

Core Strategy Pre-Submission – Chapter 14 High Quality and Distinctive Environments

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		CSPS682	14	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.</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 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 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	658	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>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. 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 from 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. 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.</p> <p>'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>					
359478	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage	CSPS2747	14.8							<p>(Comments refer to sections on 'Key Facts' and 'Relevant Evidence')</p> <p>NPPF Section 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the HE Paragraph 126.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 169.</p> <p>Has it been demonstrated that up to date evidence to asses the significance of heritage assets has been</p>	<p>Include reference to the following facts: In Christchurch there are 2 scheduled monuments on the national at risk register (2011).</p>			666	

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>applied?</p> <p>To conserve the HE one has to appreciate the condition of the areas assets. These key facts should be included. Only CA Appraisals are referred to.</p> <p>The equivalent section for the natural environment, page 152, includes a thorough schedule and commentary of the evidence available and gathered and its relevance to the subsequent strategy/policy.</p> <p>What does the evidence tell us about the threats and opportunities?</p>	<p>In East Dorset there are 42 scheduled monuments; 3 buildings, and one registered park on the national at risk register (2011).</p> <p>The Plan must provide proportionate evidence and demonstrate how it has been applied.</p>				
359478	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage	CSPS2751	14.8							<p>(comments refer to the lack of a Delivery and Monitoring section for this part of the Plan)</p> <p>There is no delivery and monitoring section. Again the comparison has to be made to the other sections in the Plan.</p>	<p>The inclusion of a short section similar that on pg 155 or 171 of the Plan.</p>			666	
524338	Mr Kenneth Brooks		CSPS252	Policy HE1							<p>I am pleased to note that Special Character Areas will be maintained in East Dorset. Following my comments on the Core Strategy Options 2010, I received confirmation from Ms Judith Plumley (letter dated 23rd June 2011) that the boundaries of the Special Character Areas will be reassessed as part of the Site Allocation DPD following adoption of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>A detailed map of St Leonards and St Ives clearly shows a chasm between residential areas in the west gaining some protection from the Dorset Heathland Policy, the south being largely in the Green Belt and St Ives Park protected by being designated as a Special Character Area, whereas the central areas of the Parish, which are just as important for their character and contribution to the local environment, receive no protection. For example, if the Lions Lane area had been designated a Special Character Area it is unlikely we would have been blighted with inappropriate planning approvals for flats at the northern end of Lions Lane and cramped and inappropriate 2 for 1 re-developments at the southern end of Lions Lane.</p> <p>Even under Planning Policies PPS1, PPS3 and East Dorset Local Plan Policy DES8 there have been wide inconsistencies between planning approvals and planning rejections by East Dorset Planning Officers and Planning Committee, let alone misguided Planning Inspectors. Developers looking to maximise their profits rather than protecting the environment were undoubtedly initially delighted with the recently adopted National Planning Policy Framework with its emphasis on a 'presumption to approve sustainable developments'. However, much will depend on the interpretation of the word 'sustainable ' and the extra weight placed on Local Plans and Localism.</p>				668	

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
360271	Cllr Paul Timberlake		CSPS498	Policy HE1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Support HE1.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		668	
653852	Mrs Susan Newman-Crane		CSPS602	Policy HE1	Yes	No			Yes		This policy, whilst most welcome, especially in its resurrection of the protection to locally listed buildings, nevertheless is a weakening of Local Plan policy BE19, in referring to 'development proposals', which might include redevelopment, rather than alterations and extensions. The Strategy wording would permit locally listed buildings to be replaced with one which respected the character etc of the original, and this is no protection at all.	Reinstate here the wording of BE19: 'Proposals to alter or extend buildings identified by the borough council as being of local interest will only be permitted providing they are sympathetic in scale, proportion and materials to the existing building and respect its setting.'	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		668	
654618	Tanner & Tilley	Pennyfarthing Homes	CSPS885	Policy HE1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Reference in the policy to protection of local listed buildings tends to imply that the LPA will resist the loss of non-listed heritage assets irrespective of the significance of the non designated heritage asset or the merits of the proposed replacement development and whether the proposed development makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. If the intention of this policy is to resist the loss of non-listed heritage assets regardless of those considerations, this would in effect impose a test on development higher than that set by the NPPF. When considering development that may affect the historic environment Paragraphs 126 and 131 of the NPPF requires LPA's to take into account, amongst other things, "...the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Furthermore, Paragraph 135 of the NPPF advises that the affect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. We suggest that the policy should be re-worded to accord with the guidance in the NPPF.	We suggest that the policy be re-worded as follows, "The protection of designated heritage assets and non-heritage assets that may include buildings on the local authority list of buildings of local interest, along with monuments, sites, gardens, landscapes and their settings of historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest will form part of the heritage protection strategy. Local lists of non designated heritage assets will identify key buildings and structures which, although not of sufficient quality to meet national listing criteria, have valuable architectural or historic merit and make a positive contribution to local character. In weighing applications that would result in the	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	We consider that participation in the oral examination is necessary to enable the Inspector to be able to fully assess how the LPA are likely to apply this policy in practice and the constraint this might have on new development likely to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness where it affects non designated heritage assets of limited significance.	668	

