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG). Additionally, this site lies within a corridor of potential heathland restoration with scope to link heathland and grassland sites to the south and north. 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. As drainage from this site is to the Moors River SSSI, housing or employment use here could also have consequences for the Moors River, where there is already concern with respect to water quality. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems would be required. DWT therefore objects to this option. It is not fully informed by evidence with respect to the nature conservation interests. We have considerable concerns regarding housing or employment uses and would maintain an objection unless evidence is produced that the natural environment could be protected.</p>			
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18 654	Preferred Option KS 3		No Opinion	<p>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.)</p>			251

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 113	Preferred Option KS 3		General Comment	<p>The St Leonards Hospital site has significant biodiversity interest including important neutral grassland with Green Winged Orchids, and heathland. The potential for heathland restoration and habitat linkages 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. Industrial development here, in a location where there has never previously been an industrial estate, would introduce an entirely new and unacceptable ever present threat of pollution to the Moors River. For further discussion of the problems please see comments below on Section 15 and Key Issue Paper 11.</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 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".</p>			251
361026	Mr	Network	CSO17	Preferred	Support		The Agency supports the protection of the Green			251

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Steve Hellier	Planning Manager Highways Agency	636	Option KS 3			Belt. If changes are made to the boundaries of the Green Belt, mixed use development is preferred to isolated housing or employment sites. Land at St Leonard's Hospital is accessed directly from the A31; therefore we have concerns over the proposed development under Preferred Option KS3. Woodland Walk, Ferndown is located close to the SRN and the site's inclusion within the urban area under Preferred Option KS4 and Non Preferred Option KS5 could have a detrimental impact on the SRN.			
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		CSO19 270	Preferred Option KS 3	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.			251

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							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		CSO19 274	Preferred Option KS 3	Object		<p>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.</p> <p>Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously having damaging implications for heathlands, be they SSSIs or SNCIs, include KS3, KS4 (Coopers Lane south), VWM4 and VMW7.</p> <p>There is a commitment to restore and link heathland within south-east Dorset and areas most suitable for such restoration have been identified. There are options within the CS which would preclude such beneficial restoration including KS3/ PC7, PC4, and PC5.</p>			251

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		CSO19 317	Preferred Option KS 3	Object		<p>The grounds of St. Leonards Hospital include heathland and bio diverse 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>			251
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		CSO19 168	Preferred Option KS 3	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</p>			251

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							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).			
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19 133	Preferred Option KS 3	Support		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.			251
522623	Mr Michael Cole	Gregory Gray Associates	CSO18 156	Preferred Option KS 3	Object		It is proposed that the Wimborne Garden Centre (Wimborne Road West, Wimborne, Dorset BH21 2DN) should be identified as an additional major developed site in the green belt. (MDS) Alternatively, should the site not be included within the core strategy, flexibility should be	It is proposed that the Wimborne Garden Centre (Wimborne Road West, Wimborne, Dorset BH21 2DN) should be identified as an additional major		251

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>provided within this option for additional major developed sites in the green belt to be identified at a later stage in the preparation of the LDF, as part of the site specific allocations DPD-see attachment.</p> <p>Response</p> <p>This response to the draft Core Strategy Options makes representations in relation to the following section of the consultation document: SECTION 4 - THE KEY STRATEGY, PREFERRED OPTION KS 3, PAGE 49</p> <p>At Preferred Option KS3, it is proposed that the Wimborne Garden Centre should be identified as an additional Major Developed Site in the Green Belt (MDS). Alternatively, should the site not be specifically be included within the Core Strategy at this stage, flexibility should be provided within the document to enable additional MDSs to be identified at a later stage in the preparation of the LDF, for example, as part of the Christchurch and East Dorset Site Specific Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The Wimborne Garden Centre site</p> <p>The Garden Centre Group occupies a 0.98 hectare site in the East Dorset area, known as the Wimborne Garden Centre, located to the north of Wimborne Road West, Stapehill, Wimborne, Dorset, BH21 2DN.</p> <p>The site is currently in use as a Garden Centre. The site is located outside the development boundary but has a substantial building footprint and a vast area of hard surfacing. It comprises approximately 3,700 square metres of floor space together with 82 car parking spaces.</p> <p>The Wimborne Garden Centre site is situated in the Green Belt, adjacent to an Urban Area within the East Dorset Local Plan 2011 (adopted January 2002). A Site Location Plan is enclosed with this letter.</p> <p>Reasons for inclusion of the site as an additional MDS.</p>	<p>developed site in the green belt. (MDS)</p> <p>Alternatively, should the site not be included within the core strategy, flexibility should be provided within this option for additional major developed sites in the green belt to be identified at a later stage in the preparation of the LDF, as part of the site specific allocations DPD</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>It is understood that the Wimborne Garden Centre site could come forward for development within the next 5-10 years (2016-2021). With the above in mind (and although located in the Green Belt), this site could provide an opportunity for new development, for example for housing or employment uses which would assist in meeting the Core Strategy's objectives to provide new housing and/or new employment opportunities for the surrounding community. Currently, nearly the entire site is covered by development or hard surfacing. The redevelopment of the site for a sympathetically designed scheme could reduce the total floor area occupied by built development. It could also create less impact on the countryside than the existing use of the site. In turn this could enhance the appearance and openness of the area.</p> <p>This would accord with the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy, as set out within Planning Policy Guidance Note 2, to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. (PPG2 paragraph 1.4).</p> <p>The site is considered to be suitable for development. Appropriate access to the site is available from Wimborne Road West and the site has good access to the wider area, via the A38. From 2015, there are not expected to be any particular market factors relating to land values or market demand that might prevent the site's future development for housing, employment or a mix of uses.</p> <p>For example, the number of houses that could be accommodated on the 0.98 hectare site would depend on the density of development. If developed at 40 dwellings per hectare, the site could accommodate approximately 39 additional dwellings. This amount of development is</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>considered achievable within the LDF plan period.</p> <p>In summary, the Wimborne Garden Centre site is considered to be a suitable as being identified as a Major Developed Sites as follows:</p> <p>(a) the site is substantial in size;</p> <p>(b) it contains a significant amount and scale of built development;</p> <p>(c) it could accommodate further development without prejudicing Green Belt objectives; and</p> <p>(d) its redevelopment would help to achieve the objectives of the Christchurch and East Dorset LDF to secure economic prosperity and achieve environmental improvements.</p> <p>Alternative suggested alteration</p> <p>At present the Wimborne Garden Centre site is not included as an MDS within Preferred Option KS3, page 49. Given the significant regeneration benefits that could arise from the redevelopment of the site in the future, it is important to confirm that its omission as an MDS from the Core Strategy Options document does not restrict the site in coming forward for development in the future, for example following its promotion through the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Should the proposal set out above to include the Wimborne Garden Centre site as an additional MDS not be taken forward, it is proposed that flexibility should be provided within the Core Strategy to enable additional MDSs to be identified at a later stage in the preparation of the LDF, as part of the Christchurch and East Dorset Site Specific Allocations DPD.</p> <p>In this regard, it is proposed that the Green Belt Policy set out within the Core Strategy should be altered to confirm that:</p> <p>“Proposals for designated Major Developed Sites will be determined in the context of national Green Belt policy”.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should go on to comment</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>that: "Delivery of Green Belt Policy should be achieved by: • identification of the boundaries of Major Developed Sites through the Site Allocations DPD." These changes to the Core Strategy are proposed in order to confirm that additional sites may be designated in the future where they become available and would accord with the policy guidance contained within PPG2. For example, it is appropriate for flexibility to be provided to enable the identification of additional Major Developed Sites through the Site Allocations DPD. Conclusion As explained above, the delivery of a sensitively designed redevelopment scheme for the Wimborne Garden Centre site in the future could enhance the site context and reduce the overall impact on the openness of the Green Belt, in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (PPG2). Section 4 of the Core Strategy should be amended to enable the Wimborne Garden Centre site to be identified as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt (MDS). It is proposed that Preferred Option KS3, page 49, is altered to include the Wimborne Garden Centre as an additional Major Developed Site in the Green Belt (MDS). Alternatively, should the site not be specifically included within the Core Strategy as a MDS at this stage, it is recommended that the wording of the Core Strategy is amended to enable the identification of additional Major Developed Sites at a later stage. Flexibility should be provided within the Core Strategy document to enable additional MDSs to be identified where they become available and would accord with the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							policy guidance contained within PPG2. For example, additional MDS could be identified in the future as part of the Christchurch and East Dorset Site Specific Allocations DPD.			
359286	Mr Andrew PATRICK	Pro Vision Planning and Design	CSO19434	Preferred Option KS 3	Object		<p>1.1 Pro Vision are instructed by Wessex Water to make representation in respect of Option KS 3</p> <p>1.2 In essence our concerns are that KS3 does not allow for the essential redevelopment of Previously Developed land at Little Canford Depot. A Core Strategy which incorporates KS3 may therefore in this respect be unsound, for reasons outlined below.</p> <p>1.3 Please read this representation in conjunction with parallel representations being made in response to KS1, KS4, PC5 and 6, and PC 8.</p> <p>1.4 Please also read the "Overview" Document "Development Opportunities at Little Canford". Option KS3</p> <p>1.5 Option KS3 proposes to recognise St Leonards Hospital as a Major Developed Site (MDS) in the Green Belt, in accord with PPG2 Annex C. However, it does not propose to recognise Little Canford Depot (with or without Stour Bank Nurseries) as an MDS. Why KS3 is unsound in respect of Little Canford Depot</p> <p>1.6 PPS12 advises that to be sound a Core Strategy must, amongst other criteria, be the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives. Leaving the Little Canford Depot washed over by the Green Belt is not the most appropriate strategy for Little Canford Depot. The attached document</p>	We request that if Little Canford Depot is not allocated or deleted from the Green Belt it should at least be identified as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt in accord with PPG2 Annex C		251

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>"Development Opportunities at Little Canford" explains that this large Previously Developed site will have to be redeveloped in one form or another during the Plan period. In the light of reasonable alternatives – such as designation as an MDS – leaving it washed over by the Green Belt is not the most appropriate strategy to enable such redevelopment to make the best contribution towards community aims and objectives. Thus KS3 is unsound in respect of Little Canford Depot.</p>			
482481	Mr Colin Molton	Director - South West Homes and Communities Agency	CSO22 916	Preferred Option KS 3		General Comment	<p>English Partnerships (the HCA's predecessor body) purchased St Leonards Hospital site from the NHS in April 2005 as part of a wider hospital sites portfolio. The site has an extant outline planning permission (ref 3/04/0067 and 3/09/0914) for a 124 unit care village (with 25% of the units to be provided as affordable housing), community and recreational facilities. The consent, which was achieved by the NHS prior to acquisition by English Partnerships, cannot be implemented without third party land for highway access.</p> <p>The site has been marketed over the last couple of years, with limited market interest. However, the HCA are now in the final stages of concluding a contract with a preferred development partner for the site. The contract is being progressed on the basis of the consented scheme. However, the developer and the HCA believe that this can be improved upon to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An environmentally sustainable solution for the site; - Energy efficient buildings, including an exploration of the potential for biomass CHP; - Minimum Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 housing; - Flexible tenure in the housing mix; - Employment and commercial uses; and 			251

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>- Improved pedestrian connectivity and transport solutions to address car dependency. It is likely that a revised or fresh planning application will be required to reflect the above changes to the scheme and to include a new access arrangement. Subject to concluding the contract with the preferred development partner, the HCA anticipates that a planning application could be submitted later this year.</p> <p>The masterplan and subsequent planning application will include comprehensive consultation with the community and key stakeholders, all of which will require prior approval by the HCA to ensure best practise is applied throughout.</p> <p>Housing Option Sites The HCA recognises the need to provide affordable housing in East Dorset, particularly in light of high house prices to wage ratios, the relatively low number of public sector homes and the consequent number of residents who cannot afford market housing or who cannot access appropriate affordable housing. The HCA is working closely with the Dorset authorities to invest and enable delivery of new affordable housing across the sub-region through the Local investment Plan.</p> <p>The St Leonards Hospital site has an extant planning permission for residential and, as outlined above, the HCA are optimistic that it is close to advancing the development of the site for a sustainable residential development, to include some employment and commercial uses. Accordingly the HCA request that the Council consider including the St Leonards site as a preferred option for housing development. On the basis of an emerging masterplan for the site the HCA envisages delivery of a scheme for around 188 units with 30% affordable housing in accordance with planning policy.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
481350	Mr Garry Brisdion		CSO156	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		<p>KS 4 proposes moving the land on Blackfield Farm to urban rather than Green Belt status. Throughout the document it is clear the intention is to preserve the heathlands, hence the suggestion that the land should be used only for elderly care homes rather than housing which would threaten the heathland. My concern is both for the protection of the heathland and the levels of current elderly living in West Moors. Your reports states that the elderly population in West Moors is currently 35% compared to the National Average of only 19%. Surely the town does not need another care home. The provision of an elderly care home would do very little for the development of the village.</p> <p>Whilst I am sure that a care home would be limited in size and raise a lesser risk to the heathlands, surely a move to reclassify the whole land to Urban would open the door to future housing development and simply delay the potential risk. In order to ensure that risk is minimised as per the Councils intention I would suggest that NPO KS6 would be the better option and move the land Green Belt status to ensure no further encroachment.</p>	Adoption of KS 6 and re-designate the Blackfield Farm area as Green Belt to ensure no future housing development in order to ensure the integrity and future safety of the adjacent Heathland		254
481350	Mr Garry Brisdion		CSO157	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		<p>KS 4 proposes moving the land on Blackfield Farm to urban rather than Green Belt status. Throughout the document it is clear the intention is to preserve the heathlands, hence the suggestion that the land should be used only for elderly care homes rather than housing which would threaten the heathland. My concern is both for the protection of the heathland and the levels of current elderly living in West Moors. Your reports states that the elderly population in West Moors is currently 35% compared to the National Average of only 19%. Surely the town does not need another care home. The provision of an elderly care home would do very little for</p>	Adoption of KS 6 and the redesignation of the Blackfield Farm area as Green Belt will ensure no future housing development and ensure the future integrity and safety of the adjacent heathland.		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							the development of the village. Whilst I am sure that a care home would be limited in size and raise a lesser risk to the heathlands, surely a move to reclassify the whole land to Urban would open the door to future housing development and simply delay the potential risk. In order to ensure that risk is minimised as per the Councils intention I would suggest that NPO KS6 would be the better option and move the land Green Belt status to ensure no further encroachment.			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO28 1	Preferred Option KS 4	Support		With regard to Wimborne, I reluctantly support the area off Julians Road being within the urban area as it seems logical to allow this small area to "follow on" from the existing row of housing & development and it would allow more affordable houses to be built close to town.			254
485066	Mr David Brenchley		CSO60 7	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		With regards to the proposals relating to Blackfield Farm, West Moors and the suggestion that it should be included in the urban area as detailed in "Preferred option KS4 of the Local Development Framework: Blackfield Farm". This is clearly not a sensible idea. The SSSI site next to Blackfield Farm is only 100m from the houses already built at this location. Therefore the field known as Blackfield Farm is only 100m wide. This provides a very small buffer zone between the SSSI and an already developed urban area. You clearly and quite correctly state that no development should be allowed within 400m of a SSSI, therefore the existing development of Blackfield Lane would not now be permitted. There is clearly no going back and Blackfield Lane will remain at only 100m distance from the SSSI. Referring to the East Dorset Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Study March 2009,	That option KS6 should be chosen instead of KS4. The inner Green Belt boundary will be amended to include Blackfield Farm, West Moors as Green Belt. This will protect the area and most importantly the SSSI at this site.		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>page 12 clearly states that there are a number of sites which were identified for the study, but which were found to be unsuitable for one reason or another. Blackfield Farm is one of those sites identified and has been excluded from development.</p> <p>How can the council completely contradict their own study and then go on to suggest that it is supported by evidence?</p> <p>Page 24 of the same document states "Conclusions: As identified in Section 6 of this report the Assessment has identified sufficient land to provide a five year deliverable supply of housing and a 15 year supply of physically developable land based on all of the possible currently known housing requirements." Again if all the desired development land has been found without including the Blackfield Farm site why is there an attempt to include it now and to cause irreparable damage to the environment, specifically the SSSI at this location?</p> <p>The Council should be championing and encouraging the regeneration of all SSSI within its boundaries. Blackfield Farm offers just such an opportunity. The area is not currently frequented by people at all!</p> <p>The suggestion that a care home would be a suitable development at Blackfield Farm flies in the face of the 400m exclusion of development where a SSSI boundary is located. Any development would necessitate the extensive use of industrial machinery and a constant stream of commercial vehicles into an area where no industrial or commercial activity currently takes place.</p> <p>The local area, by that I mean West Moors, is already over developed with residential, retirement and care homes. The council is well aware that the area cannot support yet another development of this type.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
489261	Mrs Heather Hood		CSO689	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		<p>My objections relating to the proposals relating to Blackfield Farm, West Moors and the suggestion that it should be included in the urban area as detailed in "Preferred option KS4 of the Local Development Framework: Blackfield Farm" are as follows:</p> <p>The SSSI site next to Blackfield Farm is only 100m from the houses already built at this location. Therefore the field known as Blackfield Farm is only 100m wide. This provides a tiny strip of land between the SSSI and a developed urban area. It clearly states that no development should be allowed within 400m of a SSSI, therefore the existing development of Blackfield Lane would not now be authorised.</p> <p>I thought that this council were keen to preserve the environment for future generations - that is one of the reasons why I voted them in - if this is the case then this proposal should not go ahead. On checking the East Dorset Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Study March 2009, page 12 I also see that there are a number of sites which were identified for the study, but which were found to be unsuitable and Blackfield Farm is one of those sites identified and has been excluded from development. What has now changed that the council can do a U turn on their own study or has some kind of compromise agreement reached between the council and the developer?</p> <p>The damage to the environment would be immense, there is already a risk of flooding around this area when it rains, and another development would increase this risk and impact on the SSSI - unless the council wish to see it turn into Bog land.</p> <p>The houses built near to this field have to have a pump to ensure that the sewerage is pumped out to the mains as the site is below normal gravity and too far away from the mains systems.</p>	That option KS6 should be chosen instead of KS4. The inner Green Belt boundary should be amended to include Blackfield Farm, West Moors as Green Belt. This will protect the area and most importantly the SSSI at this site as well as preserving the integrity of West Moors village.		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Another development here would impact adversely not just on the surrounding residents and their mains services but also on the environment as it tries to cope with yet more urban encroachment.</p> <p>The suggestion that a care home would be a suitable development at Blackfield Farm flies in the face of the 400m exclusion of development where a SSSI boundary is located. Any development would necessitate the extensive use of industrial machinery and a constant stream of commercial vehicles into an area where no industrial or commercial activity currently takes place.</p> <p>The transport links to Blackfield Lane are poor. Ashurst Lane which is used as a cut through to Station Road is a single lane road with a pavement on only one side. The Avenue supports a primary school and a church and is already congested. Station Road is horrendously busy and set to get worse in the coming years. Realistically none of the roads leading to Blackfield Farm would be able to cope with the increase in commercial traffic used to either build or support a care home.</p> <p>My concern is if this care home is built then that accidents and fatalities will occur around these roads that are already busy.</p> <p>West Moors, is already over developed with residential, retirement and care homes and this has impacted on the local services such as Doctors and dentists. It is not feasible that the local community services such as Doctors can support yet another care home development.</p> <p>If a care home needs to be built (which is questionable), Planning permission has already been granted for a care village on part of the land at St Leonard's. This has not been implemented but would be a better option as the transport links are better i.e. straight off the A31</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							and it doesn't necessitate the change of status of the land and I would hope that as the development is termed care village it would support its own medical facilities and not drain the ones in West Moors as the proposed site will do.			
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO2333	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		ARC would object to any development at the Cooper's Lane sites as it would have a negative effect upon the SSSI (which already has too much public pressure and incidents of arson). ARC would only agree with the development at Blackfield Farm only if it is a care home and no other use, as again it would have a negative effect upon the SSSI.			254
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Clerk Ferndown Town Council	CSO1907	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		Woodland Walk – OBJECT - it is felt that the access/egress from this site being an unmade/unadopted highway would not be suitable for increased housing provision the highways in the town are inadequate and unable to cope with the current number of traffic movements and additional housing will have a detrimental effect on the road network. Improvements to Canford Bottom Roundabout and the dualling the A31 from Ferndown to Merley should be completed before any further development of the Town is considered. Forest View Drive - SUPPORT - The Town Council has no objection to this change.			254
496039	Mr and Mrs Draper		CSO1593	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		The increase of traffic on The Avenue, a road that already is a hazard with parked cars and buses for the school and the residents.	Blackfield Farm: Remain Green Belt.		254
496129	Mr and Mrs Edward Lewington		CSO1601	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		We object to the development of a nursing home on Blackfield Farm. Having had experience of working for a group on nursing homes, it is common knowledge that they do have an impact on local resources. West Moors / Ferndown	To give Blackfield Farm Green Belt status.		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							already have a great number of nursing homes and feel that the land should be given Green Belt status, especially with regard to flora and fauna.			
496213	Mr Anthony P Syngé		CSO16 16	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		To change the status of Blackfield Farm land from Green Belt to 'urban' is not acceptable, due to its proximity to heathland and sites of special scientific interest. This is not a suitable location for a care home. The access via the Avenue is too congested at certain times of the day with cars parked on both sides of the road for 2/3rds of its length, for the school and the church. West Moors does not want or need another large care home. There are already too many elderly residents in the village for its own good, and more pressure would be placed on doctors surgeries and other facilities.	Blackfield Farm should be returned to Green Belt status as provided for in Key Strategy 6.		254
496233	Mrs Pat Gilson		CSO16 22	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		With regards to the proposals relating to Blackfield Farm, West Moors and the suggesting that it should be included in the urban area as detailed in "Preferred option KS4 of the Local Development Framework: Blackfield Farm". I wholly object to this proposal for a number of reasons: 1. The SSSI site next to Blackfield Farm is only 100m from the houses already built at this location. Therefore the field known as Blackfield Farm is only 100m wide. This provides a very small buffer zone between the SSSI and an already developed urban area. 2. You clearly and quite correctly state that no development should be allowed within 400m of a SSSI, therefore the existing development of Blackfield Lane would not now be permitted. There is clearly no going back and Blackfield Lane will remain at only 100m distance from the SSSI. 3. West Moors, is already over developed with residential, retirement and care homes and this	That option KS6 should be chosen instead of KS4. The inner Green Belt boundary will be amended to include Blackfield Farm, West Moors as Green Belt. This will protect the area and most importantly the SSSI at this site.		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>has impacted on the local services such as Doctors and dentists. It is not possible that the local community can support yet another care home development.</p> <p>4. Planning permission has already been granted for a care village on part of the land at St Leonards. This has not been implemented but would be a better option as the transport links are better i.e. straight off the A31 and if it is a care village should have its own doctors and dentists to support the care community.</p> <p>5. The transport links to Blackfield Lane are poor. Ashurst Road which is used as a cut through to Station Road is a single lane road with a pavement on only one side. Realistically none of the roads leading to Blackfield Farm would be able to cope with the increase in commercial traffic used to either build or support a care home. My concern is that facilities will happen around these roads that are already busy with a school and church.</p>			
496245	Mrs Margaret Trueman		CSO1644	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		<p>I object to the proposal to change the Green Belt at Blackfield Lane, West Moors, known as Blackfield Farm Key Strategy 4&5. The increase in traffic; heavy lorries, ambulances, cars plus the noise: - i.e. sirens that we already suffer with other care homes in the area. Their access into this area also means added danger, i.e. the entrances from side roads onto Station Road is very dangerous. Plus the school and church traffic already cause problems.</p>	<p>Stop building nursing homes and retirement homes in this village. All services, i.e. doctors are stretched too far already. We want a living vibrant village.</p>		254
496653	Mr Charles Gilson		CSO1819	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		<p>With regards to the proposals relating to Blackfield Farm, West Moors and the suggestion that it should be included in the urban area as detailed in 'Preferred Option KS 4 of the Local Development Framework: Blackfield Farm'. I do not agree and object to this proposal. The SSSI site next to Blackfield Farm is only 100m</p>	<p>That option KS 6 should be chosen instead of KS 4. The inner Green belt boundary will be amended to include Blackfield Farm, West Moors as Green Belt. This will protect the</p>		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>from the houses already built at this location. Therefore the field known as Blackfield Farm is only 100m wide. This provides a very small buffer zone between the SSSI and an already developed urban area. It clearly and quite correctly states that no development should be allowed within 400m of a SSSI, therefore the existing development of Blackfield Lane would not now be permitted. There is clearly no going back and Blackfield Lane will remain at only 100m distance from the SSSI.</p> <p>The suggestion that a care home would be a suitable development at Blackfield Farm flies in the face of the 400m exclusion of development where a SSSI boundary is located. Any development would necessitate the extensive use of industrial machinery and a constant stream of commercial vehicles into an area where no industrial or commercial activity currently takes place.</p> <p>West Moors, is already over developed with residential, retirement and care homes and this has impacted on the local services such as Doctors, hospitals and dentists. It does not seem feasible that the local community can support yet another care home development.</p> <p>In addition the transport links to Blackfield Lane are poor. Ashurst Road which is used as a cut through to Station Road is a single lane road with a pavement on only one side. Realistically none of the roads leading to Blackfield Farm would be able to cope with the increase in commercial traffic used to either build or support a care home. My concern is that fatalities will occur around these roads that are already busy with a school and church.</p>	area and most importantly the SSI at this site.		
496697	Mr and Mrs Richard and Mavis		CSO18 27	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		Have you seen the state of The Avenue. The road is breaking up and the junction into Station Road is dangerous as it is restricted. The	This should be Green Belt. Not building we support option KS6.		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Wheeler						increase in traffic would also be dangerous when the children are going or leaving school. This needs to be addressed before anything is decided. This is a quiet residential area and this proposal is inappropriate. We are also concerned about the damage to the Holt and West Moors Heath which is a listed site of special scientific interest. This would also put too much burden on village resources.			
497659	Mr & Mrs John and Sylvia Calver		CSO24 20	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		The only exit from "Blackfield Farm" area is The Avenue. The Avenue is in a very poor state from the traffic to the school, church and the bus stop. The exit to Station Road had a very poor visibility to the right with a telegraph pole in the drivers vision. We also object to this area being developed because of the listed SSSI	Suggest that the green belt boundary is not moved. Also Blackfield Farm should not be given urban status until The Avenue is upgraded and made safe for the school, church, buses and the residents having to use The Avenue.		254
497681	Miss H Walker		CSO24 24	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		Object to Blackfields Farm being included in the urban area. It should be left in the green belt area. Access will create extra traffic in the area. The Avenue will be the main road affected. This road is very busy with a school and at times is totally congested with school traffic often causing traffic jams. Also the gradual eroding of the Green Belt so near to the SSSIs is continuing - to the eventual detriment of the area.			254
497870	Mr & Mrs R Calver		CSO25 13	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		1. Whilst the core strategy has had to reconsider the original housing option due to the proximity of heathlands site close by, the development for housing under the different guise of residential care will still involve some threat to the same heathlands site. 2. Development of this site for residential care would allow a large establishment which would	Adopt Option KS 6 as preferred option. Remove Option KS 4 and KS 5 with regard to Blackfield Farm.		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>not be keeping with the residential nature of the surrounding access roads leading to the Blackfield Farm site</p> <p>3. Such a site would generate a huge increase in vehicular movements throughout the day and more particularly at night as residential care establishments involve 24 hour 7 day week facilities. This increase in vehicular movements down small residential roads will increase the risk to the many children who now live and will live in these houses in the future. It will also disrupt the quiet environment of the area as it has existed for many years.</p> <p>4. Furthermore the access from Station Road into The Avenue which leads to the site is not only a poor turning for vehicles it is also dangerous due to extremely bad sight lines. This is further exasperated due to the school and church being located on either side of the junction, which causes additional congestion on a day to day basis. The congestion is such that the cars restrict The Avenue to a single lane along two thirds of its length on a daily basis.</p> <p>5. The original Blackfield Lane development caused immense concern for the local authority with particular emphasis on this junction. Now nearly 20 years on, the vast increase in traffic movements on our local roads will have only made this situation worse. Indeed the West Moors relief road proposed in previous core strategy plans understood the need to ease pressure on the local road network in this area many years ago. Additional traffic to the proposed site will only add to congestion problems around this junction and on local roads. Congestion problems are already prevalent, and will only get worse as the relief road is never likely to go ahead, and do not need to be worsened by unnecessary development in this area.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>6. One has to consider the rationale of proposing a site that requires large number of vehicular movements, with many of these vehicles being larger delivery lorries and ambulances, through a quiet residential estate which has only occasional vehicular movements at present. Residential homes by the nature of its occupants are designed to be at the heart of the community within a close distance from the village centre will be beyond their physical capabilities.</p> <p>7. We would also raise concerns regarding the Castleman Trailway. This much used facility passes through the development area and is much used by local residents who would not want their access to the Trailway reduced or restricted in any way.</p> <p>8. With regard to statements in the options laid out in the strategy document I would make the following comments:</p> <p>a) In Option KS4 the document states Blackfield Farm is close to protected heath lands and rightly infers it is not suitable for housing. It then goes on to suggest residents in a care home pose less of a threat to the heath lands environment. I would have to point out that my understanding about the threat to such environments is not specifically from humans but from their pets. Research findings report that one cat has been known to virtually eradicate a wild life species from a protected area. The development of Blackfield Farm as a care home may not introduce additional risks to the heathlands as an individual premise, but what it will do is move the developed boundary much closer to the protected SSSI. This developed area then becomes new territory for local pets who roam as part of their natural instinct and by default threatens the SSSI. I would have to question if research has been carried out as to whether the proposed care home would be</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>inside the guidance for boundary limits (400m) for protected heathlands SSSI.</p> <p>b) In Options KS4 and 5 the strategy implies new housing is a benefit to the community. I would have to comment that whilst care home may be located in an area, residents will be drawn from a much wider community and the housing benefit to the local area is limited.</p> <p>9. As residents of West Moors we respect the village life and rural setting in this area. The green belt provides rural villages the protection to maintain the environment and protect the local rural community. Continued urbanisation is the thin end of the wedge and we cannot support these proposals and would worry about future impacts.</p> <p>10. With the number of existing care homes in the local area, is there really a need for an additional facility in the village of West Moors. In summary we feel the proposal for any development of the Blackfield Farm site is wholly inappropriate and would fully support Option KS 6 to extend the green belt boundary up to the existing properties in this area</p>			
497914	Mr Norman Snape		CSO25 18	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		<p>Object to development of any type at Blackfield Farm for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The exit from The Avenue onto Station Road is extremely dangerous. 2. There are 4 blind exits side wards onto The Avenue, the first being from the Infants School. 3. Roadside parking would need to be eliminated as would all parking along the Avenue and Blackfield Lane. 4. The sewerage pumping station in Harrison Way was very suspect under the ownership of both Clarks and Westbury. Wessex Water would not take this over and from information from them today this remains the case. Therefore any overloading would again create problems to 			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							existing properties. 5. In addition the approach along Blackfield Lane to the Land is not sufficiently wide for 2 vehicles - i.e. vans to pass with ease and safety. 6. This land is also in very close proximity to the MOD underground liquid stores - the biggest in the UK			
497932	Mr J B Higgs		CSO25 21	Preferred Option KS 4	Support		Support care home - less disturbance to present site			254
498251	Mr & Mrs Potter		CSO29 50	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		1. Blackfield Farm is within 400m of heathland and as such should not be available either for housing or an elderly care home due to an embargo on such development, supported by Natural England. These areas are also adjacent to Sites of special scientific interest and therefore any development would have a detrimental effect on the existing wildlife. 2. Road access from both of these sites is via Blackfield Lane which is extremely narrow and has an existing pinch point making it unsafe for any further increase in traffic. In addition to this point, access to Station Road from The Avenue is already extremely difficult due to both the heavy volume of traffic and sightlines. It was noted in the planning report for 2002 there was a substantial traffic flow along Station Road. This has now increased considerably. 3. Medical facilities within the village are already overstretched (our own personal experience obtaining a timely Doctor's appointment) and would not appear to be able to support further increases to demand. 4. Adjacent to Blackfield Farm there is what we believe to be 275,000 volt overhead transmission line. These overhead power lines produce electric and magnetic fields which many believe could have adverse effects on people (cancer			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>causing for example – see HM Government Department of Health report 16/10/2009 paragraphs 37-43, next steps p.25 (www.dh.gov.uk).</p> <p>5. The limited parking facilities in West Moors are already overstretched and would not safely accommodate additional vehicles</p> <p>6. From the East Dorset future housing plans, it would appear that housing needs are already met within West Moors without developing these two areas.</p> <p>7. Option KS 6 is supported, the area in question at Blackfield Farm/Lane should remain a greenfield site.</p>			
360108	Ms J Hardman		CSO3399	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		<p>Object because Blackfield Road is not wide enough to meet any increase in traffic. In addition there are sand lizards and other reptiles living here which would suffer if there is any other development. Also there are a large number of care homes already in West Moors</p>		NB - This representation is from Paul and Julie Hardmand and Derek and June Howell at 3 Harrison Way, West Moors BH22 0NL. Form signed by Julie Hardman on behalf of these 4 people.	254
489263	Mr Hugh Hood		CSO3808	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		<p>Object for the following reasons:- The SSSI site next to Blackfield Farm is only 100m from the houses already built at this location. Therefore the field known as Blackfield Farm is only 100m wide. This provides a very small buffer zone between the SSSI and an already developed urban are. It clearly and quite</p>			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>correctly state that no development should be allowed within 400m of a SSSI, therefore the existing development of Blackfield Farm would not now be permitted. There is clearly no going back and Blackfield Lane will remain at only 100m distance from the SSSI.</p> <p>The damage to the environment would be immense. There is already a risk of flooding around this area when it rains.</p> <p>The houses built near to this field have to have a pump to ensure that the sewerage is pumped out to the mains as the site is below normal so cannot rely on gravity. Another development here would impact adversely not just on the surrounding residents but also on the environment.</p> <p>The suggestion that a care home would be a suitable development at Blackfield Farm flies in the face of the 400m exclusion of development where a SSSI boundary is located. Any development would necessitate the extensive use of industrial machinery and a constant stream of commercial vehicles into an area where no industrial or commercial activity currently takes place.</p> <p>The transport links to Blackfield Lane are poor. Ashurst Lane which is used as a cut through to Station Road is a single lane road with a pavement on only one side. The Avenue supports a primary school and a church and is already congested. Station Road is horrendously busy and set to get worse in the coming years. Realistically none of the roads leading to Blackfield Farm would be able to cope with the increase in commercial traffic used to either build or support a care home.</p> <p>My concern is if this care home is build then that accidents and fatalities will occur around these roads that are already busy.</p> <p>West Moors is already over development with</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							residential, retirement and care homes and this has impacted on the local services. It is not feasible that the local community services can support yet another care home development. If a care home needs to be build, planning permission has already been granted for a care village on part of the land at St Leonards. This has not been implemented but would be a better option as the transport links are better – i.e. straight off the A31 and it doesn't necessitate the change of status of land.			
498357	Mr John Bestley and Ms Linda Knight		CSO3103	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		We object because once something (in this case a care home) is built then that is just the start and nothing can then stop it because a precedent has already been set. There are many such homes for the elderly in this area, some just a few hundred yards away already bringing extra traffic etc – enough is enough and the area must remain GREEN BELT as it always has been.			254
498579	Mr Paul Brookes		CSO3349	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		All of the comments below relate to the Blackfield Farm site proposal. I am concerned about the lack of a precise definition of "elderly care home". The proposed maximum size of the care home, number and type of residents etc is not stated. I believe it would be foolish to assume that this would not have an impact on the nearby SSSI land. It is insufficient to only consider the residents of the care home since many visitors and staff may introduce additional impacts that have not been explicitly considered. Any development will also dislodge the wildlife which may be observed frequenting the field at the end of Blackfield Lane. Increased traffic, commercial and otherwise, will provide additional road safety concerns at the junction of The Avenue and Station Road, right	Land at Blackfield Farm to be included in Green Belt and protected from development.		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							outside the village First School and church, as well as changing the character of the residential roads. Roadside parking would presumably have to be restricted to improve safety, causing issues for the school and church as well as residents of The Avenue. Commercial traffic at night would be increased and as several houses are situated right up against the roadside on Blackfield Lane, this is likely to cause a disturbance to sleeping residents especially near the traffic calming measures which generate excessive road noise as vehicles pass over them.			
499478	Mr M R Richardson		CSO3774	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		Impact on traffic - sewage, local resources. Damage to SSSI			254
499484	Mr and Mrs J Varmen		CSO3783	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		This proposed development would have a negative effect on the village and surrounding area. Traffic would worsen, more open countryside would be lost. The village has grown greatly in the last 50 years and future development needs to be controlled. This development would spoil one of the better parts of the village making it more urban. We have only been given 5 days to respond to this which is not a sensible period of time.	Make it green belt!		254
499494	Mr Ian Smith		CSO3787	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		It is already difficult to get an early appointment at the Station Road surgery. Having a significant number of elderly residents living close by will make this much worse. Any additional residential building in West Moors will only make the traffic congestion that is bad during the day much worse.			254
500141	Mr Martyn Hiscock		CSO4152	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		I strongly disagree with the proposal to remove green belt status. The proposal will greatly increase the traffic in and around Blackfield Lane	Suggest that option KS 6 is adopted - retain green belt status.		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							and will have a devastating affect on the wildlife of the surrounding area. I question the need for further old people's accommodation in West Moors.			
500214	Anne Garwood		CSO4169	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		I strongly disagree with the proposal to remove green belt status. I question the need for further old people's accommodation in West Moors. The proposal for urban status will cause severe congestion in and around Blackfield Lane and will have a devastating effect on the wildlife in the surrounding areas.	Suggest that option KS6 is adopted - retain green belt status.		254
360167	Mrs Pippa WHEATLEY		CSO17444	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		I object in relation to Coopers Lane. Both the northern and the whole of the southern parts of the Coopers Lane site should be in the Green Belt. The Urban area is not a good choice as it will give less protection to this area. The southern part is a habitat of importance to support the SSSI at Stephens Castle. The area has many mature trees, principally oak and birch. There is grazed pasture of mixed grasses and wild flowers, including spotted orchid. There are areas of impenetrable bramble which provide food and cover for wildlife. A wide variety of birds are seen including tawny owl and barn owl. Occasionally nightjars from Stephens Castle have been seen feeding on this woodland edge type habitat. There are badgers, adders, lizards, slow worms, glow worms among the many animals seen. It is also a hunting ground for cats from Coopers Lane and Coronation Road so is hopefully relieving Stephens Castle of some predators. East Dorset Local Plan Inspectors Report on Chapter 13 Para 13.37, 13.39 in the conclusions Para 7.1 to 7.13 expresses quite a lot of detail. He emphasises this land lies alongside the fragile heathland of Stephens Castle SSSI, its rarity and important international designations.	Place the whole of Coopers Lane site in Green Belt		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							He considered both parts of the Coopers Lane site and decided they both had merit and should be safeguarded. He said expert guidance in the form of an Environmental Statement addressing the impact would have helped. He again said it should be held back until more complete information of nature conservation issues is available. I therefore request that this nature conservation information or environmental impact assessment is made available. There are no suitable access points to this land			
475545	Ms Sarah Zyga		CSO17 369	Preferred Option KS 4	Support					254
507755	Mrs Maureen Niblock		CSO17 248	Preferred Option KS 4	Support		Coopers Lane			254
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 463	Preferred Option KS 4		General Comment	DWT supports the inclusion of the northern half of land at Coopers Lane, Verwood (Moorlands Road Meadow SNCI SU00/97, unimproved neutral grassland), Forest View Drive (Award Road SNCI SU00/84, humid heath) and Doe's Lane (adjacent to Dewlands Common SSSI) in the Green Belt. Habitats at Woodland Walk include secondary woodland, with boundary oaks and the area is utilised by badgers. Potential impacts on Uddens Water would also need consideration in options for this site. We consider ecological information is required to inform the decision regarding inclusion of this site in the urban area or Green Belt. The option to provide a care home at Blackfields Farm recognises the need to restrict development to such a use as it lies close to heathland. Again we consider ecological			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							information is required to inform the decision regarding inclusion of this site in the urban area or Green Belt Additional housing at Coopers Lane South would increase pressure on Stephens Castle SSSI and as it lies within 400m of the SSSI falls within the zone where housing is usually exempt as set out in the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework. We suggest it would be preferable to include this site in the Green Belt in the interests of biodiversity			
359552	Ms J WEEDON	Clerk West Moors Parish Council	CSO17901	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		Members felt that the Blackfield Farm site should be included in the Green Belt and are therefore against the Core Strategy preferred option KS4 but support non preferred option KS6.			254
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18629	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		Option KS4 involves the re-drawing of the inner Green Belt boundary to include three sites within the Green Belt and to place four sites within the urban area. There is currently uncertainty over the possible effects associated with the transferred sites. We object to this option pending resolution of the issues identified in the HRA in ensuring certainty over the location and scale of development and the associated need for mitigation measures for the European sites. Note that uses such as care homes may be a permissible use within 400m of the European sites. An appropriate assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 may still be required.			254
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18119	Preferred Option KS 4		General Comment	To avoid any conflict of interest by members, the ETAG response does not include detailed comment on the Verwood sites or that at Woodland Walk. Those concerned are submitting comments individually. It is sensible to include in the Green Belt that land which cannot be developed because of its			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>proximity to heathland. Forest View Drive is an area of heathland that should be linked to Ferndown Common as shown on the RSPB Heathland Extent and Potential Maps. ETAG supports its inclusion in the Green Belt. The Coopers Lane North site is an SNCI and to conform with policies on protection of SNCIs should be included in the Green Belt. ETAG also supports the inclusion in the Green Belt of the Doe's Lane site.</p> <p>The type of development proposed at Blackfield Farm will be restricted through its proximity to heathland SSSI on MOD land. Any proposals for development of the larger part of the site would need to consider both the commitments under the Bern Convention for no new roads on or near heathland, and the impact of light and PM10 pollution on the heathland species. We recommend that the site is surveyed as it has lain fallow for several years. It is low-lying and secluded.</p> <p>The southern area of Blackfield Farm, through which the Castleman Trailway runs, has biodiversity interest in some areas including a badger sett, unimproved grassland and heathland. This too should be surveyed. It is an important local amenity for informal recreation and dog walking. There is potential pollution risk from the pipeline from the Fuel Depot and from the former railway. The area is bounded on three sides by garden and high chain-link fences. Despite evidence of previous semi-industrial use, there would appear to be no good reason to include this section in the urban area: further urban development would detract from the setting of the Castleman Trailway.</p> <p>Julians Road, Wimborne There is a bad infestation of Japanese knotweed on this site. It is essential that this is cleared prior to any development and disposed of according to EA</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							regulations.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 637	Preferred Option KS 4	Support		The Agency supports the protection of the Green Belt. If changes are made to the boundaries of the Green Belt, mixed use development is preferred to isolated housing or employment sites. Land at St Leonard's Hospital is accessed directly from the A31, therefore we have concerns over the proposed development under Preferred Option KS3. Woodland Walk, Ferndown is located close to the SRN and the site's inclusion within the urban area under Preferred Option KS4 and Non Preferred Option KS5 could have a detrimental impact on the SRN.			254
517806	Mr Tony Marlborough		CSO17 181	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		I add my voice to other objecting to designation as 'urban status' and supporting the alternative to give the land 'green belt' status. The main reason is that the site is unsuitable for urban development due to the poor surrounding roads which are narrow and congested. The lower part of the site is, I think, part of the Castleman Trail which is constantly in use by walkers and cyclists. (Blackfield Farm)			254
517815	Mr Cyril Beecher		CSO17 210	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		Reasons for objections: Infrastructure in the area is limited. Particularly, any access roads which could be used by the development are already barely adequate for existing use and all the possible roads lead to junctions with Station Road with poor site lines. (Blackfield Farm)			254
517827	Mrs R J Thomas		CSO17 224	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		I object to this application because The Avenue is a bust road with the school at the entrance to Station Road, also I believe we should retain all of the countryside what is left for the wild animals and fauna. The village has been spoilt already with all these blocks of flats. (Blackfield Farm)			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
517829	Mr and Mrs C E Jefferies		CSO17 225	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		We are objecting to this proposed development on the grounds that it will bring extra traffic to The Avenue. It is already very congested with cars parked both sides of the road, resulting in meeting cars in the middle of the road, forcing us to reverse back to allow the oncoming car to come through. The condition of the road is so bad now, that we have named it 'the road from hell'. It was repaired in appalling weather after last winter's weather, and it is now worse than ever. (Blackfield Farm)			254
517837	Mr W.H Newell		CSO17 232	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		This proposed development is located at the end of a series of small residential roads and if granted will make life unbearable for the residents. The roads are unsuitable for the resultant volume and type of traffic and will make it more dangerous for children. In addition you (council) are proposing to change the rules relating to the distance of developments to the currently protected nature reserves. Once that happens the flood gates will open and the developers will have a field day at the expense of the village.			254
517842	Mr and Mrs W Pope		CSO17 234	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		Will bring in too much congestion into West Moors. Station Road will not be able to cope with more traffic. Doctor's surgery will not be able to cope. (Blackfield Farm)			254
517845	Mr and Mrs R A Gibbs		CSO17 237	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		We have lived here 7 years now, from the main Ringwood Road, Ferndown and we were fed up with the traffic going by, so I don't think we want to go back to constant traffic. We like it the way it is and this is why we say no thank you. We don't want any more buildings, we have had enough changes already. We like the trees and hedges and we do not want it spoilt. (Blackfield Farm)			254
517999	Mr		CSO17	Preferred	Object		The Avenue is already cluttered with people			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	R W Miller		273	Option KS 4			working at W M school and church also we have a regular bus service, do we need another care home?? (Blackfield Farm)			
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		CSO19 271	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		<p>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.</p> <p>Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously having damaging implications for heathlands, be they SSSIs or SNCIs, include KS3, KS4 (Coopers Lane south), VWM4 and VMW7.</p> <p>There is a commitment to restore and link heathland within south-east Dorset and areas most suitable for such restoration have been identified. There are options within the CS which would preclude such beneficial restoration including KS3/ PC7, PC4, and PC5.</p>			254
359875	Dr		CSO19	Preferred	Object		Woodlands			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lesley Haskins		311	Option KS 4			Ancient woodland is of course of recognised biodiversity importance, but developing secondary woodland is also valuable for biodiversity, carbon retention and landscape. Impacts can be both direct, when the habitat itself is replaced, but also indirect through access by humans and domestic pets. While problems caused by these factors on heathlands is now generally recognised, (predation by pets, disturbance by both humans and pets, dumping, trampling, and light pollution) they are also of relevance to other habitats, including and perhaps especially, woodland. Preferred Options in the Core Strategy which impact directly or indirectly upon woodland include KS4 (Woodland Walk), VW2 and VWM4.			
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		CSO19 324	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		It is understood that all these sites do have 'a planning history'. However it is very worrying that this seems to have resulted in them being isolated within the Strategy into this combined option rather than being placed within their relevant 'local' areas, especially as this is likely to mean that they pass unremarked by most consultees. Further placement of a number of such individual sites into generalised combinations is unhelpful - comments need to be made on a site by site basis. Woodland Walk is secondary woodland, and developing secondary woodland, incorporating some old oaks. It is now the last substantial undeveloped area available as foraging ground for the badgers of The Warren – who are contained to the north by the Ferndown by-pass. Much of the site has a high water table and drainage is to the very nearby Uddens Water, tributary of the Moors River. These issues suggest that development of the site may be problematic. Blackfield Farm is close to heathland which			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>could be released from MOD ownership at any time. It is dangerous to allow the site to be placed in the urban envelope unless there is absolute and permanent certainty that development would be for a care home only. Forest View Drive is a heathland site whose protection in the Green Belt is supported and which could and should be linked by habitat restoration to Ferndown Common.</p> <p>Coopers Lane South . This site is close to Stephens Castle SSSI and will inevitably result in increased pressure thereon and thus should not be placed in the urban area.</p> <p>Coopers Lane North is sensitive grassland habitat so that its placement in the Green Belt is supported. Please note that it is not possible to argue that development of Stephens Castle south could be allowed because its impact on Stephens Castle could be deflected by use of Coopers Lane North for open space since CL north is itself sensitive grassland and inappropriate for heavy POS use.</p>			
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		CSO19176	Preferred Option KS 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 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</p>			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							(Woolsbridge).			
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19138	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		Preferred Option KS4 proposes changes to the Green Belt designation - some to be incorporated, some to be deleted. This desire to change Green Belt designations simply to suit the latest intentions very much undermines any real value in Green Belt designation.			254
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSO19049	Preferred Option KS 4	Support		<p>These representations are submitted on behalf of Castleoak Care Developments Ltd (as developer), and by Persimmon Homes Ltd and Mr & Mrs C Budd (as joint landowners). All parties fully support the Councils' preferred option KS4, to formally include the land at Blackfield Farm, West Moors within the urban area (as indicated on the plan at page 50 of the Core Strategy). As the supporting text to option KS4 confirms, this site is capable of providing elderly care accommodation because its residents would pose no threat to the adjoining Heathlands SPA. The land is not in the Green Belt and therefore it is logical to include it within the West Moors urban area.</p> <p>There is an urgent need for purpose-built elderly care accommodation in East Dorset district, which is recognised within the Key Issues contained in the Core Strategy in paragraph 2.91. Please find attached a demographic report summary prepared for Castleoak, which highlights the need for purpose-built elderly care accommodation in West Moors and the surrounding area. The figures shown are based on a 20 minute drive-time catchment area from the Blackfield Farm site, which is a widely accepted industry standard. The most relevant figures are those that demonstrate the need for care beds, being the gap between the supply and demand for 2009 and 2014:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the total shortage of care beds (i.e. including 			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>those that do not meet modern standards) was 255 beds in 2009 and this is projected to rise to 447 by 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the case for accommodation that conforms to the modern-standard (in accordance with the Care Standards Act 2000) is even more pressing, with a gap of 730 beds in 2009 rising to a projected gap of 922 beds in 2014 <p>There are a number of drivers for the growing need for purpose built care accommodation – in particular, the increase in demand for care beds as the population ages (the population profile for West Moors is also included in the attached summary report). In addition, a reduction in the supply of existing beds is compounding the shortage, as smaller care homes become less viable due to economic constraints and the Care Standards Act (2000) restricts the sale of care home operations that do not comply with the minimum standards set out therein.</p> <p>West Moors itself is identified as a district centre within the Core Strategy; this allows for smaller scale community, cultural, leisure, retail, employment and residential development within the urban area. Including Blackfield Farm within the urban area will therefore allow it to be developed for an important community facility, for which an urgent need has been identified.</p> <p>The site itself is flat, is of no particular ecological value and is not within an area prone to flooding. Therefore, whilst it is not suitable for residential development due to its close proximity to the Dorset Heathlands SPA, it is suitable for Class C2 development.</p> <p>Castleoak has had a longstanding interest in developing the Blackfield Farm site. They have undertaken discussions with both East Dorset District Council (EDDC) and Natural England over the last 2 years, in order to progress development of the Blackfield Farm site for a</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Class C2 elderly care scheme. Unfortunately, the recent recession has delayed progress, but Castleoak has retained its option on the site and is now working towards a suitable development in discussion with the local planning authority. Most recently, Castleoak held a meeting with EDDC on 13th October 2010 to discuss development of the site.</p> <p>The principle of Class C2 development on the Blackfield Farm site has been accepted in principle by EDDC and by Natural England, subject to certain caveats/requirements in terms of design, layout and protection of the adjoining Heathlands. These can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact nature of the use will need to be established with the LPA prior to submission and an operating statement provided, in order to ensure that the development is restricted to Use Class C2. • There will need to be a strict "no-cats/dogs" policy for residents of the care scheme, to ensure no encroachment onto the Heathlands by cats or residents seeking to walk their dogs in the area. • Development generally not to exceed two-storeys • Natural England require a landscaped "buffer zone" between the development and the boundary of the site (approximately 10 metres) • Provision of improved fencing to the boundary of the site with the Heathlands (i.e. cat-proof fencing) • Close attention to design and layout, taking into account the amenities of residential properties to the west <p>The developable area of the Blackfield Farm site is limited to the northern half of the land indicated on the Core Strategy plan, which has a site area of 2.1ha. Although only this part of the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Blackfield Farm site is suitable for development, the status of the remaining land can be determined via other policies in the emerging Core Strategy. Given its location, it would be illogical not to include all of the Blackfield Farm land (as shown on the plan) within the urban area.			
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSO19 052	Preferred Option KS 4	Support		<p>These representations are submitted on behalf of Castleoak Care Developments Ltd (as developer), and by Persimmon Homes Ltd and Mr & Mrs C Budd (as joint landowners). All parties fully support the Councils' preferred option KS4, to formally include the land at Blackfield Farm, West Moors within the urban area (as indicated on the plan at page 50 of the Core Strategy). As the supporting text to option KS4 confirms, this site is capable of providing elderly care accommodation because its residents would pose no threat to the adjoining Heathlands SPA. The land is not in the Green Belt and therefore it is logical to include it within the West Moors urban area.</p> <p>There is an urgent need for purpose-built elderly care accommodation in East Dorset district, which is recognised within the Key Issues contained in the Core Strategy in paragraph 2.91. Please find attached a demographic report summary prepared for Castleoak, which highlights the need for purpose-built elderly care accommodation in West Moors and the surrounding area. The figures shown are based on a 20 minute drive-time catchment area from the Blackfield Farm site, which is a widely accepted industry standard. The most relevant figures are those that demonstrate the need for care beds, being the gap between the supply and demand for 2009 and 2014:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the total shortage of care beds (i.e. including those that do not meet modern standards) was 			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>255 beds in 2009 and this is projected to rise to 447 by 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the case for accommodation that conforms to the modern-standard (in accordance with the Care Standards Act 2000) is even more pressing, with a gap of 730 beds in 2009 rising to a projected gap of 922 beds in 2014 <p>There are a number of drivers for the growing need for purpose built care accommodation – in particular, the increase in demand for care beds as the population ages (the population profile for West Moors is also included in the attached summary report). In addition, a reduction in the supply of existing beds is compounding the shortage, as smaller care homes become less viable due to economic constraints and the Care Standards Act (2000) restricts the sale of care home operations that do not comply with the minimum standards set out therein.</p> <p>West Moors itself is identified as a district centre within the Core Strategy; this allows for smaller scale community, cultural, leisure, retail, employment and residential development within the urban area. Including Blackfield Farm within the urban area will therefore allow it to be developed for an important community facility, for which an urgent need has been identified.</p> <p>The site itself is flat, is of no particular ecological value and is not within an area prone to flooding. Therefore, whilst it is not suitable for residential development due to its close proximity to the Dorset Heathlands SPA, it is suitable for Class C2 development.</p> <p>Castleoak has had a longstanding interest in developing the Blackfield Farm site. They have undertaken discussions with both East Dorset District Council (EDDC) and Natural England over the last 2 years, in order to progress development of the Blackfield Farm site for a Class C2 elderly care scheme. Unfortunately, the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>recent recession has delayed progress, but Castleoak has retained its option on the site and is now working towards a suitable development in discussion with the local planning authority. Most recently, Castleoak held a meeting with EDDC on 13th October 2010 to discuss development of the site.</p> <p>The principle of Class C2 development on the Blackfield Farm site has been accepted in principle by EDDC and by Natural England, subject to certain caveats/requirements in terms of design, layout and protection of the adjoining Heathlands. These can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact nature of the use will need to be established with the LPA prior to submission and an operating statement provided, in order to ensure that the development is restricted to Use Class C2. • There will need to be a strict "no-cats/dogs" policy for residents of the care scheme, to ensure no encroachment onto the Heathlands by cats or residents seeking to walk their dogs in the area. • Development generally not to exceed two-storeys • Natural England require a landscaped "buffer zone" between the development and the boundary of the site (approximately 10 metres) • Provision of improved fencing to the boundary of the site with the Heathlands (i.e. cat-proof fencing) • Close attention to design and layout, taking into account the amenities of residential properties to the west <p>The developable area of the Blackfield Farm site is limited to the northern half of the land indicated on the Core Strategy plan, which has a site area of 2.1ha. Although only this part of the Blackfield Farm site is suitable for development,</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							the status of the remaining land can be determined via other policies in the emerging Core Strategy. Given its location, it would be illogical not to include all of the Blackfield Farm land (as shown on the plan) within the urban area.			
507525	Mr David Lander	Boyer Planning Ltd	CSO19069	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		<p>Concerns are raised regarding the status of these proposals in Core Strategy terms. Please see section 3.3 of the accompanying statement.</p> <p>3.3 Preferred Option KS4 and Non Preferred Options KS5 and KS6</p> <p>3.3.1 These Green Belt options are concerned with boundary changes in East Dorset. Irrespective of the robustness of these proposals prior to the establishment of development requirements (see above), we have concerns about the status of these proposals in terms of the Core Strategy. So far as we are aware it is the Council's intention to allocate new development sites through a subsequent DPD. As such the detail of any Green belt boundary changes will also be determined at that stage.</p> <p>3.3.2 The Council therefore needs to clarify the status of these proposals in Core Strategy terms. The comments below are made without prejudice to these considerations.</p> <p>3.3.3 Preferred Option KS4 sets out proposed changes to the Green Belt around settlements in East Dorset as a result of a reassessment of the reserved sites in the Local Plan which have not been developed. In Verwood two sites are proposed to be included in the Green Belt: Cooper's Lane North and Doe's Lane. Cooper's Lane South is the only site suggested to be included in the urban area around Verwood. Non Preferred Options KS5 and KS6 propose including all the identified sites in the urban area or in the Green Belt respectively.</p> <p>3.3.4 We do not take issue with the rejection of</p>			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							options KS5 and KSD6. As regards Preferred Option KS4 we have concerns about the proposal to include Coopers Lane South in the urban area. No development should take place within 400 metres of the Verwood Heaths, with development between 400 metres and 5 kilometres required to provide mitigation measures. Concern is therefore raised with the proposed strategy to include Cooper's Lane South within the urban area. In justifying the preferred option the strategy states that 'the other sites are proposed for inclusion within the urban areas as they are able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands.' 3.3.5 Development within 400 metres of the heaths will lead to unacceptable impacts and should not be permitted. Cooper's Lane South is within 400 metres of Verwood Heaths within an area of heathland located on the opposite side of Moorlands Road to the site. The site should therefore be included in the Green Belt as no development would be permissible on the site in accordance with the Council's own Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework, April 2010. In relation to Verwood therefore all three identified sites should be included in the Green Belt as shown in Non Preferred Option KS6.			
359286	Mr Andrew PATRICK	Pro Vision Planning and Design	CSO19437	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		Pro Vision are instructed by Wessex Water to make representation in respect of Option KS4. 1.2 In essence our concerns are that KS4 does not allow for the essential redevelopment of Previously Developed land at Little Canford Depot. A Core Strategy which incorporates KS4 may therefore in this respect be unsound, for reasons outlined below. 1.3 Please read this representation in conjunction with parallel representations being made in	We would request that, if Little Canford Depot is not allocated for development (or identified as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt in accord with PPG2 Annex C) it should at least be deleted from the Green Belt.		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>response to KS1, KS3, PC5 and 6, and PC 8.</p> <p>1.4 Please read the “Overview” Document “Development Opportunities at Little Canford”. Option KS4</p> <p>1.5 Option KS4 proposes to delete a number of sites from the Green Belt. However, it does not propose to delete Little Canford Depot (with or without Stour Bank Nurseries) from the Green Belt. Why KS4 is unsound in respect of Little Canford Depot</p> <p>1.6 PPS12 advises that to be sound a Core Strategy must, amongst other criteria, be the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives. Leaving Little Canford Depot washed over by the Green Belt is not the most appropriate strategy for Little Canford Depot. The attached document “Development Opportunities at Little Canford” explains that this large Previously Developed site will have to be redeveloped in one form or another during the Plan period. In the light of reasonable alternatives – including deletion from the Green Belt – leaving it washed over by the Green Belt is not the most appropriate strategy to enable such redevelopment to make the best contribution towards community aims and objectives. Thus KS4 would be unsound in respect of Little Canford Depot.</p>			
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 831	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		<p>This Option is inappropriate at the present time until the Authorities make up their mind about the level of housing provision and further allocations which may be needed. A degree of certainty is required with regard to Green Belt boundaries which extends beyond the Plan period for the Core Strategy. The Preferred Option is not</p>	<p>Combine Policies KS4 and KS5 and to re-word in the following way “the inner Green Belt boundary to be reviewed following identified proposals for housing allocations in East</p>		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							consistent with the advice in PPG2 in the light of the need to look at Green Belts beyond the Core Strategy period.	Dorset.”		
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 863	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		<p>The objection to this Option is that it does not go far enough.</p> <p>There is clear evidential support for an extension to the employment site at Woolsbridge. The existing employment site at Woolsbridge is shown for employment purposes in the East Dorset Local Plan and excluded from the Green Belt. It would be inconsistent to allocate the Option PC5 site for employment development without excluding that land from the Green Belt. It is noted that Bournemouth Airport employment allocation is shown on the Christchurch Local Plan as an exclusion from the Green Belt. It would therefore be entirely consistent to exclude the allocation of land at Woolsbridge from the Green Belt.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate in my view to include the extension to Woolsbridge in Preferred Option KS3 which identifies land as a major development site in the Green Belt. The significant difference between the Woolsbridge industrial site and the St Leonards Hospital site in Option KCS3 is that in the St Leonards Hospital site there are large areas of Nature Conservation Interest which would presumably not be developed.</p>	Preferred Option KCS4 be amended by a map to show the inner Green Belt boundary re-drawn to exclude the land shown in Option PC5 and will require an additional bullet point under the heading “Sites to be excluded from the Green Belt:- Woolsbridge Preferred Employment Area.”		254
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 873	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		<p>These Options are inappropriate at the present time, until the Authority makes up its mind about the level of housing provision and further applications which may be needed. A degree of certainty with regard to Green Belt boundaries which extends beyond the Plan period for the Core Area needs to be incorporated. The Preferred Option is not consistent with the advice in PPG2 in the light of the need to look at Green</p>	Delete combined Policies KS4 and KS5 and re-word in the following way:- “the inner Green Belt boundary to be reviewed following assessment of the required level of housing provision and the allocation of proposals for		254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Belts beyond the Core Strategy period.	housing development in East Dorset".		
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSO19053	Preferred Option KS 4	Support		<p>These representations are submitted on behalf of Castleoak Care Developments Ltd (as developer), and by Persimmon Homes Ltd and Mr & Mrs C Budd (as joint landowners). All parties fully support the Councils' preferred option KS4, to formally include the land at Blackfield Farm, West Moors within the urban area (as indicated on the plan at page 50 of the Core Strategy). As the supporting text to option KS4 confirms, this site is capable of providing elderly care accommodation because its residents would pose no threat to the adjoining Heathlands SPA. The land is not in the Green Belt and therefore it is logical to include it within the West Moors urban area.</p> <p>There is an urgent need for purpose-built elderly care accommodation in East Dorset district, which is recognised within the Key Issues contained in the Core Strategy in paragraph 2.91. Please find attached a demographic report summary prepared for Castleoak, which highlights the need for purpose-built elderly care accommodation in West Moors and the surrounding area. The figures shown are based on a 20 minute drive-time catchment area from the Blackfield Farm site, which is a widely accepted industry standard. The most relevant figures are those that demonstrate the need for care beds, being the gap between the supply and demand for 2009 and 2014:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the total shortage of care beds (i.e. including those that do not meet modern standards) was 255 beds in 2009 and this is projected to rise to 447 by 2014 • the case for accommodation that conforms to the modern-standard (in accordance with the Care Standards Act 2000) is even more 			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>pressing, with a gap of 730 beds in 2009 rising to a projected gap of 922 beds in 2014</p> <p>There are a number of drivers for the growing need for purpose built care accommodation – in particular, the increase in demand for care beds as the population ages (the population profile for West Moors is also included in the attached summary report). In addition, a reduction in the supply of existing beds is compounding the shortage, as smaller care homes become less viable due to economic constraints and the Care Standards Act (2000) restricts the sale of care home operations that do not comply with the minimum standards set out therein.</p> <p>West Moors itself is identified as a district centre within the Core Strategy; this allows for smaller scale community, cultural, leisure, retail, employment and residential development within the urban area. Including Blackfield Farm within the urban area will therefore allow it to be developed for an important community facility, for which an urgent need has been identified.</p> <p>The site itself is flat, is of no particular ecological value and is not within an area prone to flooding. Therefore, whilst it is not suitable for residential development due to its close proximity to the Dorset Heathlands SPA, it is suitable for Class C2 development.</p> <p>Castleoak has had a longstanding interest in developing the Blackfield Farm site. They have undertaken discussions with both East Dorset District Council (EDDC) and Natural England over the last 2 years, in order to progress development of the Blackfield Farm site for a Class C2 elderly care scheme. Unfortunately, the recent recession has delayed progress, but Castleoak has retained its option on the site and is now working towards a suitable development in discussion with the local planning authority.</p> <p>Most recently, Castleoak held a meeting with</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>EDDC on 13th October 2010 to discuss development of the site.</p> <p>The principle of Class C2 development on the Blackfield Farm site has been accepted in principle by EDDC and by Natural England, subject to certain caveats/requirements in terms of design, layout and protection of the adjoining Heathlands. These can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact nature of the use will need to be established with the LPA prior to submission and an operating statement provided, in order to ensure that the development is restricted to Use Class C2. • There will need to be a strict "no-cats/dogs" policy for residents of the care scheme, to ensure no encroachment onto the Heathlands by cats or residents seeking to walk their dogs in the area. • Development generally not to exceed two-storeys • Natural England require a landscaped "buffer zone" between the development and the boundary of the site (approximately 10 metres) • Provision of improved fencing to the boundary of the site with the Heathlands (i.e. cat-proof fencing) • Close attention to design and layout, taking into account the amenities of residential properties to the west <p>The developable area of the Blackfield Farm site is limited to the northern half of the land indicated on the Core Strategy plan, which has a site area of 2.1ha. Although only this part of the Blackfield Farm site is suitable for development, the status of the remaining land can be determined via other policies in the emerging Core Strategy. Given its location, it would be illogical not to include all of the Blackfield Farm land (as shown on the plan) within the urban</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							area.			
536846	Mr Baird Oldrey		CSO22 095	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		I saw a proposal to change the status of green belt land on the east of West Moors along the track of the old railway to 'urban housing' including a care home. I cannot find the reference to this in the core strategy paper, so am using this opportunity to comment. I use this route to walk to the village about 3 times per week, and enjoy the ability to get so near to the village centre on open land. Given that any civilised urban area is improved by its green areas, I feel it would be a great shame to lose the opportunity of keeping such an amenity in the interest of 'packing more sardines in the can'. When I did my Gap Year in the East End of London, access to green open spaces and parks were the only way of retaining my sanity in a crowded space. Judging from the state of the paths down the Trailway, it is a very well-used facility. It would be a shame to make such an irreversible degradation at this point.			254
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22 869	Preferred Option KS 4	Support		Option KS4-6 Strongly support the inclusion within the Green Belt of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the northern half of land at Coopers Lane, Verwood, • Does Lane, Verwood, • Forest View Drive, Ferndown • the northern half of land at Coopers Lane, Verwood Reasons Being contiguous with open countryside they would safeguard it from encroachment and meet one of the criteria for inclusion in the Green Belt. The additional benefit of retaining the biodiversity importance of these sites and existing linkages with larger areas should be noted. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI. Forest View Drive is a heathland site and the possibility of its linkage with Ferndown Common is identified on the RSPB maps on Heathland Extent and Potential.</p> <p>It is recommended that Coopers Lane South is also included in the Green Belt. Much of this land is also neutral grassland and scrub that has remained uncultivated for many decades. The woodland edge habitat here supports large areas of native Bluebell. Although it appears that little of it has been formally recorded at DERC, from personal observation I can confirm that there is biodiversity interest in these areas under private ownership. Development would require an appropriate assessment under Habitats Regulations: because of poor access new road construction would be required.</p> <p>Comment No justification appears to have been made for the inclusion of Blackfield Farm, West Moors or Woodland Walk, Ferndown in the urban area. These too are contiguous with open countryside so would appear to meet the requirement of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It is recommended that both are subject to full ecological survey if this recommendation proceeds to the next stage of the Core Strategy. Blackfield Farm would be subject to an appropriate assessment under the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Habitats Regulations. Support the inclusion of Julians Road, Wimborne in the urban area. This would form part of Option WMC1 where development uniquely was supported by EDDC for submission to RSS.			
538399	Mr and Mrs A M Pottle		CSO22 737	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		'Inappropriate' and very damaging to this part of West Moors. It is getting very congested in The Avenue as to try to drive into Station Road, due to bad parking for school.			254
602994	Mr Roger Angus	Chairman Woodland Walk Residents Association	CSO22 991	Preferred Option KS 4	Object		Further to our recent telephone conversation I am writing to place formally on record the concerns of this Association on learning that woodland to the North and East of Woodland Walk, which was excluded under Chapter 9 of the EDDC's 2002 Local Plan from allocation for further building, may now be under consideration for planning redesignation as suitable for housing development. You referred me to preferred options KS4-6 in current discussion papers developed for consultation purposes; but I have as yet been unable to locate these on the dorset foryou website where reference 348323 seems only to access a copy of the printed leaflet for housing options in Ferndown and West Parley as locally distributed which makes no mention of the land in question. We shall nonetheless be grateful if you will take note in your consultation and policy development process that the existing residents of this designated Special Character Area would be most strongly opposed to such a change and in particular even if any such proposed additional housing were to be of a quality and limited density consistent with the existing local stock - if access for such a development were to be contemplated through Woodland Walk itself. We are especially conscious of the bitter experience of the first residents of Badgers Walk nearby,			254

