

# Planning Purbeck's Future



**Proposed Changes to Pre-Submission Core Strategy Consultation**  
**1 September – 13 October 2011**  
**Summary of Representations**



# Core Strategy Proposed Changes to Pre-Submission: Summary of Representation

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound?</i>	<i>Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
-------------	--------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

## Proposed Change: General

Coal Authority		No comments	
Dorset County Council	<b>Sound</b>	In particular the following proposed changes are supported: factual updates on education provision, amendments to accurately reflect minerals consultation areas, clarification of the District's commitment to the CIL, as this will be a key mechanism for supporting the delivery of key infrastructure needed to support new development. The proposed NPPF may require further adjustments to policies in the Core Strategy, including more detailed matters set out in development management policies, to ensure that the strategy is sufficiently robust.	
Natural England		Supports where changes have been made to reflect previous comments.	
Royal Mail		General support.	
Theatres Trust			
Harrison		"Abbreviations should be explained at first occurrence, e.g. AONB.	
Johnson E		No comments	
West Lulworth Parish Council		Support changes made.	
Wool Parish Council		This version has perhaps for the first time taken into account the views and wishes of residents for the future of the parish.	

### Council Response to comments on General:

### ISSUES: General comments supporting the Core Strategy

### COUNCIL'S RESPONSE: No comments

### ACTIONS: None required

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
<b>Proposed Change: PC005</b>			
Trees for Dorset		Proposed changes to Planning Legislation throw Core Strategy and associated work into confusion so document might become out of date before it can be approved.	
<b>Council Response to comments on PC005:</b>			
<b>ISSUES: Concerns about Core Strategy being out of date in light of national policy changes.</b>			
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE: The NPPF has not been adopted and the Council has been advised by the Planning Inspectorate to press ahead with the Core Strategy. However, it may require review depending upon the content of the NPPF.</b>			
<b>ACTIONS: None required.</b>			
<b>Proposed Change: PC011</b>			
Purbeck Society		Supports the amended approach to increase provision of affordable homes where there is genuine proven local need, and where suitable sites are identified that are not detrimental to the AONB, the historic built environment of towns and villages as these elements are vital to tourism.	
Weld Estate	<b>Sound</b>	Support the principle of supporting innovative approaches to affordable housing, but would qualify in respect of the policy that 100% should be affordable with Other Villages. Innovative thinking could include various private finance and funding initiatives if such a policy permitted subsidised employee housing and an element of private commercial housing, whether for rent or sale.	Ensure that an innovative approach is as wide as possible without precluding private initiatives by restrict developments to 100% affordable housing.
SW Housing Association Registered Providers	<b>Sound</b>	Strongly support proposed change. Innovative approaches to delivering affordable housing will be required particularly when set against public funding landscape.	

Council Response to comments on PC011:

ISSUES: Support for innovative approaches.

COUNCIL'S RESPONSE: None.

ACTIONS: None required.