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
												loss of a non designated heritage asset or that would affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assests, regard will be given to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset and the desirability of the proposed new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Article 4 Directions withdrawing Permitted Development rights may exceptionally be considered where its is identified that such Permitted Development would harm the significance of a designated heritage".				
654852	Mr Roger Donne	The Christchurch Antiquarians	CSPS878	Policy HE1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	<p>The Christchurch Antiquarians (TCA) is a local society concerned with the study of the history and archaeology of Christchurch and, in particular, aims to safeguard the heritage of Christchurch as expressed in its built environment, scheduled monuments and open spaces within its boundary. We are particularly concerned that there should be no lessening of the protection afforded to these aspects of planning policy in the Core Strategy document in relation to the Christchurch Town Plan which it will replace. Indeed TCA would hope to see more protection afforded to Christchurch's heritage assets by the Core Strategy, although TCA's impression of the draft document published for consultation is that it actually weakens the planning provisions and provides less guidance for planning decisions.</p> <p>Core Strategy policy HE1 is stated to replace Town Plan policies BE19 and BE 20. These latter two policies relate to Ancient Monuments and local archaeology, along with Policy BE21 which is stated to have been deleted and not incorporated into HE1. Policy BE21 is crucial in planning matters as it details the procedure for dealing with sites of potential archaeological significance. TCA requests that BE21 be incorporated into Core strategy HE1 and that further detail from policies BE19, and</p>	Reinstate aspects of the previous Town Plan Policies, as noted above	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		668	

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>BE20 should be included. Currently the section on Protection of Buildings of Local Historic and Architectural Interest contains the word “archaeological” just once! A similar section in the Town Plan, entitled “ Buildings of local architectural or historic interest” contains the word “Archaeological” eighteen times and “Archaeology” twice. Given the foundation of Christchurch as a a Saxon burh and the significant archaeological potential in the town centre and surrounding areas, TCA requests that HE1 be strengthened to reflect the importance of archeology in the borough and to ensure that the new policy HE1 does not downgrade the protection offered to sites with potential archaeological significance. Christchurch is renowned for its conservation areas and their associated appraisal documents define their essential characters. TCA believes that the Core Strategy should contain as much, if not more, protection for the conservation areas than is afforded by the present Town Plan. As such, TCA does not understand why the Town Plan Policy BE1 has been deleted from the draft Core Strategy since it is a key policy defining development/alteration or extension in a conservation area. Town Plan Policies BE2 and BE3 follow from this initial policy so TCA would have expected BE1 to have been retained, especially as BE2 and BE3 have been retained. TCA requests that BE1 should be retained. In similar vein, TCA asks why Town Plan policy BE13, which relates to demolition of listed buildings, has been deleted while Policies BE14 (Alterations to listed buildings), BE15 (Setting of listed buildings) and BE16 (Maintenance of views from important buildings) have been retained. TCA also notes that Town Plan Policy BE17 (Control of advertisements on listed buildings) has been deleted; while not affecting the structure of buildings, advertisements have a great effect on the visual appearance of an area and we would not wish to see the protection afforded against unsightly and inappropriate signs weakened.</p>						
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	West Parley Parish Council	CSPS1647	Policy HE1	No	No					<p>This policy is Unsound. The policy is not positively prepared, in that it fails to mention the only scheduled monument that is relevant to any of the East Dorset building plans in the Core Strategy, namely the Iron Age Hill Fort at Dudsbury, only 100 metres away from the nearest house proposed in policy FWP7.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		668		
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	West Parley Parish Council	CSPS2012	Policy HE1	No	Yes					<p>This policy is Unsound The policy is not positively prepared, in that it fails to mention the only scheduled monument that is relevant to any of the East Dorset building plans in the Core Strategy, namely the Iron Age Hill Fort at Dudsbury, only 100 metres away from the nearest house proposed in policy FWP7.</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		668		

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
524723	Mr John Worth	Wimborne Civic Society	CSPS1934	Policy HE1							We particularly welcome the proposal (and note also its inclusion in section 3.6 as part of the Core Strategy Vision) for the local listing of key buildings and structures which have valuable architectural or historic merit and make a positive contribution to local character.				668	
361158	Mr Chris Clarke	Dorset Gardens Trust	CSPS2259	Policy HE1	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	<p>This representation is made on behalf of the Dorset Gardens Trust.</p> <p>The recognition of the EH-designated parks and gardens within East Dorset District is welcome: the Key Facts box after para 14.8 refers. Protection of these sites through Policy HE1 is noted, but the issue of local listing is not partially covered. This is because the third sentence of the policy only refers to key buildings and structures, this excluding those local heritage assets that are based on the landscape. The policy should therefore be re-worded to include all forms of heritage assets, and not just buildings.</p> <p>EH has recently published guidance on best practice for local listing. It may be appropriate for this to be noted in the plan text. The DGT has currently identified sites within East Dorset and Christchurch that it considers could well form part of a Local List. Policy HE1 as drafted would appear to preclude their consideration. Para 169 of the NPPF requires planning authorities to "have up-to-date evidence about the historic environment in their area and use it to assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to their environment". The EH list of parks and gardens is only part of this particular heritage asset. A local list of such assets is available, and the DGT would want to share this with the planning authorities and agree on how it can be carried forward into local policy. Although this representaton is made on behalf of the DGT, its premise applies equally to other typed of heritage asst that might legitimately seek some form of local listing.</p>	<p>1) Ensure that Policy HE 1 applies to all types of heritage asset, and not just buildings and structures.</p> <p>2) Set out the principles of how a Local List can be achieved within local policy.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I am willing to speak at the oral examination, but the matter could well be dealt with by a proposed alteration by planning authorities, which would negate the need for an appearance.	668	
503395	Mr Ian Davis		CSPS2327	Policy HE1		No	Yes				<p>Policy HE1 Protection of local Historical and Architectural interest.</p> <p>This policy is Unsound.</p> <p>The policy is not positively prepared, in the fact that it does not mention the only scheduled monument that is relevant to any of the East Dorset building plans in the core strategy, namely our Iron Age Hill Fort at Dudsbury, only about 100 metres away from the nearest home proposed in policy FWP7.</p>				668	
512459	Sandra Davis		CSPS2364	Policy HE1		No	Yes				<p>Policy HE1 Protection of local Historical and Architectural interest.</p> <p>This policy is Unsound.</p> <p>The policy is not positively prepared, in the fact that it does not mention the only scheduled monument that is relevant to any of the East Dorset building plans in the</p>				668	