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>whose lives have been blighted and property values significantly reduced by the planning fiasco that is The Warren. Having purchased upmarket houses in the belief and expectation that these were setting the standard for a quality estate of similar dwellings, they now find themselves facing not only a decade or more of ongoing construction traffic through a severely restricted and arguably quite inadequately narrow access roadway - but also changes of use both agreed and requested to permit much larger, commercial care home developments whose staff and services will only increase the traffic and disruption of the Badgers Walk environment on a permanent basis.</p> <p>We do not wish to share their experience and look to EDDC accordingly to ensure that at the very least no land additional to that already comprised by the existing properties in Woodland Walk is allocated and approved for development with access via this lane. We recognise of course that the road way itself is private property and in the same ownership as the woodland to the North and East in point; but there are alternative routes into the latter including both from the Sainsbury's access road and from the development on the old coach house motel site. If the preservation of a rare Special Character Area has a kind of importance to the District's planners they will not allow Woodland Walk to become a conduit for further building development. We shall also appreciate receiving notice as and when further input to the consultation process may be timely.</p>			
485066	Mr David Brenchley		CSO608	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		<p>With regards to the proposals relating to Blackfield Farm, West Moors and the suggestion that it should be included in the urban area as detailed in "Preferred option KS5 of the Local Development Framework: Blackfield Farm".</p>	<p>That option KS6 should be chosen instead of KS5. The inner Green Belt boundary will be amended to include Blackfield Farm,</p>		257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>This is clearly not a sensible idea. The SSSI site next to Blackfield Farm is only 100m from the houses already built at this location. Therefore the field known as Blackfield Farm is only 100m wide. This provides a very small buffer zone between the SSSI and an already developed urban area.</p> <p>You clearly and quite correctly state that no development should be allowed within 400m of a SSSI, therefore the existing development of Blackfield Lane would not now be permitted. There is clearly no going back and Blackfield Lane will remain at only 100m distance from the SSSI.</p> <p>Referring to the East Dorset Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Study March 2009, page 12 clearly states that there are a number of sites which were identified for the study, but which were found to be unsuitable for one reason or another. Blackfield Farm is one of those sites identified and has been excluded from development.</p> <p>How can the council completely contradict their own study and then go on to suggest that it is supported by evidence?</p> <p>Page 24 of the same document states "Conclusions: As identified in Section 6 of this report the Assessment has identified sufficient land to provide a five year deliverable supply of housing and a 15 year supply of physically developable land based on all of the possible currently known housing requirements."</p> <p>Again if all the desired development land has been found without including the Blackfield Farm site why is there an attempt to include it now and to cause irreparable damage to the environment, specifically the SSSI at this location?</p> <p>The Council should be championing and encouraging the regeneration of all SSSI within its boundaries. Blackfield Farm offers just such</p>	West Moors as Green Belt. This will protect the area and most importantly the SSSI at this site.		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>an opportunity. The area is not currently frequented by people at all!</p> <p>The suggestion that a care home would be a suitable development at Blackfield Farm flies in the face of the 400m exclusion of development where a SSSI boundary is located. Any development would necessitate the extensive use of industrial machinery and a constant stream of commercial vehicles into an area where no industrial or commercial activity currently takes place.</p> <p>The local area, by that I mean West Moors, is already over developed with residential, retirement and care homes. The council is well aware that the area cannot support yet another development of this type.</p>			
489261	Mrs Heather Hood		CSO690	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		<p>My objections relating to the proposals relating to Blackfield Farm, West Moors and the suggestion that it should be included in the urban area as detailed in "Preferred option KS4 of the Local Development Framework: Blackfield Farm" are as follows:</p> <p>The SSSI site next to Blackfield Farm is only 100m from the houses already built at this location. Therefore the field known as Blackfield Farm is only 100m wide. This provides a tiny strip of land between the SSSI and a developed urban area. It clearly states that no development should be allowed within 400m of a SSSI, therefore the existing development of Blackfield Lane would not now be authorised.</p> <p>I thought that this council were keen to preserve the environment for future generations - that is one of the reasons why I voted them in - if this is the case then this proposal should not go ahead.</p> <p>On checking the East Dorset Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Study March 2009, page 12 I also see that there are a number of sites which were identified for the study, but</p>	<p>That option KS6 should be chosen instead of KS4.</p> <p>The inner Green Belt boundary should be amended to include Blackfield Farm, West Moors as Green Belt. This will protect the area and most importantly the SSSI at this site as well as preserving the integrity of West Moors village.</p>		257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>which were found to be unsuitable and Blackfield Farm is one of those sites identified and has been excluded from development. What has now changed that the council can do a U turn on their own study or has some kind of compromise agreement reached between the council and the developer?</p> <p>The damage to the environment would be immense, there is already a risk of flooding around this area when it rains, and another development would increase this risk and impact on the SSSI - unless the council wish to see it turn into Bog land.</p> <p>The houses built near to this field have to have a pump to ensure that the sewerage is pumped out to the mains as the site is below normal gravity and too far away from the mains systems.</p> <p>Another development here would impact adversely not just on the surrounding residents and their mains services but also on the environment as it tries to cope with yet more urban encroachment.</p> <p>The suggestion that a care home would be a suitable development at Blackfield Farm flies in the face of the 400m exclusion of development where a SSSI boundary is located. Any development would necessitate the extensive use of industrial machinery and a constant stream of commercial vehicles into an area where no industrial or commercial activity currently takes place.</p> <p>The transport links to Blackfield Lane are poor. Ashurst Lane which is used as a cut through to Station Road is a single lane road with a pavement on only one side. The Avenue supports a primary school and a church and is already congested. Station Road is horrendously busy and set to get worse in the coming years. Realistically none of the roads leading to Blackfield Farm would be able to cope with the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>increase in commercial traffic used to either build or support a care home.</p> <p>My concern is if this care home is built then that accidents and fatalities will occur around these roads that are already busy.</p> <p>West Moors, is already over developed with residential, retirement and care homes and this has impacted on the local services such as Doctors and dentists. It is not feasible that the local community services such as Doctors can support yet another care home development.</p> <p>If a care home needs to be built (which is questionable), Planning permission has already been granted for a care village on part of the land at St Leonard's. This has not been implemented but would be a better option as the transport links are better i.e. straight off the A31 and it doesn't necessitate the change of status of the land and I would hope that as the development is termed care village it would support its own medical facilities and not drain the ones in West Moors as the proposed site will do.</p>			
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO23 34	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		ARC would object to development at Coopers Land and Doe Lane, Verwood and Forest View Drive, Ferndown. These would have major and ongoing negative impacts upon the SSSI's and SINC's that are close by.			257
496039	Mr and Mrs Draper		CSO15 94	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		The increase of traffic on the avenue, a road that already is a hazard with parked cars and buses for the school and the residents.	Blackfield Farm: Remain Green Belt.		257
496233	Mrs Pat Gilson		CSO16 32	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		With regards to the proposals relating to Blackfield Farm, West Moors and the suggesting that it should be included in the urban area as detailed in "Preferred option KS4 of the Local Development Framework: Blackfield Farm". I	That option KS6 should be chosen instead of KS4. The inner Green Belt boundary will be amended to include Blackfield Farm,		257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>wholly object to this proposal for a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The SSSI site next to Blackfield Farm is only 100m from the houses already built at this location. Therefore the field known as Blackfield Farm is only 100m wide. This provides a very small buffer zone between the SSSI and an already developed urban area. 2. You clearly and quite correctly state that no development should be allowed within 400m of a SSSI, therefore the existing development of Blackfield Lane would not now be permitted. There is clearly no going back and Blackfield Lane will remain at only 100m distance from the SSSI. 3. West Moors, is already over developed with residential, retirement and care homes and this has impacted on the local services such as Doctors and dentists. It is not possible that the local community can support yet another care home development. 4. Planning permission has already been granted for a care village on part of the land at St Leonards. This has not been implemented but would be a better option as the transport links are better i.e. straight off the A31 and if it is a care village should have its own doctors and dentists to support the care community. 5. The transport links to Blackfield Lane are poor. Ashurst Road which is used as a cut through to Station Road is a single lane road with a pavement on only one side. Realistically none of the roads leading to Blackfield Farm would be able to cope with the increase in commercial traffic used to either build or support a care home. My concern is that facilities will happen around these roads that are already busy with a school and church. 	West Moors as Green Belt. This will protect the area and most importantly the SSSI at this site.		
496697	Mr and Mrs		CSO18	Non	Object		Have you seen the state of The Avenue. The	This should be Green Belt.		257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Richard and Mavis Wheeler		28	Preferred Option KS 5			road is breaking up and the junction into Station Road is dangerous as it is restricted. The increase in traffic would also be dangerous when the children are going or leaving school. This needs to be addressed before anything is decided. This is a quiet residential area and this proposal is inappropriate. We are also concerned about the damage to the Holt and West Moors Heath which is a listed site of special scientific interest. This would also put too much burden on village resources.	Not building we support option KS6.		
497659	Mr & Mrs John and Sylvia Calver		CSO24 21	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		The only exit from "Blackfield Farm" area is The Avenue. The Avenue is in a very poor state from the traffic to the school, church and the bus stop. The exit to Station Road had a very poor visibility to the right with a telegraph pole in the drivers vision. We also object to this area being developed because of the listed SSSI	Suggest that the green belt boundary is not moved. Also Blackfield Farm should not be given urban status until The Avenue is upgraded and made safe for the school, church, buses and the residents having to use The Avenue.		257
497681	Miss H Walker		CSO24 25	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		Object to Blackfields Farm being included in the urban area. It should be left in the green belt area. Access will create extra traffic in the area. The Avenue will be the main road affected. This road is very busy with a school and at times is totally congested with school traffic often causing traffic jams. Also the gradual eroding of the Green Belt so near to the SSSIs is continuing - to the eventual detriment of the area.	KS 6 should be adopted		257
497870	Mr & Mrs R Calver		CSO25 14	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		1. Whilst the core strategy has had to reconsider the original housing option due to the proximity of heathlands site close by, the development for housing under the different guise of residential care will still involve some threat to the same heathlands site.	Adopt Option KS 6 as preferred option. Remove Option KS 4 and KS 5 with regard to Blackfield Farm.		257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>2. Development of this site for residential care would allow a large establishment which would not be keeping with the residential nature of the surrounding access roads leading to the Blackfield Farm site</p> <p>3. Such a site would generate a huge increase in vehicular movements throughout the day and more particularly at night as residential care establishments involve 24 hour 7 day week facilities. This increase in vehicular movements down small residential roads will increase the risk to the many children who now live and will live in these houses in the future. It will also disrupt the quiet environment of the area as it has existed for many years.</p> <p>4. Furthermore the access from Station Road into The Avenue which leads to the site is not only a poor turning for vehicles it is also dangerous due to extremely bad sight lines. This is further exasperated due to the school and church being located on either side of the junction, which causes additional congestion on a day to day basis. The congestion is such that the cars restrict The Avenue to a single lane along two thirds of its length on a daily basis.</p> <p>5. The original Blackfield Lane development caused immense concern for the local authority with particular emphasis on this junction. Now nearly 20 years on, the vast increase in traffic movements on our local roads will have only made this situation worse. Indeed the West Moors relief road proposed in previous core strategy plans understood the need to ease pressure on the local road network in this area many years ago. Additional traffic to the proposed site will only add to congestion problems around this junction and on local roads. Congestion problems are already prevalent, and will only get worse as the relief road is never likely to go ahead, and do not need</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>to be worsened by unnecessary development in this area.</p> <p>6. One has to consider the rationale of proposing a site that requires large number of vehicular movements, with many of these vehicles being larger delivery lorries and ambulances, through a quiet residential estate which has only occasional vehicular movements at present. Residential homes by the nature of its occupants are designed to be at the heart of the community within a close distance from the village centre will be beyond their physical capabilities.</p> <p>7. We would also raise concerns regarding the Castleman Trailway. This much used facility passes through the development area and is much used by local residents who would not want their access to the Trailway reduced or restricted in any way.</p> <p>8. With regard to statements in the options laid out in the strategy document I would make the following comments:</p> <p>a) In Option KS4 the document states Blackfield Farm is close to protected heath lands and rightly infers it is not suitable for housing. It then goes on to suggest residents in a care home pose less of a threat to the heath lands environment. I would have to point out that my understanding about the threat to such environments is not specifically from humans but from their pets. Research findings report that one cat has been known to virtually eradicate a wild life species from a protected area. The development of Blackfield Farm as a care home may not introduce additional risks to the heathlands as an individual premise, but what it will do is move the developed boundary much closer to the protected SSSI. This developed area then becomes new territory for local pets who roam as part of their natural instinct and by default threatens the SSSI. I would have to</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>question if research has been carried out as to whether the proposed care home would be inside the guidance for boundary limits (400m) for protected heathlands SSSI.</p> <p>b) In Options KS4 and 5 the strategy implies new housing is a benefit to the community. I would have to comment that whilst care home may be located in an area, residents will be drawn from a much wider community and the housing benefit to the local area is limited.</p> <p>9. As residents of West Moors we respect the village life and rural setting in this area. The green belt provides rural villages the protection to maintain the environment and protect the local rural community. Continued urbanisation is the thin end of the wedge and we cannot support these proposals and would worry about future impacts.</p> <p>10. With the number of existing care homes in the local area, is there really a need for an additional facility in the village of West Moors. In summary we feel the proposal for any development of the Blackfield Farm site is wholly inappropriate and would fully support Option KS 6 to extend the green belt boundary up to the existing properties in this area</p>			
497914	Mr Norman Snape		CSO2519	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		<p>Object to development of any type at Blackfield Farm for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The exit from The Avenue onto Station Road is extremely dangerous. 2. There are 4 blind exits side wards onto The Avenue, the first being from the Infants School. 3. Roadside parking would need to be eliminated as would all parking along the Avenue and Blackfield Lane. 4. The sewerage pumping station in Harrison Way was very suspect under the ownership of both Clarks and Westbury. Wessex Water would not take this over and from information from 			257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>them today this remains the case. Therefore any overloading would again create problems to existing properties.</p> <p>5. In addition the approach along Blackfield Lane to the Land is not sufficiently wide for 2 vehicles - i.e. vans to pass with ease and safety.</p> <p>6. This land is also in very close proximity to the MOD underground liquid stores - the biggest in the UK</p>			
497932	Mr J B Higgs		CSO2522	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Support		Support care home - less disturbance to present site			257
489263	Mr Hugh Hood		CSO3809	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		<p>Object for the following reasons:-</p> <p>The SSSI site next to Blackfield Farm is only 100m from the houses already built at this location. Therefore the field known as Blackfield Farm is only 100m wide. This provides a very small buffer zone between the SSSI and an already developed urban are. It clearly and quite correctly state that no development should be allowed within 400m of a SSSI, therefore the existing development of Blackfield Farm would not now be permitted. There is clearly no going back and Blackfield Lane will remain at only 100m distance from the SSSI.</p> <p>The damage to the environment would be immense. There is already a risk of flooding around this area when it rains.</p> <p>The houses built near to this field have to have a pump to ensure that the sewerage is pumped out to the mains as the site is below normal so cannot rely on gravity. Another development here would impact adversely not just on the surrounding residents but also on the environment.</p> <p>The suggestion that a care home would be a suitable development at Blackfield Farm flies in</p>			257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the face of the 400m exclusion of development where a SSSI boundary is located. Any development would necessitate the extensive use of industrial machinery and a constant stream of commercial vehicles into an area where no industrial or commercial activity currently takes place.</p> <p>The transport links to Blackfield Lane are poor. Ashurst Lane which is used as a cut through to Station Road is a single land road with a pavement on only one side. The Avenue supports a primary school and a church and is already congested. Station Road is horrendously busy and set to get worse in the coming years. Realistically none of the roads leading to Blackfield Farm would be able to cope with the increase in commercial traffic used to either build or support a care home.</p> <p>My concern is if this care home is built then that accidents and fatalities will occur around these roads that are already busy.</p> <p>West Moors is already over development with residential, retirement and care homes and this has impacted on the local services. It is not feasible that the local community services can support yet another care home development. If a care home needs to be build, planning permission has already been granted for a care village on part of the land at St Leonards. This has not been implemented but would be a better option as the transport links are better – i.e. straight off the A31 and it doesn't necessitate the change of status of land.</p>			
496653	Mr Charles Gilson		CSO3431	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		<p>Object to suggestion that Blackfield Farm should be included in urban area.</p> <p>The SSSI is only 100m from houses build at this location. The field known as Blackfield Farm is only 100m wide. This provides a very small buffer zone between the SSSI and an already</p>	<p>The KS 6 option should be chosen instead of KS 5.</p> <p>This inner Green Belt boundary will be amended to include Blackfield Farm, West Moors as Green</p>		257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>developed urban area. It clearly and quite correctly states that no development should be allowed within 400m of a SSSI, therefore the existing development of Blackfield Lane would not now be permitted. There is clearly no going back and Blackfield Lane will remain at only 100m distance from the SSSI.</p> <p>The suggestion that a care home would be a suitable development at Blackfield Farm flies in the face of the 400m exclusion of development where a SSSI boundary is located. Any development would necessitate the extensive use of industrial machinery and a constant stream of commercial vehicles into an area where no industrial or commercial activity currently takes place.</p> <p>West Moors is already over developed with residential, retirement and care homes and this has impacted on the local services such as Doctors, hospitals and dentists. It does not seem feasible that the local community can support yet another care home development.</p> <p>In addition the transport links to Blackfield Lane are poor. Ashurst Road which is used as a cut through to Station Road is a single land road with a pavement on only one side. Realistically none of the roads leading to Blackfield Farm would be able to cope with the increase in commercial traffic used to either build or support a care home. My concern is that fatalities will occur around these roads that are already busy with a school and church.</p>	Belt. This will protect the area and most importantly the SSSI at this site.		
498357	Mr John Bestley and Ms Linda Knight		CSO3105	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		<p>We object because once something (in this case a care home) is built then that is just the start and nothing can then stop it because a precedent has already been set.</p> <p>There are many such homes for the elderly in this area, some just a few hundred yards away already bringing extra traffic etc. – enough is</p>			257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							enough and the area must remain GREEN BELT as it always has been.			
498579	Mr Paul Brookes		CSO3350	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		I object to the proposal to include the Blackfield Farm site in the "urban area" as I believe it should be green belt.			257
499478	Mr M R Richardson		CSO3776	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		Impact on traffic - sewage, local resources. Damage to SSSI			257
499484	Mr and Mrs J Varmen		CSO3784	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		This proposed development would have a negative effect on the village and surrounding area. Traffic would worsen, more open countryside would be lost. The village has grown greatly in the last 50 years and future development needs to be controlled. This development would spoil one of the better parts of the village making it more urban. We have only been given 5 days to respond to this which is not a sensible period of time.	Make it green belt!		257
499494	Mr Ian Smith		CSO3792	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		It is already difficult to get an early appointment at the Station Road surgery. Having a significant number of elderly residents living close by will make this much worse. Any additional residential building in West Moors will only make the traffic congestion that is bad during the day much worse.			257
500141	Mr Martyn Hiscock		CSO4154	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		I strongly disagree with the proposal to remove green belt status. The proposal will greatly increase the traffic in and around Blackfield Lane and will have a devastating effect on the wildlife of the surrounding area. I question the need for further old people's accommodation in West Moors.	Suggest that option KS 6 is adopted - retain green belt status.		257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
500214	Anne Garwood		CSO174	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		I strongly disagree with the proposal to remove green belt status. I question the need for further old people's accommodation in West Moors. The proposal for urban status will cause severe congestion in and around Blackfield Lane and will have a devastating effect on the wildlife in the surrounding areas.	Suggest that option KS6 is adopted - retain green belt status.		257
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17464	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		DWT object to this option.			257
359552	Ms J WEEDON	Clerk West Moors Parish Council	CSO17902	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Support		Members felt that the Blackfield Farm site should be included in the Green Belt and are therefore against the Core Strategy preferred option KS4 but support non preferred option KS6.			257
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18122	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object					257
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17638	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Support		The Agency supports the protection of the Green Belt. If changes are made to the boundaries of the Green Belt, mixed use development is preferred to isolated housing or employment sites. Land at St Leonard's Hospital is accessed directly from the A31; therefore we have concerns over the proposed development under Preferred Option KS3. Woodland Walk, Ferndown is located close to the SRN and the site's inclusion within the urban area under Preferred Option KS4 and Non Preferred Option KS5 could have a detrimental impact on the SRN.			257
517815	Mr Cyril Beecher		CSO17214	Non Preferred Option KS	Object		Reasons for objections: Infrastructure in the area is limited. Particularly, any access roads which could be used by the development are already			257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
				5			barely adequate for existing use and all the possible roads lead to junctions with Station Road with poor site lines. (Blackfield Farm)			
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSO19 062	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Support		<p>These representations are submitted on behalf of Castleoak Care Developments Ltd (as developer), and by Persimmon Homes Ltd and Mr & Mrs C Budd (as joint landowners). Although this is a non-preferred option, the developers and joint landowners of the land at Blackfield Farm, West Moors would support it as an alternative option, on the basis that it seeks to include Blackfield Farm within the urban area. This site is capable of accommodating a Class C2 elderly care scheme, because its residents would pose no threat to the adjoining Heathlands area. The site is flat, of no ecological value and is not within an area prone to flooding. In addition, there is a recognised and urgent need for elderly care accommodation within West Moors and the wider district and this site will help to meet some of this demand. The principle of developing this site for such a use has been accepted in principle by East Dorset DC and Natural England, and the developers are currently designing a scheme appropriate to the site.</p>			257
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSO19 060	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Support		<p>These representations are submitted on behalf of Castleoak Care Developments Ltd (as developer), and by Persimmon Homes Ltd and Mr & Mrs C Budd (as joint landowners). Although this is a non-preferred option, the developers and joint landowners of the land at Blackfield Farm, West Moors would support it as an alternative option, on the basis that it seeks to include Blackfield Farm within the urban area. This site is capable of accommodating a Class C2 elderly care scheme, because its residents would pose no threat to the adjoining Heathlands</p>			257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>area. The site is flat, of no ecological value and is not within an area prone to flooding. In addition, there is a recognised and urgent need for elderly care accommodation within West Moors and the wider district and this site will help to meet some of this demand.</p> <p>The principle of developing this site for such a use has been accepted in principle by East Dorset DC and Natural England, and the developers are currently designing a scheme appropriate to the site.</p>			
507525	Mr David Lander	Boyer Planning Ltd	CSO19073	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Support		<p>We do not take issue with the rejection of Options KS 5 and KS 6. (Support box crossed on form)</p> <p>3.3 Preferred Option KS4 and Non Preferred Options KS5 and KS6</p> <p>3.3.1 These Green Belt options are concerned with boundary changes in East Dorset. Irrespective of the robustness of these proposals prior to the establishment of development requirements (see above), we have concerns about the status of these proposals in terms of the Core Strategy. So far as we are aware it is the Council's intention to allocate new development sites through a subsequent DPD. As such the detail of any Green belt boundary changes will also be determined at that stage.</p> <p>3.3.2 The Council therefore needs to clarify the status of these proposals in Core Strategy terms. The comments below are made without prejudice to these considerations.</p> <p>3.3.3 Preferred Option KS4 sets out proposed changes to the Green Belt around settlements in East Dorset as a result of a reassessment of the reserved sites in the Local Plan which have not been developed. In Verwood two sites are proposed to be included in the Green Belt: Cooper's Lane North and Doe's Lane. Cooper's Lane South is the only site suggested to be</p>			257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>included in the urban area around Verwood. Non Preferred Options KS5 and KS6 propose including all the identified sites in the urban area or in the Green Belt respectively.</p> <p>3.3.4 We do not take issue with the rejection of options KS5 and KSD6. As regards Preferred Option KS4 we have concerns about the proposal to include Coopers Lane South in the urban area. No development should take place within 400 metres of the Verwood Heaths, with development between 400 metres and 5 kilometres required to provide mitigation measures. Concern is therefore raised with the proposed strategy to include Cooper's Lane South within the urban area. In justifying the preferred option the strategy states that 'the other sites are proposed for inclusion within the urban areas as they are able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands.'</p> <p>3.3.5 Development within 400 metres of the heaths will lead to unacceptable impacts and should not be permitted. Cooper's Lane South is within 400 metres of Verwood Heaths within an area of heathland located on the opposite side of Moorlands Road to the site. The site should therefore be included in the Green Belt as no development would be permissible on the site in accordance with the Council's own Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework, April 2010. In relation to Verwood therefore all three identified sites should be included in the Green Belt as shown in Non Preferred Option KS6.</p>			
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 832	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		<p>This Option is inappropriate at the present time until the Authorities make up their mind about the level of housing provision and further allocations which may be needed. A degree of certainty is required with regard to Green Belt boundaries which extends beyond the Plan period for the Core Strategy. The Preferred Option is not</p>	Combine Policies KS4 and KS5 and to re-word in the following way "the inner Green Belt boundary to be reviewed following identified proposals for housing allocations in East		257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							consistent with the advice in PPG2 in the light of the need to look at Green Belts beyond the Core Strategy period.	Dorset.”		
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 875	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		These Options are inappropriate at the present time, until the Authority makes up its mind about the level of housing provision and further applications which may be needed. A degree of certainty with regard to Green Belt boundaries which extends beyond the Plan period for the Core Area needs to be incorporated. The Preferred Option is not consistent with the advice in PPG2 in the light of the need to look at Green Belts beyond the Core Strategy period.	Delete combined Policies KS4 and KS5 and re-word in the following way:- “the inner Green Belt boundary to be reviewed following assessment of the required level of housing provision and the allocation of proposals for housing development in East Dorset”.		257
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSO19 057	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Support		These representations are submitted on behalf of Castleoak Care Developments Ltd (as developer), and by Persimmon Homes Ltd and Mr & Mrs C Budd (as joint landowners). Although this is a non-preferred option, the developers and joint landowners of the land at Blackfield Farm, West Moors would support it as an alternative option, on the basis that it seeks to include Blackfield Farm within the urban area. This site is capable of accommodating a Class C2 elderly care scheme, because its residents would pose no threat to the adjoining Heathlands area. The site is flat, of no ecological value and is not within an area prone to flooding. In addition, there is a recognised and urgent need for elderly care accommodation within West Moors and the wider district and this site will help to meet some of this demand. The principle of developing this site for such a use has been accepted in principle by East Dorset DC and Natural England, and the developers are currently designing a scheme appropriate to the site.			257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
496245	Mrs Margaret Trueman		CSO22 913	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		I object to the proposal to change the Green Belt at Blackfield Lane, West Moors, known as Blackfield Farm Key Strategy 4&5. The increase in traffic; heavy lorries, ambulances, cars plus the noise:- i.e. sirens that we already suffer with other care homes in the area. Their access into this area also means added danger, i.e. the entrances from side roads onto Station Road is very dangerous. Plus the school and church traffic already cause problems.	Stop building nursing homes and retirement homes in this village. All services, i.e. doctors are stretched too far already. We want a living vibrant village.		257
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22 870	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Support		<p>Option KS4-6 Strongly support the inclusion within the Green Belt of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the northern half of land at Coopers Lane, Verwood, • Does Lane, Verwood, • Forest View Drive, Ferdown • the northern half of land at Coopers Lane, Verwood <p>Reasons Being contiguous with open countryside they would safeguard it from encroachment and meet one of the criteria for inclusion in the Green Belt. The additional benefit of retaining the biodiversity importance of these sites and existing linkages with larger areas should be noted.</p> <p>The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nighthawk. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI. Forest View Drive is a heathland site and the</p>			257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>possibility of its linkage with Ferndown Common is identified on the RSPB maps on Heathland Extent and Potential.</p> <p>It is recommended that Coopers Lane South is also included in the Green Belt. Much of this land is also neutral grassland and scrub that has remained uncultivated for many decades. The woodland edge habitat here supports large areas of native Bluebell. Although it appears that little of it has been formally recorded at DERC, from personal observation I can confirm that there is biodiversity interest in these areas under private ownership. Development would require an appropriate assessment under Habitats Regulations: because of poor access new road construction would be required.</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>No justification appears to have been made for the inclusion of Blackfield Farm, West Moors or Woodland Walk, Ferndown in the urban area. These too are contiguous with open countryside so would appear to meet the requirement of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It is recommended that both are subject to full ecological survey if this recommendation proceeds to the next stage of the Core Strategy. Blackfield Farm would be subject to an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations.</p> <p>Support the inclusion of Julians Road, Wimborne in the urban area. This would form part of Option WMC1 where development uniquely was supported by EDDC for submission to RSS.</p>			
602994	Mr Roger Angus	Chairman Woodland Walk Residents Association	CSO22 993	Non Preferred Option KS 5	Object		Further to our recent telephone conversation I am writing to place formally on record the concerns of this Association on learning that woodland to the North and East of Woodland Walk, which was excluded under Chapter 9 of the EDDC's 2002 Local Plan from allocation for			257

