

Core Strategy Pre-Submission – Chapter 12 Strategic Allocations in the East Dorset Rural Areas

| Contact Person ID | Contact Full Name | Contact Company / Organisation | ID | Number | Question 1 - Legally compliant | Question 2 - Sound | Question 3 - Positively Prepared | Question 3 - Justified | Question 3 - Effective | Question 3 - Consistent with national policy | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 | Question 7 | Order | Filename |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|------------------------|-------|---------------------------------|
| 360692 | Mrs Wendy Britton | | CSPS681 | 12 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | <p>This objection relates to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy (PSCS) and the 'soundness' of the policies regarding the potential development of land at Arch Ground, Station Road, Sturminster Marshall as a New Neighbourhood and Area of Public Open Space with recreational and community facilities. References are made (but not exclusively) to the PSCS and the following policies:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. KS1 (settlement hierarchy) 2. KS4 (housing provision and provision of land) 3. HE4 (open space provision) 4. Chapter 4 (the broad location and scale of housing) 5. Chapter 12 (strategic allocations) 6. Chapter 14 (creating high quality and distinctive environments) 7. Chapter 15 (meeting local needs) 8. RA1 (Baillie Gate) <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>This objection is in respect of policies and the text of the PSCS which would if implemented deny the development of about 7.2 hectares (ha.) of land known as Arch Ground (as shown edged red on the map attached to the hard copy submission). The promotion of the land for development has a long planning history which is available from the files held by East Dorset District Council and the owners. However, to date planning permission has not been secured due to policy restrictions resulting from the site being within the Green Belt. The current use of the land is agricultural. It is enclosed by Station Road and by the housing opposite fronting that road. It is also enclosed by the hedge-row, trees and the industrial buildings situated on or near the adjacent boundary of the Baillie Gate industrial estate. The other two boundaries are bounded by natural high hedge-rows etc. The south-east boundary is also clearly defined by an existing access track. The land is not within the conservation area, nor is it subject to flooding. Access to the site is from Station Road. The land is in private ownership and does not provide any public amenity. Views to the distant open countryside are restricted by the boundaries as previously described. The land is flat and constrained and is visually uninspiring. The site is situated on the main road through the existing built-up area. It is close to existing local amenities, facilities and services including public service vehicle routes to nearby Wimbourne Minster (5m), Poole(7m) and Blandford(7m). It is also close to the shops, post-office, school, 3 pubs, church, pharmacy, garage, hairdresser, community hall, golf course and is immediately proximate to the site of a large industrial employment estate.</p> <p>THE PROPOSAL</p> <p>It is clear from the above information that the land meets all the requirements necessary (see Note.1) for the development of a New Neighbourhood as defined in policy KS4 and referred to in</p> | <p>The following alterations are required to be made:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generally – Amend the Pre-Submission Core Strategy to include a Strategic Policy regarding, The development of a 'New Neighbourhood' and area of Public Open Space etc. at Station Road Sturminster Marshall. This policy should be drawn for the sake of clarity in a similar form as to Policy RA1. 2. Pol.HE4 - amend table to incorporate the above. 3. Pol.KS1. - amend to incorporate 1 above. 4. Pol. KS4. - Ditto 5. Chapter 4 – Ditto 6. Chapter12 – Ditto 7. Chapter 14 – Ditto 8. Chapter 15 – Ditto | Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination | To support my proposal | 590 | 2252889_0_1.pdf |

| Contact Person ID | Contact Full Name | Contact Company / Organisation | ID | Number | Question 1 - Legally compliant | Question 2 - Sound | Question 3 - Positively Prepared | Question 3 - Justified | Question 3 - Effective | Question 3 - Consistent with national policy | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 | Question 7 | Order | Filename |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|-------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Chapter 4.21. The area proposed for residential development would require the redefinition of the Green Belt boundaries to allow the removal of about 3.7ha. from the total site area of 7.2ha. currently in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Economically viable and highly sustainable low density residential development of the site would be phased in line with demand and the need to make good, the substantial housing short-fall which has accrued over the last decade or so.</p> <p>In addition the Proposal incorporates the provision of the 3.5 ha. of retained Green Belt land as Public Open Space with recreational and community facilities, similar to that described in the 'saved policy SM2 and SM3' of the 2002 local plan.</p> <p>It is to be noted that the removal of above 3.7ha. of land from the Green Belt replicates the similar removal of 3.3he. from the Green Belt in order for the highly successful and adjacent Bailie Gate industrial estate to be expanded as set out in Policy RA1.</p> <p>It is also to be noted that as an indirect result of the expansion of the Bailie Gate industrial estate the New Neighbourhood would meet the potential need for additional housing in the Sturminster Marshall area, over and above that required to meet future household growth and the making good of the current substantial short-fall.</p> <p>The Proposal would also provide additional support and enable the growth of existing services etc. currently available in Sturminster Marshall area of East Dorset.</p> <p>Note1. 'New Neighbourhoods' are residential led schemes around settlements with good access to key services, facilities and employment. They are designed to produce high quality sustainable developments, that are able to be integrated into the local character of the area without having a detrimental impact on the surrounding countryside They will require the re-drawing of the Green Belt boundaries to accommodate them. The difficulty in meeting housing need, will provide the exceptional circumstances to enable the provision of New Neighbourhoods.</p> | | | | | |