### Proposed Change: PC012

CPRE	<b>Unsound</b>	Second paragraph. The sites proposed in the core strategy, are not necessarily those which will found by local communities, under Neighbourhood planning. Such sites should therefore be regarded as sites to be considered.	'Bere Regis to find NEW housing sites'. - Delete the remainder of the sentence. (Page 3) Due to the timescale between preparation and approval of Neighbourhood plans under the localism Bill, and the submission of the Core Strategy the latter must be less area specific.
Purbeck Society		Support the development of neighbourhood plans to ensure development is appropriately located and sympathetically designed.	
The Charborough Estate		Support text from "Parish Councils" to "the Habitats Regulations" subject to previous representations. Object to lack of reference to Stakeholders. Welcome paragraph from "Plans" to "Habitats Regulations". Where new development can contribute to achieving sustainable patterns of development and can be achieved within environmental constraints, there is no reason why it should be artificially constrained by a theoretical paper target. Disappointed that there is no reference to Stakeholders. A Parish Council will be severely restricted in achieving its aims and objectives without active participation from local stakeholders such as landowners, local public house, village hall committee, and local businesses. Nor can there be any "in principle" reason why a group of stakeholders should not put forward their own proposals to the community. PC is not effective by omitting reference to stakeholders and is not in accord with National Policy through the emerging Localism Bill.	Change wording to read either: "Communities may wish to plan for and identify new housing, employment, retail and tourism opportunities within their community with the aim of making their community more sustainable", or "Parish Councils, in partnership with key stakeholders, may wish to plan for and identify new housing, employment, retail and tourism opportunities within their community with the aim of making their community more sustainable", or "Key stakeholders (including Parish Councils) may wish to plan for and identify new housing, employment, retail and tourism opportunities within their community with the aim of making their community more sustainable".
Trustees of W H	<b>Sound</b>	We welcome the inclusion of neighbourhood plans and the	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Drax 1962		ability of the Parish Council to plan new housing development	
Welfare Dwellings	<b>Unsound</b>	Development of the scale proposed for an urban extension at Swanage & provision of a 300 place school should not be dealt with at neighbourhood level by an unelected body that may not be representative of whole community. Reference to subsequent plans, including neighbourhood plans should be removed.	Delete proposed change PC12
Mason M	<b>Unsound</b>	There should be reference to consultation period overlapping with consultation on new National Planning Policy Framework.	
SW Housing Association Registered Providers	<b>Unsound</b>	As currently written Core Strategy suggests neighbourhood plans will have to conform with ALL policies within it. Government guidance & documents indicate they should only have to confirm with strategic elements of Core Strategy and they must be given more freedom and flexibility from Core Strategy policy.	Amend Core Strategy to reflect this.

#### **Council Response to comments on PC012:**

**ISSUES:** Comments with different perceptions of localism and neighbourhood plans. Core Strategy currently says neighbourhood plans should conform to all policies within it, but it should say they should conform to the strategic elements.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The comments on the content of neighbourhood plans conforming to strategic elements should be updated.

**ACTIONS:** Update wording to say that neighbourhood plans should be in general conformity with the Core Strategy.

#### **Proposed Change: PC013**

Dorset AONB Partnership		The definition of the AONB Management Plan should be strengthened to reflect its significance under Section 89 of the CRow Act. Need to include reference to the objectives and policy framework to help guide decision making. The coast is a significant aspect of Purbeck's natural environment that needs emphasising; reference should be made to the Dorset Coast Land and Seascape Assessment.	The final paragraph should include the following "...and investigate alternative transport modes (such as waterborne)." The final paragraph should also make reference to sustainable visitor management.
Dorset County Council	<b>Sound</b>	Rising sea level will inevitably increase flood risk but managed realignment will not necessarily do so and is often	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
	<p>deployed as a technique to reduce flood risk. This should be made clear or there is a risk that 'managed realignment' will be interpreted as a problem/threat when in fact it may be a solution/opportunity. This presumes that car parking will/must be replaced. One of the options would be to reduce parking provision which could in turn reduce traffic &amp; associated environmental pressures on Studland.</p>	
Hampshire J	<p><b>Unsound</b> Concern that developers are expected to bear the brunt of the cost of providing measures to maintain the integrity of Dorset Heathland. Suggests that development is mostly responsible for damage to integrity of Heathlands and ignores natural changes. Heathland is not a stable condition and is largely a result of clearance of woods and forests that if left, would return. A financial contribution could be waived if the development brought about measures which would directly mitigate harm caused by residents of an area. For example, the respondents are agreeable to provision of public footpath on periphery of their land which will link with others around the village and provide alternative to using heathland. Developers should not however be required to make provision beyond that justified by level of development they are proposing.</p>	
Purbeck Society	<p>Support the restoration of the rail link. Improvements to the A351 would have an adverse environmental impact. Swanage population 10,400 (2001 census) PDC quotes 9900. Which is correct? Wage of £23,000 is stated as average but PC24 stated this as median Which is correct? Under heading of Natural Environment there is no mention of butterflies - surveys state that 39% of Dorset butterfly population is present in Swanage.</p>	
RSPB	<p>Ch 2. Para 2.7 Welcome additional information on Natural Environment giving a clearer picture of Purbeck's nationally &amp; internationally important wildlife. Support para 2.10 but suggest minor rewording.</p>	<p>Recommend reference included in text to positive recognition of wildlife sites which provide ecosystem services / wildlife benefits and a valuable quality of life contribution to District. In para 2.10 include reference to Conservation of Habitats and Species</p>