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>further building, may now be under consideration for planning redesignation as suitable for housing development. You referred me to preferred options KS4-6 in current discussion papers developed for consultation purposes; but I have as yet been unable to locate these on the dorset foryou website where reference 348323 seems only to access a copy of the printed leaflet for housing options in Ferndown and West Parley as locally distributed which makes no mention of the land in question.</p> <p>We shall nonetheless be grateful if you will take note in your consultation and policy development process that the existing residents of this designated Special Character Area would be most strongly opposed to such a change and in particular even if any such proposed additional housing were to be of a quality and limited density consistent with the existing local stock - if access for such a development were to be contemplated through Woodland Walk itself. We are especially conscious of the bitter experience of the first residents of Badgers Walk nearby, whose lives have been blighted and property values significantly reduced by the planning fiasco that is The Warren. Having purchased upmarket houses in the belief and expectation that these were setting the standard for a quality estate of similar dwellings, they now find themselves facing not only a decade or more of on-going construction traffic through a severely restricted and arguably quite inadequately narrow access roadway - but also changes of use both agreed and requested to permit much larger, commercial care home developments whose staff and services will only increase the traffic and disruption of the Badgers Walk environment on a permanent basis.</p> <p>We do not wish to share their experience and look to EDDC accordingly to ensure that at the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							very least no land additional to that already comprised by the existing properties in Woodland Walk is allocated and approved for development with access via this lane. We recognise of course that the road way itself is private property and in the same ownership as the woodland to the North and East in point; but there are alternative routes into the latter including both from the Sainsbury's access road and from the development on the old coach house motel site. If the preservation of a rare Special Character Area has a kind of importance to the District's planners they will not allow Woodland Walk to become a conduit for further building development. We shall also appreciate receiving notice as and when further input to the consultation process may be timely.			
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO2335	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		ARC would support the inclusion of Coopers Lane and Does Lane, Verwood, Forest View Drive, Ferndown and Blackfield Farm, West Moors within the Greenbelt.			260
496142	Mr P J and Mrs Y R Sutton		CSO1602	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		Extra burden on doctors. High Street cannot cope with heavy traffic now. We do not want any more traffic in West Moors.			260
496202	Mrs Cora Ware		CSO1613	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support					260
496521	Mrs Doreen Mulford		CSO1724	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		The roads that any developers would use are very busy especially during school starting and ending The Avenue can only be negotiated with great care. Station Road and West Moors Road has trebled in traffic over the last year and therefore another development would add to this problem. The site should be protected as a	The Blackfield Farm site should be classed as a Green Belt area because the traffic in The Avenue and West Moors is very bad and buses have problems using it.		260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Green Belt site.			
496693	Mr and Mrs Archer		CSO18 25	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		West Moors is a very special place of scientific interest and this shouldn't change for the future of our children. Large developments should be on main roads and not affect residents who have worked hard to achieve their dream home for their retirement.	Blackfield farm should not be given urban status you have taken enough already. Couldn't find this on the computer. For the current plan.		260
496697	Mr and Mrs Richard and Mavis Wheeler		CSO18 29	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		Have you seen the state of The Avenue. The road is breaking up and the junction into Station Road is dangerous as it is restricted. The increase in traffic would also be dangerous when the children are going or leaving school. This needs to be addressed before anything is decided. This is a quiet residential area and this proposal is inappropriate. We are also concerned about the damage to the Holt and West Moors Heath which is a listed site of special scientific interest. This would also put too much burden on village resources.	This should be Green Belt. Not building we support option KS6.		260
497659	Mr & Mrs John and Sylvia Calver		CSO24 22	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Object		The only exit from "Blackfield Farm" area is The Avenue. The Avenue is in a very poor state from the traffic to the school, church and the bus stop. The exit to Station Road had a very poor visibility to the right with a telegraph pole in the drivers vision. We also object to this area being developed because of the listed SSSI	Suggest that the green belt boundary is not moved. Also Blackfield Farm should not be given urban status until The Avenue is upgraded and made safe for the school, church, buses and the residents having to use The Avenue.		260
497681	Miss H Walker		CSO24 26	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support					260
497870	Mr & Mrs R		CSO25 15	Non Preferred	Support		1. Whilst the core strategy has had to reconsider the original housing option due to the proximity	Adopt Option KS 6 as preferred option. Remove		260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Calver			Option KS 6			<p>of heathlands site close by, the development for housing under the different guise of residential care will still involve some threat to the same heathlands site.</p> <p>2. Development of this site for residential care would allow a large establishment which would not be keeping with the residential nature of the surrounding access roads leading to the Blackfield Farm site</p> <p>3. Such a site would generate a huge increase in vehicular movements throughout the day and more particularly at night as residential care establishments involve 24 hour 7 day week facilities. This increase in vehicular movements down small residential roads will increase the risk to the many children who now live and will live in these houses in the future. It will also disrupt the quiet environment of the area as it has existed for many years.</p> <p>4. Furthermore the access from Station Road into The Avenue which leads to the site is not only a poor turning for vehicles it is also dangerous due to extremely bad sight lines. This is further exasperated due to the school and church being located on either side of the junction, which causes additional congestion on a day to day basis. The congestion is such that the cars restrict The Avenue to a single lane along two thirds of its length on a daily basis.</p> <p>5. The original Blackfield Lane development caused immense concern for the local authority with particular emphasis on this junction. Now nearly 20 years on, the vast increase in traffic movements on our local roads will have only made this situation worse. Indeed the West Moors relief road proposed in previous core strategy plans understood the need to ease pressure on the local road network in this area many years ago. Additional traffic to the proposed site will only add to congestion</p>	Option KS 4 and KS 5 with regard to Blackfield Farm.		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>problems around this junction and on local roads. Congestion problems are already prevalent, and will only get worse as the relief road is never likely to go ahead, and do not need to be worsened by unnecessary development in this area.</p> <p>6. One has to consider the rationale of proposing a site that requires large number of vehicular movements, with many of these vehicles being larger delivery lorries and ambulances, through a quiet residential estate which has only occasional vehicular movements at present. Residential homes by the nature of its occupants are designed to be at the heart of the community within a close distance from the village centre will be beyond their physical capabilities.</p> <p>7. We would also raise concerns regarding the Castleman Trailway. This much used facility passes through the development area and is much used by local residents who would not want their access to the Trailway reduced or restricted in any way.</p> <p>8. With regard to statements in the options laid out in the strategy document I would make the following comments:</p> <p>a) In Option KS4 the document states Blackfield Farm is close to protected heath lands and rightly infers it is not suitable for housing. It then goes on to suggest residents in a care home pose less of a threat to the heath lands environment. I would have to point out that my understanding about the threat to such environments is not specifically from humans but from their pets. Research findings report that one cat has been known to virtually eradicate a wild life species from a protected area. The development of Blackfield Farm as a care home may not introduce additional risks to the heathlands as an individual premise, but what it will do is move the developed boundary much</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>closer to the protected SSSI. This developed area then becomes new territory for local pets who roam as part of their natural instinct and by default threatens the SSSI. I would have to question if research has been carried out as to whether the proposed care home would be inside the guidance for boundary limits (400m) for protected heathlands SSSI.</p> <p>b) In Options KS4 and 5 the strategy implies new housing is a benefit to the community. I would have to comment that whilst care home may be located in an area, residents will be drawn from a much wider community and the housing benefit to the local area is limited.</p> <p>9. As residents of West Moors we respect the village life and rural setting in this area. The green belt provides rural villages the protection to maintain the environment and protect the local rural community. Continued urbanisation is the thin end of the wedge and we cannot support these proposals and would worry about future impacts.</p> <p>10. With the number of existing care homes in the local area, is there really a need for an additional facility in the village of West Moors. In summary we feel the proposal for any development of the Blackfield Farm site is wholly inappropriate and would fully support Option KS 6 to extend the green belt boundary up to the existing properties in this area</p>			
497914	Mr Norman Snape		CSO25 20	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		<p>Object to development of any type at Blackfield Farm for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The exit from The Avenue onto Station Road is extremely dangerous. 2. There are 4 blind exits side wards onto The Avenue, the first being from the Infants School. 3. Roadside parking would need to be eliminated as would all parking along the Avenue and Blackfield Lane. 			260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>4. The sewerage pumping station in Harrison Way was very suspect under the ownership of both Clarks and Westbury. Wessex Water would not take this over and from information from them today this remains the case. Therefore any overloading would again create problems to existing properties.</p> <p>5. In addition the approach along Blackfield Lane to the Land is not sufficiently wide for 2 vehicles - i.e. vans to pass with ease and safety.</p> <p>6. This land is also in very close proximity to the MOD underground liquid stores - the biggest in the UK</p>			
498251	Mr & Mrs Potter		CSO2949	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		<p>Blackfield Farm/ Lane /Trailway We support this option on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. Blackfield Farm is within 400m of heathland and as such should not be available either for housing or an elderly care home due to an embargo on such development, supported by Natural England. These areas are also adjacent to Sites of special scientific interest and therefore any development would have a detrimental effect on the existing wildlife.</p> <p>2. Road access from both of these sites is via Blackfield Lane which is extremely narrow and has an existing pinch point making it unsafe for any further increase in traffic. In addition to this point, access to Station Road from The Avenue is already extremely difficult due to both the heavy volume of traffic and sightlines. It was noted in the planning report for 2002 there was a substantial traffic flow along Station Road. This has now increased considerably.</p> <p>3. Medical facilities within the village are already overstretched (our own personal experience obtaining a timely Doctor's appointment) and would not appear to be able to support further increases to demand.</p> <p>4. Adjacent to Blackfield Farm there is what we</p>			260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>believe to be 275,000 volt overhead transmission line. These overhead power lines produce electric and magnetic fields which many believe could have adverse effects on people (cancer causing for example – see HM Government Department of Heath report 16/10/2009 paragraphs 37-43, next steps p.25 www.dh.gov.uk).</p> <p>5. The limited parking facilities in West Moors are already overstretched and would not safely accommodate additional vehicles</p> <p>6. From the East Dorset future housing plans, it would appear that housing needs are already met within West Moors without developing these two areas.</p> <p>7. The quoted area should remain a greenfield space as it is a natural area of high importance and as such should be protected. Any development needs can be met elsewhere within the village (local plan 2002)</p>			
485066	Mr David Brenchley		CSO4182	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		<p>Blackfield Farm (The Field) The SSSI site (Holt and West Moors Heath, unit 14) next to Blackfield Farm is only 100m from the houses already built at this location. Therefore the field known as Blackfield Farm forms a buffer of only 100m between a residential area and a SSSI. This clearly has no effect upon the SSSI. However, the development of this field will have a devastating effect on Holt and West Moors Heath.</p> <p>You clearly and quite correctly state that no development should be allowed within 400m of a SSSI, therefore the existing development of Blackfield Lane would not now be permitted if a planning application were to be made now for what is already there. There is clearly no going back and Blackfield Lane will remain at only 100m distance from the SSSI. This is 300m within the banned area for development. The</p>	Blackfield Farm should be classed as green belt land and protected from development of any type.		260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>whole purpose of which is to provide a buffer zone between manmade developments and a heathland with a very delicate ecosystem. Blackfield Farm forms a significant buffer zone between the SSSI and this residential development. To remove this 100m zone and develop it simply does not make any sense. It would also be fair to say that if it was not for the development which currently exists at Blackfield Lane and Harrison Way, no one would even contemplate putting a care home 300m into a protected area. At worst this development would be on the edge of the exclusion zone some 300+ meters away from the SSSI. The Council should be championing and encouraging the regeneration of all SSSI within its boundaries. Blackfield Farm offers just such an opportunity. The area is not currently frequented by people at all! What is being proposed will reduce the distance between humans and a nationally / internationally important area of Heathland.</p> <p>Any development at the Blackfield Farm site will mean that the wild animals currently frequenting this area will be forced back further into the SSSI. The effect would be to cause the SSSI to reduce in practical terms, which is clearly not the aspiration of the local residents or the National policy, nor indeed that of the Council.</p> <p>The Blackfield Farm Area – Blackfield Farm is a very quiet area, in fact so quiet as to allow wild Deer and other animals to frequent the land. This summer my daughter was counting butterflies in this area, in response to a national campaign, she counted 24 in 5 minutes at just one bush. There are various birds and other animals which are frequently seen at this location. Yet you propose to reclassify this area as urban! All of this will be lost forever once any development is started in Blackfield Farm.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>The plant life in the field was growing nicely this year, but late on in the summer the owner had the whole field cut down to ground level. Had this not been done, the field would have developed into a heathland site within a few years and it too may well have been classified as SSSI. This is clearly why the land owner destroyed this developing habitat this year!</p> <p>The land owner clearly has no regard for the environment are cares not what the consequences are to the SSSI beyond.</p> <p>Blackfield Lane and Harrison Way – The area of Blackfield Lane and Harrison Way is a small and quiet residential area where children are able to ride their bikes in almost complete safety because vehicle movement in the two roads is very low. The most frequent type of vehicle to use these roads is a family sized car. Because the road is blocked at the end of Blackfield Lane and Harrison Way, there are very few movements and almost no vehicles from people not living in the two roads. Large vans are seldom seen and LGV are all but non-existent in the area. I would estimate that the total number of vehicle movements in the two roads number only 30-50 per 24 hour period.</p> <p>The road leading to Blackfield Farm has an area where the road is narrow, the width of only one vehicle. This narrowing slows the traffic in the area of Blackfield Lane and Harrison Way. It also makes the road less suitable for Heavy Goods Vehicles.</p> <p>It is completely inappropriate to place a care home at the end of a quite family orientated residential area such as Blackfield Farm and Harrison Way.</p> <p>The Avenue and Station Road junction – Another consideration is the junction at The Avenue and Station Road, which would be utilised by development traffic and all future visitors, supply</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>vehicles and staff of the care home. This junction is a very busy one now and any further traffic flow would only add to the congestion. It is also very difficult to see oncoming traffic when exiting from the Avenue on to Station Road. It is more likely than not, that accidents would occur in the area causing considerable congestion on a very busy road, not to mention the potential injuries to road users. A consequential effect is the increases in traffic which will flow into the village both during the development of the care home and once it has been completed by the supply lorries, staff and guests of the care home.</p> <p>Risks associated with placing a care home in Blackfield Farm – The Defence Fuels Group (DFG) is only 500m from the proposed site of the care home. There has been one large fire at the depot and should this happen again, the care home would need to be evacuated down the single width road and across the single width driveway. The only way to do this is to drive Ambulances up the narrow road. The problem being that all of the existing residents, who are self-reliant and have their own transport, would be evacuating their homes and driving down the same road. The pandemonium and potential loss of life does not bear thinking about.</p> <p>East Dorset Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment study, March 2009 – Referring to the aforementioned plan, page 12 clearly states that there are a number of sites which were identified for the study, but which were found to be unsuitable for one reason or another.</p> <p>Blackfield Farm is one of those sites identified and has been excluded from development. How can the council completely contradict their own study and then go on to suggest that it is supported by evidence?</p> <p>Page 24 of the same document states “conclusions: as identified in section 6 of this</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>report the assessment has identified sufficient land to provide a five year deliverable supply of housing and a 15 year supply of physically developable land based on all of the possible currently known housing requirements". Again is all the desired development land has now been found without including the Blackfield Farm site why is there an attempt to include it now and to cause irreparable damage to the environment, specifically the SSSI at this location?</p> <p>The council state that this reclassification to urban is supported locally. This is simply untrue! The West Moors Parish Council voted by 7 to 2 (abstentions, due to a personal interest) against KS4, but supporting KS6 (item 10/259 of the minutes 25th November 2010). Furthermore over eighty signatures have been received on a petition calling for Blackfield Farm to be classified as Green Belt land.</p> <p>Detriment to the existing residential area – The development of a care home at the end of Blackfield Lane would completely change the nature of the area. Where now there are very few vehicles seen in Blackfield Lane, Harrison Way and to some extent The Avenue, a development of this nature would necessitate a constant stream of traffic. There would be numerous deliveries by LGV seven days per week, providing fresh food and other perishable goods. Guests would further increase the daily traffic and there would also be a constant coming and going of staff at all hours of the day and night.</p> <p>There is also the fact that any development at Blackfield Farm will overlook all of the houses which are there now. This will be a great invasion of their privacy. The entrance to the Blackfield Farm area is across a private driveway of two houses, which is only the width of one</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>vehicle. It is clearly not designed to accommodate HGV vehicles and a constant flow of other vehicles.</p> <p>The avenue is already showing signs of wear and will in time need to be resurfaced if the reclassification and development is allowed to go ahead the increase in traffic will cause the road to need repair far sooner than at present.</p> <p>The suggestion that a care home would be a suitable development at Blackfield Farm flies in the face of the 400m exclusion of development where a SSSI boundary is located. Any development would necessitate the extensive use of industrial machinery and a constant stream of commercial vehicles into an area where no industrial or commercial activity currently takes place. The local area cannot support this type of traffic safely.</p> <p>A large building on Blackfield Farm would require extensive foundations and this would more than likely cause the level of the existing water table to rise. This will cause the local area to become wetter and may well lead to flooding. The SSSI would be affected by the higher water level and could be seriously damaged by it. The field currently has a number of water ditches which fill when there is heavy rain, it is clearly vital that these ditches are not removed or altered in any way.</p> <p>The local area, by that I mean West Moors, is already over developed with residential, retirement and care homes. The council is well aware that the area cannot support yet another development of this type. Bringing more elderly people into the area would be bad enough, but to bring elderly people who need constant care would put a completely unreasonable strain on the medical infrastructure of the village. The local doctors are already overburdened with elderly care in West Moors and have clearly stated that</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>without significant additional facilities they will be unable to support a development of this kind at Blackfield Farm.</p> <p>Such a development would not even provide for the elderly population of West Moors, because once built it would need to be filled with paying residents immediately in order for it to be a viable financial venture, thus only attracting people from outside the local area who need such facilities now.</p> <p>The area of St Leonards hospital is already identified as a major development of a care home and I believe that an agreement has been made with Care UK in this very matter. There is clearly no good, financial or intelligent reason to build yet another care home at Blackfield Farm. Both KS4 and KS5 are not a preferred option as far as West Moors Village is concerned and specifically Blackfield Farm should not be reclassified as urban! KS6, to designate Blackfield Farm as Green Belt is the only sensible way forward for this area.</p> <p>The risks posed to the Holt and West Moors Heaths are far too serious to ignore. This SSSI Heathland is currently not recovering as well as it was hoped. The last report, by Natural England in April 2007 stated that the area was "unfavourable no change". The slightest disturbance to this delicate Heathland could destroy it totally. The quite residential nature of the immediate vicinity, Blackfield Lane, Harrison Way, The Avenue and several roads leading off it will be severely affected by a development at Blackfield Farm. The local infrastructure of West Moors will be adversely affected by any development at Blackfield Farm. West Moors village does not want or needs any development in this area and neither could it cope with one. There are insufficient medical facilities to cope with another care home in West Moors. I have</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>this on good authority from a doctor who practices in West Moors. A care home at Blackfield Farm will place the elderly residents in danger due to the close proximity of DFG. The housing needs of the area can already be met without designating the area as urban, so it should be designated Green Belt.</p> <p>Blackfield Farm should be designated as Green Belt and protected from development for the foreseeable future. The re-designation of the site to urban would not benefit the village of West Moors and it is not what the village needs or wants. It is more likely than not, that nay development of the site will damage the SSSI which is in such close proximity that it could not be safeguarded no matter what development was allowed. It is completely illogical for the council to suggest that this site should be re-classified as urban when the East Dorset Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment study March 2009 found that the site should not be developed and was not needed for development in any case, because all necessary development could be adequately catered for without the site. The council should take this opportunity to protect the area of Blackfield Farm for the sake of the natural environment and for future generations of local people. The council should not allow developers to infill any open space available just because it does not yet have the protection of SSSI status.</p>			
489263	Mr Hugh Hood		CSO3810	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		The inner Green Belt should be amended to include Blackfield Farm as Green Belt. This will protect the area and most importantly the SSSI at this site.			260
498355	Mr Peter Cressey		CSO3102	Non Preferred Option KS	Support		West Moors is already over supplied with flats and Rest Homes with inadequate parking facilities. Ref: - The Avenue turning out in a car			260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
				6			is dangerous due to vision restrictions*. Cars are parked both sides of The Avenue form school or church, this situation is exacerbated during funerals when hearses are parked outside the main entrance making Station Road and The Avenue are one-way streets. *Money was set aside when new houses were built, to widen access to The Avenue. This money was part of the contract with the builder 'Where has it gone?!'			
498368	Mrs M.J. Kelly		CSO31 18	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		The care home would bring an awful lot more traffic down The Avenue and other roads off. There is the school and the church at the top of The Avenue which makes it very busy at times anyway. I think that Blackfield Farm area should be kept at Green Belt especially as it is already designated as an SSSI.			260
498371	Mr L C Hyde		CSO31 19	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		As a resident of The Avenue, West Moors I believe that until another access road is made for Blackfield Farm, NO development should be allowed. It is obvious that both the 'Inspector' and the East Dorset District Councillors have NOT been to see The Avenue during school days or Sundays when this road is single lane only, making it difficult for resident to access their properties. The junction of this road with Station Road is EXTREMELY dangerous, especially when there is a wedding or funeral taking place at the church. It must be pointed out that there was money 'supposedly' put aside by the former developers of Blackfield Farm to modify this junction, but nothing has happened to the church side, which is the most dangerous, so why would we believe that any changes would happen with any future development taking place. The option KS6 would meet some of my above			260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							concerns, without the county spending any money.			
498782	Mr P Geal		CSO33 97	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Object		Object to development. Increase of traffic. Road used 9am - 3pm due to school and in bad need of repair. Also 29 bus stop in road.			260
498801	Mr T K Hancock		CSO33 98	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		The proximity of the Holt and West Moors Heaths ought to rule the KS4 and KS5 out of consideration. KS4 and KS5 will help to destroy the nature of West Moors which has already suffered from developments which have grossly increased population and traffic. The proposed changes will create a village which is unlike the one which we chose to retire to in 1983 because of its quietness and peacefulness. How can the present road system and infrastructure possible cope? What is the point of having established and well defined principles like the Green Belt if they can be swept aside at will.			260
498940	Mr & Mrs KD and NE Wanklyn		CSO34 33	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Object		The Avenue has enough traffic to contend with especially with the school and church. The entrance to Blackfield Road is far too narrow to cope with extra traffic coming and going from a care home. The Avenue is a nice quiet residential road, one of the best in the village and it should remain that way and remain as Green Belt.	Keep the land as Green Belt		260
498956	Major & Mrs B Andrews		CSO34 34	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Object		Extra traffic / parking Damage to heaths (SSSI) Inappropriate to this particular area. The Avenue is already overused for parking by the school and the church. Burden on the local surgery and village resources.			260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
499484	Mr and Mrs J Varmen		CSO3785	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Object		This proposed development would have a negative effect on the village and surrounding area. Traffic would worsen, more open countryside would be lost. The village has grown greatly in the last 50 years and future development needs to be controlled. This development would spoil one of the better parts of the village making it more urban. We have only been given 5 days to respond to this which is not a sensible period of time.	Make it green belt!		260
499494	Mr Ian Smith		CSO3793	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support					260
499500	Mr and Mrs June and Ronald Watson		CSO3803	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		We already have a number of care homes in the area and a high proportion of elderly people. This worsens the imbalance. The Proximity to the ministry of defence petroleum depot. (Any major development of properties face a significant risk in the troubled times in which we live).	Adopt KS6 which places Blackfield Farm in the Green Belt and protected from development.		260
360167	Mrs Pippa WHEATLEY		CSO17445	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		I support in relation to Coopers Lane. The whole of this area should be in the Green Belt rather than placing some of it in the urban area. It is uncertain how much protection the 400 meter zone gives this whole area which is an important habitat for wildlife and to support Stephens Castle. See my response to KS4 There are no suitable access points for other uses. Thank you for suggesting this as a possible Option	Make this Option the preferred one for Coopers Lane		260
507755	Mrs Maureen Niblock		CSO17249	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		Coopers Lane			260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 465	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		DWT would support this option if it came forward as it is positive in relation to the natural environment.			260
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 121	Non Preferred Option KS 6		General Comment	<p>To avoid any conflict of interest by members, the ETAG response does not include detailed comment on the Verwood sites or that at Woodland Walk. Those concerned are submitting comments individually.</p> <p>It is sensible to include in the Green Belt that land which cannot be developed because of its proximity to heathland. Forest View Drive is an area of heathland that should be linked to Ferndown Common as shown on the RSPB Heathland Extent and Potential Maps. ETAG supports its inclusion in the Green Belt. The Coopers Lane North site is an SNCI and to conform with policies on protection of SNCIs should be included in the Green Belt. ETAG also supports the inclusion in the Green Belt of the Doe's Lane site.</p> <p>The type of development proposed at Blackfield Farm will be restricted through its proximity to heathland SSSI on MOD land. Any proposals for development of the larger part of the site would need to consider both the commitments under the Bern Convention for no new roads on or near heathland, and the impact of light and PM10 pollution on the heathland species. We recommend that the site is surveyed as it has lain fallow for several years. It is low-lying and secluded.</p> <p>The southern area of Blackfield Farm, through which the Castleman Trailway runs, has biodiversity interest in some areas including a badger sett, unimproved grassland and heathland. This too should be surveyed. It is an important local amenity for informal recreation and dog walking. There is potential pollution risk</p>			260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							from the pipeline from the Fuel Depot and from the former railway. The area is bounded on three sides by garden and high chain-link fences. Despite evidence of previous semi-industrial use, there would appear to be no good reason to include this section in the urban area: further urban development would detract from the setting of the Castleman Trailway. Julians Road, Wimborne There is a bad infestation of Japanese knotweed on this site. It is essential that this is cleared prior to any development and disposed of according to EA regulations.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17639	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		The Agency supports the protection of Greenfield sites under Option KS6. We would only support development on such sites once all brownfield sites have been exhausted. A robust evidence base would be required to support such proposals focusing on likely implications in terms of additional vehicular trips on the SRN.			260
517806	Mr Tony Marlborough		CSO17199	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		I support Blackfield Farm being included in the Green Belt.			260
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSO19064	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Object		These representations are submitted on behalf of Castleoak Care Developments Ltd (as developer), and by Persimmon Homes Ltd and Mr & Mrs C Budd (as joint landowners). All parties understand that the Councils have put this forward as a potential option for the 6 identified sites. They are in full agreement with the Councils that designating these sites as Green Belt should not be a preferred option. All parties therefore object to this option. With specific regard to the land at Blackfield Farm, West Moors; inclusion of this land within the Green Belt would not, in our view, meet any			260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>of the criteria for designating Green Belt land, as contained within PPG2. These criteria are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; 2. to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; 3. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 4. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and 5. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>It is considered that this area of land represents a natural "rounding-off" for development on this side of West Moors. Development beyond the Blackfield Farm site is specifically prevented by virtue of the Heathlands SPA/SSSI/Ramsar, which is already designated as Green Belt. Therefore, the Heathlands already provides the natural boundary to prevent sprawl and protect the countryside, and no additional Green Belt land is required in this location as a result.</p> <p>The Blackfield Farm site is capable of accommodating a Class C2 elderly care scheme, because its residents would pose no threat to the adjoining Heathlands area. The site is flat, is of no ecological value and is not in an area prone to flooding. It is therefore suitable for development in principle, and more specifically for Use Class C2 elderly care accommodation. In addition, there is a recognised and urgent need for elderly care accommodation within West Moors and the wider district and this site will help to meet some of this demand.</p> <p>The principle of developing this site for such a use has been accepted in principle by East Dorset DC and Natural England, and the developers are currently designing a scheme</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							appropriate to the site.			
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSO19067	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Object		<p>These representations are submitted on behalf of Castleoak Care Developments Ltd (as developer), and by Persimmon Homes Ltd and Mr & Mrs C Budd (as joint landowners). All parties understand that the Councils have put this forward as a potential option for the 6 identified sites. They are in full agreement with the Councils that designating these sites as Green Belt should not be a preferred option. All parties therefore object to this option.</p> <p>With specific regard to the land at Blackfield Farm, West Moors; inclusion of this land within the Green Belt would not, in our view, meet any of the criteria for designating Green Belt land, as contained within PPG2. These criteria are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; 2. to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; 3. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 4. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and 5. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>It is considered that this area of land represents a natural "rounding-off" for development on this side of West Moors. Development beyond the Blackfield Farm site is specifically prevented by virtue of the Heathlands SPA/SSSI/Ramsar, which is already designated as Green Belt. Therefore, the Heathlands already provides the natural boundary to prevent sprawl and protect the countryside, and no additional Green Belt land is required in this location as a result. The Blackfield Farm site is capable of</p>			260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>accommodating a Class C2 elderly care scheme, because its residents would pose no threat to the adjoining Heathlands area. The site is flat, is of no ecological value and is not in an area prone to flooding. It is therefore suitable for development in principle, and more specifically for Use Class C2 elderly care accommodation. In addition, there is a recognised and urgent need for elderly care accommodation within West Moors and the wider district and this site will help to meet some of this demand.</p> <p>The principle of developing this site for such a use has been accepted in principle by East Dorset DC and Natural England, and the developers are currently designing a scheme appropriate to the site.</p>			
507525	Mr David Lander	Boyer Planning Ltd	CSO19076	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		<p>We do not take issue with the rejection of Options KS 5 and KS 6.(Support box crossed on form)</p> <p>3.3 Preferred Option KS4 and Non Preferred Options KS5 and KS6</p> <p>3.3.1 These Green Belt options are concerned with boundary changes in East Dorset. Irrespective of the robustness of these proposals prior to the establishment of development requirements (see above), we have concerns about the status of these proposals in terms of the Core Strategy. So far as we are aware it is the Council's intention to allocate new development sites through a subsequent DPD. As such the detail of any Green belt boundary changes will also be determined at that stage.</p> <p>3.3.2 The Council therefore needs to clarify the status of these proposals in Core Strategy terms. The comments below are made without prejudice to these considerations.</p> <p>3.3.3 Preferred Option KS4 sets out proposed changes to the Green Belt around settlements in East Dorset as a result of a reassessment of the</p>			260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>reserved sites in the Local Plan which have not been developed. In Verwood two sites are proposed to be included in the Green Belt: Cooper's Lane North and Doe's Lane. Cooper's Lane South is the only site suggested to be included in the urban area around Verwood. Non Preferred Options KS5 and KS6 propose including all the identified sites in the urban area or in the Green Belt respectively.</p> <p>3.3.4 We do not take issue with the rejection of options KS5 and KSD6. As regards Preferred Option KS4 we have concerns about the proposal to include Coopers Lane South in the urban area. No development should take place within 400 metres of the Verwood Heaths, with development between 400 metres and 5 kilometres required to provide mitigation measures. Concern is therefore raised with the proposed strategy to include Cooper's Lane South within the urban area. In justifying the preferred option the strategy states that 'the other sites are proposed for inclusion within the urban areas as they are able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands.'</p> <p>3.3.5 Development within 400 metres of the heaths will lead to unacceptable impacts and should not be permitted. Cooper's Lane South is within 400 metres of Verwood Heaths within an area of heathland located on the opposite side of Moorlands Road to the site. The site should therefore be included in the Green Belt as no development would be permissible on the site in accordance with the Council's own Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework, April 2010. In relation to Verwood therefore all three identified sites should be included in the Green Belt as shown in Non Preferred Option KS6.</p>			
497218	Mr Andy	GL Hearn	CSO19068	Non Preferred	Object		These representations are submitted on behalf of Castleoak Care Developments Ltd (as			260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Shepley			Option KS 6			<p>developer), and by Persimmon Homes Ltd and Mr & Mrs C Budd (as joint landowners). All parties understand that the Councils have put this forward as a potential option for the 6 identified sites. They are in full agreement with the Councils that designating these sites as Green Belt should not be a preferred option. All parties therefore object to this option.</p> <p>With specific regard to the land at Blackfield Farm, West Moors; inclusion of this land within the Green Belt would not, in our view, meet any of the criteria for designating Green Belt land, as contained within PPG2. These criteria are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; 2. to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; 3. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 4. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and 5. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>It is considered that this area of land represents a natural "rounding-off" for development on this side of West Moors. Development beyond the Blackfield Farm site is specifically prevented by virtue of the Heathlands SPA/SSSI/Ramsar, which is already designated as Green Belt. Therefore, the Heathlands already provides the natural boundary to prevent sprawl and protect the countryside, and no additional Green Belt land is required in this location as a result.</p> <p>The Blackfield Farm site is capable of accommodating a Class C2 elderly care scheme, because its residents would pose no threat to the adjoining Heathlands area. The site is flat, is of no ecological value and is not in an area prone</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							to flooding. It is therefore suitable for development in principle, and more specifically for Use Class C2 elderly care accommodation. In addition, there is a recognised and urgent need for elderly care accommodation within West Moors and the wider district and this site will help to meet some of this demand. The principle of developing this site for such a use has been accepted in principle by East Dorset DC and Natural England, and the developers are currently designing a scheme appropriate to the site.			
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22871	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		Option KS4-6 Strongly support the inclusion within the Green Belt of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the northern half of land at Coopers Lane, Verwood, Does Lane, Verwood, Forest View Drive, Ferdown the northern half of land at Coopers Lane, Verwood Reasons Being contiguous with open countryside they would safeguard it from encroachment and meet one of the criteria for inclusion in the Green Belt. The additional benefit of retaining the biodiversity importance of these sites and existing linkages with larger areas should be noted. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nighthawk. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland			260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI. Forest View Drive is a heathland site and the possibility of its linkage with Ferndown Common is identified on the RSPB maps on Heathland Extent and Potential.</p> <p>It is recommended that Coopers Lane South is also included in the Green Belt. Much of this land is also neutral grassland and scrub that has remained uncultivated for many decades. The woodland edge habitat here supports large areas of native Bluebell. Although it appears that little of it has been formally recorded at DERC, from personal observation I can confirm that there is biodiversity interest in these areas under private ownership. Development would require an appropriate assessment under Habitats Regulations: because of poor access new road construction would be required.</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>No justification appears to have been made for the inclusion of Blackfield Farm, West Moors or Woodland Walk, Ferndown in the urban area. These too are contiguous with open countryside so would appear to meet the requirement of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It is recommended that both are subject to full ecological survey if this recommendation proceeds to the next stage of the Core Strategy. Blackfield Farm would be subject to an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations.</p> <p>Support the inclusion of Julians Road, Wimborne in the urban area. This would form part of Option WMC1 where development uniquely was supported by EDDC for submission to RSS.</p>			
602994	Mr Roger Angus	Chairman Woodland Walk Residents	CSO22994	Non Preferred Option KS 6	Support		Further to our recent telephone conversation I am writing to place formally on record the concerns of this Association on learning that woodland to the North and East of Woodland			260