| 654871 | Mr Martin Miller | Terence O'Rourke Ltd | CSPS894 | 12.1 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | <p>Eaglebeam Ltd is the owner of Matchams Stadium, which is a large previously developed site located within the green belt. Whilst we welcome the council's decision to save policy SL6 of the East Dorset Local Plan which deals with future development at the site associated within the site's continued use, in light of the publication of the NPPF in March 2012 and the ongoing environmental issues associated with the site's continued use for motorsport, there appears to be potential for part or all of the site to be redeveloped for an alternative land use during the plan period. Consequently, we consider that the Core Strategy should contain a policy that sets out the alternative land uses that would be appropriate at the site and the criteria that would need to be satisfied for planning permission to be granted.</p> | <p>We consider that the Core Strategy should contain a policy that sets out the alternative land uses that would be appropriate at the site and the criteria that would need to be satisfied for planning permission to be granted.</p> | <p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p> | <p>Matchams is a significant site within the plan area and its potential redevelopment will generate significant local interest, both for and against.</p> | 591 | |
| 656493 | Cllr Tony Gibb | Eastern Area DAPTC | CSPS1480 | 12.1 | | No | No | No | No | No | <p>RURAL RESPONSE TO EAST DORSET AND CHRISTCHURCH CORE STRATEGY This response is made to supplement those made by individual</p> | <p>The East Dorset and Christchurch Core Strategy needs to be</p> | | | 591 | |

| Contact Person ID | Contact Full Name | Contact Company / Organisation | ID | Number | Question 1 - Legally compliant | Question 2 - Sound | Question 3 - Positively Prepared | Question 3 - Justified | Question 3 - Effective | Question 3 - Consistent with national policy | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 | Question 7 | Order | Filename |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|----|--------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|------------|------------|-------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | <p>parishes. Some of the points made are general to all some are specific to a few. This response does not concern itself with Christchurch Borough.</p> <p>Area Covered by Response including the parishes and grouped parishes of Aderholt, Cranborne, Knowlton, Gussages, Vale of Allen, Holt, Pamphill & Shapwick, Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge, Sturminster Marshall. It does not include the conurbations along the A31 or Verwood and Three Legged Cross.</p> <p>Despite previous comments, the Core Strategy remains urban centric, focussing on the conurbations along the A31 and ignoring the largest part of the District. The size of the rural community (as covered by this response) is 25597 hectares or 72.21% of the East Dorset Area (source Dorset Data Book 2011). The rural population is 12950 or 14.74% of the East Dorset population. These communities deserve better recognition within the Core Strategy before it can be fully supported.</p> <p>The Defra Local Authority dataset post 2009 classified East Dorset with a rural population of 73.29% and a classification of R50.</p> <p>http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110215111010/http://archive.defra.gov.uk/evidence/statistics/rural/rural-definition.htm . The DEFRA maps classify the majority of East Dorset as "Less Sparse and Less Sparse Dispersed.</p> <p>A recent report by Prof Mark Shucksmith OBE, of Newcastle University who has conducted several studies for the Commission for Rural Communities (CRC) indicated that "It should be no surprise to us that powerful groups prevail in designing rural policy and planning, and that less powerful groups are generally excluded from decisions. Average house prices in rural areas exceed those in urban areas of England by around 25%, with higher prices in some villages costing nearly 11 times the average income.</p> <p>"Rural communities are often proclaimed by those who live there as inclusive and neighbourly, but it seems they often prevent the new housing which would enable poorer and middle income groups to share the rural idyll. People's housing opportunities are crushed and their life-chances diminished by the failure to build sufficient houses in rural Britain."</p> <p>All the points made in the latest CRC State of the Countryside Report 2010 are valid in East Dorset</p> <p>http://www.defra.gov.uk/crc/documents.state-of-the-countryside-report/sotc2010/ . The key points from Section 2 are replicated at Annex A. Since the CRC is not due to be abolished until Mar 2013, it recommended that they be consulted to enhance the credibility of the District Strategy.</p> <p>Estates. There is no reference in the Strategy to the fact that much of the rural area of the district is made up of private estates – Cranborne, Shaftesbury, Crichel, Kingston Lacy (NT), Edmondsham, Rushmore (part of). All have a part to play and are involved in various ways in the life and economy of East Dorset; this has to be recognised.</p> | <p>enhanced in a number of areas before it can be said to reflect the majority of the East Dorset area. It cannot be endorsed in its current state.</p> <p>Tourism - Reword to 'tourism including accommodation, hospitality trade and attractions, is a major part of the rural economy.</p> <p>Transport - Move the second sentence to the start as it is the cause of high car ownership.</p> <p>Landscape Character - Line 3 insert - 'of Outstanding Narural Beauty.'</p> <p>Water Environment - Line 3 winterbournes - remove capital letter as there are villages of the same name within the county. Line 6 - delete 'are' insert 'is' at the end of the line.</p> | | | | |