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
		Regulations 2010 & include text 'The heathland supports internationally important populations of woodlark, Dartford warbler and nightjar.' In para 2.13 include reference to the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework (IPF) and forthcoming Dorset Heathland Joint Mitigation Development Plan document and the Poole Harbour Aquatic Management Plan.
Save Herston Fields	<b>Unsound</b> Swanage population 10,400(2001census) PDC quotes 9900 (ONS 2009 mid year estimate) PC117 quotes figure as 9855. Socio economic profile states wage of £23k is stated as average. PC24 it is stated as median. No mention that 39% of all dorset butterfly population are found in Swanage.butterflies	Clarify and update
The Charborough Estate	Welcome clear recognition that Wareham is the hub of Purbeck District. However, reference should also be made to the importance of employment in Wareham. The town and adjoining should be focus for housing and employment development, and should be reflected in policy and proposals. Object to failure to refer to the focus of key bus services on Wareham (Poole-Swanage and Bournemouth-Exeter). Employment at Wareham is important and it is illogical to fail to refer to it. It is illogical to refer to only one form of public transport when (at present) key bus routes are an important element of the public transport system.	
Trees for Dorset	<b>Sound</b> Support enforcement of the heathland 400m buffer zone and the mitigation policy. Heath fires also affect trees at Bovington where a fire at Cranemoor killed trees.	
Welfare Dwellings	Population growth stated as being attributable to people moving into area but PC117 suggests there may have been a population decline in area.	None
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	The demographic changes about reduction in working age population are not addressed. Regarding references to SANGS and renewable energy, strategic development at	Amend paragraph 2.10 to refer to the Dorset Green Low Carbon Energy Facility (LowCEF), which will be located at the DGTP and was granted planning

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
		Wool could provide both.	permission (ref. 6/2010/0172) during 2011.
Andrews P	<b>Unsound</b>	In 1st sentence of section headed 'Settlements' the word 'easy' is misleading because of congestion on A351.	Replace 1st sentence with: 'District has ready access to the Poole/Bournemouth conurbation, principally via A351/A35 or chain ferry across Poole Harbour, although this access is seriously affected by congestion at the most useful times'.
Hadley M	<b>Unsound</b>	Some local people have initiated wider 'Swanage Climate Change Coastal Forum' to assess implications for North Swanage.	Make reference to Swanage Climate Change Coastal Forum & its aims.
Hobbs C & M	<b>Unsound</b>	Swanage population 10,400 (2001 census) PDC quotes 9900 (ONS 2009 mid year estimate) PC117 quotes figure as 9855 but reality is that 10 years ago as per 2001's Census the Swanage population was 10400.	Scrap 'The Core Strategy' in its current form and reconsult find the most accurate and recent statistics in terms of Swanage's population available and replace the inaccurate and blatantly out of date 9900.
SW Housing Association Registered Providers	<b>Sound</b>	Welcome change that highlights ageing population	
Woodland Trust	<b>Unsound</b>	Para 2.8 & 2.10 or similar wording need to be applied to cover ancient woodland & ancient trees which are not sufficiently protected.	Amendment to para 2.10 so that it conforms to national policy on ancient woodland. Incorporate sentence: 'Any new residential development between 400m - 5km of an ancient woodland site is required to avoid any adverse effects on the integrity of the woodland'.