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	
											core strategy, namely our Iron Age Hill Fort at Dudsbury, only about 100 metres away from the nearest home proposed in policy FWP7.						
359478	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage	CSPS2749	Policy HE1							<p>NPPF – Plan making. Paragraph 156. Is there a strategic policy for the protection and enhancement of the HE, including landscape? NPPF – Plan making. Paragraph 152. Has the Plan set out clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where? NPPF – Plan making. Paragraph 156. Does the plan contain a clear strategy for enhancing the HE? NPPF paragraph 7 – Achieving Sustainable Development Does the Plan contribute to the protection and enhancement of the HE? NPPF paragraph 9 – Achieving Sustainable Development Does the plan seek positive improvements in the quality of the HE? NPPF Section 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the HE. Paragraph 126. Does the plan set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the HE? NPPF Section 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the HE. Paragraph 126. NPPF paragraph 169. Is there a maintained and accessible HE record? NPPF Section 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the HE Paragraph 126. Does the Plan set out a positive strategy for the conservation heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats? NPPF Section 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the HE. Does the Plan take into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness? The commitment to article 4 directions and local lists is welcomed however there is an expectation that this policy covers a greater range of relevant matters. The policy refers to the heritage protection strategy but nowhere is this set out. The following suggested policy would suffice.</p>	<p>In accordance with the NPPF we would recommend a more thorough policy that addresses Valuing our Historic Environment. Heritage assets will be conserved and where appropriate enhanced for their historic significance and important contribution to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place. Their potential to contribute towards the economy, tourism, education and local identity will be exploited. This will be promoted by ensuring: - proposals and initiatives are supported that protect and, where appropriate, enhance the heritage significance and setting of heritage assets, especially those elements which contribute to the distinct identity of Christchurch and East Dorset. - the sensitive expansion, growth and land use change in and around towns and villages, safeguarding elements of the historic character and value within their built up areas, including surrounding historic landscape character</p>				668	

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 setting of individual settlements - working with County highways, Town and Parish Council's to provide highway improvements and street furniture that are appropriate to the historic context of those places - the sensitive re-use and adaptation of historic buildings - a maintained, and publicly accessible HE Record and its use to inform development proposals - up to date CA appraisals and the preparation of management plans where appropriate - the use of article 4 directions where there are threats to heritage assets - a maintained local list of heritage assets that identifies key buildings and structures which, although not of sufficient quality to meet national listing criteria, have valuable architectural or historic merit and make a positive contribution to local character. - rural design guides are prepared and applied The inclusion of a short section similar that on pg 155 or 171 of the Plan.				
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3402	Policy HE1		Yes					We welcome this policy which seeks to protect our heritage and its setting and includes a commitment to producing local lists . (PI see 2nd response)		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		668	
360302	Mrs Hilary	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3403	Policy HE1		No	No				We recommend the policy is strengthened by including a	Add: Where possible,	No, I do not wish to		668	

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	
	Chittenden	Dorset)									commitment to restore historic landscapes and its biodiversity interest where opportunities arise.	historic landscapes will be restored.	participate at the oral examination				
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSPS3298	Policy HE1	No				Yes		The Council should clarify what the 'heritage protection strategy' is, whether it will be a SPD to this policy and if so when it is to be published for consultation. The policy as worded could be interpreted to defer development control considerations to this strategy. If this is the case, greater clarity is required within the policy or the reasoned justification that accompanies the policy	Policy and reasoned justification to be clearer on what the 'heritage protection strategy' is and how development control decisions are proposed to be made against this over the plan period, or in the interim prior to publication of this strategy.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	We would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of the lands controlled by our client.	668	2255451_0_1.pdf 2255452_0_1.pdf	
663588	Mr Roger Street	Christchurch Conservation Trust	CSPS3746	Policy HE1							6. COMMENT/ COMPARISON OF POLICIES IN TOWN PLAN AND CORE STRATEGY CCT expresses concern regarding the combining of existing Town Plan policies into a new Core Strategy policy which fails to specifically include some of these existing policies. For example, Core Strategy policy PC5 is stated to include existing town plan policies ET1 (loss of tourism accommodation), L17 (development of undeveloped rivers and harboursides) and L19 (development of indoor/outdoor recreation facilities). However, Core Strategy PC5 fails to embody the detailed local conditions described in L17 where the development of currently undeveloped riversides and harboursides is conditioned. Core Strategy policy HE1 is stated to replace Town Plan policies BE19 and BE 20. These latter two policies relate to Ancient Monuments and local archaeology, along with Policy BE21 which is stated to have been deleted and not incorporated into HE1. Policy BE21 is crucial in planning matters as it details the procedure for dealing with sites of potential archaeological significance. CCT requests that BE21 be incorporated into Core strategy HE1 and that further detail from policies BE19, and BE20 be included. Currently the section on Protection of Buildings of Local Historic and Architectural Interest contains the word "archaeological" just once! A similar section in the Town Plan, entitled " Buildings of local architectural or historic interest" contains the word "Archaeological" eighteen times and "Archaeology" twice. CCT asks why the importance of archaeology has been downgraded in this new policy HE1. Christchurch is renowned for its conservation areas and it is difficult to understand why Town Plan Policy BE1 has been deleted. It is a key policy for development/alteration or extension in a conservation area. Policies BE2 and BE3 follow from this initial policy so CTT would have expected BE1 to remain as a saved					668	