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Association					<p>Walk, which was excluded under Chapter 9 of the EDDC's 2002 Local Plan from allocation for further building, may now be under consideration for planning redesignation as suitable for housing development. You referred me to preferred options KS4-6 in current discussion papers developed for consultation purposes; but I have as yet been unable to locate these on the dorset foryou website where reference 348323 seems only to access a copy of the printed leaflet for housing options in Ferndown and West Parley as locally distributed which makes no mention of the land in question.</p> <p>We shall nonetheless be grateful if you will take note in your consultation and policy development process that the existing residents of this designated Special Character Area would be most strongly opposed to such a change and in particular even if any such proposed additional housing were to be of a quality and limited density consistent with the existing local stock - if access for such a development were to be contemplated through Woodland Walk itself. We are especially conscious of the bitter experience of the first residents of Badgers Walk nearby, whose lives have been blighted and property values significantly reduced by the planning fiasco that is The Warren. Having purchased upmarket houses in the belief and expectation that these were setting the standard for a quality estate of similar dwellings, they now find themselves facing not only a decade or more of on-going construction traffic through a severely restricted and arguably quite inadequately narrow access roadway - but also changes of use both agreed and requested to permit much larger, commercial care home developments whose staff and services will only increase the traffic and disruption of the Badgers Walk environment on a permanent basis.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							We do not wish to share their experience and look to EDDC accordingly to ensure that at the very least no land additional to that already comprised by the existing properties in Woodland Walk is allocated and approved for development with access via this lane. We recognise of course that the road way itself is private property and in the same ownership as the woodland to the North and East in point; but there are alternative routes into the latter including both from the Sainsbury's access road and from the development on the old coach house motel site. If the preservation of a rare Special Character Area has a kind of importance to the District's planners they will not allow Woodland Walk to become a conduit for further building development. We shall also appreciate receiving notice as and when further input to the consultation process may be timely.			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO28 5	4.42		General Comment	I neither support or object however, my concerns relate to the evidence (or lack of evidence) for housing needs in the future. Projections are all very well but THEY ARE JUST PROJECTIONS. I would not wish to see swathes of new houses built (and in particular market housing) based on projections which may or may not be right. We can never build ourselves out of a problem of affordability for local people; new market housing will just attract buyers from outside our area, as it has in the past.			263
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19 139	4.42	Object		Para 4.42 states:- "Strategies should set out policies for delivery of housing for at least 15 years. At any time at least 5 years of supply must be available, suitable and achievable." Such objectives seem designed to satisfy the paper demands of Government long term policy, which is ironic in view of likely changes in governments and their policies within 5 years, let			263

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							alone 15 years. The word supply infers that Councils are responsible for manufacturing land suitable for development and then issuing compulsory purchase orders to ensure they are available and achievable!			
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO668	4.44	Object		This paragraph needs to be to be changed due to the ramifications of the Coalition proposed changes to provision for social housing tenancies and changes to welfare entitlement to housing benefit. More recent employment trends suggest that the numbers of those unemployed are likely to rise thus negating some effects of there being insufficient workers available to support the local economy by 2016.			265
360597	Mr Gordon Wheeler		CSO2488	4.44	Object		I quote "Dorset County Council predicts that by 2027 there will be twice as many 80 year olds than 30 year olds in the two Districts and that by 2016 East Dorset will have insufficient workers available to support the local economy." This is a sweeping statement, the number of over 80 will depend if this area is congenial for retirement or not by the changers that will be made by 2027. Is it your intention to deter people from outside the area from retiring here?			265
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO18004	4.44		General Comment	We note in the Key Facts beneath 4.44, that Dorset County Council predicts that by 2027, there will be twice as many 80- year olds as 30 year olds. This information should be placed in Section 2.			265
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19140	4.45	Object		Para 4.45 states:- "The new Coalition Government has now revoked Regional Spatial Strategies. The Core Strategy is seeking our views on how much housing we should provide			267

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							and where this should be across the area over the next 15 years. Yet we are now expected to respond to new urban extensions, some as proposed in the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy and some new proposals now initiated by this Core Strategy with minimal preliminary discussion.			
523419	HLF Planning	HLF Planning	CSO18390	4.45	Object		<p>2.14 Given that the Masterplan Report was finalised in the summer of 2010 and that it relies heavily upon figures produced when the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) was undergoing various stages of consultation it is considered important for EDDC to take a step back and assess the consequences of the revocation of RSSs before bulldozing on with plans that were formed in a very different planning environment (especially given the publishing of the Localism Bill in December 2010). It is not simply enough to continue with the proposals on the basis that that Secretary of State stated that evidence which informed the preparation of the RSS may still be a material consideration. A period of reflection is required whilst the contents of the Localism Bill are digested.</p> <p>2.15 Returning to PPS3, there is no mention in the Masterplan Report of whether the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit (NHPAU) had been consulted with as recommended in Para 33. The NHPAU is able to assess the impact of strategic proposals for affordability.</p>			267
361050	Dr Alan Marshall		CSO64	4.46	Support		Bullet point 5 is very significant - a failure to meet the housing needs of younger families can only have an adverse effect on the area in the medium term as the population continues to age and therefore the number of working age decreases and therefore the local economy shrinks etc. It is a dangerous downhill spiral. A glance at the make-up of the town centre of			268

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Ferndown (for example) shows how a local centre can be affected by its demographic profile			
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO669	4.46	Object		We need to build houses close to where there will be employment opportunities for the young as with increased tuition fees at university and travel costs rising much more than RPI inflation, they will not have the employment opportunities in this area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Christchurch and East Dorset are amongst the least affordable areas in the south west. * The size of households in the area is shrinking which increases housing demands. * Young people find it particularly hard to afford a home in the area. * There is a need to provide suitable housing to reduce health inequalities and improve educational attainment. * The population of Christchurch and East Dorset is ageing and a lack of housing delivery will contribute to local economic decline. There is a need to provide an appropriate mix of housing, close to where the new employment opportunities will be developed, to meet the needs of families and young people who are vital to the economy of the area. 		268
359350	Mr Jim Biggin	Chairman West Christchurch Residents	CSO1578	4.48	Support			As previously stated you simply don't need this number of houses. The stopping of "garden	Comments are relating to supporting Para 4.49	270

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Assoc & J.R.A.						grabbing", which was destroying our environment, is strongly welcomed		
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO2376	4.48	Support	General Comment	Vital - more limits to growth			270
360792	Miss Carol Evans	Planning Consultant Evans Traves	CSO18580	4.48	Support		<p>This paragraph states, 'A large proportion of the predicted new housing is anticipated to be built on existing housing land, including gardens. This will reduce the number of homes that can be built in the existing urban areas.' This paragraph continues by stating that an update to the SHLAA to reflect the changes in PPS3 WILL BE carried out in the summer of 2011.</p> <p>These changes to the SHLAA should have been carried out prior to the issuing of this document. The policy Options for specific housing numbers that we are presented with for Christchurch, as well as where development is acceptable, is based principally on the evidence base of the SHLAA which is out of date at the time of making the preferred policy assumptions. Due the statements made in this paragraph the evidence base for the housing policies in Christchurch is fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>I concur with the statement that the amount of land to be built upon will be reduced in the existing urban area. Given that paragraph 2.43 states that there is 'a greater demand for housing across all tenures (private as well as affordable) than the current stock of housing can meet (even with the drop in prices in the last 2 years)', land such as those areas that are prone to flooding must be considered provided that the development can be made safe.</p> <p>Christchurch Council, in not having an up-to-date SHLAA, has not demonstrated that the</p>			270

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							sequential test as required by PPS25 can be satisfied. As such, the potential to develop new housing on areas of flood risk needs to be considered. Provided it is demonstrated that it is safe to develop on land within areas of flood risk, on a case by case basis, the principle of development in these areas should be acceptable to ensure the delivery of housing within the Borough of Christchurch.			
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19 141	4.48		General Comment	<p>Para 4.48 states:- "The East Dorset Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2009) predicts that there is capacity to build about 3300 homes in the existing built up areas over a period of 15 years. Since these predictions were prepared the Coalition Government have made changes relating to "garden grabbing" and housing densities which will have an impact on the figures." This paragraph goes on to admit:- "this will reduce the number of houses that can be built in existing urban areas. The Councils intend to update the Assessments so they will be available as evidence when decisions on the scale of housing to be provided will be making in the summer of 2011." Rather than an 'update', the whole method of making this Assessment requires a complete re-think. This suggestion is based on recent actual experience in St Leonards and St Ives, which is summarised as follows:-</p> <p>In April 2010 extract from the EDDC Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment were put through the letterboxes of many residents in St Leonards and St Ives without any explanation attached. I refer you to a letter from EDDC Ref DM/LC/NF35 dated 14th June 2010 to St Leonards and St Ives Parish Council, and to a report on the front page of the Stour and Avon Magazine dated 21st May 2010. Although the individual responsible remains unknown, it was</p>			270

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							clearly meant to worry residents to the extent that our Council may be about to issue Compulsory Purchase Orders to facilitate wholesale redevelopment at much higher densities per hectare. I have read the full section of the SHLAA relating to St Leonards and St Ives and the largest projected increases in the number of dwellings coincides with localities having the largest garden plots. This is underlined by a letter to me dated 28th May 2010 Ref LJK/394.10.4/sh where Mrs King admits: "Identification of land in the SHLAA with potential for development is effectively what could physically fit on the site." The absurdity of this statement is illustrated by figures in the East Dorset Housing Options Masterplan Report November 2010 issued during this consultation process. Even sites with a density per hectare of 27, 38 and 60, the area of the site covered by buildings is only 18%, 20% and 26% respectively. In view of the inconsistencies in interpreting planning policies, both at local level and by different planning inspectors, it is absolutely no reassurance for East Dorset District Council to say:- "Even if a site has been identified for development in the SHLAA it does not mean planning permission will be granted." Indeed, one of the problems with this 'desk top' appraisal is that few actual sites are specifically identified. Clearly a more realistic and detailed SHLAA is urgently required before proceeding to the next stage of the Core Strategy process.			
521738	Mr Richard Goodall	Turley Associates	CSO18065	4.48	Object		According to paragraph 4.48 of the Core Strategy the East Dorset 2009 SHLAA shows a housing land supply within the urban area of 3,300 homes. This assessment predates the publication of a revised PPS3 in June 2010 which removed the minimum density requirement of 30 units per hectare and removed			270

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>private garden land from the previously developed or brownfield land classification. Given that garden land is the principal source of the identified SHLAA sites within East Dorset, substantial discounting of this figure will be necessary.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.48 also suggest that the latest SHLAA, which will reflect latest PPS3 policy, will be available in Summer 2011 and will inform the districts' Strategic Housing Requirement which will also be published then. Bellway Homes will make detailed comments at this stage as this will be the point where strategic housing issues can be properly considered.</p> <p>Despite the anticipated demise of the RSS, the sections of PPS3 relating to maintaining a rolling five year housing land supply up to 15 years is retained, as is the requirement for such supply to be properly informed by an evidence base.</p>			
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO915	4.49	Object		<p>Any community at Roeshot is likely to be very isolated situated between the two formal boundaries of the A35 and the railway line which will encourage more car use. Perhaps a better option would be to develop Burton further using green belt line to the East which could then have far better shops and perhaps even a school and be closer to new employment opportunities near Hurn. A bigger Burton would justify better bus links to Christchurch and Bournemouth</p>	<p>In addition to the housing that is predicted to be built through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments there are a series of options to provide housing as part of a new neighbourhood. This includes options located to the north of Christchurch, on land east of Burton.</p>		271
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO2379	4.49		General Comment	The site is east not north of Christchurch			271
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO327	4.50	Support		I support the fact that no definite housing numbers have yet been decided as yet and I agree that the towns identified are the main			272

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>settlements within East Dorset. More importantly, though, any consideration of housing development should take account of the lack of infrastructure, schools, hospitals etc. and more importantly the present road congestion in particular with regard to the A31T which is at capacity and with no time scale for dualling the sections between Amyesford, Canford Bottom and beyond.</p> <p>In 2008 East Dorset District Council together with Dorset County Council, Poole and Bournemouth Borough Councils publically stated that it was against greenbelt development on urban extensions quoting lack of infrastructure as being the reason. Nothing has changed and in the meantime I would say that from my experience, congestion on the A31 and at Canford Bottom roundabout has got worse. I would also mention that Heathland Mitigation is at present unproved and it is therefore unknown just what impact there would be to our internationally protected Heathland should thousands of new houses be built in East Dorset.</p>			
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		CSO18587	4.50	Object		<p>I am glad the emphasis is on providing affordable homes rather than yet more executive homes, retirement flats, second homes etc., but it needs to be clear these are for local people, especially the young.</p> <p>I am glad the Council recognises the limits to development. The environmental limit has already been reached. The Strategy should not propose any building on the Green Belt.</p>	Please see earlier comments and my general letter.		272
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO328	4.52	Support		<p>The Council should take notice of their Councillors (the public's elected representatives) views NOT to support proposed plan for housing development on "urban extensions" in the greenbelt with the exception of Cuthbury allotment site.</p>			274

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361003	Mr M A Hodges	Planning Executive Highcliffe Residents Association	CSO19 344	4.54		General Comment	<p>Very strong support was expressed concerning limits to growth, these include: Christchurch is the smallest surviving of the old urban districts, like Bournemouth it is coastal and urban. Both these boroughs were in Hampshire until 1974.</p> <p>The size of Christchurch Borough is limited by the sea as well as boundaries with New Forest, East Dorset and Bournemouth.</p> <p>Further topographical constraints are the beaches, harbour and water courses: Avon, Stour, Moors, Mude, Bure and Chew Rivers. The flood plains of these rivers and rising sea levels have constraints on building in these areas.</p> <p>Environmental constraints arise from 70% of Christchurch Borough being Green Belt land and 24% subject Nature Conservation Areas.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. As a result it has a very large retired population, the highest proportion of its population in all of Europe. The large number of elderly people creates particular demands on health and social services and for the protection of quality of life.</p> <p>The high proportion of retired people tends to lead to relatively high standard of living and to high housing costs making it difficult for younger people to get a foot on the housing ladder. This is unlikely to change, land available is limited.</p>			276

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Hence younger people often have to accept longer travel to work distances. Hence it will continue to be important for the Borough to have good communication routes by road and rail and for housing to be sought outside Christchurch Borough. The limited development land and the high costs of homes will continue to require some workers to travel to Christchurch from other Districts.			
507546	Mr Nigel Pugsley	Senior Planner BNP Paribas Real Estate	CSO17975	4.54		General Comment	OPTIONS KS 7 TO KS 12 – WHERE AND HOW MUCH HOUSING SHOULD THERE BE IN CHRISTCHURCH The abovementioned policy options relate to the delivery of new homes within the Borough of Christchurch, differentiated by the quantity and location of new housing. Whichever of the options the Council is minded to progress with (following further consultation and examination), it would be essential that the infrastructure needed to support the planned growth is provided for in a timely manner.			276
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO916	Option KS 7	Object		This is the worst of the 4 options as any community at Roeshot is likely to be very isolated situated between the two formal boundaries of the A35 and the railway line which will encourage more car use. Perhaps a better option would be to develop Burton further using green belt line to the East which could then have far better shops and perhaps even a school and be closer to new employment opportunities near Hurn. A bigger Burton would justify better bus links to Christchurch and Bournemouth	Christchurch: Delivery of (3,200) dwellings during the plan period 2007 – 2027 * Includes housing potential of sites identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment for comprehensive redevelopment where garden land would be used but excludes back land (back gardens) sites involving plot severance * Applies a discounting rate of 5% for non-		277

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								implemented planning permissions * Includes about 950 dwellings brought forward within the urban extension east of Burton		
360597	Mr Gordon Wheeler		CSO2495	Option KS7	Object		As this exercise started in 2007 how many, to date, of the 3200 houses have been built and how many are affordable homes?			277
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO2380	Option KS7	Object		3,200 is not likely to be attained			277
498027	Mr Mark Keighley	Business Development Manager Bournemouth Transport Ltd	CSO3242	Option KS7	Support		Option maximises potential of the site and existing public transport links			277
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	CSO10738	Option KS7	Support		The Core Strategy (CS) identifies, in Paragraph 6.2, that despite the abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) "...there is still a high level of housing need to address over the plan period to 2027." Thereafter, Paragraph 6.20 quantifies housing demand on an annual basis; 293 open market dwellings and 243 affordable dwellings – in total, 536 each year. The CS contains a range of housing strategy options for the borough, from a high of 3,778 (KS9) to a low of 2,178 (KS11). Due to various constraints, none of these options appears capable of satisfying the future housing requirements for the borough, as set out in Paragraph 6.20. Indeed, given the level of constraints, even the upper level set out in Option KS9 appears unrealistic. The appropriate level of housing in the CS needs to respond to the advice set out in PPS 3, with	Limit the dwelling numbers in Option KS7 to 600 units		277

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>particular regard to: Evidence of current and future needs. Local and sub regional evidence within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. □ Advice on affordability, including overall ambitions. □ The latest published household projections. □ Sustainability appraisal □ Although there is now no statutory requirement to meet the housing target set out in the RSS, all of the background evidence used to inform it indicated that there is a need to deliver a quantum of housing towards the top end of the range now set out in the CS (taking into account our earlier comments in respect of Option KS9). For example, an appropriate target could be based on the RSS figure (3,450), less completions for the period 2006 – 2009 (4191), plus an allowance (202) for the additional year of the plan period 2026 – 2027. This indicates that a target of approximately 3,230 dwellings would be appropriate for the period 2012 – 2027. This is consistent with the delivery target set out in Option KS7. This can generally be supported, but qualified in respect of the components of that target figure. In this respect, please see our separate representations in respect of Option UE4 and our proposed additional policy option</p>			
508135	E P Wright		CSO11 607	Option KS 7	Support					277
507452	Jill Turvey		CSO10 987	Option KS 7	Support					277
508518	Mr Warren Brown		CSO11 846	Option KS 7	Support		Affordable homes are important because of the number of people waiting on the housing list is still very high.			277
508689	Mr		CSO12	Option KS	Support		In the present economic climate when the threat			277

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Andy Jones		093	7			of negative equity and high rents are a reality for many families the importance of affordable housing and social housing is greater than it has been for many decades. I believe that this has to be a fundamental part of the core strategy and that the options selected above will best achieve this.			
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18 655	Option KS 7		No Opinion	Natural England will not be providing views on the number of new houses proposed for Christchurch Borough during the plan period (as set out in options KS7-KS11) Our advice will focus on ensuring that the scale and rate of housing within the Borough, including the proposed urban extension, is implemented without harm to the natural environment through the range of mitigation measures contained within the emerging DPD and through the provision of Sustainable Alternative Natural Green space (SANGs) delivered as part of the north Christchurch urban extension.			277
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 630	Option KS 7	Object		We object to options KS7 – KS11 (inclusive) relating to housing provision in Christchurch, pending resolution of the issues identified in the HRA in ensuring certainty over the location and scale of development and the associated need for mitigation measures for the European sites.			277
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 640	Option KS 7	Support		The Agency has no “in principle” objection to the quantum of development proposed within Preferred Options KS7, KS8, KS10 and KS11. However we would object to the quantum proposed within KS9 as this exceeds the figures that were in the recently abolished draft SWRSS. We support the provision of housing within existing urban areas where services can accommodate and support growth.			277
521508	Ms	Jackson	CSO17	Option KS	Object		KS7 -11 – Housing Options Christchurch			277

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lisa Jackson	Planning Ltd	872	7			<p>The type and level of housing to be developed in the Borough must be changed by two significant alterations to policy that has been made by the Coalition Government. These policy changes need further work and support as they are not reflected in the current Options document. The reclassification of garden land as no longer brownfield, as part of the revision to PPS3 in June 2010, changes significantly the availability of sites within the Borough. Approximately 570 dwellings are lost from potential supply as a result of this change. In this regard the option that does not rely on garden land –KS10 - is supported in part, although this does not give sufficient overall supply. KS10 does not include the upper limit for Roeshot urban extension at 1250 dwellings as expressed in option KS9. Given the problems with supply Meyrick Estate Management strongly believe that best use must be made of the urban extension site.</p> <p>There is strong recognition that further intensification of the urban area is damaging to the quality of the Borough. This is recognised in the Draft Dorset Green Infrastructure Strategy Report February 2010. In assessing the quality of the urban areas it was noted in the study: "Pressure for urban infill and for parking has reduced, and is likely to continue to reduce, the amount and quality of private open green space (e.g. the infill of gardens, the loss of mature trees). This can have a negative impact on the character of residential areas, as well as on biodiversity and adaptation to climate change, and increase the demand for public open space and access to the surrounding countryside."</p> <p>A more strategic and spatial response to this issue is required in the Core Strategy, as it is evident that the current approach has significant negative effect on existing residents and is likely to put greater visitor pressure on the protected</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>landscapes. A more critical and considered assessment on the existing urban area should be completed and given the new emphasis on local involvement this must fully engage the existing populations most affected by re-use of garden land and urban infill.</p> <p>The revocation of regional spatial strategies has removed regional targets. It is clear that housing demand in the Borough remains beyond the ability of the Borough to meet supply, and this is exacerbated by the new pressure on garden land and the lack of supply of brownfield sites given the strong local economy. Further pressure on employment land due to doubts over the strategic allocation of employment land at Bournemouth airport only serve to reduce the likely availability of brownfield land in the urban area.</p> <p>Despite the loss of the regional strategy the evidence behind it remains crucial to delivering the appropriate level of development in the Borough. Further allocations of land may be required to overcome this significant potential shortfall in supply. Given the lack of a five year housing land supply early release of sites must be facilitated by the Core Strategy. The policy confirming housing growth needs to be revised to reflect demand and this is likely to require the strategic allocation of additional sites.</p> <p>The likely result of this assessment is that further capacity for housing development may need to be found elsewhere in the Borough in addition to that identified in the options. This is unlikely to be found in any significant brownfield sites within the town due to the lack of availability of this type of site as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The approach in the current options is not sufficiently robust or flexible enough to satisfy housing demands to 2027 and create a deliverable five year supply of</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							land as required by PPS3. To fail to deliver development at the higher levels, close to demand, is to reduce the chance of a decent home to residents of the Borough, and may result in the failure of the whole Core Strategy.			
521395	D2 Planning	D2 Planning Limited	CSO17 818	Option KS 7	Object		Objections are lodged in respect of the proposed draft housing provision for Christchurch on the basis that it appears to be based purely on delivery and capacity rather than an analysis of housing requirement based on population growth, household formation etc. It is considered that the housing provision up to 2027 should at least be in line with that identified in the draft RSS of 3,450 dwellings			277
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO18 984	Option KS 7	Support		Options KS 7 – KS 11 Christchurch housing development The broad location of residential development in existing urban areas is supported to promote sustainable access to services and reduce the need to travel by car. The principle of locating residential development to the south of the railway line at Roeshot Hill is supported as it is close to existing food retail, schools and rail station. There are also opportunities to improve sustainable access to Christchurch town centre and the rest of the conurbation. Sustainable travel patterns need to be established at the time of occupation of new development through the use of travel plans for new residential areas.			277
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO91 7	Option KS 8	Object		This is one of the worst of the 5 options as any community at Roeshot is likely to be very isolated situated between the two formal boundaries of the A35 and the railway line which will encourage more car use. Perhaps a better option would be to develop Burton further using green belt line to the East which could then have far better shops and perhaps even a school and	Christchurch: Delivery of between (2,900 - 3,100) dwellings during the plan period 2007 – 2027. * Includes housing potential of sites identified in the strategic housing land availability		279

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							be closer to new employment opportunities near Hurn. A bigger Burton would justify better bus links to Christchurch and Bournemouth	assessment for comprehensive redevelopment where garden land would be used but excludes back land (back gardens) sites involving plot severance. * Applies a discounting rate of 5% for non-implemented planning permissions. * Includes between 650 - 850 dwellings brought forward within the urban extension east of Burton		
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	CSO10 741	Option KS 8	Object		Please see our principal representations in respect of Option KS7.	Delete policy option		279
508254	Mr R B Holloway		CSO11 648	Option KS 8	Support					279
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18 657	Option KS 8		No Opinion	Natural England will not be providing views on the number of new houses proposed for Christchurch Borough during the plan period (as set out in options KS7-KS11) Our advice will focus on ensuring that the scale and rate of housing within the Borough, including the proposed urban extension, is implemented without harm to the natural environment through the range of mitigation measures contained within the emerging DPD and through the provision of Sustainable Alternative Natural Green space (SANGs) delivered as part of the north Christchurch urban extension.			279
359571	Mr Renny	Conservation Officer	CSO18 631	Option KS 8	Object		We object to options KS7 – KS11 (inclusive) relating to housing provision in Christchurch,			279

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds					pending resolution of the issues identified in the HRA in ensuring certainty over the location and scale of development and the associated need for mitigation measures for the European sites.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 641	Option KS 8	Support		The Agency has no "in principle" objection to the quantum of development proposed within Preferred Options KS7, KS8, KS10 and KS11. However we would object to the quantum proposed within KS9 as this exceeds the figures that were in the recently abolished draft SWRSS. We support the provision of housing within existing urban areas where services can accommodate and support growth.			279
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17 873	Option KS 8	Object		<p>KS7 -11 – Housing Options Christchurch</p> <p>The type and level of housing to be developed in the Borough must be changed by two significant alterations to policy that has been made by the Coalition Government. These policy changes need further work and support as they are not reflected in the current Options document. The reclassification of garden land as no longer brownfield, as part of the revision to PPS3 in June 2010, changes significantly the availability of sites within the Borough. Approximately 570 dwellings are lost from potential supply as a result of this change. In this regard the option that does not rely on garden land –KS10 - is supported in part, although this does not give sufficient overall supply. KS10 does not include the upper limit for Roeshot urban extension at 1250 dwellings as expressed in option KS9. Given the problems with supply Meyrick Estate Management strongly believe that best use must be made of the urban extension site.</p> <p>There is strong recognition that further intensification of the urban area is damaging to the quality of the Borough. This is recognised in the Draft Dorset Green Infrastructure Strategy</p>			279

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Report February 2010. In assessing the quality of the urban areas it was noted in the study: "Pressure for urban infill and for parking has reduced, and is likely to continue to reduce, the amount and quality of private open green space (e.g. the infill of gardens, the loss of mature trees). This can have a negative impact on the character of residential areas, as well as on biodiversity and adaptation to climate change, and increase the demand for public open space and access to the surrounding countryside."</p> <p>A more strategic and spatial response to this issue is required in the Core Strategy, as it is evident that the current approach has significant negative effect on existing residents and is likely to put greater visitor pressure on the protected landscapes. A more critical and considered assessment on the existing urban area should be completed and given the new emphasis on local involvement this must fully engage the existing populations most affected by re-use of garden land and urban infill.</p> <p>The revocation of regional spatial strategies has removed regional targets. It is clear that housing demand in the Borough remains beyond the ability of the Borough to meet supply, and this is exacerbated by the new pressure on garden land and the lack of supply of brownfield sites given the strong local economy. Further pressure on employment land due to doubts over the strategic allocation of employment land at Bournemouth airport only serve to reduce the likely availability of brownfield land in the urban area.</p> <p>Despite the loss of the regional strategy the evidence behind it remains crucial to delivering the appropriate level of development in the Borough. Further allocations of land may be required to overcome this significant potential shortfall in supply. Given the lack of a five year</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							housing land supply early release of sites must be facilitated by the Core Strategy. The policy confirming housing growth needs to be revised to reflect demand and this is likely to require the strategic allocation of additional sites. The likely result of this assessment is that further capacity for housing development may need to be found elsewhere in the Borough in addition to that identified in the options. This is unlikely to be found in any significant brownfield sites within the town due to the lack of availability of this type of site as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The approach in the current options is not sufficiently robust or flexible enough to satisfy housing demands to 2027 and create a deliverable five year supply of land as required by PPS3. To fail to deliver development at the higher levels, close to demand, is to reduce the chance of a decent home to residents of the Borough, and may result in the failure of the whole Core Strategy.			
521395	D2 Planning	D2 Planning Limited	CSO17 820	Option KS 8	Object		Objections are lodged in respect of the proposed draft housing provision for Christchurch on the basis that it appears to be based purely on delivery and capacity rather than an analysis of housing requirement based on population growth, household formation etc. It is considered that the housing provision up to 2027 should at least be in line with that identified in the draft RSS of 3,450 dwellings			279
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO18 985	Option KS 8	Support		Options KS 7 – KS 11 Christchurch housing development The broad location of residential development in existing urban areas is supported to promote sustainable access to services and reduce the need to travel by car. The principle of locating residential development to the south of the railway line at Roeshot Hill is supported as it is			279

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							close to existing food retail, schools and rail station. There are also opportunities to improve sustainable access to Christchurch town centre and the rest of the conurbation. Sustainable travel patterns need to be established at the time of occupation of new development through the use of travel plans for new residential areas.			
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO918	Option KS 9	Object		This is the worst of the 5 options as any community at Roeshot is likely to be very isolated situated between the two formal boundaries of the A35 and the railway line which will encourage more car use. Perhaps a better option would be to develop Burton further using green belt line to the East which could then have far better shops and perhaps even a school and be closer to new employment opportunities near Hurn. A bigger Burton would justify better bus links to Christchurch and Bournemouth	Christchurch: Delivery of between (3,478 – 3,778) dwellings during the plan period 2007 - 2027. * This option exceeds the South West Regional Spatial Strategy target of 3,450 dwellings. * Includes redevelopment potential and the use of garden land. * Includes 950 - 1250 dwellings brought forward within the urban extension east of Burton * Does not provide a discounted rate for non-implemented planning consents.		281
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO2381	Option KS 9	Object		3778 is not likely to be attained			281
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	CSO10766	Option KS 9	Object		Please see our principal representations in respect of Option KS 7	Delete policy option.		281
508198	Mr Lorraine		CSO11616	Option KS 9	Support					281
508218	Mr		CSO11	Option KS	Support					281

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	P Heaton		624	9						
508241	Mr L Hibbard		CSO11 640	Option KS 9	Support					281
508353	Mr J Codling		CSO11 669	Option KS 9	Support					281
508360	Ms Jocelyn Britton		CSO11 677	Option KS 9	Support					281
508369	Mr A Hill		CSO11 685	Option KS 9	Support					281
360575	Mr Roy Avery		CSO11 867	Option KS 9	Support					281
507591	Mr Mark		CSO11 170	Option KS 9	Support					281
507599	Mr M Avnir		CSO11 193	Option KS 9	Support					281
508542	Mr H Cramer		CSO11 881	Option KS 9	Support					281
508661	Mr Burton		CSO12 049	Option KS 9	Support					281
508679	Mr A O'Connor		CSO12 076	Option KS 9	Support					281