| Contact Person ID | Contact Full Name | Contact Company / Organisation | ID | Number | Question 1 - Legally compliant | Question 2 - Sound | Question 3 - Positively Prepared | Question 3 - Justified | Question 3 - Effective | Question 3 - Consistent with national policy | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 | Question 7 | Order | Filename |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|----|--------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|-------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | <p>The Core Strategy. There is a lack of a clearly defined Aim for the document. If there is to be a Vision it should lead to an Aim "To produce a Strategy For the Development of East Dorset during the period 2013 to 2028". Para 4.1 of the Key Strategy is therefore limiting in that it says that the strategy is only concerned with identifying the locations for development; it is putting the cart before the horse. The objectives should cover the key areas of the strategy: economy, housing, welfare, environment, communications. The policies should be specific within each key objective.</p> <p>Core Strategy Objectives. Either all the objectives cover the partnership area or all need to specify which parts they pertain to. (Obj 1 and 4). Too many of the objectives start to discuss particular aspects, which limit their application. An objective should be an achievable target from which the policy statements are derived.</p> <p>Whilst the majority of the rural economy is based on agriculture, there are also a wide variety of home workers who need stronger recognition in the strategy. Both need firm policies to support their continued existence; the national evidence would suggest that home working will increase dramatically during coming years as the price of travelling continues to rise and central government supports the improvements of the communications infrastructure.</p> <p>Generic policy statements are not sufficient to embrace them.</p> <p>Market Towns. The lack of any partnership working within East Dorset reduces the role of the market towns as a focus for their area. The location of the market towns in the south of the district does not help. There is confusion of terminology within the document between Rural Service Centres and Key Settlements.</p> <p>Communications – Broadband will play an essential part of the future of East Dorset. It is an essential requirement for farmers, home workers and the service sector. 100% coverage of mobile communications is required to ensure connection with the emergency services at all times and to make up for the poor broadband coverage. A firm policy to support enhanced communications across the rural community is essential.</p> <p>Highways. Rural roads must be maintained to support the local economy and tourist traffic which will only increase. The A354 is classified as a strategic route yet there is no strategy or policy to support this. The B3081 / B3078 / B3082 roads are all secondary and local distributor roads; within the rural community these roads are as important as the streets in the towns yet they are not recognised within the strategy or policies.</p> <p>Environmental Issues – surface water drainage. The chalk landscape produces particular problems with flooding in certain areas which can lead to paralysis of the economy and infrastructure with an allied impact on foul water drainages. It is essential that the District recognises their liability to work with the county council to mitigate the effects of surface water flooding which are now more common than 25 years ago.</p> <p>Population shift. The increase in elderly population can only continue as efforts are made to sustain the rural centres. These</p> | | | | | |

| Contact Person ID | Contact Full Name | Contact Company / Organisation | ID | Number | Question 1 - Legally compliant | Question 2 - Sound | Question 3 - Positively Prepared | Question 3 - Justified | Question 3 - Effective | Question 3 - Consistent with national policy | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 | Question 7 | Order | Filename |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|----|--------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|-------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | <p>will attract retired people who will not necessarily contribute to the local economy except through volunteering.</p> <p>Housing. A policy is required to encourage major landowners to build Affordable Housing within their estates to make up for the properties that have been sold off and are used as second homes. A policy of 100% taxation of second homes is required to support the infrastructure costs of the district.</p> <p>Growth potential. – Whilst mention is made of diversification, there need to be strong policies to encourage small business units and Home Working within the rural area. Limiting this will be to stifle the rural economy.