Name	Plan sound? Comment on soundness	Proposed Amendment
Council Response to comments on PC013:		
ISSUES: Numerous comments on the characteristics of Purbeck requiring additional detail or clarification and some comments querying accuracy of data. There are also comments for or against development depending on the viewpoint of the representor.		
COUNCIL'S RESPONSE: There is no objection to redefining the AONB Management Plan, but the purpose of the sentence is to provide a brief flavour of what it is about. The natural and built environments are well covered by the plan already. We agree that some additional information should be inserted where it adds value, but as this is a strategic document not all information is particularly relevant. A technical clarification of managed realignment could be beneficial to avoid misconceptions. It is worth including omitted strategies. Figures on wages and population should be consistent throughout the plan.		
ACTIONS: In para 2.2 ensure population figure is consistent with para 7.5.2. In para 2.3 add after Poole harbour 'although this access is seriously affected by congestion at times.' In para 2.5 clarify that the wage is median. In para 2.12 redefine AONB Management Plan as 'the AONB Partnership's vision for the area, which provides a planning and management framework to help guide decision'. Also include reference to the Dorset Coast Land and Seascape Assessment, Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework (IPF), forthcoming Dorset Heathland Joint Mitigation Development Plan, and the Poole Harbour Aquatic Management Plan. In para 2.18 state that managed realignment can be a technique to reduce flood risk and add reference to Swanage Climate Change Coastal Forum.		
Proposed Change: PC018		
The Charborough Estate	Support substitution of "the local population" for "Purbeck". Object to omission of word "local" between "diverse" and "employment opportunities". Omission of word "local" would not be in accordance with national policy. Omission also ignores opportunities to achieve some employment in villages as part of a package of development proposed by PC12.	Retain the word 'local'.
Wareham Town Trust	<b>Unsound</b>	'Distinctive' should be left in the description of Wareham town centre because it is part of its attraction.
Wyatt Homes	<b>Sound</b>	Supports that development should be of high quality and make a positive contribution.
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	NPPF and existing national policy means there should be greater recognition to the need to deliver new sustainable growth, particularly economic growth.
Insert text: 'the Council will plan for new development to meet future housing needs and promote economic growth within Purbeck and will prioritise the location of new development in line with the principles of sustainable development'.		Retain 'distinctive' in the vision for Wareham town
Wareham Town	<b>Unsound</b>	The reference to Wareham town centre in the vision for