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>policy, especially as BE2 and BE3 have been saved. CCT requests that BE1 remains as a saved policy. In similar vein, CCT asks why Town Plan policy BE13, which relates to demolition of listed buildings, has been deleted while Policies BE14 (Alterations to listed buildings), BE15 (Setting of listed buildings) and BE16 (Maintenance of views from important buildings) remain as saved policies. CCT also asks why policy BE17 (Control of advertisements on listed buildings) has also been deleted.</p> <p>CCT notes that Town Plan policy ENV15, concerned with wildlife corridors, has been incorporated into Core strategy ME1. Turning to policy ME1 (at pages 153/155) there is no mention of wildlife corridors. The Town Plan at pages 21/22 devotes nearly a page to this subject, which although described as non-designated sites are increasingly seen as vital to nature conservation.</p>					
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSPS3783	Policy HE1	No				Yes		<p>CHRISTCHURCH AND EAST DORSET PRE-SUBMISSION CORE STRATEGY (APRIL 2012)</p> <p>Thank you for the invitation to comment on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy DPD. I write on behalf of our client, Burry & Knight Ltd, who are the owners and developers of Hoburne Farm Estate, which includes land east of phase 8 of the Hoburne Farm Estate (SHLAA reference 8/11/0525); and are the owners and operators of Hoburne Caravan Park (SHLAA reference 8/11/0287). Our clients support the Council in their objective to progress and adopt a Local Plan for the area as quickly as possible. This will provide clarity and certainty for the development industry and all those who interact with the planning system. More importantly it will assist the Council in its efforts to address the significant housing land supply shortages in the borough, particularly over the next five years.</p> <p>We have reviewed the plan and its evidence base and conclude that revisions are needed if the Council are to satisfy the tests of soundness in the NPPF. The following paragraph/policy specific comments are therefore made to assist the Council in finalising the plan before it is formally submitted to the Secretary of State. We would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of the lands controlled by our client.</p> <p>Policy HE1 – Protection of local historic and architectural interest</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>The Council should clarify what the 'heritage protection strategy' is, whether it will be a SPD to this policy and if so when it is to be published for consultation. If this is intended to be used for development control purposes, then the policy should make this explicit. It should also confirm what considerations will be taken into account</p>	<p>Suggested Change</p> <p>The policy and reasoned justification should be revised to clarify what the 'heritage protection strategy' is and how development control decisions are proposed to be made against this over the plan period, or in the interim prior to publication of this strategy.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>We would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of the lands controlled by our client.</p>	668	

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
											pending adoption of this strategy for avoidance of doubt.					
359529	Mrs Lisa Goodwin	Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council	CSPS2485	14.12							Line 2 - Delete – “..... with a scattering of houses in the remainder of the countryside.” This is a completely misleading statement.				672	2248948_0_1.pdf 2248860_0_1.pdf 2248941_0_1.pdf
359478	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage	CSPS2752	14.13							(This comment refers to the 'Relevant Evidence' part of the section) Christchurch Character Assessments, 2003 and East Dorset Special Character areas - this information should be included in the evidence base.	Refer to both the Christchurch Character Assessments, 2003 and East Dorset Special character areas in the evidence base.			673	
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSPS191	Policy HE2	Yes	Yes					It is important that the scale, height, bulk of any new development does not "dwarf" existing property. i.e. 2/3 storey houses and flats should not be built next to single storey dwellings. Mature trees should be retained wherever possible		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		675	
474490	Mrs Sheila Bourton	Keep Wimborne Green	CSPS221	Policy HE2	Yes	Yes					We consider that it is really important that existing properties adjoining any new proposed neighbourhood, are not "overshadowed" by new houses or development which would affect the existing residents in a detrimental way. For example: single storey dwellings should not have double or multistorey buildings built next to them. If possible, a buffer zone should be in place between new and existing housing development.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		675	
524338	Mr Kenneth Brooks		CSPS253	Policy HE2							I am pleased to see that the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document confirms that Policy HE2 will directly incorporate East Dorset Local Plan Policies DES8 and BUCON6. I understand the adopted Core Strategy will form the basis of the emerging new East Dorset Local Plan. Mr Greg Clark, the Planning Minister, was recently reported as having made it crystal clear to the Planning Inspectorate that any of its decision had to be made on a localist approach and ensure residents views were respected if developers tried to overturn Local Plans.				675	
360271	Cllr Paul Timberlake		CSPS499	Policy HE2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Support HE2.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		675	
654618	Tanner & Tilley	Pennyfarthing Homes	CSPS897	Policy HE2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Whilst Pennyfarthing Homes supports the general aims of Policy HE2 to require the design of development to be of a high quality, reflecting and enhancing areas of recognised local distinctiveness, we consider that the existence of 17 special character areas within East Dorset District and the extent of some of those areas is a constraint to making effective and efficient use of land within the existing built up areas. We consider that some	That the supporting text to Policy HE2 include the following paragraph:- "Whilst promoting high quality design that reflects and enhances areas of recognised	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		675	

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
											of the special character areas have been designated as a means to resist further residential development in some of those areas and to keep densities low. We consider that some of these areas could accommodate subdivision and higher density residential development that would make a valuable contribution to providing for housing needs and assist in the delivery of affordable housing without harm to the general character and appearance of some of these areas. Whilst there may be some of the existing special character areas where it would be appropriate to preserve their low density character, we consider that the Core Strategy should indicate that a review of the existing special character areas will be undertaken in preparation of Development Plan Documents to identify whether some of those areas are capable of accommodating additional residential development.	local distinctiveness, the local planning authority acknowledges the need to critically review those existing areas currently designated as Special Character Areas with a view to strengthening those which should be safeguarded as 'low density areas' and to identify those areas that could accommodate additional housing development either through subdivision of existing plots or by allowing housing development at higher density without harm to the general character and appearance of the area. This approach accords with the guidance contained in the NPPF which seeks to make efficient and effective use of land within the existing settlement boundaries."				
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3404	Policy HE2		No	No				The text should be amended to ensure that it is clear that new neighbourhoods must comply. We support inclusion of the relationship to mature trees but suggest that development should take account of all existing habitats and features.	Amend first sentence: ...the design of development, including new neighbourhoods and employment sites, must... Amend final bullet point: Relationship to existing habitat and features.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		675	
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSPS3639	Policy HE2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The policy is not positively prepared as it does not reflect the requirement for good design to limit the impact of light pollution as required in paragraph 125 of the NPPF, it is therefore inconsistent with national policy. In addition it is not effective, as it does not appear to	Policy HE2 needs to include good lighting design as part of criteria that make development	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		675	