</p> <p>Annex A to Eastern Area DAPTC Response to EDDC Core Strategy Submission Extract From CRC State of the Countryside Report 2010 Key summary points on social issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between 2001 and 2008 the population of rural England rose faster than in urban areas. The fastest growth was in Village, hamlet and isolated dwellings – Less sparse areas which grew by 6.1%. • 23.5% of people in rural areas are over state retirement age compared with 18.1% in urban areas. • Whilst over 98% of urban residents have the following services within 4km, for rural residents 51% have a bank or building society, 85% have cashpoints, 80% a GP surgery, 62% a supermarket, 57% an NHS dentist, 67% a pharmacy and 48% a secondary school. • Approximately 5% of rural households were using dial-up internet connections in 2009 compared with 2% in urban areas. • People in villages and hamlets with the lowest incomes spend an average of £50 per week on travel compared with £32 in rural towns and £28 in urban areas. • In rural areas the cheapest housing is six times the annual income of the lowest income households, compared to five times in urban areas. Despite house price falls during the recession in hamlets in sparse areas of the country the multiple is nine times annual household incomes. • 28% of those households not on the mains gas network in villages and hamlets are in fuel poverty compared with 13% who are on the mains gas network. The comparative figures for urban areas are 18% and 12%. • 87% of people living in the most rural districts are satisfied with their area as a place to live compared with 76% living in the most urban authorities. • 29% of people living in the most rural districts have given unpaid voluntary help at least monthly over the last year compared with 21% of people living in the most urban authorities. <p>Health - The smaller villages rely on docotors surgeries in the larger villages. Sixpenny Handley has a full time practice operating more than one surgery.</p> <p>Education - Dorset is moving to a two tier system.</p> <p>Economy - The poor broadband DOES inhibit rural homeworking</p> | | | | | |

| Contact Person ID | Contact Full Name | Contact Company / Organisation | ID | Number | Question 1 - Legally compliant | Question 2 - Sound | Question 3 - Positively Prepared | Question 3 - Justified | Question 3 - Effective | Question 3 - Consistent with national policy | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 | Question 7 | Order | Filename | |
|-------------------|-------------------|--|--------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|--|------------|-------|----------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | and businesses. There has to be a policy to rectify this. Tourism - Reword Transport - Reword Landscape Character - Reword Water Environment - Reword | | | | | | |
| 359529 | Mrs Lisa Goodwin | Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council | CSPS2478 | 12.1 | | | | | | | (In relation to table on Key Characteristics of the East Dorset Rural Area.) Health The smaller villages rely on doctors surgeries in the larger villages. Sixpenny Handley has a full time practice operating more than one surgery. Education Dorset is changing to a two tier education system – this should be noted as it could result in severe repercussions for some communities if implemented in East Dorset. Economy The poor broadband does inhibit rural home working and businesses. There has to be a policy to rectify this. Tourism Reword to: “Tourism, including the associated accommodation, hospitality and trade attractions, is a major part of the rural economy.” Transport Move the second sentence to the start as it is the primary cause of higher car ownership – “.... and no trains. As a result car ownership” Landscape Character Line 3 insert: “..... of Outstanding Natural Beauty.” Water Environment Line 5 - Small w - winterbournes – can be confused with the many villages of the same name in Dorset. Line 6 delete are and INSERT is at the end of the line | | | | | 591 | 2248948_0_1.pdf 2248860_0_1.pdf 2248941_0_1.pdf |
| 652631 | Dr George Green | | CSPS440 | 12.2 | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | I am contacting you to express my concerns regarding your policy RA1 – Bailie Gate, Employment Allocation, Sturminster Marshall. It is my understanding that this would involve the extension of the existing industrial estate close to the site operated by Marshall Fishery. I also know this site as Sturminster Marshall Gravel Pit. I have been studying the birdlife and some other elements of the wildlife associated with this site and its immediate environs since 1997. During the period 1997-2012 I have recorded 145 different species of bird which represents 35% of the total number of birds recorded in Dorset. My observations show that the Marshall Fishery site and its border hedges/trees support a good diversity of breeding birds, particularly those associated with woodland and still freshwaters, the latter being a scarce ecological resource in Dorset. A total of 38 different species of bird have been recorded breeding of which 34 breed annually. The most notable woodland breeders are Stock Dove, Cuckoo, Green & Great Spotted Woodpeckers, Lesser Whitethroat, Nuthatch, Treecreeper and Bullfinch. The most notable wetland breeders are Canada Goose, Great Crested Grebe, Moorhen, Coot, Little Ringed Plover (once only), Cetti’s Warbler (intermittent), Sedge & Reed Warblers and Reed Bunting. In addition the site is an | Remove this proposal from the core strategy. | No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination | | | 593 | |