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Council		Purbeck as "distinctive and thriving" has been revised to refer only to "continue to thrive". However the town's distinctiveness including its historic character is clearly a vital aspect of Wareham's attraction which we would wish to see retained in the vision for the future.	centre.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC018:</b>			
<b>ISSUES:</b> concerns raised regarding 'vision' in respect of 'distinctive' and not going far enough in supporting sustainable growth.			
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The vision has been changed to ensure it covers all of the district rather than focussing on specific areas or towns.			
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.			
<b>Proposed Change: PC021</b>			
Welfare Dwellings	<b>Unsound</b>	Reference to subsequent plans unacceptable. Not clear what this means but insofar as there is reference to PC12, to a range of plans, including neighbourhood plans, that is not sufficiently clear.	Delete PC23
Rees W	<b>Unsound</b>		Give examples of 'subsequent plans'. Preferably define what type of plans will be needed. Indicate boundaries on the 'subsequent plans'.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC021:</b>			
<b>ISSUES:</b> objection to the use of subsequent plans.			
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> the use of additional development plan documents and other supporting documents is acceptable under existing and emerging policy.			
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.			
<b>Proposed Change: PC023</b>			
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	By diverting future assessments to a subsequent plan(s), the Council is not providing a clear 'delivery strategy' in line with paragraph 4.1 of PPS12.	The Core Strategy should set out a clear delivery strategy, which sets out how much development is intended to happen where, when and by what means it will be delivered.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC023:</b> <b>ISSUES:</b> objection to the use of subsequent plans.  <b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> the use of additional development plan documents and other supporting documents is acceptable under existing and emerging policy.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC024</b>		
Bloor Homes Ltd	<b>Sound</b> Supports the alteration of the settlement boundary at Wareham to reflect the location of the settlement extension proposed at Worgret Road.	
CG Fry & Son Ltd	<b>Unsound</b> It is not explicitly stated, but amendment to settlement boundary will necessitate a review of the green belt boundary. Object to wording as it only provides for review of settlement boundaries to accommodate proposed settlement extensions.	
Hampshire J	<b>Unsound</b> Change refers to amending settlement boundaries. Since the North East Purbeck Local Plan was not 'saved' and the Purbeck District Plan was not adopted, there is nothing to be amended.	Delete 'amended' and insert 'defined'.
Scott Estate	<b>Unsound</b> Supports the realignment of the Wareham settlement boundary. Proposed changes to Policy LD are not consistent with objective of NPPF as they will not increase the supply of housing, do not deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, do not widen opportunities for home ownership, do not create sustainable inclusive mixed communities. The changes do not reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the draft NPPF as they have not been prepared on the basis that 'objectively assessed development needs should be met[	To ensure flexible & responsive supply of land is available and clarify spatial choices on location of new development needed in CS Policy LD should include clear reference to location of all of the settlement extensions that are needed to implement the plan.
The Charborough Estate	Support changes to paragraph commencing with "Settlement boundaries", alterations to para 5 and support paragraph commencing "A further review ...". Object to new sentence "For example, and exception is made....." and to	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
		new paragraph "Settlement boundaries in Lytchett Matravers .....". Support in principle the review of settlement boundaries through preparation of subsequent plans, and the review of housing provision in other villages without settlement boundaries which could be in line with national policy in form of emerging NPPF, and support in principle new ways of providing housing in rural areas affordable to local people.	
Welfare Dwellings	<b>Unsound</b>	Refers to amending settlement boundaries which are not defined in any Adopted Local Plan. Inappropriate to refer to extensions at Lytchett Matravers, Upton & Wareham & not to refer to the largest town & urban extension at Swanage	Delete PC24
Wyatt Homes	<b>Sound</b>	Supports alteration of settlement boundaries but expresses concerns over how tight the boundary is for the Policeman's Lane settlement extension.	
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	The Council's approach to new development in major employment locations is unclear, inconsistent with national policy guidance and confusing. DGTP and Holton Heath should be identified in Policy LD as suitable locations for new development because they can accommodate forecasted growth.	Key employment sites including DGTP and Holton Heath should be explicitly identified within the settlement hierarchy in Policy LD as suitable locations for new development.
Mason M	<b>Unsound</b>	Does not include sufficient flexibility to recognise that there will be further minor changes to settlement boundary.	Reword: These 'provisional' amended boundaries 'until further review' are set out .....
Scott Estate	<b>Sound</b>		