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508847	Mr V Cromer		CSO12 245	Option KS 9	Support					281
508885	Mr J Heath		CSO12 301	Option KS 9	Support					281
508936	Mr M Brawner		CSO12 366	Option KS 9	Support					281
509082	Mr Richard		CSO12 484	Option KS 9	Support					281
509220	Mrs U Richard		CSO12 581	Option KS 9	Support					281
509235	Mr M Kenny		CSO12 587	Option KS 9	Support					281
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18 658	Option KS 9		No Opinion	Natural England will not be providing views on the number of new houses proposed for Christchurch Borough during the plan period (as set out in options KS7-KS11) Our advice will focus on ensuring that the scale and rate of housing within the Borough, including the proposed urban extension, is implemented without harm to the natural environment through the range of mitigation measures contained within the emerging DPD and through the provision of Sustainable Alternative Natural Green space (SANGs) delivered as part of the north Christchurch urban extension.			281
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the	CSO18 632	Option KS 9	Object		We object to options KS7 – KS11 (inclusive) relating to housing provision in Christchurch, pending resolution of the issues identified in the HRA in ensuring certainty over the location and			281

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Protection of Birds					scale of development and the associated need for mitigation measures for the European sites.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17642	Option KS9	Object		The Agency has no "in principle" objection to the quantum of development proposed within Preferred Options KS7, KS8, KS10 and KS11. However we would object to the quantum proposed within KS9 as this exceeds the figures that were in the recently abolished draft SWRSS. We support the provision of housing within existing urban areas where services can accommodate and support growth.			281
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17874	Option KS9	Object		<p>KS7 - 11 – Housing Options Christchurch</p> <p>The type and level of housing to be developed in the Borough must be changed by two significant alterations to policy that has been made by the Coalition Government. These policy changes need further work and support as they are not reflected in the current Options document. The reclassification of garden land as no longer brownfield, as part of the revision to PPS3 in June 2010, changes significantly the availability of sites within the Borough. Approximately 570 dwellings are lost from potential supply as a result of this change. In this regard the option that does not rely on garden land –KS10 - is supported in part, although this does not give sufficient overall supply. KS10 does not include the upper limit for Roeshot urban extension at 1250 dwellings as expressed in option KS9. Given the problems with supply Meyrick Estate Management strongly believe that best use must be made of the urban extension site.</p> <p>There is strong recognition that further intensification of the urban area is damaging to the quality of the Borough. This is recognised in the Draft Dorset Green Infrastructure Strategy Report February 2010. In assessing the quality of the urban areas it was noted in the study:</p>			281

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>"Pressure for urban infill and for parking has reduced, and is likely to continue to reduce, the amount and quality of private open green space (e.g. the infill of gardens, the loss of mature trees). This can have a negative impact on the character of residential areas, as well as on biodiversity and adaptation to climate change, and increase the demand for public open space and access to the surrounding countryside."</p> <p>A more strategic and spatial response to this issue is required in the Core Strategy, as it is evident that the current approach has significant negative effect on existing residents and is likely to put greater visitor pressure on the protected landscapes. A more critical and considered assessment on the existing urban area should be completed and given the new emphasis on local involvement this must fully engage the existing populations most affected by re-use of garden land and urban infill.</p> <p>The revocation of regional spatial strategies has removed regional targets. It is clear that housing demand in the Borough remains beyond the ability of the Borough to meet supply, and this is exacerbated by the new pressure on garden land and the lack of supply of brownfield sites given the strong local economy. Further pressure on employment land due to doubts over the strategic allocation of employment land at Bournemouth airport only serve to reduce the likely availability of brownfield land in the urban area.</p> <p>Despite the loss of the regional strategy the evidence behind it remains crucial to delivering the appropriate level of development in the Borough. Further allocations of land may be required to overcome this significant potential shortfall in supply. Given the lack of a five year housing land supply early release of sites must be facilitated by the Core Strategy. The policy</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							confirming housing growth needs to be revised to reflect demand and this is likely to require the strategic allocation of additional sites. The likely result of this assessment is that further capacity for housing development may need to be found elsewhere in the Borough in addition to that identified in the options. This is unlikely to be found in any significant brownfield sites within the town due to the lack of availability of this type of site as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The approach in the current options is not sufficiently robust or flexible enough to satisfy housing demands to 2027 and create a deliverable five year supply of land as required by PPS3. To fail to deliver development at the higher levels, close to demand, is to reduce the chance of a decent home to residents of the Borough, and may result in the failure of the whole Core Strategy.			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO18 005	Option KS 9	Support		We support Option KS 9, of delivering between 3,478 – 3,778 dwellings during the plan period. This is the only option that delivers the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the Draft RSS (although slightly above it). We have seen no evidence that suggests that the RSS target, which is supported by evidence, should be reduced below 3,400 dwellings over the plan period. This option also maximises the number of homes to be delivered through an urban extension in Christchurch. In the district, much of the housing supply will come from small developments of 1 – 5 dwellings, this source of affordable housing is too unpredictable to be relied upon to deliver large amounts of affordable housing and so a large urban extension is also required.			281
359291	Mr Jeremy	Woolf Bond Planning	CSO18 343	Option KS 9	Support		Options KS7-KS11 – The Broad Location for Future Housing Development			281

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Woolf						<p>One of the principal objectives for the CS should be to ensure that development is located in sustainable locations in order to encourage travel by sustainable modes of transport. This requires allocating land for development that can access existing services and facilities by walking, cycle and or public transport.</p> <p>The key is to identify land for development that can contribute towards and help create sustainable patterns of development. This means identifying strategic sites for development at the most sustainable locations. This includes planning for housing development by means of a strategic site release at Roeshot Hill which can help to address both the quantitative and qualitative demand for new housing.</p> <p>As set out in the consultation paper, the Core Strategy will set out the spatial approach to meeting development needs, including that for housing, employment and infrastructure, during the period possibly to 2027.</p> <p>Preparation of the CS provides the locus against which the overall amount and location of growth to be met within the area will be determined.</p> <p>The policy basis against which the Core Strategy is to be prepared includes the emerging South West RSS together with the content of the national Planning Policy Statement.</p> <p>The Proposed Changes to the draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) were published in July 2008 and followed publication of the RSS Panel's Report, setting a requirement for the delivery of 3,450 dwellings within Christchurch Borough during the period 2006 to 2026, equivalent to 172 dwellings per annum. Of this total, 600 dwellings were to be located in the area of search to the North of Christchurch at Roeshot Hill (area of search 7C).</p> <p>In May 2010 the SoS for Communities and Local Government wrote to all local authority Chief</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Planning Officers to highlight the Government's intention to rapidly abolish Regional Spatial Strategies and return decision making powers on housing and planning to local councils.</p> <p>The DCLG's subsequent announcement and accompanying advice note dated 6 July 2010 stated that Regional Strategies had been revoked by the Secretary of State under s79 (6) of the Local Democracy Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 and were said to no longer form part of the development plan for the purposes of s38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It was advised at that time that the legal basis for Regional Strategies is a matter to be abolished through the Localism Bill.</p> <p>The 6 July revocation decision was then subject to challenge in the Cala Homes (South) Ltd case (2010 EWHC 2866). This was decided on 10 November 2010 and the outcome was to quash the 6 July revocation with the court ordering the decision by the SoS to revoke the strategies with immediate effect was unlawful. The effect of the decision is to re-establish Regional Strategies as part of the development plan.</p> <p>The November 2010 decision post-dates publication of the draft Core Strategy for consultation and represents a major change in the policy position. Accordingly, preparation of the Core Strategy should at least have regard to the provisions of the emerging RSS. The plan provides the most recent evidence of housing need, considered at a strategic level. Both the emerging RSS and the Council's SHMA document indicated a higher level of housing need than provided for in the current draft Core Strategy.</p> <p>Planning for a level of housing below the 173 dwellings per annum set out in the proposed changes to the RSS, the emerging Core Strategy</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>would be unsound. Moreover, such an approach would fail to meet the level of affordable housing need identified through the SHMA.</p> <p>As set out in PPS3, when determining the local level of housing provision, LPAs are required to take into account evidence of current and future levels of need and demand for housing and affordability levels based upon, inter alia, local and sub-regional evidence of need and demand, set out in SHMAs and other relevant market information such as long term house prices. This is likely to necessitate a higher annualised strategic housing requirement to be met within Christchurch Borough than the 173 dwellings per annum set out in the proposed changes to the RSS.</p> <p>A number of growth scenarios are proposed at options KS7 to KS11. These may be compared to the levels of growth set out in the proposed changes to the RSS and the level of need identified in the SHMA.</p> <p>Option - SHMA Annualised Requirement 243 (affordable only) Req 2007 to 2027 4860</p> <p>Option - RSS Proposed Changes Annualised Requirement 173 Req 2007 to 2027 3460</p> <p>Option - KS 7 Annualised Requirement 160 Req 2007 to 2027 3200</p> <p>Option - KS8 Annualised Requirement 145 - 155 Req 2007 to 2027 2900 - 3100</p> <p>Option - KS9 Annualised Requirement 174 - 189 Req 2007 to 2027 3478 - 3778</p> <p>Option - KS 10 Annualised Requirement 131 Req 2007 to 2027 2628</p> <p>Option - KS 11</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Annualised Requirement 109 - 116 Req 2007 to 2027 2178 - 2328</p> <p>Evident from the above options is that none of the proposed levels of growth in options KS7 to KS11 will meet the level of affordable housing need identified in the SHMA. Only KS9 would plan for anywhere near the level of growth proposed in the proposed changes to the RSS. We therefore support the upper figure in option KS9 as being one which may be found sound – subject to such a figure being underpinned by a robust evidence base. However, KS9 relies on all the previously identified garden land through the SHLAA as forming a significant part of housing land supply. With the changes to PPS3 in June 2010 garden land is no longer defined as brownfield and should not be relied upon. Therefore the capacity of the urban area should be reduced in line with Policy KS10, but the capacity of Roeshot Hill urban extension should be identified for up to 1250 units to ensure best use of the site.</p> <p>We therefore support a growth target of around 3,778 to be planned for as a minimum during the plan period.</p> <p>In addition to the above, and evident from the Dec 2010 AMR, is that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land. As identified at paragraph 6.11 of the document, the Council is looking at ways to increase housing supply/delivery and is supportive of the strategic release of land at Roeshot Hill. The strategic site release forms and integral and essential part of the emerging strategy and is vital to the delivery of additional housing opportunity and choice in meeting identified needs during the plan period to 2027.</p> <p>Based upon a requirement of 3,778 dwellings to be met during the period 2007 to 2027 and given the known completions achieved in the three</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>year period 2007 to 2010, the residual requirement to be met during the remainder of the plan period is as follows: Requirement 2007 to 2027 3,778 Completions 2007 to 2010 393 Residual Req. 2010 to 2027 3,385 (199pa) The various options also propose a range of dwelling completions from the urban extension suite at Roeshot Hill from 500 to 1,250. In reality, all projections are merely assumptions at this stage until such time as a detailed master planning exercise has been undertaken including having regard all relevant site specific considerations. We are keen to progress proposals for the site with the Council and appropriate consultation bodies and look forward to continuing our discussions in this regard. Additional representations are set out in response to Chapter 6 (Christchurch urban Extension) below.</p>			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO19 119	Option KS 9	Support		<p>We support Option KS 9, of delivering between 3,478 – 3,778 dwellings during the plan period. It is accepted that providing for this many houses would be harder than for some of the lower targets, none of the obstacles set out in the document are insurmountable. It also maximises the number of homes to be delivered through an urban extension. We believe this to be of a paramount importance if the Council is to stabilise affordability in the district's housing market. This could mean providing more than one urban extension in Christchurch extending the area of the urban extension as well as considering alternative locations</p>			281
521395	D2 Planning	D2 Planning Limited	CSO17 821	Option KS 9	Object		<p>Objections are lodged in respect of the proposed draft housing provision for Christchurch on the basis that it appears to be based purely on delivery and capacity rather than an analysis of</p>			281

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							housing requirement based on population growth, household formation etc. It is considered that the housing provision up to 2027 should at least be in line with that identified in the draft RSS of 3,450 dwellings			
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO18986	Option KS 9	Support		Options KS 7 – KS 11 Christchurch housing development The broad location of residential development in existing urban areas is supported to promote sustainable access to services and reduce the need to travel by car. The principle of locating residential development to the south of the railway line at Roeshot Hill is supported as it is close to existing food retail, schools and rail station. There are also opportunities to improve sustainable access to Christchurch town centre and the rest of the conurbation. Sustainable travel patterns need to be established at the time of occupation of new development through the use of travel plans for new residential areas.			281
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO919	Option KS 10	Object		This is one of the worst of the 5 options as any community at Roeshot is likely to be very isolated situated between the two formal boundaries of the A35 and the railway line which will encourage more car use. Perhaps a better option would be to develop Burton further using green belt line to the East which could then have far better shops and perhaps even a school and be closer to new employment opportunities near Hurn. A bigger Burton would justify better bus links to Christchurch and Bournemouth	Christchurch: Delivery of 2,628 dwellings during the plan period 2007 – 2027. * This option does not meet the 'First Detailed Proposals' figure of 3,200 (established by the Joint Strategic Authorities to inform the Regional Spatial Strategy) or the South West Regional Spatial Strategy Proposed Changes target of 3,450. * Excludes redevelopment of large dwellings or large plots where the existing dwelling would either be subdivided or redeveloped		283

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								or additional dwellings built on the plot. This would exclude all garden land. * Applies a discounting rate of 5% for non-implemented planning permissions. * Includes 950 dwellings brought forward within the urban extension east of Burton.		
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	CSO10 774	Option KS 10	Object		Please see our principal representations in respect of Option KS 7	Delete policy option.		283
360975	Mrs Julia Woodward		CSO11 941	Option KS 10	Support					283
507414	Mr L Wijesinghe		CSO10 978	Option KS 10	Support					283
507477	Mrs Sally Owen		CSO11 019	Option KS 10	Support					283
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18 659	Option KS 10		No Opinion	Natural England will not be providing views on the number of new houses proposed for Christchurch Borough during the plan period (as set out in options KS7-KS11) Our advice will focus on ensuring that the scale and rate of housing within the Borough, including the proposed urban extension, is implemented without harm to the natural environment through the range of mitigation measures contained within the emerging DPD and through the provision of Sustainable Alternative Natural			283

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Green space (SANGs) delivered as part of the north Christchurch urban extension.			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 633	Option KS 10	Object		We object to options KS7 – KS11 (inclusive) relating to housing provision in Christchurch, pending resolution of the issues identified in the HRA in ensuring certainty over the location and scale of development and the associated need for mitigation measures for the European sites.			283
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 643	Option KS 10	Object		The Agency has no “in principle” objection to the quantum of development proposed within Preferred Options KS7, KS8, KS10 and KS11. However we would object to the quantum proposed within KS9 as this exceeds the figures that were in the recently abolished draft SWRSS. We support the provision of housing within existing urban areas where services can accommodate and support growth.			283
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17 875	Option KS 10	Object		KS7 - 11 – Housing Options Christchurch The type and level of housing to be developed in the Borough must be changed by two significant alterations to policy that has been made by the Coalition Government. These policy changes need further work and support as they are not reflected in the current Options document. The reclassification of garden land as no longer brownfield, as part of the revision to PPS3 in June 2010, changes significantly the availability of sites within the Borough. Approximately 570 dwellings are lost from potential supply as a result of this change. In this regard the option that does not rely on garden land –KS10 - is supported in part, although this does not give sufficient overall supply. KS10 does not include the upper limit for Roeshot urban extension at 1250 dwellings as expressed in option KS9. Given the problems with supply Meyrick Estate Management strongly believe that best use must			283

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>be made of the urban extension site. There is strong recognition that further intensification of the urban area is damaging to the quality of the Borough. This is recognised in the Draft Dorset Green Infrastructure Strategy Report February 2010. In assessing the quality of the urban areas it was noted in the study: "Pressure for urban infill and for parking has reduced, and is likely to continue to reduce, the amount and quality of private open green space (e.g. the infill of gardens, the loss of mature trees). This can have a negative impact on the character of residential areas, as well as on biodiversity and adaptation to climate change, and increase the demand for public open space and access to the surrounding countryside."</p> <p>A more strategic and spatial response to this issue is required in the Core Strategy, as it is evident that the current approach has significant negative effect on existing residents and is likely to put greater visitor pressure on the protected landscapes. A more critical and considered assessment on the existing urban area should be completed and given the new emphasis on local involvement this must fully engage the existing populations most affected by re-use of garden land and urban infill.</p> <p>The revocation of regional spatial strategies has removed regional targets. It is clear that housing demand in the Borough remains beyond the ability of the Borough to meet supply, and this is exacerbated by the new pressure on garden land and the lack of supply of brownfield sites given the strong local economy. Further pressure on employment land due to doubts over the strategic allocation of employment land at Bournemouth airport only serve to reduce the likely availability of brownfield land in the urban area.</p> <p>Despite the loss of the regional strategy the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							evidence behind it remains crucial to delivering the appropriate level of development in the Borough. Further allocations of land may be required to overcome this significant potential shortfall in supply. Given the lack of a five year housing land supply early release of sites must be facilitated by the Core Strategy. The policy confirming housing growth needs to be revised to reflect demand and this is likely to require the strategic allocation of additional sites. The likely result of this assessment is that further capacity for housing development may need to be found elsewhere in the Borough in addition to that identified in the options. This is unlikely to be found in any significant brownfield sites within the town due to the lack of availability of this type of site as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The approach in the current options is not sufficiently robust or flexible enough to satisfy housing demands to 2027 and create a deliverable five year supply of land as required by PPS3. To fail to deliver development at the higher levels, close to demand, is to reduce the chance of a decent home to residents of the Borough, and may result in the failure of the whole Core Strategy.			
521395	D2 Planning	D2 Planning Limited	CSO17 822	Option KS 10	Object		Objections are lodged in respect of the proposed draft housing provision for Christchurch on the basis that it appears to be based purely on delivery and capacity rather than an analysis of housing requirement based on population growth, household formation etc. It is considered that the housing provision up to 2027 should at least be in line with that identified in the draft RSS of 3,450 dwellings			283
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer	CSO18 988	Option KS 10	Support		Options KS 7 – KS 11 Christchurch housing development The broad location of residential development in			283

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Dorset County Council					existing urban areas is supported to promote sustainable access to services and reduce the need to travel by car. The principle of locating residential development to the south of the railway line at Roeshot Hill is supported as it is close to existing food retail, schools and rail station. There are also opportunities to improve sustainable access to Christchurch town centre and the rest of the conurbation. Sustainable travel patterns need to be established at the time of occupation of new development through the use of travel plans for new residential areas.			
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO920	Option KS 11	Object		<p>This is the least worst of the 5 options as any community at Roeshot is likely to be very isolated situated between the two formal boundaries of the A35 and the railway line which will encourage more car use. Perhaps a better option would be to develop Burton further using green belt line to the East which could then have far better shops and perhaps even a school and be closer to new employment opportunities near Hurn. A bigger Burton would justify better bus links to Christchurch and Bournemouth</p>	<p>* This option does not meet the 'First Detailed Proposals' figure of 3,200 (established by the Joint Strategic Authorities to inform the Regional Spatial Strategy) or the South West Regional Spatial Strategy Proposed Changes target of 3,450. * Excludes redevelopment of large dwellings or large plots where the existing dwelling would either be subdivided or redeveloped or additional dwellings built on the plot. This would exclude all garden land. * Applies a discounting rate of 5% for non-implemented planning permissions. * Includes 500 - 650 dwellings brought forward within the urban extension east of Burton</p>		285

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO23 82	Option KS 11	Support		2328 units are possible			285
508440	Mr Angus Macmillan		CSO11 786	Option KS 11	Support					285
508456	Rev. Dudley Powell		CSO11 806	Option KS 11	Support					285
508467	Mr Trevor Crutcher		CSO11 814	Option KS 11	Support					285
360099	Mr John FOSKETT		CSO11 704	Option KS 11	Support					285
507575	Mr M Adams		CSO11 134	Option KS 11	Support					285
507585	Mrs Angela Everitt		CSO11 148	Option KS 11	Support					285
508623	Mr Allan Thompson		CSO12 000	Option KS 11	Support					285
508994	Mr & Mrs L Ruckley		CSO12 427	Option KS 11	Support					285
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and	CSO18 660	Option KS 11		No Opinion	Natural England will not be providing views on the number of new houses proposed for Christchurch Borough during the plan period (as set out in options KS7-KS11). Our advice will focus on ensuring that the scale and rate of			285

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Somerset Team					housing within the Borough, including the proposed urban extension, is implemented without harm to the natural environment through the range of mitigation measures contained within the emerging DPD and through the provision of Sustainable Alternative Natural Green space (SANGs) delivered as part of the north Christchurch urban extension.			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 634	Option KS 11	Object		We object to options KS7 – KS11 (inclusive) relating to housing provision in Christchurch, pending resolution of the issues identified in the HRA in ensuring certainty over the location and scale of development and the associated need for mitigation measures for the European sites.			285
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 644	Option KS 11	Object		The Agency has no “in principle” objection to the quantum of development proposed within Preferred Options KS7, KS8, KS10 and KS11. However we would object to the quantum proposed within KS9 as this exceeds the figures that were in the recently abolished draft SWRSS. We support the provision of housing within existing urban areas where services can accommodate and support growth.			285
359327	Cllr. Mr Peter Hall	Town Centre Ward Christchurch Borough Council	CSO19 359	Option KS 11	Support		Strongly objects to any development in the Grange Ward that would reduce the existing amount of open space. Furthermore, Council owned open space should not be built on in this area.			285
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSO17 876	Option KS 11	Object		KS7 -11 – Housing Options Christchurch The type and level of housing to be developed in the Borough must be changed by two significant alterations to policy that has been made by the Coalition Government. These policy changes need further work and support as they are not reflected in the current Options document. The reclassification of garden land as no longer			285

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>brownfield, as part of the revision to PPS3 in June 2010, changes significantly the availability of sites within the Borough. Approximately 570 dwellings are lost from potential supply as a result of this change. In this regard the option that does not rely on garden land –KS10 - is supported in part, although this does not give sufficient overall supply. KS10 does not include the upper limit for Roeshot urban extension at 1250 dwellings as expressed in option KS9. Given the problems with supply Meyrick Estate Management strongly believe that best use must be made of the urban extension site.</p> <p>There is strong recognition that further intensification of the urban area is damaging to the quality of the Borough. This is recognised in the Draft Dorset Green Infrastructure Strategy Report February 2010. In assessing the quality of the urban areas it was noted in the study: "Pressure for urban infill and for parking has reduced, and is likely to continue to reduce, the amount and quality of private open green space (e.g. the infill of gardens, the loss of mature trees). This can have a negative impact on the character of residential areas, as well as on biodiversity and adaptation to climate change, and increase the demand for public open space and access to the surrounding countryside."</p> <p>A more strategic and spatial response to this issue is required in the Core Strategy, as it is evident that the current approach has significant negative effect on existing residents and is likely to put greater visitor pressure on the protected landscapes. A more critical and considered assessment on the existing urban area should be completed and given the new emphasis on local involvement this must fully engage the existing populations most affected by re-use of garden land and urban infill.</p> <p>The revocation of regional spatial strategies has</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>removed regional targets. It is clear that housing demand in the Borough remains beyond the ability of the Borough to meet supply, and this is exacerbated by the new pressure on garden land and the lack of supply of brownfield sites given the strong local economy. Further pressure on employment land due to doubts over the strategic allocation of employment land at Bournemouth airport only serve to reduce the likely availability of brownfield land in the urban area.</p> <p>Despite the loss of the regional strategy the evidence behind it remains crucial to delivering the appropriate level of development in the Borough. Further allocations of land may be required to overcome this significant potential shortfall in supply. Given the lack of a five year housing land supply early release of sites must be facilitated by the Core Strategy. The policy confirming housing growth needs to be revised to reflect demand and this is likely to require the strategic allocation of additional sites.</p> <p>The likely result of this assessment is that further capacity for housing development may need to be found elsewhere in the Borough in addition to that identified in the options. This is unlikely to be found in any significant brownfield sites within the town due to the lack of availability of this type of site as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The approach in the current options is not sufficiently robust or flexible enough to satisfy housing demands to 2027 and create a deliverable five year supply of land as required by PPS3. To fail to deliver development at the higher levels, close to demand, is to reduce the chance of a decent home to residents of the Borough, and may result in the failure of the whole Core Strategy.</p>			
521395	D2 Planning	D2 Planning	CSO17	Option KS	Object		Objections are lodged in respect of the proposed			285

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Limited	823	11			draft housing provision for Christchurch on the basis that it appears to be based purely on delivery and capacity rather than an analysis of housing requirement based on population growth, household formation etc. It is considered that the housing provision up to 2027 should at least be in line with that identified in the draft RSS of 3,450 dwellings			
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO18989	Option KS 11	Support		Options KS 7 – KS 11 Christchurch housing development The broad location of residential development in existing urban areas is supported to promote sustainable access to services and reduce the need to travel by car. The principle of locating residential development to the south of the railway line at Roeshot Hill is supported as it is close to existing food retail, schools and rail station. There are also opportunities to improve sustainable access to Christchurch town centre and the rest of the conurbation. Sustainable travel patterns need to be established at the time of occupation of new development through the use of travel plans for new residential areas.			285
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	CSO22746	Option KS 11	Object		Please see our principal representations in respect of Option KS 7	Delete policy option.		285
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO329	Option KS 12	Support		It is right that no target is set for any new housing because, in my view, central Government's policy on many aspects of housing delivery is as yet unformed. Also, I have personally asked for more detail of the Housing Waiting List which I am told will not be available for another 6 months. How can the number of new houses proposed to be built be justified without up to date information? Also, Heathland Mitigation plans are as yet untested and it is most important to ensure that our internationally			288

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							protected heathland areas are not at risk from an increased population from any new housing to be built. I would also refer to 4.40 of this consultation when the largest proportion of the respondents to the Issues & Options exercise in 2008 told you that they did not want greenbelt land to be released for housing or employment development. Also I refer to 4.52 of this Consultation where none of the proposals for housing development was supported by the District Council (with the exception of Cuthbury Allotments)			
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2555	Option KS 12		General Comment	Support a policy to include up to 3,300 homes within the existing urban areas, subject to a further review of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Inclusion of new homes within existing urban areas is preferable to the development of new sites, although we understand that it probably cannot meet the need for more affordable homes.			288
502050	Mr Alan Symons		CSO6474	Option KS 12		General Comment	The consent of perpetual large new housing developments needs to be reined in - see the attached newspaper article regarding the poor use of existing housing stock (Daily Mail - 14.11.10 -'Shame of thousands of homes that have lain empty for years'). There seems to be too many tax breaks for Buy to Let and Second Home owners (in addition to reasons mentioned in the article). Sensitive universal industrial expression is required to attract local jobs, although, even now there are many empty units. Article When builders began to refurbish 300 houses in Enfield, North London, last month it marked the beginning of the end for a blot on the landscape			288

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>that has taken 40 years to remove. Within two years families will once more be living in homes that have lain empty since they were compulsorily purchased in the early 1970's to make way for the widening of the North Circular Road which never happened. These solid 1930's suburban semis with garages and big gardens have since been occasionally occupied by squatters but generally left to rot. Many are now in such a poor state that they will have to be pulled down.</p> <p>In England there are 762,000 homes that have lain empty for more than six months, and half of those have been unoccupied for years. They not only deny needy families a home, but also put pressure on building land and devalue neighbouring homes by about 15%</p> <p>The reasons for abandonment are usually death, disputes or destitution, and the collapse in demand for new-build city centre flats put up in the buy-to-let boom has added to the list. On Ipswich's Waterfront development, for example, more than 1,000 flats sit empty. The story is the same in Leeds, Liverpool, Leicester and Manchester. The weak housing market is likely to make the situation worse.</p> <p>The chief executive of the Empty Homes Agency, David Ireland, is calling for a cut in VAT on refurbishment to 5 per cent to help owners make homes ready for letting to needy tenants. He also wants council tax discounts and exemptions removed on empty homes and the New Homes Bonus to include refurbished empty homes.</p> <p>"The Government's current proposal would see councils rewarded by getting homes built by a grant equivalent to six years' council tax," says Ireland.</p> <p>"We think that long-term vacant homes returned to use provide new homes in just the same way,</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>but with the added benefit of clearing up eyesore abandoned property."</p> <p>Ireland also wants to see housing groups given the chance to occupy homes on sites awaiting development.</p> <p>"Short-life housing co-ops and property guardian companies provide huge benefits giving housing to those in need, additional rental income and ensuring that empty property doesn't fall victim to crime," he says.</p> <p>Although there are council grants to help owners refurbish derelict empty homes, and enforcement action such as compulsory purchase orders can be taken, only about one per cent of vacant property is put back to us every year.</p> <p>Ireland wants the public sector to put its own houses in order too. About 100,000 empty homes are owned by government bodies.</p>			
360167	Mrs Pippa WHEATLEY		CSO17 442	Option KS 12	Object		<p>1. It is not fully formed</p> <p>2. There is too much uncertainty about true housing need figures, especially in relation to the Housing Register. While people can register on multiple lists with no information between these lists how can the figure be known? How can we ensure local affordable houses are for local people? Does there need to be more defined criteria stating who is eligible to go on the Housing Register? These concerns are shared by many and if raised often enough and strongly enough perhaps the situation will change.</p> <p>3. The government agenda is for local involvement. Will this change the way we manage housing need?</p>	I have nothing to suggest in the current situation but hope my comments help toward pressure for change.		288
476245	Mr Robert Pearce		CSO17 422	Option KS 12		General Comment	<p>When we attended one of the recent public consultations on the options, my wife and I were surprised to hear that EDDC has no target number of r housing growth in and around Wimborne</p>			288

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359547	Mrs V Bright	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17 932	Option KS 12	Support		Support a policy to include up to 3,300 homes within the existing urban areas, subject to a further review of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Inclusion of new homes within existing urban areas is preferable to the development of new sites, although we understand that it probably cannot meet the need for more affordable homes.			288
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 648	Option KS 12		No Opinion	We reserve comment on KS12 until it has been drafted in totality.			288
361028	Ms Helen Patton	Head of Policy and Plans New Forest National Park Authority	CSO18 878	Option KS 12		General Comment	The Authority appreciates that this consultation document has evolved during a period of considerable flux with national (e.g. recent changes to PPS3) and regional (the uncertainty over the status of the RSS) planning policies which has undoubtedly raised a number of issues, particularly in relation to the options for housing provision. However, notwithstanding this the Authority is of the opinion that the lack of a housing figure for East Dorset (e.g. Option KS12) will have hindered consultees in responding fully to the document. The approach for East Dorset is at odds with the approach for Christchurch where a level of housing (albeit within a range from 2,178 to 3,778 additional dwellings) has been provided, presumably based around the draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy (Secretary of States Proposed Changes) housing target of 3,400 dwellings. The corresponding figure for East Dorset (6,400 dwellings) amounts two thirds of the combined draft RSS housing figure for the joint area, and yet this consultation document fails to provide details on this. Clearly this will			288

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							need to be worked up in revising the document.			
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		CSO19 315	Option KS 12	Object		Housing. It continues to be the case that the population growth in south-east Dorset is primed by immigration from other parts of the UK, particularly the south-east, where house prices are higher, giving these immigrants an uplifted purchasing capacity in the Dorset housing market. Consequently building more and more houses can never ensure that there is ready affordable provision for 'locally bred' individuals, particularly the young. It is of course now a huge relief that the required level of housing imposed by the South west Regional Strategy has now been removed and clearly the Core Strategy is infinitely better than it might have been had this Regional Strategy still been in place. However it is also deeply disappointing that the Core Strategy has simply dipped the housing levels from the highly horrendous to the deeply damaging while perpetuating the myth that building will bring benefits to locals.			288
359979	Mr Les Flay		CSO19 356	Option KS 12	Object		New movements of through traffic, to the west country, should be included in your immediate programme, as movement of traffic from Picket Post to Ringwood, is a complete disaster, because of the new layout roundabout at underpass on the A31, and its many roundabouts until the roundhouse, at Sturminster Marshall. As already stated all traffic must be turned right at Picket Post, dual carriageway, with lead off junctions to West Moors, Wimborne, and eventually connecting to the A31 west of Worlds End public house, thus on to Bere Regis, Dorchester, Weymouth, and the West Country. Your views must consider the future development of traffic control, and density of			288

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							vehicles, which increase every year, and will not go away, but can only get worse, so futuristic thoughts are now required, together with determination, to advance the whole structure of Dorset. Bold decisive planning must be the key, so grasp it now, through your new core planning.			
360112	Mr Kenneth Brooks	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19 142	Option KS 12		General Comment	Since this option cannot be fully formulated until you have carried out a realistic SHLAA taking into account the current Government's statements on 'garden grabbing', relaxing density requirements and, presumably, the new policies outlined in the Localism Bill launched on the 13th December 2010, there is not really an Option to support or reject. As I understand reports of the current Government's intentions, they are not setting any density per hectare targets or, indeed, any targets for the number of new houses. I understand they are proposing to leave these decisions to local residents and their parish and District Councils through a Neighbourhood Plan. Of course, most localities within East Dorset have produced Parish and Town Plans over the past 4 years which are ready to be incorporated into the Local Development Framework.			288
507525	Mr David Lander	Boyer Planning Ltd	CSO19 078	Option KS 12	Object		It is considered unfortunate in our view that the Council has not been willing to take a lead in suggesting a potential level of provision. See Section 3.4 of the accompanying statement. 3.4.1 Option KS12 seeks opinions on the housing target for East Dorset over the period 2012 to 2027. Although the option states that up to 3,300 homes will be provided in the existing urban areas, no indication is given of the level of development which can be expected to create new neighbourhoods. 3.4.2 Whilst it is recognised that recent changes			288

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>to Government policy have led to uncertainty over housing requirements and introduced greater flexibility for local authorities to take in to account local considerations, there is still a clear duty, as we have stated above, to ensure they are carefully justified taking into account estimates of future need and demand.</p> <p>3.4.3 The final paragraph under option KS12 indicates a range of evidence that is relevant to this consideration. The government's household's projections needs to be added to this list along with the evidence which underpinned the RSS process, consistent with CLG advice. Given the existence of this data it is unfortunate in our view that the Council has not been willing to take a lead in suggesting a potential level of provision. That needs to be rectified and we would urge the Council to carry out a further consultation on this matter at an early stage.</p> <p>3.4.4 Once a housing target is in place this should be distributed across the District in accordance with the settlement hierarchy established in Preferred Option KS1.</p> <p>3.4.5 In our submission Verwood has a key role to play in accommodating future housing provision. Not only is it identified as a main settlement, the top tier in the hierarchy, but it also has an important position as the main free-standing settlement serving the rural hinterland in the north of the district. It benefits from a relatively good range of local facilities and clearly has the basic community infrastructure to support modest growth.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>4.2 No housing target has been set at this stage. Notwithstanding the emerging changes to the planning system this is a key requirement which has an important influence on a number of other considerations – in particular the scale of the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							need for green belt boundary changes. 4.3 Up to date government policy is clear that the housing provision must be derived from a robust and wide ranging evidence base that reflects, among other things, identified needs and demands. We consider that irrespective of local responses to the current consultation the Council must progress this assessment as a matter of urgency and a further consultation at an early stage should be carried out in relation to this.			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	CSO18006	Option KS 12		General Comment	With the absence of any preferred option or suggested options, we recommend that the Council continue with the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the Draft RSS of 6,400 dwellings over the plan period. Extremely robust evidence will be required for the Council to reduce their target below this level.			288
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO17793	Option KS 12	Support		OPTION KS12: HOUSING NUMBERS NOT FULLY INFORMED YET Housing numbers are usually based on both population trends and current social behavioural trends. This together with affordable housing needs and local population and housing assessments give rise to household projections. CPRE,2009: Housing the Future: 'Household projections are neither estimates of future housing need nor of future housing demand. They are not statements of the inevitable nor are they national policy. They simply indicate the consequences, in terms of household numbers, of continuing recently experienced trends.' This means that social change can alter the projections. In East Dorset there is a net decrease in the 20-29 year olds, and a net increase in those of 50-59. This could change over the next few years. 1. An increase in retirement age, a drop in pension pots, a loss of investments and interest			288

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>rates, this coupled with a trend on spending and not saving could mean less money for the 50-59 year olds to spend on housing.</p> <p>2. The affordable housing needs: this is based on those waiting for subsidised housing. Do those individual applicants still come under Data Protection preventing any LA from eliminating multiple applications by comparing lists? Until we are assured the figures are accurate any housing projections may be faulty.</p> <p>TABLE 1: DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGE 1996 - 2006 (see attached)</p> <p>3. Government Policy: this could impact on the type of household formation and could reduce overall numbers of new households. If the Government introduces tax changes to make marriage more popular this may lead to more families and less single households. Major modifications to benefits may also impact on the number of single households, making it more beneficial to operate as a family.</p> <p>4. Flexible tenancies: Councils and housing associations will now have the flexibility to offer new social housing tenants fixed tenancies – offering minimum contracts of two years. This should help drive down the numbers on housing lists as tenants will have a right to social housing only while they are not in a position to move into the private market.</p> <p>5. If the housing benefit is capped, one spin off may be over supply and lack of demand for the private rental sector till they reduce their tariffs. In the current situation it is not possible to be clear over the actual future housing need. There are a number of new influences on their total. We understand that a variety of options have been put forward so the residents of East Dorset District, and interested parties, can choose which sites they support or object to. There is no</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>suggestion of housing projections. You have predicted the number of jobs that will be required (based on population trends?) we presume you have some sort of figure in mind for the housing.</p> <p>TABLE 2: COMPARISON OF PROJECTED HOUSING FIGURES: DRAFT RSS AND CORE STRATEGY ORIGINAL DRAFT RSS CORE STRATEGY (see attached)</p> <p>We wondered how many people had actually totalled the figures to realise the total Core Strategy figures are more than the dreaded RSS?</p> <p>Out in the field, the opposition against all local options is quite considerable, doubtless each group will protect their own patch, calling for any house building to be elsewhere. Others will demand no housing at all on the Green Belt, concluding that Dorset's ageing population is a result of market forces that should not be interfered with, dedicated environmentalists will object to any green field development as it increases pressure on our ecological systems reducing their ability to function efficiently, especially with the predicted climate change. As residents who love East Dorset it is with considerable reluctance that we will not object to all the Green Belt options for housing, only objecting to those that deeply offend our principles by visibly sprawling over the countryside. We can only take this approach to a realignment of the Green Belt by creating our own 'exceptional circumstances'. This is on the understanding that a 40% of affordable housing is agreed and delivered on all potential sites in order to halt the decline in the younger age groups. The only exception is WMC5, south of Leigh Road, where we understand the housing is 'enabling housing', financing the relocation of the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>football and rugby clubs and recreational grounds.</p> <p>TABLE 3: SHOWING THE AGEING POPULATION IN EAST DORSET DISTRICT (see attached)</p> <p>Unfortunately some of these figures are mid-year estimates so the results are not as accurate as purely census figures but they do show the trend towards an ageing population. It is not very sustainable for our District if East Dorset's over 60s population is growing and our young and working population is shrinking. The market housing in East Dorset is just too expensive for the bulk of the ordinary workers to afford, possibly because there is so much demand from an older population in-migrating to East Dorset and this keeps the prices up. In the Core Strategy it has the ratio to earnings currently at 11.18, but the latest figures from the National Housing Federation, the 2010 Home Truths, has this ration at 13.0. This is why we feel that affordable housing is so important we are prepared to support EDDC in some of their proposed development.</p> <p>If we continue to grow older in our District it may become less lucrative than in the past.</p> <p>TABLE 4: SHOWING DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGE AGAINST HOUSING FIGURES (see attached)</p> <p>The figures indicate that our population grows in response to new housing build, but our over 60's population seems to increase as the affordable housing completions decrease. These figures indicate the overriding need to achieve a far greater percentage of affordable housing if we are building large numbers of market housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will the impact be on the proposed increase in the retirement age on in-migrants? • What will the impact be of lower pension pots and less savings? 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>It may mean that in-migrants are older and less well off.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How soon before they start to demand more medical services, and support to stay in their homes? • Instead of contributing to the wealth of East Dorset they may demand more than they contribute in local taxes much sooner than in the past. • The more carers East Dorset has to support, the greater the requirement for affordable housing as, in general, their wages are not very high. <p>This is a vicious circle that could damage the ability of our District to function efficiently and sustainably.</p> <p>Ignoring the current situation regarding the legality of revoking RSS, we are very concerned that developers will 'cherry pick' the more lucrative green field sites, leaving the more difficult sites undeveloped. This is likely to be a particular problem in Wimborne, but we do feel that urban regeneration should take priority, even though this will mean development of the south of Leigh Road will have to take place first, to allow options WMC1 (Cuthbury, and WMC2 (the relocation of sports grounds and possibly the market) to take place.</p> <p>The projections of job numbers. We assume this projection is based on population growth and housing demand. Both of which we show are uncertain. If the numbers of over 60's increase, they could continue in their existing jobs and this could lead to a demand for more employment. We are not quite sure what the job expansion is based on. 1,700 new jobs to 2020 is reasonable, but 10,200 replacement jobs are a puzzle. If someone moves jobs this should leave a vacancy for someone else moving jobs. The only bit we do understand is that the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							population projection to 2030 is a 12,000 increase and this is the total number of new jobs required!			
521738	Mr Richard Goodall	Turley Associates	CSO18066	Option KS 12	Object		<p>Housing Numbers</p> <p>My client's fundamental concern is the failure to include the Strategic Housing Requirement within draft policy KS12. This approach is considered unprecedented and is further compounded by the inclusion of a Strategic Housing Requirement for Christchurch. Given that this is a joint planning policy document this provides an obvious imbalance and calls into question whether it is a genuine joint planning document or separate Core Strategies which have been combined for administrative advantage.</p> <p>The Strategic housing requirement is pivotal to many of the issues which the Core Strategy seeks to clarify and therefore its absence undermines the value of the document to the point where it is virtually impossible to make meaningful representations.</p> <p>A recent successful legal challenge by Cala Homes means that Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) currently forms part of the Development Plan, although the clear intent of the Coalition Government is to revoke them. In the case of the South West the situation is further complicated because the RSS, although subject to EiP and a Panel Report, was never formally approved. Notwithstanding these issues, the latest RSS Strategic Housing Requirement for East Dorset District is 6,400 units from 2006 to 2026, which equates to 320 units per annum. This figure is informed by an evidence base which has been through the rigours of EiP, and therefore even if the RSS is abandoned, the strategic housing figures cannot be entirely ignored. The RSS housing figures indicate that East</p>			288