| Contact Person ID | Contact Full Name | Contact Company / Organisation | ID | Number | Question 1 - Legally compliant | Question 2 - Sound | Question 3 - Positively Prepared | Question 3 - Justified | Question 3 - Effective | Question 3 - Consistent with national policy | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 | Question 7 | Order | Filename |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------|---------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | <p>important feeding and refuge area for a number of birds which breed in the immediate vicinity most notably Buzzard, Kestrel, Hobby, Peregrine, Barn & Tawny Owls, Nightjar, Kingfisher and Sand Martin.</p> <p>In winter Marshall Fishery acts as an important feeding and refuge site for a variety of wildfowl and the Common Snipe particularly when the River Stour is flooding and during periods of cold weather. Similarly the site is a valuable feeding and refuge site for migrant birds in spring and autumn including small numbers of Green and Common Sandpipers.</p> <p>The site also supports a good diversity of butterflies and dragonflies including the nationally rare Scarce Chaser Libellula fulva.</p> <p>My main concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Despite the provision of significant landscape barriers, there will be an increase in noise which will cause disturbance to the birds using the Marshall Fishery site. These include breeding birds such as a pair of Great Crested Grebes which are a scarce breeding bird in Dorset and protected by law. 2. The risk of pollution from the extension of the industrial site. There is already an open ditch draining the site which enters the road ditch (Moor Lane) a short distance from the entrance gate to Marshall Fishery. During periods of high rainfall and flooding any contamination in the roadside ditch could easily enter Marshall Fishery and pollute the lake. I have seen water draining from the roadside ditch across the road and into the lake on at least 2 occasions in the recent past. <p>I also understand that there is conductivity through the river gravels underlying Marshall Fishery and the extension of the industrial site. Consequently there is a risk that any contamination from industrial site which soaks into the ground can reach the lake at Marshall Fishery and ultimately the River Stour.</p> <p>Can the council confirm that (i) a co-ordinated and comprehensive pollution prevention plan is in place and (ii) an environmental impact assessment is undertaken before planning permission is granted for the extension to the existing industrial site at Sturminster Marshall?</p> | | | | | |
| 641635 | Mr Ernest Turner | | CSPS10 | Policy RA1 | Yes | | | | | No | There is no vehicular access directly from A31 causing traffic congestion and danger to pedestrians near the village shop and primary school. This proposal will increase these factors | Para 3: Agreement of a site development brief incorporating new vehicular access to the estate directly from the Roundhouse Roundabout (A31) | No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination | | 597 | |
| 360692 | Mrs Wendy Britton | | CSPS683 | Policy RA1 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | This objection relates to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy (PSCS) and the 'soundness' of the policies regarding the potential development of land at Arch Ground, Station Road, Sturminster Marshall as a New Neighbourhood and Area of Public Open Space with recreational and community facilities. References are made (but not exclusively) to the PSCS and the | The following alterations are required to be made:- 1. Generally – Amend the Pre-Submission Core Strategy to include a Strategic Policy regarding, | Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination | To support the proposal | 597 | 2252889_0_1.pdf |

| Contact Person ID | Contact Full Name | Contact Company / Organisation | ID | Number | Question 1 - Legally compliant | Question 2 - Sound | Question 3 - Positively Prepared | Question 3 - Justified | Question 3 - Effective | Question 3 - Consistent with national policy | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 | Question 7 | Order | Filename |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|----|--------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|------------|------------|-------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | <p>following policies:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. KS1 (settlement hierarchy) 2. KS4 (housing provision and provision of land) 3. HE4 (open space provision) 4. Chapter 4 (the broad location and scale of housing) 5. Chapter 12 (strategic allocations) 6. Chapter 14 (creating high quality and distinctive environments) 7. Chapter 15 (meeting local needs) 8. RA1 (Bailie Gate) <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>This objection is in respect of policies and the text of the PSCS which would if implemented deny the development of about 7.2 hectares (ha.) of land known as Arch Ground (as shown edged red on the map attached to the hard copy submission). The promotion of the land for development has a long planning history which is available from the files held by East Dorset District Council and the owners. However, to date planning permission has not been secured due to policy restrictions resulting from the site being within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The current use of the land is agricultural. It is enclosed by Station Road and by the housing opposite fronting that road. It is also enclosed by the hedge-row, trees and the industrial buildings situated on or near the adjacent boundary of the Bailie Gate industrial estate. The other two boundaries are bounded by natural high hedge-rows etc. The south-east boundary is also clearly defined by an existing access track. The land is not within the conservation area, nor is it subject to flooding. Access to the site is from Station Road. The land is in private ownership and does not provide any public amenity. Views to the distant open countryside are restricted by the boundaries as previously described. The land is flat and constrained and is visually uninspiring. The site is situated on the main road through the existing built-up area. It is close to existing local amenities, facilities and services including public service vehicle routes to nearby Wimbourne Minster (5m), Poole(7m) and Blandford(7m). It is also close to the shops, post-office, school, 3 pubs, church, pharmacy, garage, hairdresser, community hall, golf course and is immediately proximate to the site of a large industrial employment estate.