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
Council Response to comments on PC024:		
ISSUES: Objections from landowners that the policy is not flexible enough to enable additional housing growth and queries over the status of settlement boundaries that are being carried forward.		
COUNCIL'S RESPONSE: The policy guides the location of development and is flexible enough to enable the development proposed elsewhere in the Core Strategy. The emergence of the NPPF will encourage more development outside of settlement boundaries to deliver affordable housing and this will be considered through subsequent plans. We have been advised by the Planning Inspectorate that we can carry forward previously designated settlement boundaries from the Local Plan on the Proposals Map. The review of settlement boundaries will also amend the green belt boundary and this is already mentioned under policies NE and CEN.		
ACTIONS: None required.		
Proposed Change: PC026		
Ashvilla Estates Ltd	<b>Unsound</b> Habitats Regs Assessment gives insufficient consideration to predicting effects of further development accompanied by mitigation/avoidance measures. HRA states no obvious SANG site to enable growth to west of Wareham.	CS could be made deliverable, and thus sound, by the inclusion of reference to the potential for, and availability of, a SANG at Worgret Manor Farm provided in conjunction with development west of Wareham.
CPRE	<b>Unsound</b> Since the figure of 2400 dwellings was already inflated for 'political' reasons, over & above District requirements, any consideration of dwellings over that figure should be discarded.	Amend the sentence to read, "The study concludes that growth over and above 2,400 dwellings for the plan period has limited..." Delete the sentence after 'mitigation' up to 'reasons' and make 'this growth scenario a new sentence.
JS Bloor (Newbury) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b> The study 'Implications of Additional Growth Scenarios for European Protected Sites' (Sept 2010) is insufficiently robust and lacks credibility for strategic planning in the District. It fails to identify the opportunity to deliver strategic green space mitigation as part of a large scale housing proposal at Lytchett Minster which could divert recreation pressures on protected habitats from trips to Purbeck from the conurbation or further afield. There is a bias in the way sites/areas have been reviewed in the study. It has involved an inconsistent and incomplete approach to assessing impacts of different strategic growth options and the findings should be considered inconclusive.	Policy HS should set clear process and timetable to consider potential for higher levels of housing growth and the benefits of doing so in the context of Purbeck and the wider housing market area. A robust and credible delivery plan for higher levels of growth in Purbeck is required, supported by comprehensive sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessments and a wider variety of options for expansion of settlements/potential growth locations. This must be progressed as part of a multi agency - joined up approach - so that the delivery issues including strategic mitigation proposals are comprehensively tackled.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Redwood Partnership	<b>Unsound</b>	Contends that Wool could support higher growth and an additional 1000 houses. The plan is not being flexible to support this and is therefore contrary to national planning policy.	Identify the Wool/East Burton/DGTP as a key location for further development.
The Charborough Estate		Support penultimate sentence "It cautiously .....below". Object to sentence "The study concludes ....mitigation". Wool is not the hub of Purbeck District and the sustainability principle precludes large scale development at Wool.	
Weld Estate	<b>Unsound</b>	Section 8 of Implications for Additional Growth Scenarios for European Sites (Sept 2010). It states that Wareham is the worst place to develop in Purbeck in terms of air pollution effects on heathland and that a large allocation of housing is likely to be less damaging at Wool than Wareham or Lytchett Matravers. The study indicates that Wool is the only area with potential to provide mitigation for protected sites.	The conclusions of the study Implications for Additional Growth Scenarios for European Sites (Sept 2010) should be more clearly stated as they are not properly reflected in these amendments. Reference to not pursuing development at Wool should be removed.
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>		Support the regeneration of the DGTP site to meet the higher levels of housing growth envisaged, improving affordability and stimulating employment growth.
