



# **Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Examination**

## **MATTER 11: OTHER MATTERS**

### **Statement by Christchurch and East Dorset Councils**



Prepared by Christchurch Borough Council and  
East Dorset District Council

**August 2013**



## 1 Issue 1: Previously Developed Site in the Green Belt

### Response to Issue

#### Previously developed site in the green belt

#### Issue 1: VTSW7 St Leonards Hospital

- **Does the policy set out a robust strategy to ensure that any future development avoids harm to the SNCI priority habitats on the site and to the adjacent SSSI and Dorset Heaths?**

#### 1.1 Background Documents

- Core Strategy Pre-Submission Background Paper 02 The Key Strategy (September 2012) (see comments on Policy KS3) SD15.1

#### 1.2 Response to Issues

**1.3** The Policy, as amended in the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy Pre-Submission (November 2012)(SD18) makes specific reference to the need for a wildlife strategy to be agreed with the Council to ensure no harm to features of biodiversity importance from any future development of the site.

**1.4** Natural England (Consultee number 612430), in their response to the above document, have requested that the Policy be further amended.

**1.5** The Council are currently in negotiation with the agents acting for the prospective developer of the site, DWT, NE and ETAG to agree a form of wording that satisfies all parties as to the most appropriate Policy to protect the features of nature conservation importance on the site and it is anticipated that the final wording will be set out in a Statement of Common Ground which will be submitted during the Examination.

**1.6** The Council formally asks the Inspector to accept the wording proposed in the forthcoming Statement of Common Ground as a Main Modification to the Core Strategy.



## 2 Issue 2: Areas of Potential Change

### Response to Issue

#### Areas of potential change

#### Issue 2: WMC7 Leigh Park Area of Potential Change

- **Is there any realistic prospect that part of this area could be used for some housing development to meet local needs?**

**2.1** See response to Matters and Issues 5: Strategic Allocations WMC7 Leigh Park which addresses this issue and indicates that there is potential for development on the one third of the site not registered as a QEII Field in Trust.



## 3 Issue 3: Historic Heritage

### Response to Issue

#### Historic Heritage

#### Issue 3: Policy HE1 Protection of local historic and archaeological interest

- Is the Policy heading coherent?
- Is the Policy consistent with the NPPF?
- Is the Policy internally consistent?

**3.1** The Policy heading is incorrect and should indeed read '**Protection of *Buildings of Local Historic and Architectural Interest***', rather than as submitted.

**3.2** The wording of the policy was revised following comments made during the Pre-Submission consultation. The Councils believe the policy is consistent with the NPPF and follows guidance and comments previously suggested by English Heritage.

**3.3** It is proposed that the first paragraph of Policy HE1 is deleted for coherency as there is repetition with the second paragraph and it does not provide an exhaustive list of heritage assets. Policy HE1 constitutes the Councils' heritage protection strategy which will be complemented by policies prepared as part of the Councils' Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD.





## 4 Issue 4: Open Space Provision

### Response to Issue

#### Open Space Provision

#### Issue 4: Appendix 1

- **Do the guidelines for open space provision allow sufficient flexibility to allow for individual site circumstances?**

#### 4.1 Response to Issues

**4.2** The Open Space Guidelines have been prepared using the the results of the PPG17 Open Space Sport and Recreation Study (ED35), and the needs identified from this evidence report. The approach conforms with the NPPF, supports the delivery of new open space, protect existing open space and collaborates with partners, such as the Health Authorities in supporting improvements to healthy lifestyles.

**4.3** The Open Space guidelines are specifically designed to be flexible to allow for consideration of the needs of the Local Needs Area and what the individual site can help deliver. However, references to specific financial amounts in the guidelines could be removed as a modification to provide added flexibility and in view that contributions to site specific children's equipped and unequipped play space will be negotiated through a Section 106 agreement which is consistent with the Councils' draft Regulation 123 list. Charges for children's play provision will be reviewed on an annual basis as part of a CIL monitoring report.



## 5 Issue 5: Druitt Hall

### Response to Issue

#### Issue 5: Druitt Hall

- To address the concerns of residents.

**5.1** Druitt Hall is a community hall, located to the west of Christchurch High Street, adjacent to an area of open space known as Druitt Gardens. Druitt Hall was built in 1953 and is owned by Christchurch Borough Council.

**5.2** In the past few years there have been various proposals for its replacement with a more modern facility, as well as calls for the existing hall to be retained, or modernised.

**5.3** In August 2008 Christchurch Community Partnership gained planning permission for a new Druitt Hall, and set about raising funds for its construction.

**5.4** In June 2013, the Druitt Hall Association gained outline planning permission for an alternative replacement for Druitt Hall.

**5.5** Reference to support for a community facility in Christchurch Town Centre in the Core Strategy Vision has changed during the preparation of the document:

- Options stage: ***"In particular, a new Druitt Hall community facility will be developed in Christchurch in parallel with remodelled community gardens, which will act as a focus for community activity in the town."***
- Pre-Submission stage: ***"The provision of a new community facility in Christchurch town centre will be supported."***
- Pre-Submission Proposed Changes stage: the sentence relating to support for a community facility in Christchurch town centre was removed from the Vision.

**5.6** Between Options stage and Pre-Submission, the re-modelling of Druitt Gardens was completed, but there was uncertainty over the funding for the Community Hall. The reference in the Vision at Options stage was therefore out of date and needed to be changed.

**5.7** The revised wording at Pre-Submission stage was intended to indicate support for a town centre community facility, but to be more flexible in relation to its location.

**5.8** At Schedule of Proposed Changes stage, with continuing uncertainty over funding of a replacement Druitt Hall, the Council proposed to remove any specific reference to a town centre community facility from the Vision. This removed any interpretation that the Council might fund or financially support such a facility.

**5.9** Policy LN6 of the submitted Core Strategy allows for the provision of community facilities in the area, and suggests that these are concentrated in the main settlements. The Council considers that this policy already supports the provision of a community hall in Christchurch town centre, or indeed anywhere in the Core Strategy area. A specific reference in the Vision for such a facility is unnecessary, but its removal from the Vision does not preclude its development.