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
											control light pollution issues in relation to urban areas, as it implies the policy is applicable only to 'landscape quality and character'. Light pollution from the urban area can, and does, affect the landscape character of the rural area and in the designated landscape areas. The policy is not justified by evidence, and there is no assessment of light pollution impacts and effects. In addition the policy does not deal with artificial light pollution impacts on amenity and effects on intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation as required by the NPPF in paragraph 125.	proposals acceptable including criteria with regard to light impact on local amenity and impact on intrinsically dark landscapes. In addition to be consistent with the NPPF Policy HE3 should be revised with a new specific point with regard to artificial lighting pollution to protect all areas, but in particular with regard to intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.				
654660	Ms Anne Mason	Transition Town Christchurch	CSPS967	Policy HE3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	GOOD 'Natural features such as trees, hedgerows, woodland, field boundaries, water features and wildlife corridors.' Wildlife corridors are of increasing importance due to species and bio-diversity loss related to development i.t				680	2259130_0_1.pdf
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	West Parley Parish Council	CSPS1648	Policy HE3	Yes						This policy is Sound. This policy is supported, and is particularly applicable to policy FWP7.				680	
360245	Mr Richard Burden	Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB	CSPS1568	Policy HE3							Thank you for consulting the AONB on this important policy document. As the ANOB considers there are some quite fundamental matters for discussion this letter is being sent simultaneously to Judith Plumley and yourself. The Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB has been established under the 1949 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act to conserve and enhance the outstanding natural beauty of this area which straddles three County, one Unitary and five District councils. It is clear from the Act, subsequent government sponsored reports, and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 that natural beauty includes wildlife, scientific, and cultural heritage. It is also recognised that in relation to their landscape characteristics and quality, National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are equally important aspects of the nation's heritage and environmental capital. The AONB Management Plan (2009 – 2014) is a statutory document that has been approved by the Secretary of State and was adopted by your Council early in 2009. The ANOB has looked with considerable interest at your Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document. We are acutely aware, with the production of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the revocation of				680	2239336_0_1.pdf 2239337_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>the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), and the removal of the whole suite of Planning Policy Statements and Planning Policy Guidance that all Core Strategy documents are in real danger of being insufficiently detailed to provide adequate policy guidance through to 2028.</p> <p>It is, however, clear from the NPPF that Government envisages the re-emergence of Local Plans with considerable detail within them to cover policy and decision making needs. It is noticeable that the NPPF puts equal weight on achieving economic, social and environmental gains jointly and simultaneously through sustainable development. There is a clear implication that solely economic proposals are not automatically sustainable.</p> <p>Crucially Paragraph 14, in association with Footnote 9, clearly indicates that there should be special policies in these emerging Local Plans to cover special situations. Those special situations include designated landscapes such as AONBs. Paragraph 218 also indicates that it would be in order for Local Plans to take on board those policies that have been lost in the revocation of the RSS. The thrust, therefore, of the AONB's comments relate to matters that we feel should be included in the Core Strategy to overcome the policy vacuum created by the loss of the higher level strategies and policies on which the whole concept of Core Strategies was predicted. Whilst there is much to be supported in the pre-submission Core Strategy the AONB is of the view that without the additional policies to fill the gaps created by the loss of the higher level strategies and policies it will not be fully fit for purpose through to 2028 and therefore would have to be regarded as less than sound.</p> <p>In particular the AONB would wish to see clear policies that indicate the special character of the AONB, and proposed developments within it, would be handled in ways different from other, undesignated, areas of countryside within the District. Similarly we would commend the RSS suite of policies ENV1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and in particular ENV3 which relates to the setting of AONBs. We would wish to see priority given to conserving and enhancing natural beauty within the AONB and to priority being given to conserving and enhancing natural beauty where there is conflict with proposed development.</p> <p>Turning to the historic environment there should be, we suggest, reference to the Historic Landscape Characterisation and the Historic Environment Action Plans recently completed by the AONB and we would also suggest that the AONB Management Plan is relevant evidence in relation to landscape quality and character. Policy HE3 (Landscape Quality) seems insufficiently robust as it appears that the wording could be interpreted as relating to proposals within the AONB</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
											or only within the setting of the AONB and excluding the AONB itself. The AONB recommends that the policy, in relation to landscape quality should relate to landscape character assessments much more explicitly, historic landscape characterisation, and separate policy statements relating to development proposals within the AONB and for those within the setting of the AONB. We would also urge you to consider wording that is rather more robust than 'will need to have regard to the relevant Management Plan'. A more proactive approach to actively sustaining the landscape characteristics would, we advise, be more appropriate.					
359553	Mrs Linda Leeding	West Parley Parish Council	CSPS2013	Policy HE3		Yes					This policy is Sound This policy is supported, and is particularly applicable to policy FWP7		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		680	
360082	Mr and Mrs K Healy		CSPS2510	Policy HE3	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Generally this policy is supported but it needs to be amended and strengthened. Please see changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To quote: 'Development will need to protect and seek to enhance the landscape character of the area.' this needs to be amended by adding: not just of the larger scale landscape character but the very local landscape to protect the features the residents know and love from harmful development. It is so difficult in East Dorset, so many areas designated for their ecology and/or landscape value that all development is crammed in the parts that most of the population lives in. This degrades our local features and our lives. See NPPF paragraph 109: 'protecting and enhancing valued landscape.' This should not apply to just landscapes with special designations. Point 2. All of these must be taken into account and also it is 	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		680	