</p> <p>THE PROPOSAL</p> <p>It is clear from the above information that the land meets all the requirements necessary (see Note.1) for the development of a New Neighbourhood as defined in policy KS4 and referred to in Chapter 4.21. The area proposed for residential development would require the redefinition of the Green Belt boundaries to allow the removal of about 3.7ha. from the total site area of 7.2ha. currently in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Economically viable and highly sustainable low density residential development of the site would be phased in line with demand and the need to make good, the substantial housing short-fall which has accrued over the last decade or so.</p> <p>In addition the Proposal incorporates the provision of the 3.5 ha.</p> | <p>The development of a 'New Neighbourhood' and area of Public Open Space etc. at Station Road Sturminster Marshall. This policy should be drawn for the sake of clarity in a similar form as to Policy RA1.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Pol.HE4 - amend table to incorporate the above. 3. Pol.KS1. - amend to incorporate 1 above. 4. Pol. KS4. - Ditto 5. Chapter 4 – Ditto 6. Chapter12 – Ditto 7. Chapter 14 – Ditto 8. Chapter 15 – Ditto | | | | |

| Contact Person ID | Contact Full Name | Contact Company / Organisation | ID | Number | Question 1 - Legally compliant | Question 2 - Sound | Question 3 - Positively Prepared | Question 3 - Justified | Question 3 - Effective | Question 3 - Consistent with national policy | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 | Question 7 | Order | Filename | |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|---|---|------------|------------|-------|----------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | <p>of retained Green Belt land as Public Open Space with recreational and community facilities, similar to that described in the 'saved policy SM2 and SM3' of the 2002 local plan. It is to be noted that the removal of above 3.7ha. of land from the Green Belt replicates the similar removal of 3.3he. from the Green Belt in order for the highly successful and adjacent Bailie Gate industrial estate to be expanded as set out in Policy RA1. It is also to be noted that as an indirect result of the expansion of the Bailie Gate industrial estate the New Neighbourhood would meet the potential need for additional housing in the Sturminster Marshall area, over and above that required to meet future household growth and the making good of the current substantial short-fall.</p> <p>The Proposal would also provide additional support and enable the growth of existing services etc. currently available in Sturminster Marshall area of East Dorset.</p> <p>Note1. 'New Neighbourhoods' are residential led schemes around settlements with good access to key services, facilities and employment. They are designed to produce high quality sustainable developments, that are able to be integrated into the local character of the area without having a detrimental impact on the surrounding countryside They will require the re-drawing of the Green Belt boundaries to accommodate them. The difficulty in meeting housing need, will provide the exceptional circumstances to enable the provision of New Neighbourhoods.</p> | | | | | | |
| 656462 | Mrs Lynne Vipond | | CSPS1186 | Policy RA1 | | | | | | | I am not a Barrister! How can you expect an ordinary member to give a qualified answer to such a technical point? | Bailie Gate already has many empty units. Previous tenants say it is very expensive. There is a large area at the front which could provide a larger shop with parking or a skate park which the youngsters desperately need. | | | 597 | | |
| 359541 | Mr Roger Lucas | Sturminster Marshall Parish Council | CSPS1897 | Policy RA1 | | | | | | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We cannot answer for the legality of the docuemtns as we feel that legal compliancy is beyond our collective professional experience. 2. With regards to the propsoed exxpansion of the industrial site, whilst we would like to think that this would give village residents employment opportunities, we envisage that the additional traffic volumes that it would bring to our already congested roads could be potentially a hazard. In particular as the site is adjacent to the village school. 3. The environmental impact of this expanded industrial site would need careful consideration, in particular the noise pollution, again the proximity to the village school causes concern. 4. There is already some problems casued by water, sometimes polluted, and this therefore has to be taken into account when | | | | | 597 | |

| Contact Person ID | Contact Full Name | Contact Company / Organisation | ID | Number | Question 1 - Legally compliant | Question 2 - Sound | Question 3 - Positively Prepared | Question 3 - Justified | Question 3 - Effective | Question 3 - Consistent with national policy | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 | Question 7 | Order | Filename |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|---|---|--|------------|-------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | increasing hard surface run-off that further development would inevitably bring. Disposal of this needs clarification before approval or inclusion. 5. A thorough environmental survey is felt to be essential before this section of the Core Strategy is implemented or included in the next stage. | | | | | |