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Dorset would need to provide in the region of 2,400 units via urban extensions. The urban extension options considered by the current Core Strategy total 2,570 units, although many of the options which make up that number are mutually exclusive and appear to show unrealistically high yields from some sites. These figures must therefore be viewed with significant caution.</p> <p>The publication of the Core Strategy without any Strategic Housing Requirement and clearly ahead of the requisite evidence base is considered to conflict with PPS3. Moreover, the evidence base is inconclusive, whilst the RSS evidence base appears to indicate a significant requirement for urban extensions.</p> <p>In light of the above it is contended that the current version of the Core Strategy cannot be properly considered in advance of the Strategic Housing Requirement being provided. Moreover, the evidence base is incomplete. The SHLAA does not reflect current PPS3 guidance and when it has been reassessed in light of this it will have a significant bearing on the Strategic Housing Requirement and in particular the need for urban extensions.</p> <p>In addition, the Housing Options Masterplan Report is not objective and has not properly considered options which have been promoted by landowners and their representatives.</p> <p>For the above reasons Bellway Homes raise fundamental objections to the Core Strategy as it currently stands and will be submitting further representations when a more complete version of the Core Strategy is issued for consultation.</p>			
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSO18 321	Option KS 12	Object		Taylor Wimpey objects to the omission of a strategic housing requirement in this policy. This is contrary to the approach taken for the Christchurch plan area, which rightly presents			288

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>options for comment. This is also contrary to PPS12 (paragraph 4.1) and PPS3 (paragraphs 32/33) which encourage LPAs to consult and agree these key objectives, and then set out options for delivery. The Council has jumped to options for delivery without first providing the justification for the need to consider or discount certain delivery options, or whether these options are in fact sufficient. The Council should include a strategic housing requirement to inform rather than retrospectively justify the delivery options already put forward in this consultation document.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey recommends that the Council consults on range of options, having regard to the evidence base that informed the draft South West Plan. This remains part of the Development Plan until the Decentralisation and Localism Bill is enacted and therefore remains a material consideration. It is notable that even using the draft South East Plan requirement of 6,400 homes or 320 homes a year (2006-2026) as a minimum, the Council would fall well short of meeting the 440 affordable homes a year needed to meet the Councils assessments of need in 2007 (Paragraph 2.40 of the Core Strategy Options document, Oct -2010). It is also clear from reviewing the 'Dorset Survey of Housing Need and Demand (2008)' that there remained an acute shortage of affordable housing in 2008, a need which may well have been exacerbated by the current economic downturn.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey considers the quantum of housing required for the plan period should be agreed as a matter of urgency. This and a robust up to date SHLAA will in turn dictate the quantum of green field land required for release within and beyond the plan period. This will inform and justify assessments of and revisions</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>to green belt boundaries, having regard to guidance within PPG2 – Green Belts.</p> <p>The evidence base that informed the draft South West Plan concluded the need to release land for around 2400 dwellings from the green belt from three search areas, one of which being north / west of Corfe Mullen. Whilst the government has signalled its intention to abandon RSS following enactment of the Decentralisation and Localism Bill, the evidence base that informed the RSS has been through the rigours of an EIP and cannot be entirely ignored.</p> <p>Despite the anticipated demise of the RSS, the provisions of PPS3 with respect to maintaining a rolling five year supply of deliverable sites for housing remain. As does the requirements to provide a 15 years supply of housing from adoption of the DPD and for this to informed by a robust evidence base. The draft South West Plan should therefore be used as a relevant starting point or bench mark for the Council until the RSS is formerly abandoned and the Council have provided a more up to date evidence base in its place.</p> <p>It is noted that further work is being undertaken on the SHLAA to be able to quantify the capacity of urban areas to accommodate development without harming their quality. Taylor Wimpey note and support the Council's intention to take account of the recent revisions to PPS3 with respect to density and garden land when updating the SHLAA. This and the inclusion of sufficient discounting for the non-implementation of sites is considered essential if the Council are to present a robust evidence base. In the absence of this and an agreed strategic housing requirement it is difficult to assess whether the delivery options the Council suggest are the right ones, how or why alternatives have been</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							discounted, or indeed whether current options are even sufficient. Taylor Wimpey therefore reserve the right to provide further representations on these matters once this critical evidence base is published.			
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSO18 430	Option KS 12	Object		.Policy KS 12 is supported in so far as the principle that new housing development beyond existing urban areas is recognised, however the level of housing provision needs to be identified in future drafts of the Core Strategy.			288
523893	Lindsay Thompson	Terence O'Rourke Ltd	CSO18 446	Option KS 12	Support		At the time of writing we note that there is uncertainty about the weight to be attributed to the draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy. Although the government has indicated its intention to abolish the regional planning framework, the regional strategy is still part of the development plan, although we note that this consultation document was published at the time when the Regional Spatial Strategies were considered to be revoked. We can therefore understand why the Council does not wish at this time to set housing targets. However, paragraph 4.1 of PPS12 clearly sets out what core strategies should include and a key part of this is "how much development is intended to happen". It is clear through the use of "xx" in option KS12 that the Council intend to clarify this position. We hope that this will be undertaken for the next round of consultation to enable appropriate development and consideration of the strategy.			288
524088	Mr Ken Parke	Ken Parke Planning Consultants	CSO18 455	Option KS 12	Support		Support in principle but needs further clarification and further consultation 7.2.3.1 Clearly it is difficult to provide a detailed response to this policy option given that the figures are not complete. 7.2.3.2 There is support in principle for this			288

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							approach dependent upon the numbers involved and the ability of the policy to meet the housing needs of the district. If however the LPA decide they wish to have limited or no Green Belt release then there would be a strong objection. Additionally, the LPA may wish to consider increasing the amount of development to be included within the existing urban areas however it is again difficult to comment on an incomplete option.			
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 830	Option KS 12	Object		It is inappropriate to consider Areas of Search and potential housing allocations in the absence of agreed level of housing provision over the Plan period. The Planning Authority should be concentrating on establishing what the requirements for housing are, having regard not only to the need for local affordable housing but also demands for market housing and the mechanism for the delivery of affordable housing. The number of houses should not be determined simply by reference to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. It is noted that the Review of the Regional Spatial Strategy was suggesting 6,400 additional dwellings. This Option suggests 3,300 homes could be provided within the existing urban areas but Paragraph 10.45 of the Plan states that the assessment of homes which could be provided within the urban area will have to be re-visited in the light of the Coalition Government's recent announcements on "garden grabbing" and densities. I am of the opinion that these recent pronouncements by the Government have resulted in fewer planning permissions for infill housing and redevelopment at higher densities. It is clear that this is happening both at local level and in appeal decisions. The Local Planning Authority therefore needs to review as a matter of urgency the capacity of the existing urban	Delete Option KS12 and inset "the level of housing provision over the Plan period is to be reviewed having regard to the Housing Market Assessment, the need for affordable housing and the delivery mechanism, as well as Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments."		288

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							areas. Clearly, the 6,400 houses proposed in the Regional Spatial Strategy was a modest level of growth in an area of significant potential, on the fringe of the Conurbation.			
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18897	Option KS 12	Object		It is inappropriate to consider Areas of Search and potential housing allocations in the absence of an agreed level of housing provision over the Plan period. The Planning Authority should be concentrating on establishing what the requirements for housing are, having regard not only to the need for local affordable housing but also the demands for market housing and the mechanism for the delivery of affordable housing. The number of houses should not be determined simply by reference to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. It is noted that the Review of the Regional Spatial Strategy was suggesting 6,400 additional dwellings. This Option suggests 3,300 homes could be provided within the existing urban areas but Paragraph 8.42 of the Options Consultation Document states "it is identified that about 1,100 new homes could be provided over a 15 year period (within the built up area of Wimborne and Colehill) although this assessment will have to be re-visited in the light of the Coalition Government's recent announcements on "garden grabbing" and densities." I am of the opinion that these recent pronouncements by the Government have resulted in fewer planning permissions for infill housing and redevelopment at higher densities. It is clear that this is happening both at local level and in appeal decisions. The Local Planning Authority need to review capacity for the development within the existing urban areas as a matter of urgency. Clearly, the 6,400 houses proposed in the Regional Spatial Strategy was a modest level of	Delete Option KS12 and inset "the level of housing provision over the Plan period is to be reviewed having regard to the Housing Market Assessment, the need for affordable housing and the delivery mechanism, as well as Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments."		288

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							growth in an area of significant potential, on the fringe of the Conurbation.			
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO18 990	Option KS 12	Support	General Comment	Option KS 12 East Dorset housing development The broad location of residential development in existing urban areas is supported to promote sustainable access to services and reduce the need to travel by car. Additional work is required through SEDMMTS to assess the level of development which can be delivered and accommodated on the transport network up to 2027. Sustainable travel patterns need to be established at the time of occupation of new development through the use of travel plans for new residential areas.			288
361342	Mr Graham Clarke	Spatial Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO22 828	Option KS 12		General Comment	The lack of any overall housing figure for the district means that at present it is not possible to identify the precise level of public services and essential infrastructure that will be needed to support any proposed new development. Consequently Christchurch and East Dorset Councils are advised to continue to work closely with the County Council in developing their options so that the emerging infrastructure implications can be properly planned.			288
557299	Mr Peter Weatherhead	DTZ Planning	CSO22 932	4.59	Support		The Malmesbury Estate agrees with the comment that a strategic employment area like Bournemouth Airport has the potential to attract significant investment and influence a step change in the regional economy.			294
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO92 1	4.60	Object		These figures are based on "Roger Tym and Partners Employment Projections (2008)" which I suspect are now outdated as the projections will have been prepared before the recession in late 2008.	The following estimates were produced prior to the recession in late 2008 and may be overestimating the numbers of jobs being created. Over the next 15		295

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								years it is anticipated that there will be 6,900 new jobs created across Christchurch and East Dorset. Growth in office jobs is expected to be in the region of 250 in Christchurch and 700 in East Dorset. Employment in industrial/warehousing is predicted to decline by 700 jobs in Christchurch and increase by 81 jobs in East Dorset. (1) It is also anticipated that a significant amount of employment growth will be outside of the traditional employment uses such as health, leisure, tourism and education and land requirements associated with this growth will need to be met.		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18125	4.60		General Comment	The predicted decline in industrial/warehousing jobs does not appear to have been used to offset suggested demand for new employment land. Further, the proposals for rural diversification and changes to a green knowledge economy do not appear to have been included in the overall predicted/suggested demand.			295
557299	Mr Peter Weatherhead	DTZ Planning	CSO22933	4.60	Support		The Malmesbury Estate agrees with the comment that a strategic employment area like Bournemouth Airport has the potential to attract significant investment and influence a step change in the regional economy.			295
359945	Mr		CSO92	4.61	Support		Developing land east of Burton for both housing	South East Dorset due to		296

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Geoff Bantock		2				and employment would make Burton a much more vibrant community than say building just housing at Roeshot.	the current availability of employment land within the sub region (2). The needs for employment within South East Dorset cannot be solely met on land outside the Green Belt. This need provides the exceptional circumstances that could justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, including land to the east of Burton to provide for economic development.		
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	CSO1918	4.61	Object		The last sentence of this paragraph states "This need provides exceptional circumstances that could justify changes to Green Belt boundaries to provide for economic development". In Hurn this sentence relates to the proposed removal of the southern sector of the Airport from the green belt. We consider the sentence to be inaccurate. Such 'employment need' will be mostly fulfilled in the North West Business Park Sector which is not in the green belt. Any improved facilities required in the Southern Sector for Airport operation need not be at the expense of the green belt and do not provide exceptional circumstances. Indeed airports may be 'washed' by green belt and still provide employment and operational growth. We have made further specific comments under Preferred Option BA3.	Remove the last sentence of paragraph 4.61.		296
557299	Mr Peter Weatherhead	DTZ Planning	CSO22934	4.61	Support		The Malmesbury Estate agrees with the comment that a strategic employment area like Bournemouth Airport has the potential to attract significant investment and influence a step change in the regional economy.			296

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO341	4.62		General Comment	The phrase "subject to major transport improvements being put in place" is vitally important. No new major employment sites should be developed until the important problems of traffic congestion has been addressed.			297
557299	Mr Peter Weatherhead	DTZ Planning	CSO22935	4.62	Support		The Malmesbury Estate agrees with the comment that a strategic employment area like Bournemouth Airport has the potential to attract significant investment and influence a step change in the regional economy.			297
557299	Mr Peter Weatherhead	DTZ Planning	CSO22936	4.63	Support		The Malmesbury Estate agrees with the comment that a strategic employment area like Bournemouth Airport has the potential to attract significant investment and influence a step change in the regional economy.			298
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO354	Preferred Option KS 13		General Comment	I neither support or object. Again projections are used to calculate the amount of employment land which may be needed for the period up to 2027. Projections are just that and are not necessarily facts. I object to any site being part residential/part employment (live/work units) as I consider this to be very bad for the physical and mental health of employees who need a physical distance between their work place and home			299
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO923	Preferred Option KS 13	Support		Consideration should be given for developing land east of Burton for both housing and employment would make Burton a much more vibrant community than say building just housing at Roeshot. We do need to curtail the distance people have to travel to work. There is little housing close to the airport for example			299
360597	Mr Gordon		CSO2496	Preferred Option KS	Object		Have any of the authors of this consultative paper ever lived near an airport, I doubt it. I know			299

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Wheeler			13			that it would be easier to travel on foot or bicycle to work, but if it means living by a noisy airport NO.			
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2556	Preferred Option KS 13		General Comment	Support potential for more local employment			299
495527	Miss Caroline Green	Planner Broadway Malyan	CSO1478	Preferred Option KS 13	Support		We support East Dorset District in looking to provide a mix of employment uses within the district which will contribute towards meeting the wider strategic requirement for Employment Land across South East Dorset as determined in the 2008 Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Workspace Strategy. We support a minimum of 30ha of employment land being provided within East Dorset, however we feel the district has the potential to accommodate more if required and no maximum should be set. We support the inclusion of 3.3ha of employment land at Sturminster Marshall within the Options for East Dorset.			299
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	CSO1919	Preferred Option KS 13	Object		The maps shown in this Option are not specific and are unclear. The Parish Council were unable to identify 2 small areas shown in red as employment sites, which they believe to be within the Parish of Hurn.	Each area shown in red as an employment site should be named so that it is clear and specific which areas they are.		299
499532	Bournemouth Borough Council	Bournemouth Borough Council	CSO3811	Preferred Option KS 13		General Comment	Whilst the importance of employment generation at the airport operation and the employment land allocation at the airport are recognised the policy requires some clarification. The policy states that an 'appropriate mix of premises will be encouraged on employment sites'. The policy should make it clear that within this 'appropriate mix' major B1 office development will not be deemed appropriate at the airport employment allocation. The land at the airport, subject to infrastructure improvements, does have potential	Add to the policy the following 'The employment allocations will accommodate limited office development that does not adversely affect the vitality and viability of office development in Bournemouth town centre'.		299

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							for particular employment uses not suitable to more urban locations. The priority, and most sustainable, locations for major B1 office development will remain at town centre locations, including Bournemouth town centre.			
500350	Mr P H Bartlett		CSO42 37	Preferred Option KS 13	Support					299
361113	Mr Alan Meade		CSO72 24	Preferred Option KS 13	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			299
359916	JB Cossins		CSO17 075	Preferred Option KS 13	Support		Employment opportunities will have to be local to new housing development to avoid too much traffic going long distances.			299
360626	Mr Frank Miller	Chair Person Sturminster Marshall Affordable Housing Self Build Homes Group	CSO17 102	Preferred Option KS 13	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.			299
361014	Mr Peter Hammond		CSO17 061	Preferred Option KS 13	Support		Further development of Bournemouth Airport will require a new junction on the A338 in the Avon Common area, so that traffic can access these areas from the East, thus relieving congestion on Parley Lane and Matchams Lane.			299
476792	Mr and Mrs Lomas		CSO17 129	Preferred Option KS 13	Support					299
481604	Mr Gerald Toomer		CSO17 002	Preferred Option KS 13	Support					299

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
485695	Mr John Cornish		CSO16 951	Preferred Option KS 13	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.			299
496996	Mr R Hayward		CSO16 915	Preferred Option KS 13	Support					299
500746	Mrs J Lothian		CSO17 029	Preferred Option KS 13	Object		This development at Bournemouth Airport will mean more deliveries by land and air. These roads were not designed to take half of this present traffic. And you want to build at the Parley Crossroads area!			299
500817	Mr L Lothian		CSO17 090	Preferred Option KS 13	Object		Already too much traffic on the roads which are in poor condition after 2 years of frosts.			299
502921	Mr and Mrs L Forinton		CSO17 176	Preferred Option KS 13	Support					299
508562	K Clayson		CSO17 171	Preferred Option KS 13	Object					299
508993	Mr A Samways		CSO17 216	Preferred Option KS 13	Support					299
509795	Mr R Ridley		CSO17 151	Preferred Option KS 13	Support					299
511761	Mr G Burge		CSO17 201	Preferred Option KS 13	Support					299

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
513651	Mrs W Pearsall		CSO17 048	Preferred Option KS 13	Support		<p>1. Improved public transport to these employment sites.</p> <p>2. Business centres for starting business with full back office support.</p> <p>3. Tax breaks to encourage businesses to move to our area.</p> <p>4. Subsidised training for all age groups in starting up and running a business.</p> <p>4. Part time apprenticeship training for all age groups.</p>			299
359547	Mrs V Bright	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17 933	Preferred Option KS 13	Support		Support potential for more local employment			299
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 638	Preferred Option KS 13	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.</p> <p>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>			299
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 126	Preferred Option KS 13		General Comment	<p>Has not included the TWAs of North and West Dorset, Wiltshire or Hampshire.</p> <p>Under the heading Why is it the Preferred Option, there is no evidence that the proposed economic growth would be sustainable (please see above for the definition of sustainability).</p> <p>LTP3 indicates that East Dorset will not benefit from any public transport improvements in East Dorset during the life of the Core Strategy.</p>			299

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 645	Preferred Option KS 13	Support		<p>We welcome the proposal to locate employment land close to existing settlements on brownfield sites and where out commuting exists. However future employment sites must be supported by a range of public transport links in order to encourage people to commute by means other than the private car.</p> <p>Allocations at Christchurch may provide an opportunity to utilise rail links for the movement of freight, and the Agency encourages the Council to actively investigate this opportunity where possible.</p> <p>The Agency has concerns that sites at Wimborne and Ferndown within Preferred Option KS13 are extremely close to existing junctions on the SRN. We would therefore require strategic modelling at the earliest opportunity in order to identify the likely impacts on the SRN. This is discussed further in respect of section 15 below - Creating Prosperous Communities.</p>			299
475541	Mr Phil Spencer		CSO17 923	Preferred Option KS 13	Object		<p>Bournemouth itself and the area around Bournemouth Airport have been recognised as major centres of employment. The potential expansion of employment at Bournemouth Airport and at sites adjacent to the Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates as envisaged in Option KS13 will inevitably increase traffic using the Canford Bottom Roundabout. It should be a pre-requisite that a full flyover scheme for A31 traffic at this junction and the provision of a dual carriageway between Ameysford and Merley is constructed prior to permitting the proposed developments envisaged in the Core Strategy. SEE ATTACHMENT</p>			299
515479	Mr D Lenehan		CSO16 717	Preferred Option KS 13		No Opinion				299

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
515763	Mr V S Harris		CSO16 784	Preferred Option KS 13	Object					299
515788	Mrs J M May		CSO16 831	Preferred Option KS 13		No Opinion				299
516313	Mr Julian Humphries		CSO16 930	Preferred Option KS 13	Support		The northern business park, development of new employment land and the operational airport are good sites on existing areas with adequate transport.			299
517528	Dr Susan Burton		CSO16 977	Preferred Option KS 13		No Opinion				299
517835	Mr G D Rodrigues		CSO17 238	Preferred Option KS 13		No Opinion				299
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		CSO19 316	Preferred Option KS 13	Object		<p>Employment</p> <p>Another simple truth is that provision of employment land encourages immigration. People move here, either to retire or to take up jobs on so readily released employment land. The system is self-perpetuating. There is a very strange phenomenon whereby local people are much less likely to object to employment development than housing development. They do not perceive the fact that it is the ready provision of employment land which actually encourages immigration, leading to the housing conundrum above. It is also strange because employment is just as damaging to our biodiversity as housing – albeit in slightly different ways.</p> <p>I have taken part in Local and County Strategic Plan Examinations in Public since the early 1980s and can sadly confirm that nothing has</p>			299

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							changed to address our underlying problems in all that time. We continue to perpetuate the same myth that growth will provide a solution - whereas in fact it is the problem.			
507546	Mr Nigel Pugsley	Senior Planner BNP Paribas Real Estate	CSO17 980	Preferred Option KS 13	Support		My client is supportive of the Council's preferred option which promotes sustainable economic growth and meets business requirements and projected land requirements to 2027.			299
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		CSO17 706	Preferred Option KS 13	Support		<p>Travel for Employment, Education, Shopping and Leisure.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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</p>			299

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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 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.</p> <p>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</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>million sticky plaster solution⁸ 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> <p>How else could the necessary road improvements be funded?</p> <p>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>Theoretical Human Life Cycle Transportation Requirements (Personal view of the author)</p> <p>Age (years) Events Location Probability Desirability</p> <p>0-1 Birth to Communication Home Walk Car 1-3 Nursery Local to Parents Work Public Transport Car 3-5 Nursery School Neighbourhood Walk Car 5-9 1st School Neighbourhood Walk Car 9-13 Middle School Neighbourhood Walk Car 13-16 Upper School Out of Neighbourhood School Bus Car</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							16-18 6th Form / College Out of Town Public Transport Scooter / Motor Cycle / Car 18-23 University Out of Town Public Transport Car 16-70 Employment Mobility Car 23-35 Life Partnership Mobility Car 30-40 Home Buyer Local Public Transport Car 30-60 Parenting Local Car 60-90 Retirement Local Car / Taxi 80-100 Support / Nursing Local Minibus Occasional Chauffeuring PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT			
521395	D2 Planning	D2 Planning Limited	CSO17 824	Preferred Option KS 13	Object		Objections are made to this policy in respect of overall provision of employment land. The Preferred Option sets out an employment provision of 65.3ha requirement for Christchurch, East Dorset and Bournemouth. However, this Core Strategy does not include Bournemouth Borough and therefore the employment provision for that Borough should be excluded from this Core Strategy. The employment requirement should be amended.			299
521457	Mr and Mrs M Daymond		CSO17 857	Preferred Option KS 13		General Comment	Commuters Although we have a sizeable industrial estate in Verwood, many of the employees travel there from the Ringwood direction. Local work opportunities do not necessarily support local residents.			299
527661	W Barnes		CSO18 852	Preferred Option KS 13		No Opinion				299
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 862	Preferred Option KS 13	Support		This policy is supported because we believe there is a fundamental need to bring forward sites for employment purposes in order to create a prosperous community. For many years now employers have complained that although			299

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Strategic Plans have often identified sites for employment purposes, they have not been actually available. In addition to the evidence related by the Planning Authorities, we have submitted evidence of local commercial agents to testify to the demand for and the lack of deliverable employment sites in the area. Those letters are appended to our Representations on Policy PC5.</p> <p>There are clearly some issues with regard to deliverability of many of the sites in the area but the one site where there is no issue over deliverability is the Woolsbridge site. Please see evidence submitted in support of Policy PC5.</p>			
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO18991	Preferred Option KS 13		General Comment	<p>Option KS 13 Employment development Provision of employment and retail services close to existing centres of population and on brownfield land are supported. Improvements to sustainable access and necessary infrastructure provision will be sought in conjunction with any future development of these sites. Sustainable travel patterns need to be established at the time of occupation of new development through the use of travel plans for new employment and retail areas.</p> <p>The consolidation of future employment development at the Ferndown Industrial Estate (FIE) is supported rather than the proposed separate development sites off Ham Lane near Canford Bottom roundabout. A greater opportunity exists at FIE to provide access via alternatives to the car as an extension there would offer economies of scale and practicality when providing for sustainable travel to work. A higher level of development here could provide improved bus services to the estate and new development can be integrated with the site's existing Travel Plan. The Ham Lane sites are isolated from the nearby built up area and would</p>			299

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>fragment the provision of local employment areas making it more difficult to provide an efficient sustainable travel to work package. Bailie Gate Industrial Estate is isolated in terms of sustainable travel and this is unlikely to be easily overcome with Travel Plan measures. There is no nearby large local population to draw on and there are limited public transport opportunities.</p> <p>Woolsbridge is fairly isolated but sits between three population areas and there is potential to improve cycle and public transport accessibility to the benefit of the whole estate and the wider communities.</p> <p>Other, small, isolated sites outside of the urban area should be avoided.</p>			
536930	Mrs Susannah Spencer		CSO22 340	Preferred Option KS 13	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.			299
557299	Mr Peter Weatherhead	DTZ Planning	CSO22 937	Preferred Option KS 13	Support		<p>The Estate supports Preferred Option KS 13 on the distribution of employment land but suggests that the supporting text should refer to land adjacent to Bournemouth Airport rather than the Airport Business Park. This would support development of the Estate land adjacent to the terminal buildings as shown on plan DTZ 1.</p>	Bournemouth Airport should be identified as a BROAD LOCATION for employment development. Land on Plan DTZ 1 should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for employment and airport related uses as well as being a potential location for the proposed park and ride facility.		299
361342	Mr Graham Clarke	Spatial Planning Officer Dorset County	CSO22 832	Preferred Option KS 13	Support		The proposals for employment are broadly to be supported. As with housing supply, the County Council would welcome continued close working to ensure that			299

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Council					infrastructure needs can be properly planned for to meet proposed levels of development. It will also be important to ensure that delivery strategies for the area, including the use of the CIL, are set out clearly to provide the necessary certainty over delivery of the strategy.			
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO924	4.66	Object		<p>I suggest the recent recession after these figures were provided in 2008 has reduced the need for the numbers of retail units - I suspect there are now substantially more empty units. Apart from the recession this will be exacerbated by the amount of trade now taking place on the internet.</p> <p># There is a need for in the region of 9,000 - 11,000sqm (this figure is now excessive) of additional non-food retail floor space in Christchurch to 2027 (Joint Retail Study, 2008)</p> <p># There is no need for further supermarket floor space in Christchurch Borough (Joint Retail Assessment 2008) (I suggest if we build more housing in Burton, we will need to provide some further supermarket floor space in Burton</p>	<p>* Christchurch Town Centre has about 209 shops, 80 of which are comparison retail including a wide range of national and local comparison stores, including national food stores. Its catchment population for major food shopping is in the region of 40,000 people (Dorset County Council)</p> <p>* Highcliffe centre has 120 retail outlets, 48 of which are comparison retail (Joint Retail Study, 2008)</p> <p>* There is a need for in the region of 9,000 - 11,000sqm of additional non-food retail floor space in Christchurch to 2027 (Joint Retail Study, 2008). This estimate need to be reviewed in light of the recession since 2008 and the increased levels of shopping undertaken on the internet and also where the new housing is eventually built in Christchurch</p> <p>* In Christchurch Town</p>		305

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								<p>Centre there is capacity to accommodate between 6,900 - 8,000sqm of additional non-food retail floor space</p> <p>* In Highcliffe centre there is capacity to provide in the region of 800sqm additional comparison (non-food) retail floor space to 2026 (Joint Retail Assessment (2008))</p> <p>* There is no need for further supermarket floor space in Christchurch Borough (Joint Retail Assessment 2008)</p> <p>* There is a need for in the region of 7,250 - 8,500 sqm of new convenience floor space (food store) and 10,200 - 12,600 sqm of additional comparison (non-food) floor space in East Dorset to 2027 (Joint Retail Study, 2008)</p> <p>* Ferndown Town Centre has about 90 shops of which the large proportion are local, anchored by a major Tesco food store. Its catchment population for major food shopping is in the region of 28,000 people</p> <p>* In Ferndown there is capacity to provide approximately 5,200 sqm of additional comparison (non-food) retail floor</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								<p>space and 5,500 sqm of additional convenience floor space</p> <p>* Verwood has about 40 shops in the main town centre, with additional shopping associated with a Morrison's food store. Its catchment population for major food shopping is in the region of 15,000 people</p> <p>* In Verwood there is capacity to provide approximately 1,100 sqm of additional comparison (non-food) retail floor space and 700 sqm of additional convenience floor space</p> <p>* West Moors Town Centre has about 40 shops</p> <p>* Wimborne Town Centre has about 160 shops which are primarily local, supported by a new Waitrose. The catchment population for major food shopping is in the region of 18,000 people</p> <p>* In Wimborne there is capacity to provide approximately 6,600 sqm of additional comparison (non-food) retail floor space and 1,000 sqm of additional convenience floor space</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360597	Mr Gordon Wheeler		CSO2847	4.66	Object		As quoted "There is no need for further supermarket floor space in Christchurch Borough (Joint Retail Assessment 2008)" A reported in the local press that two new supermarkets where likely to be built in the Purewell area.			305
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO2383	4.66		General Comment	Christchurch had 209 shops, Highcliffe has 120 shops but what about Bournemouth and New Milton?			305
360749	Cllr. Mrs T. B. Coombs	Verwood Dewlands Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO19404	4.66		General Comment	(This comment referred to the Key Fact about Verwood's catchment) figures do not take account of hinterland that come to Verwood to shop, suggest figure is too low as current population is 14,700.			305
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO357	4.67	Support					307
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO925	Preferred Option KS 14	Object		Burton should become a District Centre with more housing and business development	The Christchurch town centre hierarchy should be as follows: Town Centres: Christchurch District Centres: Highcliffe, Burton and Barrack Road Local Centres: Purewell Parades: All other clusters of shops The proposed hierarchy elevates Barrack Road from a local centre to a district centre and Burton from a parade to a District Centre		310
361026	Mr Steve	Network Planning	CSO17646	Preferred Option KS	Support		What should the town hierarchy be for Christchurch and East Dorset?			310

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Hellier	Manager Highways Agency		14			The Agency supports the Council's approach to the proposed hierarchy of the town centres in Christchurch and East Dorset, as set out in Preferred Options KS14 and KS16. We recognise the fact that town centres are the most accessible by means other than the car. Where and how much retail development should there be in Christchurch and East Dorset? The Agency supports the amount of retail development proposed at key retail centres across Christchurch and East Dorset under Preferred Option KS18. We would also support limited provision at smaller centres in order to promote self-containment.			
361050	Dr Alan Marshall		CSO65	Preferred Option KS 16	Support		It's fine having Ferndown in the top echelon of the hierarchy, but the reality is that the town centre does not attract a range of retail businesses. In all senses of the word "attract". It is sadly a fairly soulless place with a preponderance of 'services' rather than 'shops'.			315
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO358	Preferred Option KS 16	Support		It would seem logical to include Wimborne, Ferndown and Verwood as being Town Centres as these areas are already fulfilling that role.			315
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO959	Preferred Option KS 16	Support		Support in part. Agreed that Corfe Mullen is a Local Centre. However, as the Lockyers site is unlikely to come forward, and given that the Parish Council does not agree with its use as retail centre (see comments to Option 1) the reference to possible change should be removed from Option KS 16. The assessment that Corfe Mullen is a minor centre is reflected in KS13 and KS18 neither of which propose additional [employment or retail] development in Corfe Mullen: another reason why its description in KS1 as a main settlement is erroneous.			315

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO25 57	Preferred Option KS 16	Support		I have always wanted Verwood to have a Town Centre and regret that this has not yet been achieved.			315
359547	Mrs V Bright	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17 935	Preferred Option KS 16	Support		Support. We have always wanted Verwood to have a vibrant Town Centre and regret that this has not yet been achieved. See also options KS18 and VWM5 & 6			315
524088	Mr Ken Parke	Ken Parke Planning Consultants	CSO18 456	Preferred Option KS 16	Object		<p>This policy option seeks to establish a town centre hierarchy for East Dorset. Colehill is not mentioned within the policy option. It is evident from the preferred option that Colehill has no facilities which would rank it within the town centre hierarchy even as a local centre. Indeed, Colehill would not even make the lowest rank as a parade with 'a cluster of shops'. Colehill is therefore clearly not a settlement or town in its own right either physically or functionally.</p> <p>7.2.4.2 Notwithstanding the observations in relation to the definition of the settlements set out in Section 6 above, it would seem that the promotion of the subject land and the provision of a village in association with a residential development would enable the suburban area to be ranked within the hierarchy in a manner which its size and status deserves.</p> <p>7.2.4.3 West Parley is not identified as a separate settlement but yet still appears within the town centre hierarchy separate from its main town centre of Ferndown.</p> <p>7.2.4.4 It seems clear that the various preferred options put forward in relation to urban expansion in and around Wimborne do not address the needs of Colehill and nor do the settlement hierarchy or key strategy preferred options. Indeed, in providing the ranking of the various settlements and centres, the Core Strategy is merely stating what the existing situation is. It would seem more appropriate for</p>			315

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the strategy to include firmer proposals which would raise the proposed status of Colehill to a level befitting of its size and population towards meeting the needs of the area where it is viewed as a settlement in its own right or as part of the wider settlement of Wimborne.</p> <p>7.2.4.5 A key submission of this representation therefore is that the key strategy areas in respect of Colehill and its future development should be seriously reconsidered in order to provide an identified suburban centre with the facilities it needs and deserves towards meeting sustainability objectives and also to view this suburban area as part of the wider settlement of Wimborne. Failure to utilise such an approach would be a significant failing of the Core Strategy and its ability to meet the identified needs and issues as set out in the Wimborne and Colehill overview document.</p> <p>7.2.4.6 Rather than simply identifying the existing situation, the settlement and town centre hierarchies should go a step further and set out strategic level proposals for actions that should be taken to meet any deficiencies. This submission recommends the inclusion of Colehill as part of the wider settlement of Wimborne in terms of the settlement hierarchy and the development of the subject land for residential purposes, including the provision of a village centre. These options are discussed in detail below. The alternative is to keep Colehill as a separate settlement however the document should seek to provide it with a realistic status within the settlement and town centre hierarchies again through the development of the subject land along with an appropriately sized centre.</p> <p>7.2.4.7 For the avoidance of doubt, the use of the term 'village centre' is a term of reference. The intention is to provide a public space with an array of shops and other community uses in an</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							identifiable centre which will act as a focus for the wider community.			
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22878	Preferred Option KS 16		General Comment	<p>Option KS16.</p> <p>Despite all that has been said by the consultants on the reasons for Verwood remaining a District Centre, this Option proposes Verwood should be a Town Centre with no justification for dismissing the consultants' view. Indeed given that the geographic centre is Morrisons and when that complex was built it was intended to be the retail centre for Verwood, to attempt now to revert to the historic village centre as a Town Centre cannot be justified. The statement in the Core Strategy Options that Verwood's position in the town centre hierarchy is supported by evidence from Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners is incorrect.</p> <p>The inadequacy of parking provision at the Potters Wheel and Bakers Farm has been ignored. The problems in Verwood for people with less than full mobility are significant and have not been taken into consideration in the planning and location of retail units. There is gross under-provision of disabled parking places: slopes and ramps cause difficulties when attempting to access the butchers, Post Office, Chinese Takeaway, electrical retailer, bakers and chiropodist. Narrow pavements outside the new shop frontages in Station Road will also be problematic for disabled users. The steep gradient of the pathway from the Bakers Farm Car Park to the units on the south side of Station Road causes difficulties for those with certain mobility problems.</p> <p>Traffic management in Ringwood Road/Station Road is a priority issue now without adding to road transport in this area. There are problems most mornings along the B3081 with delivery lorries from Tesco, Baileys, and Spar, together</p>			315

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>with frequent pavement parking outside the shops in Station Road (a particularly dangerous place because of visibility). This creates major hold-ups which snarl up the road at prime commuter time. Spar lorries also park on the pavement alongside the Heritage Centre to offload, instead of delivering through the back of the shop: this holds up other vehicles going in and out of the car park. The problems are exacerbated by delivery lorries for Tesco competing with customers for a space outside the shop, and cars park on the double yellow lines here. Tesco delivery lorries and other HGVs and vans use the Potters Wheel car park to turn around rather than driving to the roundabout by the fire station and coming back on themselves. Vehicles approaching that do so at speed. The Manor Road one way system is abused by motorists who turn right and ignore the "No Right Turn" sign, again to avoid driving over the same road twice in order to get back to where they started.</p> <p>If any other retail units are proposed for Verwood it is essential that there is adequate space for safe, off-road delivery of goods from the rear and that additional time restricted parking is made available.</p> <p>The occupation of the shops and office premises in Verwood retail areas as at Jan. 2011 is listed below. Those units that offer comparative shopping are shown in bold type</p> <p>Manor Road – Butcher, PO, Chinese Takeaway, Bank, Alternative therapy, Financial Services Bakers Farm – Vet, Chemist, Medical Centre Station Road – Gift shop, chemist, school outfitters, 2 hairdressers, estate agent, 1 unit to let, 3(?) new units being built Edmondsham Road – Picture Framer (part time), Estate Agent, Soft Furnishings Ringwood Road (Historic Centre) –</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Travel Agent, Estate Agent x 3, Hairdresser, Bank, Electrical retailer, Baker (and coffee shop), Solicitor, Vet, Chiropractor, Beauty parlour, Financial Services, Bank, Bookmaker, Takeaway/coffee shop, Tesco convenience store, Heritage Centre (Coffee), 1 unit closed, Greetings Card shop, Solicitor, Funeral Parlour, Printing services in offices over., other offices remain unlet.</p> <p>Vicarage Road – Florist, Optician, Dry cleaner, Charity Shop</p> <p>Other – Indian restaurant/takeaway, (Italian restaurant subject to planning) , Surplus Stores</p> <p>Small convenience shop at Garage/Petrol Station</p> <p>Small convenience Shop at traffic lights (junction Blackhill)</p> <p>Co-op under construction</p> <p>Shops at Morrisons:– hairdresser, 2 x takeaway, newsagent. However these are likely to be re-thought when the site is redeveloped.</p>			
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO926	Preferred Option KS 18	Object		Burton needs to be upgraded to a District Centre with more housing and retail space	In order for key retail centres in Christchurch and East Dorset to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability, it is important that provision is made for additional retail floor space to meet projected requirements to 2027. Further retail floor space is necessary to meet the needs of a growing population with associated increasing levels of available retail expenditure. It is also important for our retail centres to maintain their		320

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								<p>market share of retail expenditure within the South East Dorset sub region and provide the opportunity to increase this market share. This option sets out the broad locations and level of additional retail floor space that could be accommodated across the retail centres of Christchurch and East Dorset to 2027, informed by the Joint Retail Assessment (2008) which are set out below. For most centres, floor space figures are set out as ranges to reflect requirements of lower and higher population growth scenarios which will be determined by the level of new housing to be delivered in Christchurch and East Dorset to 2027. The Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document will determine specific sites within the centres where retail development can take place.</p> <p>Christchurch: Christchurch Town Centre:</p> <p>* Comparison Retail Floor space (non- Food shopping): 6,900 -</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								8,000sqm * Convenience Floor space (food shopping): No additional requirement to 2027 Highcliffe Centre: * Comparison Floor space: 800sqm * Convenience Floor space: No additional requirement to 2027 Burton Centre: * Comparison Floor space: 0sqm * Convenience Floor space: ?400sqm No additional requirement to 2027 East Dorset: Ferndown * Comparison Floor space: 750 - 5,200 sqm * Convenience Floor space: 3700 - 5,600 sqm Verwood * Comparison Floor space: 160 - 1,150 sqm * Convenience Floor space: 200 - 700 sqm West Moors * Comparison Floor space: 80 - 550 sqm * Convenience Floor space: 0 - 110 sqm Wimborne Minster: * Comparison Floor space: 950 - 6,650 sqm * Convenience Floor space: 700 - 1,030 sqm		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO25 58	Preferred Option KS 18		General Comment	Given that option KS16 identifies Verwood as one of the three major town centres in East Dorset, it seems contradictory that the floor space figures (both comparison & convenience) for Verwood are well below those for Ferndown and Wimborne and not that much greater than those for West Moors - KS16 "recognises the fact that West Moors has little opportunity for further town centre development"			320
359547	Mrs V Bright	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17 940	Preferred Option KS 18		General Comment	Given that option KS16 identifies Verwood as one of the three major town centres in East Dorset, it seems contradictory that the floor space figures (both comparison & convenience) for Verwood are well below those for Ferndown and Wimborne and not that much greater than those for West Moors - KS16 "recognises the fact that West Moors has little opportunity for further town centre development"			320
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 651	Preferred Option KS 18	Object		We support the location of new retail development within existing town centres. However, it is possible that new retail development will have an adverse effect and therefore we object to option KS18, pending resolution of outstanding issues identified in the HRA in relation to the European sites.			320
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		CSO17 709	Preferred Option KS 18	Object		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			320