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
												important to make sure they are 'fit for purpose'. A wildlife corridor that is too narrow for the species it is supposed to aid is of little use. • Point 5. Tranquillity, this point should apply to SANGS. No peace from invasive lights/noise/smell is very stressful				
503395	Mr Ian Davis		CSPS2328	Policy HE3		Yes					Policy HE3 Landscape Quality. This policy is Sound. This policy is supported and is particularly applicable to policy FWP7. Thank you for your time reading this response, I trust that a "meaningful engagement and collaboration" with a wide section of the West Parley community would evolve from this reply.				680	
512459	Sandra Davis		CSPS2366	Policy HE3		Yes					Policy HE3 Landscape Quality. This policy is Sound. This policy is supported and is particularly applicable to policy FWP7. Thank you for your time reading this response, I trust that a "meaningful engagement and collaboration" with a wide section of the West Parley community would evolve from this replay.				680	
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3405	Policy HE3		Yes					We welcome the general provisions of the policy but consider they should be strengthened in line with NPPF (PI see 2nd response).		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		680	
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3407	Policy HE3		No				No	The policy should make provision for setting criteria against which development proposals will be judged (NPPF para 113) particularly where there is potential for impact on the AONB and AGLVs. This should include, for example, an indication of the width of wildlife corridors that may be required to achieve their objective. The Strategy has not identified areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. (NPPF para 123). The impact of light pollution (NPPF para 125) has only been considered in relation to WMC6. We strongly recommend that the detailed technical information contained in ETAG's supplementary advice to the Options consultation (Light Pollution – Issues for consideration in developing the Core Strategy submitted to EDDC, 5.6.11) is taken into account and forms the basis for an SPD on light pollution.	1.Add to 14.17: Supplementary Planning Guidance will be produced to establish criteria for landscape and its component features, for tranquillity and for light pollution. 2. The policy should make provision for setting criteria against which development proposals will be judged	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		680	

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
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSPS3299	Policy HE3		No			Yes		The use of the words 'protect and seek to enhance' is insufficiently flexible to endure the plan period. For example there may be many instances where the loss of some features are more than compensated for through additional provisions on and off a site, which may also generate wider social, economic and environmental benefits as a consequence. For consistency with other policies of the plan, this policy should seek to maintain and where possible enhance the landscape character of the area. The Council should seek to protect existing features that contribute to this character where possible. Where impacts to such features are proven unavoidable, but result in wider social, economic or environmental gains, the LPA should seek to secure suitable mitigation to maintain or where possible enhance the landscape character of the area.	Include flexibility suggested in the comments section, bringing this more into line with the other environmental policies of the plan.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	We would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of the lands controlled by our client.	680	2255452_0_1.pdf 2255451_0_1.pdf
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSPS3641	Policy HE3	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The policy is not positively prepared as it does not reflect the requirement for good design to limit the impact of light pollution as required in paragraph 125 of the NPPF, it is therefore inconsistent with national policy. In addition it is not effective, as it does not appear to control light pollution issues in relation to urban areas, as it implies the policy is applicable only to 'landscape quality and character'. Light pollution from the urban area can, and does, affect the landscape character of the rural area and in the designated landscape areas. The policy is not justified by evidence, and there is no assessment of light pollution impacts and effects. In addition the policy does not deal with artificial light pollution impacts on amenity and effects on intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation as required by the NPPF in paragraph 125.	Policy HE2 needs to include good lighting design as part of criteria that make development proposals acceptable including criteria with regard to light impact on local amenity and impact on intrinsically dark landscapes. In addition to be consistent with the NPPF Policy HE3 should be revised with a new specific point with regard to artificial lighting pollution to protect all areas, but in particular with regard to intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		680	
523319	Mr Ryan Johnson	Turley Associates	CSPS3784	Policy HE3		No			Yes		Thank you for the invitation to comment on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy DPD. I write on behalf of our client, Burry & Knight Ltd, who are the owners and developers of Hoburne Farm Estate, which includes land east of phase 8 of the Hoburne Farm Estate (SHLAA reference 8/11/0525); and are the owners and operators of Hoburne Caravan Park (SHLAA reference 8/11/0287). Our clients support the Council in their objective to progress and adopt a Local Plan for the area as quickly as possible. This will provide clarity and certainty for the development industry and all those who interact with the planning system. More importantly it will assist the Council in its efforts to address the significant housing	Suggested Change Include flexibility suggested in the comments section, bringing this more into line with the other environmental policies of the plan.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	We would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of the lands controlled by our client.	680	