| 657451 | Mr George Goodbody | | CSPS1885 | Policy RA1 | | No | | Yes | Yes | | Not justified - local need. Additional office/light industrial/storage facilities are not required. Unlet premises have been available for a number of years and are still available now. There is not a demand. Not effective - access The site is accessed by a narrow residential road. This is unsuitable for the weight and type of traffic that would be generated. Not effective - safety The site is adjacent to a school and disabled people's facilities. Additional site traffic would be a safety hazard. The access road is also used by local walkers and horse riders using it to gain country access. Industrial traffic is not compatible with horse riders and walkers. | Do not put office/industrial/storage facilities where indicated on map. Use side to develop a small country park for local use. | No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination | | 597 | |
| 524723 | Mr John Worth | Wimborne Civic Society | CSPS1927 | Policy RA1 | | | | | | | In furtherance of the objectives set out above we would support limited changes to the boundaries of the Green Belt. We would therefore be happy to see 3.3hectares of Green Belt land at Bailie Gate be developed for new employment. | | | | 597 | |
| 657747 | Mr Craig Boxshall | Marshall Fisheries | CSPS2326 | Policy RA1 | | | | | | | I am writing to you to strongly object to the proposed development Policy RA1 – Bailie Gate, Employment Allocation, Sturminster Marshall. We own Marshall Fishery, a family run business, directly adjacent to the Industrial Estate. This land is greenbelt and I have always had to adhere to very strict conditions imposed by East Dorset Council Planning for my business. This is to protect the green belt, Sturminster Marshall Village and people wanting to enjoy the countryside. I 100% have always supported and done this, as I believe it is very important to protect our green belt land. I object to the industrial estate being extended as it could compromise the green belt. I believe that B1 (office and light industrial) development could include something like a car spray bodyshop. Although there is one already in the estate I believe, but one nearer to our fishery could be very harmful to us. If the wind is blowing in the right direction towards us the fumes could contaminate our water, potentially killing the fish and wildlife. Plus our members do not want to be sitting around the lake breathing in these fumes, as I am sure the local golfers, school children, horse riders in the bridal ways, and walkers don't either. Another major concern for us is the potential noise pollution that this development will cause. Although there is some noise currently, extending the site would increase this quite dramatically. Fishing is a quiet sport and this would have a large impact on it and the local wildlife. I am sure the local golf course, | | | | 597 | |

| Contact Person ID | Contact Full Name | Contact Company / Organisation | ID | Number | Question 1 - Legally compliant | Question 2 - Sound | Question 3 - Positively Prepared | Question 3 - Justified | Question 3 - Effective | Question 3 - Consistent with national policy | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 | Question 7 | Order | Filename |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|---|------------|--|------------|-------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | <p>school and people enjoying the local countryside would be disturbed too.</p> <p>This area is prone to flooding in high rainfall times, especially the local roads, one of which borders the local school. I believe that to construct more buildings will compromise the safety of these roads and the people who use them to access the school and local businesses.</p> <p>As Sturminster Marshall is a village, this building work will increase the traffic through this small village. The local school is right next to the industrial estate where if possible, children are encouraged to walk. I would not feel happy walking my child to school with lorries thundering past. Sturminster Marshall is a quiet village and I feel that the size of the industrial site already is big enough and the local infrastructure will not support a larger industrial site and juggernauts.</p> <p>I also believe the increased pollution will have a detrimental effect on the children when out to play and travelling to school. I believe to develop the industrial estate any further when there are on average about 11 units to let at anyone time is a waste of time and money. I do not see how this can create employment for local people, as if business wanted to make use of the industrial estate they would be using these 11 units. I believe there will just be more units standing empty, providing no additional employment opportunities for anyone.</p> <p>I have asked several questions, which could not be answered at the Public Exhibitions or by email following this meeting. If I had answers to these I could provide my views but as there isn't information I would like to say I am concerned about the following,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The significant landscape buffers, what is significant? I have been told no information at this stage, I am concerned what these will be. • Access to these new units. Where? From the existing entrance or else where.? If else where, this will compromise local business where locals are currently employed. • What provisions for improved drainage from the industrial estate will be provided if further construction takes place? How will this effect Moor Lane, where the drainage ditch is only adequate currently? Again no ideas at this stage, but a very serious consideration with the close proximity of the River Stour and drainage channels running from this which flood on a regular basis on to local roads. | | | | | |