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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?</p> <p>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 for Education</p> <p>Whilst all of the First and Middle School requirements can be accommodated within Wimborne and Colehill, 40% of the Upper School requirements require travel along or over the A31. (i.e. Ferndown or Corfe Hills)</p> <p>All of the Colleges of Further Education, or Universities, are situated in Poole, Bournemouth, or outside of area necessitating travel either along or over the A31.</p> <p>Most or all of these Institutions can be accessed via public, or private hire transport, but in the case of travel time to Bournemouth and Poole journey times are long and convoluted, and many require bus changes to get to appropriate</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>destinations. Journeys are far quicker and much more convenient using personal transport. (see Seats of Learning attached 20)</p> <p>Travel for Shopping Most daily shopping requirements can be fulfilled within Wimborne and Colehill, but weekly shopping requirements vary dependent on ones loyalty to a particular Supermarket Brand. Therefore travel to Ferndown, Poole or Bournemouth by accessing or crossing the A31 is highly likely.</p> <p>It should also be recognised that many residents have their groceries delivered from Poole or Ferndown, where it is necessary for delivery transport to access or cross the A31.</p> <p>For larger purchases and greater choice of items such as Branded Clothing, Furniture, Electrical Goods, Computers, Mobile Phones, DIY requirements etc., people generally shop in the larger Retail Centres in Poole and Bournemouth, and perhaps as wide afield as Southampton, all of which requires access to or crossing of the A31.</p> <p>Wimborne and Colehill only have one garden Centre, others being located at Stapehill, Longham and Merley, they also require access to, or crossing of, the A31</p> <p>Travel for Hospital Minor health ailments can be addressed and treated locally in Wimborne, but more serious cases are dealt with in Bournemouth, Poole or Southampton Hospitals. Again these require access to, or over, the A31, by both patients and visitors alike.</p> <p>Travel for Leisure Most sedentary leisure pursuits can be accomplished in Wimborne or Colehill, but more active past times such as Sailing, Camping, Bathing, Surfing, Canoeing, Safe Cycling, Concerts, Shows, Exhibitions, Rambling,</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Holidays, Motor Sports, Tourist Attractions etc., are out of area and require travel either East, West or South and most engage the A31 in one way or another.</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 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.</p> <p>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</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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? Well clearly the A31 has to be upgraded to a</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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; 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 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 solution⁸ applied to the Canford Bottom Roundabout which will only, if successful, move the bottleneck from one</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>roundabout on the A31 along to another. IT IS TIME FOR MAJOR SURGERY.</p> <p>How else could the necessary road improvements be funded?</p> <p>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>			
523627	Rachel Robinson	WYG Planning & Design	CSO18 439	Preferred Option KS 18	Support	General Comment	<p>Whilst these comments are submitted as a general representation they relate in particular to Preferred Option KS18.</p> <p>Policies regarding future retail development in Christchurch and East Dorset should accord with national policy, and in particular with Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4): Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth in respect of the following matters.</p> <p>PPS4 identifies that development plans should set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth (Policy EC2.1a, PPS4).</p> <p>It is also considered that to plan for sustainable</p>			320

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							economic growth, local planning authorities should seek to make the most efficient and effective use of land, whilst reflecting the different location requirements of businesses, taking into consideration matters such as the size of the site required, site quality, access and proximity to markets and to the locally available workforce (Policy EC.2d, PPS4). Policy EC.4 (PPS4) recognises that local planning authorities should proactively plan to provide consumer choice by planning for a strong retail mix so that the range and quality of the comparison and convenience retail offer meets the requirements of the local catchment area.			
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO18994	Preferred Option KS 18		General Comment	Option KS 18 Retail development Provision of retail services within existing urban areas, ideally within town centres are supported. Improvements to sustainable access and necessary infrastructure provision will be sought in conjunction with any future development of these sites. Sustainable travel patterns need to be established at the time of occupation of new development through the use of travel plans for new retail areas.			320
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO362	4.75		General Comment	An observation. How can congestion on the A31 and A35 be improved by building thousands of new houses and building large employment centres in East Dorset when new residents will need to access their places of work, often by car or van if they live in Wimborne or Ferndown ?			326
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO927	4.75	Object		I think "Reduce congestion particularly on the A35 and A31(T)" is being overoptimistic in the current economic climate. There are no funds available for capital projects on trunk roads with the Government cut backs. Even if congestion was improved on these trunks, bottle necks	* Improving access to services, employment and leisure. * Improve public transport links to deprived areas and reducing isolation in		326

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							would inevitably be created elsewhere.	rural areas. * Reduce congestion particularly on the A35 and A31(T) if this is economically viable. * Improve access for disabled people. * Provide integrated / cycle paths, especially in the town centres and to the schools.		
360597	Mr Gordon Wheeler		CSO2862	4.75	Object		The key facts are all based on 2001 census which would be old and unreliable by now surely there are newer statistics around, if not why not wait until the next census			326
474971	Mr Peter Durant		CSO646	4.76	Object		Many people are ambivalent about their attitude to car use. They want the convenience for their own use, but resent others causing them to get delayed by traffic jams. Londoners did not willingly vote for congestion charges and high parking charges, but have got used to them, and now largely accept them. The traffic situation at rush-hour is unpleasant, noisy and dirty for those residents living on the main traffic arteries. Most cars being driven at that time contain only one person. It is time that the situation was confronted. So long as the local authorities are willing to spend £millions to 'improve' the road network, then there will always be those who will find it convenient to extend their car use.	Make concerted and determined efforts to coax car driving commuters to reconsider their habits. Facilitate bicycling and walking by making an imaginative attempt to provide an attractive and coherent network of paths. What is presently available, rarely provides attractive proper through routes. The local planning officers should be dispatched to one of the Continental countries to see how it can be done. The whole tenor of this document appears to be providing lip-service to the need to cut down on private car use, whilst tacitly accepting yet		328

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								greater pressure on the road network.		
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO928	4.76		General Comment	The cutbacks in Government expenditure, combined with increased cost of living for most families will reduce car use (people will have to use their car less). It is noticeable to me that the queues on local roads are less than 2 years ago (I notice that car parking income received in Christchurch was less than budgeted which also suggests less car use)			328
502050	Mr Alan Symons		CSO6482	4.76		General Comment	The overall subject of all development on the A31 is of concern. I can only anticipate increased traffic flow on an absurdly over-used stretch of road. This will result in the PREDICTABLE 'cheap' options of speed restrictions, roundabouts. electronic signage rather than a strategic review of the entire road to WEYMOUTH. The section of the A31 between Poulner Hill and Weymouth continues to be sub-standard width or no re-aligning (stet) on the horizon. Whilst I am fully aware of the current economic situation, it is disappointing that even during the 'good' times, no previous consideration was given to major improvement. This is a major holiday route and we all know that at peak times, motoring enjoyment ceases at the Ferndown Industrial Estate where the carriageway reduces to a single lane. Beyond, there is little or no opportunity to overtake due to the 'cheap' option of long stretches of 'hatches' done, of course, for safety reasons. I can only dream of dual carriageway ALL the way down to Dorchester/Weymouth - some chance of that happening!			328
527849	Miss Kate	Transport Planning	CSO18980	4.76		General Comment	These comments are provided on behalf of Dorset County Council by the Transport Planning			328

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Tunks	Officer Dorset County Council					<p>Group.</p> <p>1. GENERAL POINTS</p> <p>The future direction of transport planning in Dorset contained in LTP3</p> <p>The transport strategy for the southern, urban part of East Dorset and Christchurch is now emerging through the South East Dorset Multi Modal Transport Study (SEDMMTS). A separate transport study has been undertaken for the northern, rural part of East Dorset. Two areas have been identified for study because of the different transport issues experienced in the different parts of the Core Strategy area. The northern part of East Dorset experiences rural accessibility problems whilst the more urban areas to the south and Christchurch experience peak hour traffic congestion problems. The northern part of East Dorset will also experience very little development compared with Christchurch and the southern part of East Dorset. The outcomes of both studies will be included in the LTP3.</p> <p>The integration of planning and transport policies within the LDF Core Strategy and the LTP3 will occur through continued close working between County and District / Borough officers. The following draft paragraphs outline the approach to be taken in LTP3 which should be reflected in Dorset's Core Strategies.</p> <p>"The highway authorities, together with their partners, will seek to manage travel demand through a mix of hard and soft measures to encourage sustainable travel patterns, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use planning policies and strategic spatial planning • Encouraging people and businesses to reduce the need to travel via virtual (internet) access and co-location of facilities through the land use planning process • Encouraging smarter choices 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parking policies • Prioritising the use of the highway network <p>When preparing Local Development Documents, and their regeneration and investment strategies, the Local Planning Authorities should have regard to the provisions of the LTP3. This will ensure that as far as possible, development and redevelopment proposals make the best use of existing transport infrastructure and services, improve connectivity locally and in the wider area where appropriate, and provide high levels of accessibility for all with an emphasis on sustainable modes of travel. Where major development is permitted outside town centre areas, additional public transport, cycling and walking facilities will be sought in order to minimise use of the car.</p> <p>Through seeking a step change in the quality and reliability of public transport services, transport policy within the LTP will support land use policy that encourages major development in the main urban areas and in centres along key public transport corridors and around transport hubs, to maximise the potential use of public transport.</p> <p>By further integrating transport policy into Local Development Documents and development management processes the authorities will encourage positive design solutions for all new developments which ensure key services are accessible locally and that provide maximum opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport use. Where appropriate, assistance will be provided to developers in the form of clear design guidance setting out design requirements and best practice.</p> <p>Transport Assessments and residential and workplace travel planning will be used to effectively assess the impacts of new development and manage the journeys created.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>In assessing planning applications, the full environmental impacts of the development over its expected lifetime will be considered, including the impacts on carbon emissions from associated travel demand.</p> <p>In order to support delivery of the LTP, the Local Planning Authorities will have regard to the provision of developer funding requirements for transport within Local Development Documents in order to ensure that new development is served by adequate transport infrastructure and that impacts on the existing transport network are mitigated. This will include requirements for developers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Contribute towards priorities and schemes contained within the LTP that are deemed to directly relate to, and mitigate impacts of, their development ii. Fund the necessary transport infrastructure and mitigation measures required for the development of their particular site. This will include sufficient links to walking, cycling and public transport networks iii. Make financial contributions towards pooled funds or when introduced a Community Infrastructure Levy, where appropriate, to provide transport infrastructure identified as necessary to support planned growth and mitigate the proportionate cumulative impact of additional trips generated by their development on the wider transport network, in accordance with government guidance. <p>Working closely with the Local Planning Authorities, the highway authorities will seek to ensure that accessibility planning is embedded within planning and strategy documents and continue to encourage service providers to embed accessibility considerations within their service delivery investment programmes. Local Planning Authorities must have regard to the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>requirements for significant transport improvements as proposed in the LTP3 when establishing land reservations in Local Development Documents.”</p> <p>Emerging SED Transport Strategy for inclusion within the Core Strategy</p> <p>The preferred transport strategy for SE Dorset as part of the Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset LTP3 is currently out for consultation until the end of February 2011. The highway authorities welcome comments on the strategy from the planning authorities.</p> <p>In line with national government guidance, the emerging LTP3 and given the lack of funding in the short term, the likely continuing focus for transport in South East Dorset will be to widen travel choice to promote alternatives to the car. Specific proposals which should be reflected in the next stage of the Core Strategy include:</p> <p>Short and Medium Term (up to 2020)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote ‘greener’ travel options through travel plans, new car clubs, promotion of car sharing • Development of a comprehensive cycle network • Increased cycle parking and improved pedestrian access to stations and town centres • Improvements to walking routes including crossing facilities • Locate development close to public transport corridors and plan development to encourage walking and cycling • Introduce electric charging points for electric vehicles • Express bus services to outlying areas (in East Dorset and Christchurch) • Community travel planning, community led bus services (particularly for rural areas) • Designate HGV routes and produce updated freight map • A31 improvements west of Ringwood and 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Canford Bottom</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B3073 Parley Lane / Christchurch Road improvements • Bus showcase corridor – A35 Poole to Christchurch <p>Long Term (beyond 2020)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build on the success of the short and medium term measures including supporting 'greener' travel choices • To support the level of development currently proposed in the SE Dorset area, significant additional infrastructure will be required including bus showcase corridors with complementary Park & Ride system and increased rail frequency alongside development of a light rail system • A number of road building schemes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A31 widening into a dual carriageway from Merley to Ameysford o New north - south road link from Magna Road to Canford Bottom o New east - west road link from B3073 Chapel Gate to A341 Magna Road o Bus showcase corridors – extensions to Wimborne, Ferndown, the airport and to the east of Christchurch (along the A35 and the A337) o New Airport Park & Ride site o New Northbourne Park & Ride site (on the border between West Parley & Bournemouth) o Development of a Park & Rail site at Hinton Admiral station (on the border between Christchurch & Hants) <p>The short / medium term proposed measures are in line with those currently outlined in the transport related policies in the Core Strategy. Some of the new longer term schemes have emerged from the technical transport modelling and analysis work undertaken by the consultants Atkins. The need for these schemes was not foreseen in time for inclusion at this stage of the Core Strategy.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Atkins tested the impacts of a relatively high level of development in the quantities, type and locations suggested by Christchurch and East Dorset Planning Officers. The new road schemes have been recommended because even with the measures to encourage more sustainable travel, a significant increase in vehicular traffic is predicted to be generated by that future development. However, it may be that not all the schemes are deliverable up to 2027 and this may limit the amount of development that can come forward. A balance must be struck between the level of development to be delivered, the need for additional infrastructure to serve it and the ability to deliver this infrastructure because of funding and environmental constraints. This work is yet to be finished. Once approved, the final transport strategy and schemes can inform the future decisions regarding the phasing of development and should be included in the next stage of the Core Strategy.			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO37 1	Preferred Option KS 19	Support		Although the whole concept of reducing the need to travel by locating housing development close to town centres, employment centres and prime transport corridors is a good one, in reality, the towns and villages in East Dorset are miles away from the main employment centres in Poole and Bournemouth (the now defunct Regional Spatial Strategies recognised this fact). Even the Highways Agency at session 4/7 of the Examination in Public of the SWRSS stated its concern at any large scale development in a band stretching from Ferndown, Wimborne to Corfe Mullen because (and I quote) "significant impact on the A31 Trunk road given the remote location of these settlements from employment centres" the Agency then went on to state that (and I quote) "if further growth in the volume of			330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>traffic is incurred, the A31 will no longer effectively fulfil its strategic function in respect to inter regional connectivity". I have been told by East Dorset District Council that the Highways Agency have now withdrawn their objections to the building of "urban extensions" at Wimborne, Ferndown and Corfe Mullen but if that is the case, I cannot see why they should have withdrawn their objections because nothing has changed with the congestion particularly on the A31 trunk road and, as a regular driver on the A31, I would say that the problem of congestion has got worse.</p> <p>Also, in the Issues & Options exercise conducted in 2008 and in answer to Option UE13 General (in respect of UE13 "Where should industrial/employment development be A) Blunts Farm, B) South of Wimborne Road, C) Both, D) Another place within the area of search. The Highways Agency answered "This urban extension relates to 20 ha of employment provision west 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 the 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 would also draw your attention to the Scoping Report 008583, A31 to Poole Corridor February 2007 by Buro Happold in which they state on page 83 "environment restraints within the study area, particularly RAMSAR, SPA, SAG, and SSSI designations seriously constrain the ability to provide new road links "</p> <p>I would state my serious concerns as to whether satisfactory road transport facilities can be implemented given the environmental constraints</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							within East Dorset area. By adding a possible further 1000 new households in the Wimborne area, potentially there could be a further 1,500 cars on our local roads and some of those, making 2 trips per day.			
474971	Mr Peter Durant		CSO647	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		There appears to be an expectation that the planned proximity of work and living areas will somehow result in people driving less. That is quite frankly a pipe dream. Looking for work rarely involves decisions about commuting more involved than deciding that extended distances make commute time too onerous and expensive. Rarely would an employee decide a distance of upwards of 10 miles to be too far. It is attractive to see the references to cycling an walking route improvements, and car sharing. However, unless some properly worked out provision is made for such laudable aims, they will once again appeal only to those in society who take their social responsibilities seriously. There comes a time when a certain amount of fiscal coercion becomes unavoidable.	Attempt to persuade car commuters that their individual decisions and actions are part of the problem.		330
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		CSO929	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		A worthy aim but very difficult to achieve" Encouraging low carbon travel and reducing the need to travel" Short term(within the first five years of the plan period) – Corridors through existing built up areas * B3072 Ferndown northwards through West Moors, Three Legged Cross to Verwood * A35 and A337 through Christchurch (A35 identified in Local Transport Plan2) * A348 Bear Cross roundabout to Longham mini roundabouts and Ferndown * B3073 Airport to Wimborne town centre Also need to include Airport to Burton District Centre along Avon Causeway It is proposed to improve the interchange	Short term(within the first five years of the plan period) – Corridors through existing built up areas * B3072 Ferndown northwards through West Moors, Three Legged Cross to Verwood * A35 and A337 through Christchurch (A35 identified in Local Transport Plan2) * A348 Bear Cross roundabout to Longham mini roundabouts and		330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>facilities provided at the rail stations at Christchurch and Hinton Admiral to help retain current patronage levels and encourage greater use of rail services. Improvements will include cycle parking, co-ordinated bus and rail timetables and improved waiting facilities, as well as improved cycling and walking links. The very nature of where Christchurch Hinton Admiral are means that improved cycling routes are nonstarters. Hinton Admiral has always been out on a limb from where buses go to so an improved co-ordinated bus and rail time table is a non -starter.</p> <p>Christchurch Borough Council will continue to press for a Christchurch Bypass as a long term solution to the severe traffic congestion in the town centre, with a suitable route being identified and funding secured. I suggest that this will always be a nonstarter due to a lack of funding. Commuting to Bournemouth from Highcliffe journey times are not excessive at the moment from my own personal experience and have improved over the past 2 years with less car use locally.</p>	<p>Ferndown * B3073 Airport to Wimborne town centre *Airport to Burton District Centre along Avon Causeway It is proposed to improve the interchange facilities provided at the rail station at Christchurch to help retain current patronage levels and encourage greater use of rail services. Improvements will include cycle parking, co-ordinated bus and rail timetables and improved waiting facilities, as well as improved walking links. It is intended to increase the levels of reasonably priced parking at Hinton Admiral railway station to reduce car use. Christchurch Borough Council will no longer press for a Christchurch Bypass as a long term solution to the severe traffic congestion in the town centre and will look to other means to reduce car use.</p>		
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO960	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		<p>Whilst there may be scope for limited improvements here, this will do little to help the general flow of traffic in and out of the village as the remainder of the B3074 (Windgreen to A31) and other roads out of the village are sub-standard for the levels of traffic.</p>			330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360597	Mr Gordon Wheeler		CSO2874	Preferred Option KS 19		General Comment	Observation: The use of the car will only be curtailed by the price of fuel. The question is - is there the option of reliable public transport now and in the future to facilitate the increase in so called rush hours when travellers stop using their cars.			330
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO2384	Preferred Option KS 19	Support					330
474426	Mr Phillip Barnes		CSO1575	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		This whole section is full of laudable aims but experience has shown that there will be no investment made in anything other than the road network and from what we have seen in the past 10 years there will be precious little of that. The cycle paths in the East Dorset are a joke. Apart from the old railway line through Delph Woods (which is very poorly maintained) they amount to someone drawing lines on the pavement or at the side of already congested roads, neither will encourage anyone to get on their bike, even if these so called cycle paths actually joined up with each other and went anywhere.			330
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2559	Preferred Option KS 19	Object	General Comment	Support the identification of one of the access roads to Verwood (B3072) as a 'prime transport corridor'. Deplore the fact that Verwood's other main access routes (B3081) & the Ringwood Road from Three Legged Cross to the A31/A338 junction are NOT identified as a 'prime transport corridors'. The B3081 should be included as a prime transport corridor. The B3081 provides access to the Ebblake industrial estate, Bournemouth (via the A338), the public transport interchange at Ringwood and to the A31 eastbound for onward travel outside the district, while the B3072 only provides access to Poole and the A31		Long comments given, but have taken the view this is an objection to this Option. SK (15.6.11)	330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>westbound. In reality, most residents in the north and east of Verwood use the B3081 to access the A31 in both directions as it is so much quicker.</p> <p>As Verwood is in the Bournemouth 'travel to work' area (and not the Poole 'travel to work' area - see option KS13), why is our only 'prime transport corridor' a link to Poole?</p> <p>The Ringwood Road through Ashley Heath is also a major link for the southern part of the town and Three Legged Cross.</p> <p>This option places unrealistic expectations on the viability of walking or cycling to work in Verwood, given that the commuting distance to work is currently over 5km for more than 75% of working Verwood residents (a greater percentage than for Wimborne or Ferndown - see 11.21 and equivalent sections in chapters 8 & 10). I support improvements for cyclists for local travel and travel to school.</p> <p>VWM 5</p>			
498027	Mr Mark Keighley	Business Development Manager Bournemouth Transport Ltd	CSO3300	Preferred Option KS 19	Support		Add provision of bus lanes and other public transport priority measures to the Prime Transport Corridors section.			330
499532	Bournemouth Borough Council	Bournemouth Borough Council	CSO3818	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		Object to the inclusion of reference to land within Bournemouth in the definition of the Prime Transport Corridor along the route 'A348 Bear Cross roundabout to Longham mini roundabouts and Ferndown'. The Bournemouth Core Strategy is not promoting that section of the A348 between Bear Cross roundabout and the borough boundary at the River Stour as a PTC.	Amend the description of this PTC by deleting the stretch of road in Bournemouth Borough.		330
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife	CSO17466	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		Preferred Option KS 19/Alternative Preferred Option KS 20 DWT objects to the inclusion of the Christchurch			330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Trust					and West Moors bypasses. The DWT has objected to previous proposals for these roads as the options put forward had considerable impacts on sites of international, national and local biodiversity importance. We do not consider that inclusion of these sites would meet national rules, regulations and advice and strongly recommend removal from the draft Core Strategy.			
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18 663	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		The preferred alignments for a Christchurch by pass and a West Moors by pass significantly impacted on the Dorset Heathlands European sites, Ramsar site and some SSSIs and also some SNCIs. Therefore we do not agree with inclusion of the councils aspirations for these bypasses in the options and also with the assessments as conforming to national and local rules, regulations and advice. These bypasses should not be retained as part of any option taken forward into the Draft Submission Core Strategy.			330
359547	Mrs V Bright	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17 936	Preferred Option KS 19	Object	General Comment	Support the identification of one of the access roads to Verwood (B3072) as a 'prime transport corridor'. Deplore the fact that our other main access routes (B3081) & the Ringwood Road from Three Legged Cross to the A31/A338 junction are NOT identified as a 'prime transport corridors'. The B3081 should be included as a major transport corridor. The B3081 provides access to the Ebblake industrial estate, Bournemouth (via the A338), the public transport interchange at Ringwood and to the A31 eastbound for onward travel outside the district, while the B3072 only provides access to Poole and the A31 westbound. In reality, most residents in the north and east of the town use the B3081 to access			330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the A31 in both directions as it is so much quicker.</p> <p>As Verwood is in the Bournemouth 'travel to work' area (and not the Poole 'travel to work' area - see option KS13), why is our only 'prime transport corridor' a link to Poole?</p> <p>The Ringwood Road through Ashley Heath is also a major link for the southern part of the town and Three Legged Cross.</p> <p>This option places unrealistic expectations on the viability of walking or cycling to work in Verwood, given that the commuting distance to work is currently over 5km for more than 75% of working Verwood residents (a greater percentage than for Wimborne or Ferndown - see 11.21 and equivalent sections in chapters 8 & 10). We support improvements for cyclists for local travel and travel to school.</p>			
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	Clerk West Parley Parish Council	CSO17 952	Preferred Option KS 19	Support		Parish Council supports policy of encouraging low carbon travel , and reducing the need to travel.			330
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 653	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		<p>We welcome proposals in KS19 to encourage low carbon travel and to reduce need to travel. We therefore question the reference to bypasses, as providing additional road capacity runs counter to the Councils' objective to reduce travel by private car. Moreover, the routes are not included in the Core Strategy and therefore their impacts cannot be assessed. Given the uncertainty over the nature of proposal, including the suggestion of a Christchurch bypass, we object to options KS19, KS20 and KS21, pending resolution of outstanding issues identified in the HRA in relation to the European sites.</p>			330
360245	Mr Richard	Landscape and Planning	CSO18 756	Preferred Option KS		General Comment	From my work with the North and North East Dorset Transportation Study Group we are			330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Burden	Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB		19			aware of the problems with transportation across a rural area, particularly that part of the District that is within the AONB. We do, therefore, recognise that realistic public transport is not feasible or realistic in the way that it would be around Christchurch or Wimborne Minster. The implications of that are that those people in rural areas will need personal private transport to access services, shopping, recreational facilities, and work places in the more urban parts of the District.			
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 127	Preferred Option KS 19	Support		ETAG supports the over-riding principle in these options of encouraging low carbon travel. Though commendable, it is difficult to envisage how the Core Strategy will facilitate car sharing schemes to make development sustainable: the mechanisms for achieving this should be clarified. With funding for the West Moors Bypass no longer available, the prime Transport Corridor from Ferndown, through West Moors and Three Legged Cross to Verwood cannot be implemented. It is, in any event, an unacceptable scheme because of biodiversity impacts. Lack of funds will delay adequate improvement of other transport corridors so further assessment of the priority routes should be considered together with what this means in terms of location of new housing and employment opportunities. Increased frequency, reliability and Real Time information will be essential to ensure greater use of public transport. With the exception of Wimborne, LTP3 is not proposing any improvements to bus services north of the A31. We strongly support the use of Travel Plans. If housing development proceeds in Wimborne, it is essential that it does not create bottlenecks and rat runs: transport mechanisms (including those for construction traffic) must be planned			330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							and put in place before building starts. There should be no incursion into strictly rural networks.			
360379	Mr Andrew Murray	Planning Advisor Manchester Airport	CSO18 529	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		Do the prime transport corridors align with the results of the SE Dorset transport study and draft LTP3?			330
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 647	Preferred Option KS 19	Support		How can accessibility and safety be improved to encourage people to use alternatives to the car and reduce the impact on climate change? The Agency is encouraged by the aspiration within Option KS19 to encourage low carbon travel and reduce the need to travel. We also support the proposed corridor based approach provided that this is focussed on sustainable modes. The A31 itself is sensibly excluded from the list of corridors, however a number of these across the A31 (for example the B3073 airport to Wimborne town centre, crossing the A31 at Canford Bottom and identified for short term delivery). In such locations it will be essential for the Agency to become involved in developing the corridor proposals at the earliest opportunity. SEDMMTS is identified as the evidence base but it is rightly clarified that this has yet to be completed.			330
475541	Mr Phil Spencer		CSO17 895	Preferred Option KS 19		General Comment	Public transport Wimborne and Colehill The Options Report emphasises the need for more "affordable housing" (see paragraph 8.20) with the expectation that these will form 40% to 50% of the total new homes built. I assume that a larger proportion of occupants of these affordable homes will not have access to a car when compared with Wimborne as a whole, and therefore public transport will be of greater importance. Unsurprisingly the larger sites under consideration are furthest from, and north or east			330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>of, the town centre with its facilities and bus routes. In Appendix B to this submission I have therefore put forward detailed proposals for providing bus routes to serve the new communities.</p> <p>There are many references in the “Core Strategy Options for Consideration” report on the desirability of seeking a modal shift away from the car to more sustainable forms of transport. Some of the more significant references are indicated in the following table.</p> <p>Paragraph Nr Reference</p> <p>2.91 (last bullet point) Need to encourage people to use alternative modes of transport to the car.</p> <p>3.4 (7th bullet point) Reduce the need to travel, and encourage more sustainable patterns of transport development.</p> <p>3.13 (6th bullet point) The transport network in the area is increasingly congested, and there is a need to provide better and more sustainable travel choice for residents and visitors.</p> <p>3.29 These will be attractive new areas, including high quality sustainable homes, areas of open space, new community facilities, and improved transport links to the surrounding area.</p> <p>3.55 Significant transport improvements are proposed at Canford Bottom Roundabout A31 (T) Merley to Ameysford dualling, and B3073/A338 airport transport improvements. The overall aim will be to reduce congestion in key locations by reducing the need to travel and encouraging public transport use, walking and cycling as alternatives to the car.</p> <p>4.75 (2nd bullet point) Improve public transport links to deprived areas and reducing isolation in rural areas</p> <p>(last bullet point) Provide integrated/cycle paths, especially in the town centres and to schools</p> <p>16.5 (4th bullet point) The integration of transport and spatial planning is central to the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>development and delivery of effective local development frameworks. Development must be located in sustainable, accessible locations (PPG12)</p> <p>(5th bullet point) By shaping the pattern of development, location, scale, density, design and mix of land uses planning can help reduce the need to travel, reduce the length of journeys and make it safer and easier for people to access jobs by public transport, walking and cycling (PPG13)</p> <p>(6th bullet point) All development should be highly accessible by public transport, walking and cycling</p> <p>KS19 Improvements will be made to public transport with more frequent services within the urban areas in particular and an expansion of the Real Time Information at bus stops.</p> <p>Despite these aspirations I believe that the Options Report is deficient in not identifying any strategy showing how this objective could be implemented.</p> <p>Research carried out in London indicates that there is a greater usage of public transport if the following criteria are met -</p> <p>Every route has a "clock face" timetable (i.e. operating at the same minutes past the hour)λ</p> <p>A frequent service: it has been shown that with a minimum of 4 services per hour passengers are willing to turn up and wait,λ whereas at a lower frequency it is important to provide easy to use timetables and passengers will plan their journey</p> <p>A bus route within 800metres, and preferably 400metres, of people's homes.λ</p> <p>I believe it is only by providing an attractive level of service and positively promoting bus routes and public transport that the level of development proposed for Wimborne would be sustainable. In my view it is essential that this</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>"once in a lifetime" opportunity is taken to permanently achieve a modal shift away from the private car and onto public transport. I suggest that the developers should be required to provide the necessary infrastructure for these new and upgraded routes – e.g. bus shelters incorporating "real time" bus information, facilities at the terminating points for buses to turn and have a lay-over period together with toilet facilities for the bus drivers. Additionally funding should be secured, to the extent that it is possible, through Section 106 Agreements to subsidise these routes and ensure their retention rather than rely on market forces.</p> <p>I therefore suggest the following strategy of new and extended bus routes for the Wimborne area to meet these aspirations.</p> <p>Route 3C Wimborne (Cranborne Road) to Poole via Corfe Mullen</p> <p>This would be an extension of the existing Poole-Wimborne via Corfe Mullen service.</p> <p>Route:</p> <p>This service would no longer use The Square. From West Street buses would turn into West Borough and run to a new terminus within the proposed development either side of Cranborne Road. (For the purpose of the description given below it is assumed that this will at the new first school at the north-west of the development area). It is believed that this proposal is compatible with the proposed redevelopment of The Square.</p> <p>Bus stops:</p> <p>Northbound services:</p> <p>NatWest Bank (West Borough)* Blind Lane* Wimborne Road opposite Shakespeare Road** Cranborne Road at access point into the new development** Terminus at proposed school***</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Southbound services: Cranborne Road at access point for new developments** Wimborne Road just south of Shakespeare Road** West Borough opposite School Lane* High Street south of Mill Lane (existing bus stop)</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements: * Bus shelter with "real time" information display ** Bus lay-by, bus shelter with "real time" information display *** Bus lay-by, bus shelter with "real time" information display, toilet facilities for bus driver</p> <p>Service frequency: Mon-Sat daytime (up to 19.00) 30minute frequency Mon-Sat evenings (19.00-23.00) 60minute frequency Sunday (up to 20.00) 60minute frequency</p> <p>Route 3M Wimborne (QE School/Leisure Centre) to Poole via Merley This would be an extension of the existing Poole-Wimborne via Merley service. Route: This service would no longer use The Square. From East Borough buses would turn into the High Street, run via King Street and Victoria Road and terminate at the Queen Elizabeth School/Leisure Centre. It is believed that this proposal is compatible with the proposed redevelopment of The Square. Buses towards Poole would use the proposed new bus stop in West Borough (NatWest Bank) and thence the existing route. It would be necessary to confirm that the buses can negotiate the junction from Victoria Road into West Street at "The Pudding and Pye", although this is not thought to be an insuperable problem.</p> <p>Bus stops: Northbound services:</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>High Street south of Mill Lane (existing bus stop) King Street just beyond the Model Town (existing lay-by)* Victoria Road outside the hospital* St Margarets Hill at its junction with Stone Lane** Terminus at Queen Elizabeth School/Leisure Centre***</p> <p>Southbound services: St Margarets Hill at its junction with Stone Lane** Victoria Road opposite the hospital* NatWest Bank (West Borough)*</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements: * Bus shelter with "real time" information display ** Bus lay-by, bus shelter with "real time" information display *** Bus lay-by, bus shelter with "real time" information display, toilet facilities for bus driver</p> <p>Service frequency: Mon-Sat daytime (up to 19.00) 30minute frequency Mon-Sat evenings (19.00-23.00) 60minute frequency Sunday (up to 20.00) 60minute frequency</p> <p>It is suggested that the current signalised junction between St Margarets Hill and Stone Lane is modified to become a gyratory, with appropriate bus stops for Route 3M included in these works. This would enable late evening and week-end buses to terminate and turn at the Stone Lane junction.</p> <p>This bus route would also serve the proposed new development on Cuthbury Allotments with the stop in Victoria Road outside the hospital being about 400metres from the furthest point in the development site.</p> <p>Route 13 Wimborne to Bournemouth Route: This route would remain unchanged. Infrastructure requirements: All bus stops to include "real time" information</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>displays. Bus shelters to be provided wherever practicable. Service frequency: Mon-Sat daytime (up to 19.00) 30minute frequency Mon-Sat evenings (19.00-23.00) 60minute frequency Sunday (up to 20.00) 60minute frequency Route 13A Wimborne to Bournemouth via Ameysford/Ferndown Industrial Estate This would complement Route 13 but serve the Ferndown Industrial Estate Route: Between Wimborne and Canford Bottom either via Colehill (as Route 13) or via Leigh Common - Canford Bottom Roundabout - Wimborne Road West – Cobham Road – Ameysford Roundabout – Ferndown By-pass – West Moors Road – Victoria Road then as Route 13. Infrastructure requirements: All bus stops to include “real time” information displays. Bus shelters to be provided wherever practicable. Service frequency: Mon-Sat daytime (up to 19.00) 30minute frequency Route 88 Wimborne Town Circular Route: The eastern part of this route would remain unchanged. The western leg would no longer serve the QE School but would be diverted to run from King Street to Julians Road and the Cuthbury development via the proposed signalised junction immediately east of Julians Bridge. The route would terminate at the rear of the hospital. Bus stops: Outbound services: High Street south of Mill Lane (existing bus stop) King Street just beyond the Model Town (existing</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>lay-by)* On the new road into the development adjacent to Julians Road** Terminus at Wimborne hospital*** Inbound services On the new road into the development adjacent to Julians Road** Note: as far as possible bus stops should not be located in Julians Road itself because it is not feasible to provide lay-bys clear of the carriageway and buses stopping on the carriageway could have an adverse effect on traffic flows. The exception to this is the necessity for inbound buses to use the existing bus stop at the east end of Julians Road. Infrastructure requirements: * Bus shelter with "real time" information display ** Bus lay-by, bus shelter with "real time" information display *** Bus lay-by, bus shelter with "real time" information display, toilet facilities for bus driver New route Wimborne to Holt via Furzehill This new route would provide a bus service for the Council Offices in Furzehill. Route: Leigh Park – Leigh Road – Lewens Lane – Hanhams Road – Allenview Road – Lacy Drive (optional) – Burts Hill – Cranborne Road - Furzehill – EDDC Offices [Mon-Fri daytime only] – Furzehill – Holt (Church) Bus stops: To be determined, but to include bus stops in Allenview Road and the proposed bus stop on Cranborne Road for route 3C. There would be a formal bus stop within the EDDC complex and at the Church/Village hall in Holt. Other sections of the route through Furzehill could operate on the "hail and ride" principle. Infrastructure requirements: All bus stops to include "real time" information</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>displays. Bus shelters to be provided wherever practicable.</p> <p>Service frequency: Mon-Sat daytime (up to 19.00) 60minute frequency Sun (10.00-18.00) every 2 hours</p> <p>This new route would allow residents of Furzehill and Holt to have good access to both Poole and Bournemouth for both work and leisure purposes with a change of bus in Wimborne. It would also provide improved access to council services at Furzehill. The timetable should facilitate good connections in Wimborne with these other services.</p> <p>Summary These options are put forward for discussion and merely indicate one means of creating a high quality public transport network. It is reasonable to assume other options would be possible. However in my submission it is important that appropriate levels of public transport provision are identified and included as an integral part of the core strategy, and not left to be developed by market forces at a later date. See attachment</p>			
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		CSO19 325	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		<p>KS19 4.212 The West Moors By-Pass would have severely damaging consequences for biodiversity, impacting both on the Moors River and Holt Heath. It is understood that this scheme will not be progressing due to lack of funding. However in any event its impact is such that it should absolutely not be included as a preferred option in the Core Strategy under any circumstances. It is argued elsewhere that proposals which increase demand for such a by-pass i.e. development in West Moors and Verwood, should not be permitted. Equally it can be argued that in the absence of a by-pass (be</p>			330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							that for financial or biodiversity reasons) there should be no question of increasing the load on the existing through routes by further development at West Moors or Verwood. 4.211 As a resident of East Dorset I have confined my site specific comments to those within the District. However having witnessed the first conception of the Christchurch Bypass many years ago, I cannot help but insert the observation that such a scheme, certainly in its outer form, would be the most damaging scheme any person could possibly aspire to design - being from its start to finish almost entirely located on internationally important sites. It is staggering that such a scheme should still be finding its way onto the pages of any modern planning document.			
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		CSO19 184	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		A bypass for West Moors would inevitably involve a crossing of the Moors River and several preferred options in the Core Strategy will inevitably increase long term demand for such a by-pass. These include all developments in West Moors and Verwood.			330
360749	Cllr. Mrs T. B. Coombs	Verwood Dewlands Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO19 405	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		No consideration of the major route for Verwood residents B3081 and Spur Road.			330
361003	Mr M A Hodges	Planning Executive Highcliffe Residents Association	CSO19 342	Preferred Option KS 19	Support		There was agreement by HRA members that there is a need for a Christchurch By-Pass which should also include Highcliffe. This route will probably need to run from and to locations outside the Borough and thus involve other Local Government corporations, such as New Forest (and Hampshire), Bournemouth and East Dorset. There was also agreement on the need for a high quality road to Hurn (Bournemouth) Airport			330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							from the Spur Road, to serve employment opportunities as well as air transport.			
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		CSO17 715	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		<p>The Core Strategy identifies that we place too high a reliance on personal motorised transportation and that we need to reduce our dependency on this. It suggests that this can be achieved by relying on public transport, cycling and walking. I believe this to be totally unrealistic in our highly pressurised, motivated, mobile, materialistic and ageing society.</p> <p>Travel for Employment, Education, Shopping and Leisure.</p> <p>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 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?</p> <p>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</p>			330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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 for Education Whilst all of the First and Middle School requirements can be accommodated within Wimborne and Colehill, 40% of the Upper School requirements require travel along or over the A31. (i.e. Ferndown or Corfe Hills) All of the Colleges of Further Education, or Universities, are situated in Poole, Bournemouth, or outside of area necessitating travel either along or over the A31. Most or all of these Institutions can be accessed via public, or private hire transport, but in the case of travel time to Bournemouth and Poole journey times are long and convoluted, and many require bus changes to get to appropriate destinations. Journeys are far quicker and much more convenient using personal transport. (see Seats of Learning attached 20)</p> <p>Travel for Shopping Most daily shopping requirements can be fulfilled within Wimborne and Colehill, but weekly shopping requirements vary dependent on ones loyalty to a particular Supermarket Brand. Therefore travel to Ferndown, Poole or Bournemouth by accessing or crossing the A31 is highly likely. It should also be recognised that many residents have their groceries delivered from Poole or Ferndown, where it is necessary for delivery transport to access or cross the A31. For larger purchases and greater choice of items such as Branded Clothing, Furniture, Electrical</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Goods, Computers, Mobile Phones, DIY requirements etc., people generally shop in the larger Retail Centres in Poole and Bournemouth, and perhaps as wide afield as Southampton, all of which requires access to or crossing of the A31.</p> <p>Wimborne and Colehill only have one garden Centre, others being located at Stapehill, Longham and Merley, they also require access to, or crossing of, the A31</p> <p>Travel for Hospital</p> <p>Minor health ailments can be addressed and treated locally in Wimborne, but more serious cases are dealt with in Bournemouth, Poole or Southampton Hospitals. Again these require access to, or over, the A31, by both patients and visitors alike.</p> <p>Travel for Leisure</p> <p>Most sedentary leisure pursuits can be accomplished in Wimborne or Colehill, but more active past times such as Sailing, Camping, Bathing, Surfing, Canoeing, Safe Cycling, Concerts, Shows, Exhibitions, Rambling, Holidays, Motor Sports, Tourist Attractions etc., are out of area and require travel either East, West or South and most engage the A31 in one way or another.</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 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,</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>materialistic and ageing society. (see Theoretical Human Life Cycle Transportation Requirements attached19) We must solve the problem and not skirt round it.</p> <p>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>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<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? 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; 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 frustration, high energy consumption and more importantly high pollution to our area.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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 solution⁸ 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> <p>How else could the necessary road improvements be funded?</p> <p>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>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							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			
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO17799	Preferred Option KS 19	Support		<p>PPS1 paragraph 23 (vii): Sustainable economic development: 'The aim should be to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of a decent home, in locations that reduce the need to travel;'</p> <p>PPG13: Transport, has recently been update. It refers to our quality of life being dependant on good transport links but goes on to say. 'But the way we travel and the continued growth in road traffic is damaging our towns, harming our countryside and contributing to global warming.'</p> <p>All the messages on sustainable development is that work and all services are close to any new development, hence your first paragraph.</p> <p>'Encouraging low carbon travel and reducing the need to travel.' If all the housing options were taken forward there would be an estimated 9,000 additional cars on the road as well as the additional services/deliveries etc. associated with development.</p> <p>The first objective of any transport policy should be to prevent any increase in vehicles on the road. The May 2010 briefing note for the SEDTS: one of the strategic aims was to reduce carbon emissions from transport sources. Yet there are options for development in Verwood, surely the most unsustainable location as anyone living there would have to travel some distance to sources of employment. Corfe Mullen is little better.</p> <p>Prime Transport Corridors, these will be vital to keep existing traffic flowing. We are pleased to note that a bridge will provide a safe route over</p>			330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the new Canford Bottom roundabout. We assume this is for cyclists and disabled scooters as well as pedestrians. This does cause us some concern though, as these modifications to the roundabout will benefit through traffic rather than council tax paying locals.</p> <p>We also hear that public transport will be introduced to serve some of the industrial estates, but if the industrial units have vast acres of parking spaces it will be easier and cheaper for people to drive their own cars. The new building in Brook Road, and the one on the corner of Wimborne Rd West and Cobham Road are examples of this extravagant use of land. If you are paying more than lip service for the need to reduce carbon emissions, then next to the all-important need for affordable housing, you have to provide direct, safe, well lit, all weather cycle and foot paths. They will, hopefully take some of the school run vehicles off the road as well as reducing the number of workers in private vehicles. Once these are in place, together with public transport serving industrial sites, then you can make it more difficult for people to use private transport.</p> <p>The overall conclusions of the Consultant's Report of the SEDTS (Oct 2010) is that: 'investment in initiatives to encourage greener travel plus walking and cycling were widely supported.' So too was improved public transport.</p> <p>Have you ever considered the policy of producing leaflets and advertising to illustrate to households exactly how much money they could save by car sharing within families rather than running two or more cars? In rural areas this would not be practical, but in areas close to service centres, with improved and more direct cycle and pedestrian routes, running more than one car may no longer be necessary.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
521399	Mrs Margaret Holden		CSO17 814	Preferred Option KS 19		General Comment	<p>You have asked for the public's views on transport in this borough, after living in London the transport policy is rather pathetic, feels like we are living in the wilds of Scotland cannot access places easily from West Moors. I would like to see more frequent and reliable buses and bus shelters with seats if I have to wait as recently one and a half hours for a bus to arrive amid all the excuses for the ones that did not arrive.</p> <p>Re-instate a rail line so that residents of West Moors and Verwood can actually get to places. Later buses, from Poole and Bournemouth, if I want to go to the theatre in these places how do I get back to West Moors?</p> <p>If you want us to give up our cars, at least put the relevant bus numbers on bus stops so that we know if our required number stops there. Coming back from Turbury Park to West Moors not one bus stop had the number 37 on it and no one seemed to know if they stopped at any of the four stops I walked to see where I could catch the bus, gave up in the end especially as it was well past the arrival time and called for husband to collect me!!! waste of time and petrol.</p>			330
521457	Mr and Mrs M Daymond		CSO17 830	Preferred Option KS 19	Object		<p>More homes mean more traffic – most homes have at least 2 cars as both partners work. With so many different directions and long distances in which to travel for work, public transport cannot adequately support residents. Besides a car is too convenient and other errands such as collecting children from school and shopping are accomplished en route. 400 homes could equal 800 more cars – you will not succeed with making people think “public transport” in Verwood, as existing amenities are too scattered.</p>			330
523531	Mr	Savills	CSO18	Preferred	Object		.	The timescale for		330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Tim Hoskinson		431	Option KS 19			The identification of a Prime Transport Corridor from Poole to Corfe Mullen in Option KS 19 is supported; however the timescale for improvements should be brought forward to within the first five years of the plan period.	improvements to the Poole to Corfe Mullen Prime Transport Corridor should be brought forward to within the first five years of the plan period		
519114	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	CSO18 835	Preferred Option KS 19	Support		I support the identification of the A348 as a prime transport corridor. Consideration needs to be given to alterations to the mini-roundabouts at Longham which currently cause substantial congestion because of the conflict between north/south and east/west vehicle movements at these two mini-roundabouts.			330
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO18 995	Preferred Option KS 19		General Comment	Preferred Option KS 19 Encouraging low carbon travel and reducing the need to travel The measures contained in this policy to encourage low carbon travel and reduce the need to travel by car are supported. References to the construction of a Christchurch and West Moors bypass are not supported as neither scheme is affordable or deliverable and they do not fit with the ethos of this policy. SEDMMTS has not recommended either scheme as part of the future transport strategy for SE Dorset so they will not be included within LTP3 and will therefore not be progressed by Dorset County Council as highway authority within the period to 2026. Alternative transport improvements are being pursued instead as outlined above. The District and Borough Councils need to carefully consider inclusion of these schemes within future transport policies in the Core Strategy. Perhaps long held council aspirations could be placed within supporting text rather than within policies. Delivery of the spatial strategy should not be predicated on transport schemes which are not going to materialise			330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							within the plan period. There is a risk that by including undeliverable road schemes within Core Strategy policies, the plan could be found unsound against PPS12 tests of soundness at examination.			
536628	Mr C.A Wills		CSO21 690	Preferred Option KS 19		General Comment	. Provide more affordable transport across area.			330
361342	Mr Graham Clarke	Spatial Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO22 833	Preferred Option KS 19	Support		The transportation proposals in the consultation document are broadly in accordance with County Council policies. The implementation of key transport improvements will be crucial to the delivery of the development proposals in the document particularly the bringing forward for development of employment land at Bournemouth Airport, which forms a major element of the employment strategy for the sub-region. The continuing work on the Core Strategy will need to take account of the findings of the South East Dorset Multi-modal Transportation Study. In terms of delivery, the role of developer contributions and tariffs is a matter which will need to be addressed to reflect the latest Government policy on the issue . A tariff-based system using the CIL will be a critical delivery mechanism for transport infrastructure, for which the County Council has a key responsibility.			330
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		CSO22 902	Preferred Option KS 19		General Comment	Transport issues: public transport needs to be addressed - there are TOO MANY CARS ON THE ROAD. People need to realise the damage caused by heavy use of road transport not only to the environment but to the general health of the population. Drastic guidelines and law passed needs to be done to reduce transport (one car per household!). Walking into			330