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	
											land supply shortages in the borough, particularly over the next five years. We have reviewed the plan and its evidence base and conclude that revisions are needed if the Council are to satisfy the tests of soundness in the NPPF. The following paragraph/policy specific comments are therefore made to assist the Council in finalising the plan before it is formally submitted to the Secretary of State. We would wish to participate at the Examination in Public to elaborate on these comments, particularly in the context of the lands controlled by our client. Policy HE3 – Landscape Quality Comment The use of the words ‘protect and seek to enhance’ is insufficiently flexible to endure the plan period. For example there may be many instances where loss of some features can be mitigated through replacement features on and off a site. There may also be wider social, economic and environmental benefits to the proposals that may weigh in favour of such an approach. For consistency with other policies of the plan, this policy should therefore seek to maintain and where possible enhance the landscape character of the area. The Council should seek to protect existing features that contribute to this character where possible. Where impacts to such features are unavoidable, or are outweighed by other material considerations, the LPA should seek to secure suitable mitigation to maintain or where possible enhance the landscape character of the area.						
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3406	14.17		Yes					We welcome the general provisions of the policy but consider they should be strengthened in line with NPPF (PI see 2nd response).		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		681		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3408	14.17		No				No	The policy should make provision for setting criteria against which development proposals will be judged (NPPF para 113) particularly where there is potential for impact on the AONB and AGLVs. This should include, for example, an indication of the width of wildlife corridors that may be required to achieve their objective. The Strategy has not identified areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. (NPPF para 123). The impact of light pollution (NPPF para 125) has only been considered in relation to WMC6. We strongly recommend that the detailed technical information contained in ETAG’s supplementary advice to the Options consultation (Light Pollution – Issues for consideration in developing the Core Strategy submitted to EDDC, 5.6.11) is taken into account and forms the basis for an SPD on light pollution.	1.Add to 14.17: Supplementary Planning Guidance will be produced to establish criteria for landscape and its component features, for tranquillity and for light pollution. 2. The policy should make provision for setting criteria against which development proposals will be judged	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		681		
654660	Ms Anne	Transition Town Christchurch	CSPS968	14.19			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	GOOD				683	2259130_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
	Mason															
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3410	14.19		Yes					Support in part We welcome recognition of the benefits of natural open green space to people's health and wellbeing and the commitment to protect and enhance biodiversity. (PI see 2nd response).		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		683	
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3413	14.19		No	No				We suggest the needs of horse riders should be acknowledged.	Amend para 14.20 ...informal recreation(such as cycling, dog walking and horse riding)...	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		683	
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3764	14.19							Within the "Open space, leisure and green infrastructure" section of Chapter 14, we would welcome greater recognition of the opportunities for enhancing urban biodiversity. This is perhaps best achieved by a commitment within the Core Strategy to delivering a design guide SPD. Examples exist in the region, including a notable and award winning publication by Exeter City Council. We would be pleased to discuss this further with the Councils at an appropriate juncture.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	683	
654660	Ms Anne Mason	Transition Town Christchurch	CSPS969	14.20		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Green infrastructure will also be designed to protect and enhance sites of biodiversity value. GOOD				684	2259130_0_1.pdf
654660	Ms Anne Mason	Transition Town Christchurch	CSPS970	14.20		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Green infrastructure will also be designed to protect and enhance sites of biodiversity value. GOOD				684	2259130_0_1.pdf
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3411	14.20		Yes					Support in part We welcome recognition of the benefits of natural open green space to people's health and wellbeing and the commitment to protect and enhance biodiversity. (PI see 2nd response).		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		684	
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3414	14.20		No	No				We suggest the needs of horse riders should be acknowledged.	Amend para 14.20 ...informal recreation(such as cycling, dog walking and horse riding)...	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		684	
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3765	14.20							We support the text in paragraph 14.20 which identifies that large public open space and green infrastructure may divert recreational pressure away from the Dorset heathlands, and that SANGS may be enhanced by green infrastructure connectivity.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in	684	

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
														the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.		
360271	Cllr Paul Timberlake		CSPS500	Policy HE4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Support HE4.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		685	
360692	Mrs Wendy Britton		CSPS679	Policy HE4	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 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 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</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 suport my proposal	685	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>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. 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 from 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. 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.</p> <p>'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>					
654660	Ms Anne Mason	Transition Town Christchurch	CSPS971	Policy HE4		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Existing open spaces and leisure facilities identified on				685	2259130_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
											the Proposals Map will be protected and their loss will not be permitted unless their whole or partial redevelopment would result in greater benefits to the community than retaining that facility. On such occasions the replacement must be provided in close proximity, unless it can be shown that the open space, sport or recreational facility was not required. This is too weak to protect valuable open spaces and leisure facilities.					
656249	Ms Gemma Care	Barton Willmore LLP	CSPS1084	Policy HE4	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy (JCS) Pre-Submission document. On behalf of our client, Stour Valley Properties (Dorset) Ltd., we are pleased to provide the following response, which should be read in conjunction with the accompanying Consultation Response Forms.</p> <p>Background Barton Willmore LLP has been instructed to make representations to this document, on behalf of Stour Valley Properties (Dorset) Ltd. ('SVP') SVP have land interests within East Dorset and welcome the opportunity to contribute to the emerging Core Strategy (JCS). SVP are currently promoting the release of their land to the south of Wimborne for housing. Fundamentally, SVP have serious concerns over the level of overall housing provision identified within the draft JCS and the degree to which that which is proposed is sufficient to meet identified needs within the East Dorset and Christchurch locality. We submit, having regard to the evidence base material available that the level of housing proposed for East Dorset within the draft JCS is inappropriate and inconsistent with national planning policy, which states that each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities are expected to ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.</p> <p>Consideration is given within the submitted representations to the strategic site allocations for Wimborne and Colehill identified within the JCS and the extent to which the proposed allocations fulfil the overall objectives and spatial vision for East Dorset and Christchurch. On the premise that insufficient housing requirements are identified in the Pre-Submission JCS we submit that additional strategic allocations or an increase in the specified number of required new dwellings are required in order to plan positively for the further housing growth we consider necessary in light of</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To ensure our case is presented in full and to be party to discussions.	685	

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>our appraisal of the Council’s published JCS evidence base.</p> <p>In accordance with section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) local plans must be ‘sound’: i.e. they must be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. We suggest that the housing strategy adopted within the JCS as it stands is (a) not the most appropriate (on the basis that it is not considered fully justified) and (b) it is not ‘positively prepared’ – i.e. it is not based on a strategy which in our view genuinely seeks to meet objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>Within these representations we do not comment on every aspect of the JCS; our intention is to comment on those sections where non-compliance with tests of soundness is apparent, or where we are particularly supportive. To be clear, our primary concern in this instance is the content and justification of Policy KS4 and the proposed housing allocations for Wimborne and Colehill – specifically Policy WMC6.</p> <p>An alternative proposal for housing to the south of Wimborne is considered with specific reference to the SVP land shown on the concept plan attached at Appendix 1 to these submissions.</p> <p>Comments are also provided on a number of other policies within the JCS, on individual response forms, as requested. The full list of policies to which these representations respond are: Policy KS1, KS4, KS5, KS10 Policy WMC3, WMC6 Policy FWP3, FWP4, FWP6, FWP7, FWP8 Policy ME3 Policy HE4</p> <p>Copies of all Core Strategy Response Forms relating to each policy addressed within these representations are contained at Appendix 4.</p> <p>Appendices 1 – 3 to this cover letter are those referred to in the various consultation forms.</p> <p>I trust that all of the enclosed is clear and in order and we look forward to engaging with you further in the consultation process.</p> <p>Broadly support however question the appropriateness of a 2007 evidence base.</p>					
360157	Mr Peter Fenning	The Open Spaces Society	CSPS3262	Policy HE4							<p>As local correspondent for The Open Spaces Society I am making the following comments. It should be noted that The Open Spaces Society was founded in 1865 and has the principal aims of protecting common land, town and village greens, open spaces, and public rights of way.</p> <p>1 The existing Borough of Christchurch Local Plan, adopted in March 2001, has a section, 8.51 at Pages 147/148, dealing with "Public Rights of Way". This</p>				685	