| 474462 | Mrs Sheila Bourton | | CSPS185 | Policy RA2 | Yes | No | | Yes | | | <p>I strongly object to the plans to move East Dorset District Council offices from Furzehill to the Allendale area of Wimborne when the council already has a modern purpose built building. The partnership between East Dorset District Council and Christchurch Borough Council does not justify a move of EDDC's offices to the centre of Wimborne and the associated waste of public finances.</p> <p>Therefore the need to amend the village envelope for Furzehill should not arise.</p> | | Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination | | 602 | |

| Contact Person ID | Contact Full Name | Contact Company / Organisation | ID | Number | Question 1 - Legally compliant | Question 2 - Sound | Question 3 - Positively Prepared | Question 3 - Justified | Question 3 - Effective | Question 3 - Consistent with national policy | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 | Question 7 | Order | Filename |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|------------|-------|----------|
| 359461 | Mrs Nicola Brunt | Dorset Wildlife Trust | CSPS1499 | Policy RA2 | | Yes | | | | | DWT support the retention of the woodland on site. | | | | 602 | |
| 524723 | Mr John Worth | Wimborne Civic Society | CSPS1924 | Policy RA2 | | | | | | | We welcome the proposed assessment of flood risk, conservation, public car parking and community facilities in relation to the Allendale Area. Other than refurbishment of the Allendale Centre we find the arguments for redeveloping the Area totally unconvincing, particularly moving the District Council offices from Furzehill. This would critically lose valuable car parking space. As a consequence it would not be necessary to amend the Furzehill village envelope to include the present EDDC offices and neighbouring buildings. | | | | 602 | |
| 360302 | Mrs Hilary Chittenden | Environment TAG (East Dorset) | CSPS3332 | Policy RA2 | | Yes | | | | | We welcome the requirement for recognition of the site's location in the Green Belt particularly the retention of the woodland and public access to it. Landscape protection is also welcomed and any subsequent planning application should ensure that the intrinsically dark skies of the AONB are not affected. (PI see 2nd response) | | No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination | | 602 | |
| 360302 | Mrs Hilary Chittenden | Environment TAG (East Dorset) | CSPS3334 | Policy RA2 | | No | | | | No | We recommend that there should be provision for the long term management of the woodland and the contribution it can make to establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks (NPPF para 109). | Amend requirement b):retained and managed as a surviving remnant of ancient oak with hazel woodland. | No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination | | 602 | |
| 654392 | Mr Geoffrey Chopping | | CSPS674 | Map 12.2 | | No | | No | | | I object to Policy RA2 as there is insufficient justification to impose such a devastating change onto the hamlet of Furzehill. The Council Offices at Furzehill are not in practice part of the Hamlet of Furzehill and should not be included as part of the residential hamlet. It is an office site, within the greenbelt, which has little interaction with the Hamlet of Furzehill other than generating a considerable part of the peak traffic movements along the narrow road called Furzehill. If there is so much money available to pay for the Council to move and to pay for a traffic-calming scheme in Furzehill, then why I ask is there no money for a traffic-calming scheme now? Perhaps the answer is that the money comes from selling the site for residential development. If this is the case it should have been used to justify the proposal. It was not. Consequently the proposal lacks any justification and also any financial soundness. The justification for moving the Council Offices to the centre of Wimborne is so poor, as explained in my comments to 8.30 that it should be totally removed from the Core Strategy. Consequently there would be no need for Policy RA2. The combination of: moving the Council Offices to Wimborne; redeveloping the Furzehill Council site as housing; classifying the Hamlet of Furzehill as a Village; and decimating the greenbelt between Wimborne and Furzehill; would effectively make Furzehill another part of Wimborne. In my opinion that is not what greenbelts are for. Yet this core strategy is proposing radical changes to Furzehill and its | Delete Policy RA2 | No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination | | 603 | |

| Contact Person ID | Contact Full Name | Contact Company / Organisation | ID | Number | Question 1 - Legally compliant | Question 2 - Sound | Question 3 - Positively Prepared | Question 3 - Justified | Question 3 - Effective | Question 3 - Consistent with national policy | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 | Question 7 | Order | Filename |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|--|------------|-------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | relationship to Wimborne, it would seem mainly so the council can have some new offices in Wimborne. | | | | | |
| 360302 | Mrs Hilary Chittenden | Environment TAG (East Dorset) | CSPS3333 | Map 12.2 | | Yes | | | | | We welcome the requirement for recognition of the site's location in the Green Belt particularly the retention of the woodland and public access to it. Landscape protection is also welcomed and any subsequent planning application should ensure that the intrinsically dark skies of the AONB are not affected. (PI see 2nd response) | | No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination | | 603 | |
| 360302 | Mrs Hilary Chittenden | Environment TAG (East Dorset) | CSPS3335 | Map 12.2 | | No | | | | No | We recommend that there should be provision for the long term management of the woodland and the contribution it can make to establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks (NPPF para 109). | Amend requirement b):retained and managed as a surviving remnant of ancient oak with hazel woodland. | No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination | | 603 | |