Gleeson Developments Ltd		The Core Strategy does not assess the demands on the area through migration and an aging demographic. When combined these factors will require a greater number of homes to accommodate the larger number of households across the District.	
Rees W	<b>Unsound</b>	Inappropriate & not required. CS deals with period up to 2027 & all development on greenfield sites for this period has been allocated. Consequently an environmental assessment in 2010 is irrelevant. Post 2027 CS would require wholly new assessment. Would have been promised break from greenfield development. Recent over-development has put strain on village & is unsustainable. This new section obfuscates the currently clear land allocation within CS & could lead to misinterpretation of very	Delete or, if not possible to delete, at least modify paragraph to state that growth scenario of 1000 dwellings will not be pursued.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Wool Parish Council		clear council position of no greenfield development within Wool or its outliers for at least duration of this CS (2027).  Provides strong and reliable evidence against large scale development at Wool.	
<b>Council Response to comments on PC026:</b>			
<b>ISSUES:</b> Comments argue for and against more/less development, depending upon the interests of the representor.			
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> We recognise that the housing target does not meet ONS household projections or will meet all local needs. The target reflects a balance between protection of the natural environment and housing growth. Growth options explored west of Wareham and at Upton have been ruled out as mitigation may not be successful. We don't consider large scale growth at Wool to be appropriate, as there is a lack of infrastructure, even if nature conservation concerns can be overcome. A bedding in period is needed to test the success of heathland mitigation in Purbeck before additional growth can be considered.			
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.			
<b>Proposed Change: PC027</b>			
Arne Parish Council	<b>Unsound</b>	The final sentence is in opposition to the challenge [para 3.1] "Improving the range of employment opportunities" and spatial objective [para 4.3.1] "Promote a prosperous local economy".	Although there is an abundant supply of employment land elsewhere in Purbeck, Dorset Green would provide a suitable site for additional high technology employment and growth in this area which would support the Purbeck vision.
Redwood Partnership	<b>Unsound</b>	The plan does not provide the flexibility to meet identified needs. Discusses why the Wool area should be identified as a strategic location for development. There is no justification to say that the Purbeck Gate development has met housing requirements for the plan period. There is no evidence to suggest that transport infrastructure would be unlikely to support the potential increase in vehicles. It is contrary to the NPPF because it does not plan positively for new development; has not been prepared on the basis that objectively assessed development needs should be met; and does not reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development.	Identify the Wool/East Burton/DGTP as a key location for further development.
The Charborough Estate		Support change. Wool is not the hub of Purbeck and it would not be appropriate for large scale development to	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
		take place in Wool, which would be contrary to national policy.	
Wareham St Martin Parish Council	<b>Unsound</b>	The final sentence is in opposition to the challenge [para 3.1] "Improving the range of employment opportunities" and spatial objective [para 4.3.1] "Promote a prosperous local economy".	Although there is an abundant supply of employment land elsewhere in Purbeck, Dorset Green would provide a suitable site for additional high technology employment and growth in this area which would support the Purbeck vision.
Weld Estate	<b>Unsound</b>	Wool is a key service villages and should be focus for development. Attempts to justify exclusion because recent housing didn't result in expansion of employment opportunities at Dorset Green is flawed. Housing does not stimulate employment growth but provides sustainable homes.	The proposed changes should be deleted to permit housing development at Wool.
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	DGTP should be a strategic employment location and this has not been fully explored. The Purbeck Gate development is not an appropriate example by which to gauge the potential for the regeneration of the DGTP site as it is new and has not been marketed towards the DGTP work force.	Support regeneration of the DGTP site to meet the higher levels of housing growth envisaged, improving affordability and stimulating employment growth.