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							wimborne, as I do (I do not own a car), is as bad as being a passive smoker, being forced to consume carcinogenic toxins. The building work proposed will exacerbate this problem. We are already overpopulated on this area. I realise some of these proposals will have to take place, but it is too much (in the case of Wimborne, my main concern) as the infrastructure will not support such a drastic building plan. Historically we are a market town which should be maintained as our local heritage.			
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO373	Alternative Preferred Option KS 20		General Comment	I neither support or object but observe that this may have to be an option owing to financial and environmental constraints			333
499532	Bournemouth Borough Council	Bournemouth Borough Council	CSO3819	Alternative Preferred Option KS 20	Object		Object to the inclusion of reference to land within Bournemouth in the definition of the Prime Transport Corridor along the route 'A348 Bear Cross roundabout to Longham mini roundabouts and Ferndown'. The Bournemouth Core Strategy is not promoting that section of the A348 between Bear Cross roundabout and the borough boundary at the River Stour as a PTC.	Amend the description of this PTC by deleting the stretch of road in Bournemouth Borough.		333
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17467	Alternative Preferred Option KS 20	Object		Preferred Option KS 19/Alternative Preferred Option KS 20 DWT objects to the inclusion of the Christchurch and West Moors bypasses. The DWT has objected to previous proposals for these roads as the options put forward had considerable impacts on sites of international, national and local biodiversity importance. We do not consider that inclusion of these sites would meet national rules, regulations and advice and strongly recommend removal from the draft Core Strategy.			333

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18664	Alternative Preferred Option KS 20	Object		The preferred alignments for a Christchurch by pass and a West Moors by pass significantly impacted on the Dorset Heathlands European sites, Ramsar site and some SSSIs and also some SNClS. Therefore we do not agree with inclusion of the councils aspirations for these bypasses in the options and also with the assessments as conforming to national and local rules, regulations and advice. These bypasses should not be retained as part of any option taken forward into the Draft Submission Core Strategy.			333
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18661	Alternative Preferred Option KS 20	Object		Given the uncertainty over the nature of proposal, including the suggestion of a Christchurch bypass, we object to options KS19, KS20 and KS21, pending resolution of outstanding issues identified in the HRA in relation to the European sites.			333
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18129	Alternative Preferred Option KS 20	Support		ETAG supports the over-riding principle in these options of encouraging low carbon travel. Though commendable, it is difficult to envisage how the Core Strategy will facilitate car sharing schemes to make development sustainable: the mechanisms for achieving this should be clarified. With funding for the West Moors Bypass no longer available, the prime Transport Corridor from Ferndown, through West Moors and Three Legged Cross to Verwood cannot be implemented. It is, in any event, an unacceptable scheme because of biodiversity impacts. Lack of funds will delay adequate improvement of other transport corridors so further assessment of the priority routes should be considered together with what this means in terms of location of new housing and employment opportunities. Increased frequency, reliability and Real Time information will be essential to ensure greater			333

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							use of public transport. With the exception of Wimborne, LTP3 is not proposing any improvements to bus services north of the A31. We strongly support the use of Travel Plans. If housing development proceeds in Wimborne, it is essential that it does not create bottlenecks and rat runs: transport mechanisms (including those for construction traffic) must be planned and put in place before building starts. There should be no incursion into strictly rural networks.			
475541	Mr Phil Spencer		CSO17945	Alternative Preferred Option KS 20		General Comment	<p>Public transport Wimborne and Colehill</p> <p>The Options Report emphasises the need for more “affordable housing” (see paragraph 8.20) with the expectation that these will form 40% to 50% of the total new homes built. I assume that a larger proportion of occupants of these affordable homes will not have access to a car when compared with Wimborne as a whole, and therefore public transport will be of greater importance. Unsurprisingly the larger sites under consideration are furthest from, and north or east of, the town centre with its facilities and bus routes. In Appendix B to this submission I have therefore put forward detailed proposals for providing bus routes to serve the new communities.</p> <p>There are many references in the “Core Strategy Options for Consideration” report on the desirability of seeking a modal shift away from the car to more sustainable forms of transport. Some of the more significant references are indicated in the following table.</p> <p>Paragraph Nr Reference</p> <p>2.91 (last bullet point) Need to encourage people to use alternative modes of transport to the car.</p> <p>3.4 (7th bullet point) Reduce the need to travel, and encourage more sustainable patterns of transport development.</p>			333

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>3.13 (6th bullet point) The transport network in the area is increasingly congested, and there is a need to provide better and more sustainable travel choice for residents and visitors.</p> <p>3.29 These will be attractive new areas, including high quality sustainable homes, areas of open space, new community facilities, and improved transport links to the surrounding area.</p> <p>3.55 Significant transport improvements are proposed at Canford Bottom Roundabout A31 (T) Merley to Ameysford dualling, and B3073/A338 airport transport improvements. The overall aim will be to reduce congestion in key locations by reducing the need to travel and encouraging public transport use, walking and cycling as alternatives to the car.</p> <p>4.75 (2nd bullet point) Improve public transport links to deprived areas and reducing isolation in rural areas</p> <p>(last bullet point) Provide integrated/cycle paths, especially in the town centres and to schools</p> <p>16.5 (4th bullet point) The integration of transport and spatial planning is central to the development and delivery of effective local development frameworks. Development must be located in sustainable, accessible locations (PPG12)</p> <p>(5th bullet point) By shaping the pattern of development, location, scale, density, design and mix of land uses planning can help reduce the need to travel, reduce the length of journeys and make it safer and easier for people to access jobs by public transport, walking and cycling (PPG13)</p> <p>(6th bullet point) All development should be highly accessible by public transport, walking and cycling</p> <p>KS19 Improvements will be made to public transport with more frequent services within the urban areas in particular and an expansion of the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Real Time Information at bus stops.</p> <p>Despite these aspirations I believe that the Options Report is deficient in not identifying any strategy showing how this objective could be implemented.</p> <p>Research carried out in London indicates that there is a greater usage of public transport if the following criteria are met -</p> <p>Every route has a "clock face" timetable (i.e. operating at the same minutes past the hour)λ</p> <p>A frequent service: it has been shown that with a minimum of 4 services per hour passengers are willing to turn up and wait,λ whereas at a lower frequency it is important to provide easy to use timetables and passengers will plan their journey</p> <p>A bus route within 800metres, and preferably 400metres, of people's homes.λ</p> <p>I believe it is only by providing an attractive level of service and positively promoting bus routes and public transport that the level of development proposed for Wimborne would be sustainable. In my view it is essential that this "once in a lifetime" opportunity is taken to permanently achieve a modal shift away from the private car and onto public transport. I suggest that the developers should be required to provide the necessary infrastructure for these new and upgraded routes – e.g. bus shelters incorporating "real time" bus information, facilities at the terminating points for buses to turn and have a lay-over period together with toilet facilities for the bus drivers. Additionally funding should be secured, to the extent that it is possible, through Section 106 Agreements to subsidise these routes and ensure their retention rather than rely on market forces.</p> <p>I therefore suggest the following strategy of new and extended bus routes for the Wimborne area to meet these aspirations.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Route 3C Wimborne (Cranborne Road) to Poole via Corfe Mullen This would be an extension of the existing Poole-Wimborne via Corfe Mullen service. Route: This service would no longer use The Square. From West Street buses would turn into West Borough and run to a new terminus within the proposed development either side of Cranborne Road. (For the purpose of the description given below it is assumed that this will be at the new first school at the north-west of the development area). It is believed that this proposal is compatible with the proposed redevelopment of The Square.</p> <p>Bus stops: Northbound services: NatWest Bank (West Borough)* Blind Lane* Wimborne Road opposite Shakespeare Road** Cranborne Road at access point into the new development** Terminus at proposed school*** Southbound services: Cranborne Road at access point for new developments** Wimborne Road just south of Shakespeare Road** West Borough opposite School Lane* High Street south of Mill Lane (existing bus stop)</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements: * Bus shelter with "real time" information display ** Bus lay-by, bus shelter with "real time" information display *** Bus lay-by, bus shelter with "real time" information display, toilet facilities for bus driver</p> <p>Service frequency: Mon-Sat daytime (up to 19.00) 30minute frequency Mon-Sat evenings (19.00-23.00) 60minute</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>frequency Sunday (up to 20.00) 60minute frequency Route 3M Wimborne (QE School/Leisure Centre) to Poole via Merley This would be an extension of the existing Poole-Wimborne via Merley service. Route: This service would no longer use The Square. From East Borough buses would turn into the High Street, run via King Street and Victoria Road and terminate at the Queen Elizabeth School/Leisure Centre. It is believed that this proposal is compatible with the proposed redevelopment of The Square. Buses towards Poole would use the proposed new bus stop in West Borough (NatWest Bank) and thence the existing route. It would be necessary to confirm that the buses can negotiate the junction from Victoria Road into West Street at "The Pudding and Pye", although this is not thought to be an insuperable problem. Bus stops: Northbound services: High Street south of Mill Lane (existing bus stop) King Street just beyond the Model Town (existing lay-by)* Victoria Road outside the hospital* St Margarets Hill at its junction with Stone Lane** Terminus at Queen Elizabeth School/Leisure Centre*** Southbound services: St Margarets Hill at its junction with Stone Lane** Victoria Road opposite the hospital* NatWest Bank (West Borough)* Infrastructure requirements: * Bus shelter with "real time" information display ** Bus lay-by, bus shelter with "real time" information display *** Bus lay-by, bus shelter with "real time" information display, toilet facilities for bus driver</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Service frequency: Mon-Sat daytime (up to 19.00) 30minute frequency Mon-Sat evenings (19.00-23.00) 60minute frequency Sunday (up to 20.00) 60minute frequency It is suggested that the current signalised junction between St Margarets Hill and Stone Lane is modified to become a gyratory, with appropriate bus stops for Route 3M included in these works. This would enable late evening and week-end buses to terminate and turn at the Stone Lane junction. This bus route would also serve the proposed new development on Cuthbury Allotments with the stop in Victoria Road outside the hospital being about 400metres from the furthest point in the development site. Route 13 Wimborne to Bournemouth Route: This route would remain unchanged. Infrastructure requirements: All bus stops to include "real time" information displays. Bus shelters to be provided wherever practicable. Service frequency: Mon-Sat daytime (up to 19.00) 30minute frequency Mon-Sat evenings (19.00-23.00) 60minute frequency Sunday (up to 20.00) 60minute frequency Route 13A Wimborne to Bournemouth via Ameysford/Ferndown Industrial Estate This would complement Route 13 but serve the Ferndown Industrial Estate Route: Between Wimborne and Canford Bottom either via Colehill (as Route 13) or via Leigh Common - Canford Bottom Roundabout - Wimborne Road West – Cobham Road – Ameysford Roundabout</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>– Ferndown By-pass – West Moors Road – Victoria Road then as Route 13. Infrastructure requirements: All bus stops to include “real time” information displays. Bus shelters to be provided wherever practicable. Service frequency: Mon-Sat daytime (up to 19.00) 30minute frequency Route 88 Wimborne Town Circular Route: The eastern part of this route would remain unchanged. The western leg would no longer serve the QE School but would be diverted to run from King Street to Julians Road and the Cuthbury development via the proposed signalised junction immediately east of Julians Bridge. The route would terminate at the rear of the hospital. Bus stops: Outbound services: High Street south of Mill Lane (existing bus stop) King Street just beyond the Model Town (existing lay-by)* On the new road into the development adjacent to Julians Road** Terminus at Wimborne hospital*** Inbound services On the new road into the development adjacent to Julians Road** Note: as far as possible bus stops should not be located in Julians Road itself because it is not feasible to provide lay-bys clear of the carriageway and buses stopping on the carriageway could have an adverse effect on traffic flows. The exception to this is the necessity for inbound buses to use the existing bus stop at the east end of Julians Road. Infrastructure requirements: * Bus shelter with “real time” information display</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>** Bus lay-by, bus shelter with "real time" information display *** Bus lay-by, bus shelter with "real time" information display, toilet facilities for bus driver New route Wimborne to Holt via Furzehill This new route would provide a bus service for the Council Offices in Furzehill. Route: Leigh Park – Leigh Road – Lewens Lane – Hanhams Road – Allenview Road – Lacy Drive (optional) – Burts Hill – Cranborne Road - Furzehill – EDDC Offices [Mon-Fri daytime only] – Furzehill – Holt (Church) Bus stops: To be determined, but to include bus stops in Allenview Road and the proposed bus stop on Cranborne Road for route 3C. There would be a formal bus stop within the EDDC complex and at the Church/Village hall in Holt. Other sections of the route through Furzehill could operate on the "hail and ride" principle. Infrastructure requirements: All bus stops to include "real time" information displays. Bus shelters to be provided wherever practicable. Service frequency: Mon-Sat daytime (up to 19.00) 60minute frequency Sun (10.00-18.00) every 2 hours This new route would allow residents of Furzehill and Holt to have good access to both Poole and Bournemouth for both work and leisure purposes with a change of bus in Wimborne. It would also provide improved access to council services at Furzehill. The timetable should facilitate good connections in Wimborne with these other services. Summary These options are put forward for discussion and merely indicate one means of creating a high</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							quality public transport network. It is reasonable to assume other options would be possible. However in my submission it is important that appropriate levels of public transport provision are identified and included as an integral part of the core strategy, and not left to be developed by market forces at a later date. See attachment			
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		CSO17717	Alternative Preferred Option KS 20	Object		<p>The Core Strategy identifies that we place too high a reliance on personal motorised transportation and that we need to reduce our dependency on this. It suggests that this can be achieved by relying on public transport, cycling and walking. I believe this to be totally unrealistic in our highly pressurised, motivated, mobile, materialistic and ageing society. 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 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 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?</p> <p>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,</p>			333

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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 for Education Whilst all of the First and Middle School requirements can be accommodated within Wimborne and Colehill, 40% of the Upper School requirements require travel along or over the A31. (i.e. Ferndown or Corfe Hills) All of the Colleges of Further Education, or Universities, are situated in Poole, Bournemouth, or outside of area necessitating travel either along or over the A31. Most or all of these Institutions can be accessed via public, or private hire transport, but in the case of travel time to Bournemouth and Poole journey times are long and convoluted, and many require bus changes to get to appropriate destinations. Journeys are far quicker and much more convenient using personal transport. (see Seats of Learning attached 20)</p> <p>Travel for Shopping Most daily shopping requirements can be fulfilled within Wimborne and Colehill, but weekly shopping requirements vary dependent on ones loyalty to a particular Supermarket Brand. Therefore travel to Ferndown, Poole or Bournemouth by accessing or crossing the A31 is highly likely. It should also be recognised that many residents</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>have their groceries delivered from Poole or Ferndown, where it is necessary for delivery transport to access or cross the A31.</p> <p>For larger purchases and greater choice of items such as Branded Clothing, Furniture, Electrical Goods, Computers, Mobile Phones, DIY requirements etc., people generally shop in the larger Retail Centres in Poole and Bournemouth, and perhaps as wide afield as Southampton, all of which requires access to or crossing of the A31.</p> <p>Wimborne and Colehill only have one garden Centre, others being located at Stapehill, Longham and Merley, they also require access to, or crossing of, the A31</p> <p>Travel for Hospital Minor health ailments can be addressed and treated locally in Wimborne, but more serious cases are dealt with in Bournemouth, Poole or Southampton Hospitals. Again these require access to, or over, the A31, by both patients and visitors alike.</p> <p>Travel for Leisure Most sedentary leisure pursuits can be accomplished in Wimborne or Colehill, but more active past times such as Sailing, Camping, Bathing, Surfing, Canoeing, Safe Cycling, Concerts, Shows, Exhibitions, Rambling, Holidays, Motor Sports, Tourist Attractions etc., are out of area and require travel either East, West or South and most engage the A31 in one way or another.</p> <p>Travel Issues 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</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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.</p> <p>Wimborne's problem will not be resolved by a £6 million sticky plaster solution⁸ 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> <p>How else could the necessary road improvements be funded?</p> <p>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</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							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. 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			
521457	Mr and Mrs M Daymond		CSO17831	Alternative Preferred Option KS 20	Object		More homes mean more traffic – most homes have at least 2 cars as both partners work. With so many different directions and long distances in which to travel for work, public transport cannot adequately support residents. Besides a car is too convenient and other errands such as collecting children from school and shopping are accomplished en route. 400 homes could equal 800 more cars – you will not succeed with making people think “public transport” in Verwood, as existing amenities are too scattered.			333
361342	Mr Graham Clarke	Spatial Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO22834	Alternative Preferred Option KS 20	Support		The transportation proposals in the consultation document are broadly in accordance with County Council policies. The implementation of key transport improvements will be crucial to the delivery of the development proposals in the document particularly the bringing forward for development of employment land at Bournemouth Airport, which forms a major element of the employment strategy for the sub-region. The continuing work on the Core Strategy will need to take account of the findings of the South East Dorset Multi-modal Transportation Study. In terms of delivery, the role of developer			333

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							contributions and tariffs is a matter which will need to be addressed to reflect the latest Government policy on the issue . A tariff-based system using the CIL will be a critical delivery mechanism for transport infrastructure, for which the County Council has a key responsibility.			
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		CSO22903	Alternative Preferred Option KS 20		General Comment	Transport issues: public transport needs to be addressed - there are TOO MANY CARS ON THE ROAD. People need to realise the damage caused by heavy use of road transport not only to the environment but to the general health of the population. Drastic guidelines and law passed needs to be done to reduce transport (one car per household!). Walking into Wimborne, as I do (I do not own a car), is as bad as being a passive smoker, being forced to consume carcinogenic toxins. The building work proposed will exacerbate this problem. We are already overpopulated on this area. I realise some of these proposals will have to take place, but it is too much (in the case of Wimborne, my main concern) as the infrastructure will not support such a drastic building plan. Historically we are a market town which should be maintained as our local heritage.			333
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSO375	Preferred Option KS 21		General Comment	I neither support or object but would reiterate my major concerns about any development taking place around Ferndown and Wimborne due to capacity problems on the A31 trunk road and no likelihood of this problem being resolved in the near future. East Dorset District Council admit in this Preferred Option KS21 that (and I quote) : "A31(T) dualling across the conurbation (Merley to Ameysford) which IS REQUIRED TO ACCOMMODATE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT".			337
359945	Mr		CSO93	Preferred	Object		I do not believe that it is possible to make	The following		337

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Geoff Bantock		0	Option KS 21			significant improvements to the A35 given the layout of the road particularly if the housing development at Roeshot is not carried out. By developing Burton to the east for both housing and employment and improving access along Avon Causeway to Bournemouth Airport, I suggest less traffic will use the A35. If this also combined better public transport in Burton to Christchurch and Bournemouth and more retail space, Burton will become a much more vibrant community where there is less need to have a car.	improvements are required to accommodate the proposed Christchurch Urban Extension and general housing growth in the Borough to 2027: * A35 Staple Cross (Salisbury Road) Access Improvements (needed for extra housing and employment development in Burton which will replace the housing development at Roeshot)		
490527	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	Corfe Mullen Parish Council	CSO961	Preferred Option KS 21	Object		This will achieve little to cope either with current or future traffic levels and will be of no benefit to Corfe Mullen and could exacerbate current problems. The A31 should be duelled along its entire length.			337
360653	Mr M A Hodges		CSO2385	Preferred Option KS 21	Object		Does not mention Highcliffe or a Bypass			337
496919	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Parish Clerk Hurn Parish Council	CSO1920	Preferred Option KS 21	Object		We have made specific objections and comments regarding proposed "B3073 improvements Parley Cross to Cooper Dean" under Preferred Options BA6 – BA11	This option should be removed from the Strategy and each improvement to connectivity looked at individually.		337
498027	Mr Mark Keighley	Business Development Manager Bournemouth Transport Ltd	CSO3301	Preferred Option KS 21	Support					337
499532	Bournemouth Borough Council	Bournemouth Borough Council	CSO3821	Preferred Option KS 21	Object		Object to the lack of reference to cycle and walking linkages from Bournemouth to the airport via Throop and Hurn. This route has been			337

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							planned for some time and should be recognised in the policies. It is acknowledged Preferred Option BA6 makes provision for an 'off carriageway cycle lane adjacent to the A338 providing access to Bournemouth' however this should not be as an alternative to the Throop/Hurn route, rather it should be in addition to it.			
502050	Mr Alan Symons		CSO6502	Preferred Option KS 21		General Comment	<p>The overall subject of all development on the A31 is of concern. I can only anticipate increased traffic flow on an absurdly over-used stretch of road. This will result in the PREDICTABLE 'cheap' options of speed restrictions, roundabouts. electronic signage rather than a strategic review of the entire road to WEYMOUTH.</p> <p>The section of the A31 between Poulner Hill and Weymouth continues to be sub-standard width or no re-aligning (stet) on the horizon.</p> <p>Whilst I am fully aware of the current economic situation, it is disappointing that even during the 'good' times, no previous consideration was given to major improvement. This is a major holiday route and we all know that at peak times, motoring enjoyment ceases at the Ferndown Industrial Estate where the carriageway reduces to a single lane. Beyond, there is little or no opportunity to overtake due to the 'cheap' option of long stretches of 'hatches' done, of course, for safety reasons.</p> <p>I can only dream of dual carriageway ALL the way down to Dorchester/Weymouth - some chance of that happening!</p>			337
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	Clerk West Parley Parish Council	CSO17953	Preferred Option KS 21	Support		Parish Council supports policy Improvements to Connectivity, in particular improvements to Canford Bottom Roundabout and B3073 Parley Lane.			337

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 662	Preferred Option KS 21	Object		Given the uncertainty over the nature of proposal, including the suggestion of a Christchurch bypass, we object to options KS19, KS20 and KS21, pending resolution of outstanding issues identified in the HRA in relation to the European sites.			337
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Chairperson Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSO18 130	Preferred Option KS 21	Support		ETAG supports the over-riding principle in these options of encouraging low carbon travel. Though commendable, it is difficult to envisage how the Core Strategy will facilitate car sharing schemes to make development sustainable: the mechanisms for achieving this should be clarified. With funding for the West Moors Bypass no longer available, the prime Transport Corridor from Ferndown, through West Moors and Three Legged Cross to Verwood cannot be implemented. It is, in any event, an unacceptable scheme because of biodiversity impacts. Lack of funds will delay adequate improvement of other transport corridors so further assessment of the priority routes should be considered together with what this means in terms of location of new housing and employment opportunities. Increased frequency, reliability and Real Time information will be essential to ensure greater use of public transport. With the exception of Wimborne, LTP3 is not proposing any improvements to bus services north of the A31. We strongly support the use of Travel Plans. If housing development proceeds in Wimborne, it is essential that it does not create bottlenecks and rat runs: transport mechanisms (including those for construction traffic) must be planned and put in place before building starts. There should be no incursion into strictly rural networks.			337
360379	Mr	Planning	CSO18	Preferred	Object		The requirements are not solely attributable to	The following		337

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Andrew Murray	Advisor Manchester Airport	511	Option KS 21			development at the airport. This is recognised in the SE Dorset Transport Strategy. The improvements will, however, help to facilitate the development.	improvements will help to facilitate development at the Airport Business Park, potential developments at West Parley and Ferndown as well as serving wider economic and community needs.		
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 649	Preferred Option KS 21	Support		Preferred Option KS21 identifies improvements to Canford Bottom junction as a short term (2010/11) measure designed to alleviate congestion, while A31 dualling between Merley and Ameysford is identified as a medium to long term (2014 to post 2019) improvement required to accommodate future development. The Agency supports the recognition of these proposals affecting the SRN, provided that their delivery status is clarified, particularly in relation to funding. Revised information is likely to be needed for Canford Bottom by the time the Autumn 2011 consultation commences.			337
521118	Mr Alan Spencer		CSO17 719	Preferred Option KS 21	Object		The Core Strategy identifies that we place too high a reliance on personal motorised transportation and that we need to reduce our dependency on this. It suggests that this can be achieved by relying on public transport, cycling and walking. I believe this to be totally unrealistic in our highly pressurised, motivated, mobile, materialistic and ageing society. 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			337

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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 for Education Whilst all of the First and Middle School requirements can be accommodated within Wimborne and Colehill, 40% of the Upper School requirements require travel along or over the A31. (i.e. Ferndown or Corfe Hills) All of the Colleges of Further Education, or Universities, are situated in Poole, Bournemouth, or outside of area necessitating travel either along or over the A31. Most or all of these Institutions can be accessed via public, or private hire transport, but in the case of travel time to Bournemouth and Poole</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>journey times are long and convoluted, and many require bus changes to get to appropriate destinations. Journeys are far quicker and much more convenient using personal transport. (see Seats of Learning attached 20)</p> <p>Travel for Shopping</p> <p>Most daily shopping requirements can be fulfilled within Wimborne and Colehill, but weekly shopping requirements vary dependent on ones loyalty to a particular Supermarket Brand. Therefore travel to Ferndown, Poole or Bournemouth by accessing or crossing the A31 is highly likely.</p> <p>It should also be recognised that many residents have their groceries delivered from Poole or Ferndown, where it is necessary for delivery transport to access or cross the A31.</p> <p>For larger purchases and greater choice of items such as Branded Clothing, Furniture, Electrical Goods, Computers, Mobile Phones, DIY requirements etc., people generally shop in the larger Retail Centres in Poole and Bournemouth, and perhaps as wide afield as Southampton, all of which requires access to or crossing of the A31.</p> <p>Wimborne and Colehill only have one garden Centre, others being located at Stapehill, Longham and Merley, they also require access to, or crossing of, the A31</p> <p>Travel for Hospital</p> <p>Minor health ailments can be addressed and treated locally in Wimborne, but more serious cases are dealt with in Bournemouth, Poole or Southampton Hospitals. Again these require access to, or over, the A31, by both patients and visitors alike.</p> <p>Travel for Leisure</p> <p>Most sedentary leisure pursuits can be accomplished in Wimborne or Colehill, but more active past times such as Sailing, Camping,</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Bathing, Surfing, Canoeing, Safe Cycling, Concerts, Shows, Exhibitions, Rambling, Holidays, Motor Sports, Tourist Attractions etc., are out of area and require travel either East, West or South and most engage the A31 in one way or another.</p> <p>Travel Issues 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 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.</p> <p>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</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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.</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 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 solution⁸ applied to the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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> <p>How else could the necessary road improvements be funded?</p> <p>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>			
521457	Mr and Mrs M Daymond		CSO17 832	Preferred Option KS 21	Object		<p>More homes mean more traffic – most homes have at least 2 cars as both partners work. With so many different directions and long distances in which to travel for work, public transport cannot adequately support residents. Besides a car is too convenient and other errands such as collecting children from school and shopping are accomplished en route. 400 homes could equal 800 more cars – you will not succeed with making people think "public transport" in Verwood, as existing amenities are too scattered.</p>			337

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
524495	Mr Stanley Jackson		CSO18 603	Preferred Option KS 21	Support		I see no likelihood of the drop in percentage of the residents enjoying car ownership. Upgrading some of the main arteries given available finance is essential. In fact I think that any significant development should only go ahead if it is carried out in conjunction with corresponding improvements to roads and other infrastructures. As a first step consideration should be given to making the A31 a dual carriageway from Canford Bottom to the Merley roundabout and ideally doing the same from Ameysford with a flyover at Canford Bottom. The strategy could be planned in conjunction with the minerals extraction suggested for the land between the A31 and Canford School. After extraction the dual carriageway and proposed country park could be explored. I understand that the idea of creating an olympic size rowing course on this site is not feasible.			337
524723	Mr John Worth	Chair Wimborne Civic Society	CSO18 727	Preferred Option KS 21	Support		We see no likelihood of the drop in the percentage of the residents enjoying car-ownership. Upgrading some of the main arteries is essential. In fact we consider that any significant development should only go ahead if it is carried out in conjunction with corresponding improvements to roads and other infrastructure. As a first step, consideration should be given to making the A31 a dual carriageway from Canford Bottom to the Merley Roundabout, and ideally doing the same from Ameysford with a flyover at Canford Bottom. The strategy could be planned in conjunction with the minerals extraction suggested for the land between the A31 and Canford School, which proposal we supported in our response to the Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole Minerals Site Allocations Discussion Paper in December 2008. After extraction, the dual carriageway and proposed country park could be explored. Further we would like to see a			337

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							new link road between the A31 and Poole, as agreed by us in our submission on the SE Dorset Transport Study in July 2010.			
527733	Mr Richard Barnes	Chair Bournemouth Airport Transport Forum	CSO18 882	Preferred Option KS 21	Support		Junction improvements needed in the vicinity of the airport. The response made previously about junctions and incorporating measures to benefit public transport, cycling and walking needs to be mentioned here as well.			337
359288	Mr Steve Molnar	Terence O'Rourke	CSO18 947	Preferred Option KS 21	Support		Banner Homes supports the proposed B3073 improvements from Parley Cross to A338 Cooper Dean. The development of housing on land under Banner's control at West Parley in the form identified in the submitted concept sketch master plan could contribute funding towards the improvement of the Parley Cross junction (if required), in conjunction with contributions from other potential residential development in the area, the airport, and available public funds. In addition there is potential for the development to include a link between New Road and Christchurch Road through the site, which would provide traffic relief of approximately 15% in the peak periods (13.8% reduction in the morning peak and 17.6% reduction in the evening peak) based on 2020 predictions. This is a significant reduction which has a bearing on the implementation of the Prime Transport Corridor and the opportunity to improve links with the airport. A drawing is submitted with these representations which shows how the existing junction of Lingfield Drive and New Road might be improved to provide this link.			337
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County	CSO18 998	Preferred Option KS 21		General Comment	Preferred Option KS 21 Improvements to connectivity This option is supported however there is current uncertainty over when the medium and longer			337

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Council					<p>term schemes will be delivered due to a lack of public funding, the timing of development and therefore the availability of developer contributions. It is hoped that the picture will become clearer by the end of March 2011 as an Implementation Plan derived from SEDMMTS will form part of LTP3. A current issue is that the SED Transport Strategy short, medium and long term definitions differ from the RSS timescales which were used in the Core Strategy. Work is on-going to design junction improvements along the A35 through Christchurch as part of the A35 Route Management Strategy (RMS). It is perhaps premature to state that all the junctions listed along the A35 are specifically required to accommodate development as this work has not finished yet. It may be more accurate to say that they are 'likely' to be required at the current time. The HA has stated that it will be relying heavily on developer contributions to deliver a major improvement of the A31 and that without government funding it is unlikely to be delivered by 2020.</p> <p>The B3073 improvements are also subject to further study as part of future development proposals at West Parley, the airport and business parks. The timescale for delivery of improvements is yet to be determined but will be outlined in LTP3.</p>			
360029	Mr David Lanigan		CSO22 906	Preferred Option KS 21	Support		<p>We also need better bus services, to coax us out of our cars and Park & Ride schemes for Bournemouth & Christchurch, similar to those in Salisbury, which has five with a capacity of more than two thousand cars. We need also to plan to provide more mains water, sewerage, electricity and gas as well as waste disposal possibly involving an incinerator in the local area generation electricity.</p>			337

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Some road junctions are already congested and with increased population bringing with it increased road traffic, this problem will need to be addressed or some busy roads will become grid locked. In the short term the Sailing Olympics in 2012, will generate extra traffic along the A31 and the roads around Weymouth. Some temporary measures will be necessary to give priority to this Olympic Games traffic. Long term, improvements will be necessary, however, at currently busy junctions. For instance I have experienced considerable delays approaching the Canford Bottom Roundabout on the edge of Wimborne, and approaching the cross roads in the centre of West Parley.</p> <p>In outline I would propose for the Canford Bottom Roundabout, that the through traffic on the A31 is carried above the roundabout on a dual carriageway. Locally we have an example at Ringwood Where the A31 is elevated over a roundabout used by local traffic. At the West Parley Cross roads the provision of slip roads enabling a left filter not controlled by traffic lights would ease congestion. There is an example of pedestrian underpasses in West Moors where the A31 has a junction with the A348 at the Palmersford Roundabout.</p>			
361342	Mr Graham Clarke	Spatial Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO22 835	Preferred Option KS 21	Support		<p>The transportation proposals in the consultation document are broadly in accordance with County Council policies. The implementation of key transport improvements will be crucial to the delivery of the development proposals in the document particularly the bringing forward for development of employment land at Bournemouth Airport, which forms a major element of the employment strategy for the sub-region. The continuing work on the Core Strategy will need to take account of the findings of the South East Dorset Multi-modal</p>			337

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Transportation Study. In terms of delivery, the role of developer contributions and tariffs is a matter which will need to be addressed to reflect the latest Government policy on the issue. A tariff-based system using the CIL will be a critical delivery mechanism for transport infrastructure, for which the County Council has a key responsibility.</p>			