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>section details a number of footpaths including the two long distance footpaths, namely the Avon Valley and Stour Valley footpaths. There is a significant statement the "The Borough Council consider that the existing rights of way network should be protected and maintained and where opportunities arise the network should be extended".</p> <p>I can find no such statement reiterated in new Policy HE4, open space provision, where there is no mention of the maintenance of existing rights of way and no commitment to extend the network of rights of way. Nowhere in this document is the phrase "right of way" mentioned. This is a serious deficiency and I request appropriate amendments be made to remedy these omissions.</p> <p>2 Existing Town Plan Policy at page 134, section 8.16 considers the "Protection of Existing Recreation, Open Spaces and Public Open Space" and comments that "Open spaces are protected for their contribution to the environmental quality of the area. The guiding principle of sustainable development is relevant as it is important to protect this valuable part of our environmental inheritance" It is then stated that Policy L1 will apply to any public open space or other open spaces across the Borough.</p> <p>Perusal of Appendix 4 of the core strategy submission document shows that policy L1 will be deleted and replaced by a new core strategy policy HE4 which, at page 169, states that "existing open spaces and leisure facilities identified on the Proposals map will be protected and their loss will not be permitted unless the whole or partial redevelopment would result in greater benefits to the community than retaining that Facility". This new policy HE4 weakens the protection of open spaces as detailed in the provisions of policy L1. I request that the Policy L1 becomes a stand alone saved policy. No proposals map accompanies the core strategy document so one is at a loss to discover if changes have been made to the existing network of open spaces. It is essential that the present open spaces are protected from future redevelopment.</p> <p>3 Existing Town Plan, 2001, chapter 3 entitled "Conservation of the Natural Environment", page 9 deals with the Green Belt and at page 23, section 3.44 states that the final Green Belt boundary around Christchurch has been "defined" and will not be altered except in "exceptional circumstances". This is followed by confirmatory policies ENV16, ENV17, ENV18, ENV19, ENV20, ENV21 and ENV22. Reference to deleted policies excluded in the new core strategy reveal at pg 221, appendix 4, reveal that policies ENV16,17,19,20 and 21, will be deleted. The only 2 policies to survive, and listed as "saved policies" are ENV18, which details</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	
											proposals for reuse of green belt buildings, and policy ENV22 which deals with the protection of agricultural land. At a stroke, protection of the Green Belt will be removed! The Core Strategy vision, page 20 states that "the Green Belt policy will be kept in place to protect the character of the area, subject to limited alterations of boundaries to enable its extension and elsewhere to allow for some housing and employment growth to help meet the needs of the local communities" This statement opens the way for future encroachment and development into the Green Belt and is contrary to the statement, above, that the Green Belt policy will be kept in place. I oppose this Core Strategy vision permitting development and encroachment into the Green Belt.						
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3409	Policy HE4		Yes					Support in part We welcome recognition of the benefits of natural open green space to people's health and wellbeing and the commitment to protect and enhance biodiversity. (PI see 2nd response).		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		685		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3412	Policy HE4		No	No				We suggest the needs of horse riders should be acknowledged.	Amend para 14.20 ...informal recreation(such as cycling, dog walking and horse riding)...	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		685		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3766	Policy HE4							We support the general ambition of this policy		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	685		
619967		Home Builders Federation (South West)	CSPS3686	Policy HE4		No		Yes		Yes	The policy is unsound with regard to the requirement for new developments to make contributions to open space. It is unjustified and contrary to national policy. The policy appears to require that all developments make contributions to providing open space even though this may not be necessary. To require all development to contribute to the provision of additional open space would be contrary to the Framework (paragraph 204) if the area where the development occurs is already adequately served by open space. Financial contributions towards off site provision is contrary to the Framework; open space should be provided on site if it		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The HBF would like to appear at the examination to debate these matters further.	685		

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>is necessary to address unacceptable impacts. Contributions to providing more open infrastructure may be legitimately be pursued through a CIL. This would be the more appropriate mechanism to achieve this objective.</p> <p>The requirement also needs to be assessed for its potential impact on the viability of schemes in conjunction with other policy requirements of the Core Strategy as required by paragraph 173 of the NPPF. We have been unable to detect the inclusion of the cost of open space provision in the existing two affordable housing viability assessments. It is, therefore, unclear what consequences such a policy requirement may have on the viability of schemes and therefore the delivery of the CS.</p>					
359291	Mr Jeremy Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning	CSPS3814	Policy HE4	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>The policy is not justified as we consider the reference to recommended open space standards from the 2007 Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study is overly prescriptive in its requirements. This could lead to viability constraints in regard to delivering circa 850 dwellings at the Christchurch urban extension, whilst failing to meet the actual needs of the special locality. Further, we note that the proposed overall provision level is in excess of generally accepted national standards and consider the policy should refer to 'national standards' as an alternative.</p>	<p>We propose the following change to page 169, first paragraph, first and second line: After 'provided' delete 'by the 2007 Open Space, Sport and Recreation Studies will be applied' and insert 'within evidence based documents will be considered'.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		685	