#### **Council Response to comments on PC027:**

**ISSUES: Support for employment and other development in the Wool area.**

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE: We don't consider large scale growth at Wool to be appropriate, as there is a lack of infrastructure, even if nature conservation concerns can be overcome.**

**ACTIONS: None required.**

#### **Proposed Change: PC032**

Trustes of W H Drax 1962	<b>Sound</b>	We welcome the flexibility of neighbourhood planning to bring forward development at Bere Regis	
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	Deferring decisions to subsequent plan(s) does not accord with paragraph 4.1 of PPS12.	Set out a clear delivery strategy which identifies how much development is intended to happen where, when and by what means it will be delivered.
Rees W	<b>Sound</b>	Deletion of Wool is correct & reflects Council decision.	
SW Housing	<b>Unsound</b>	Do not consider it appropriate for the delivery of housing to	



<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Association Registered Providers		be dependent on neighbourhood plans. They can not be relied upon to be brought forward in the same way that Site Allocations DPDs produced by local authority can be. A contingency should be put in place.	
<b>Council Response to comments on PC032:</b>			
<b>ISSUES:</b> Objection to the use of subsequent plans.			
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The use of additional development plan documents and other supporting documents is acceptable under existing and emerging policy.			
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.			
<b>Proposed Change: PC035</b>			
Purbeck Society		6.4.4 Map 5 is incorrectly referred to as Map 3	change 6.4.4. to read Map 5
<b>Council Response to comments on PC035:</b>			
<b>ISSUES:</b> paragraph 6.4.4 refers to map 3 instead of map 5.			
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Map number should be updated.			
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Amend map number to 5 in para 6.4.4.			
<b>Proposed Change: PC036</b>			
JS Bloor (Newbury) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	The study 'Implications of Additional Growth Scenarios for European Protected Sites' is insufficiently robust and lacks credibility for strategic planning in the District. It fails to identify the opportunity to deliver strategic green space mitigation as part of a large scale housing proposal at Lytchett Minster which could divert recreation pressures on protected habitats from trips to Purbeck from the conurbation or further afield.	It should be made clear that the proposed total housing provision fails to provide for the needs of Purbeck, for example, as evidenced by the latest emerging strategic housing market assessment. Policy HS should set clear process and timetable to consider potential for higher levels of housing growth and the benefits of doing so in the context of Purbeck and the wider housing market area. A robust and credible delivery plan for higher levels of growth in Purbeck is required, supported by comprehensive sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessments and a wider variety of options for expansion of settlements / potential growth locations. This must be progressed as part of

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Redwood Partnership	Object to deletion of final paragraph as insufficient housing is planned to meet needs and therefore not consistent with NPPF. The change removes the flexibility to consider further growth at Wool in subsequent plans.	a multi agency -joined up approach - so that the delivery issues including strategic mitigation proposals are comprehensively tackled.
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b> Core Strategy accepts that growth over 2400 dwellings is required to meet district housing needs. Assessment of scenarios over 2400 houses including land at Wool has not been properly investigated.	Identify Wool/East Burton/DGTP as a key location for further development and increase housing provision to about 4000 dwellings by 2016.
		Regeneration of the DGTP site has the potential to deliver new economic growth alongside new housing, thereby assisting Purbeck in meeting the higher levels of housing growth envisaged, improving affordability and stimulating employment growth. The Core Strategy should reconsider the delivery of new housing growth (alongside economic growth) at the DGTP site.

#### **Council Response to comments on PC036:**

#### **ISSUES: Arguments for higher level housing growth.**

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The level of growth the Council has agreed upon is considered appropriate for the plan period. We recognise that the housing target does not meet ONS household projections or will meet all local needs. The target reflects a balance between protection of the natural environment and housing growth. Growth options explored west of Wareham and at Upton have been ruled out as mitigation may not be successful. We don't consider large scale growth at Wool to be appropriate, as there is a lack of infrastructure, even if nature conservation concerns can be overcome. A bedding in period is needed to test the success of heathland mitigation in Purbeck before additional growth can be considered.

**ACTIONS: None required.**

#### **Proposed Change: PC037**

Welfare Dwellings	<b>Unsound</b> Not a factual update to refer to future plans in such vague terms	Delete PC37
-------------------	--	-------------

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC037:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> Objection to the use of subsequent plans.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The use of additional development plan documents and other supporting documents is acceptable under existing and emerging policy.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC045</b>		
Arne Parish Council	Wool is the settlement near to Dorset Green & should be reinstated in Table 2.	Replace N/A with Wool.
Wareham St Martin Parish Council	Wool is the settlement near to Dorset Green & should be reinstated in Table 2	Replace N/A with Wool
Weld Estate	<b>Unsound</b> Policy LD is inconsistent in its amended form and Wool is the settlement associated with Dorset Green Technology Park.	Reinstate Wool as the settlement associated with Dorset Green Technology Park.
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b> The Council's approach towards new development within Purbeck's major employment locations is unclear, inconsistent with national guidance and confusing. DGTP should be identified in Table 2 as a settlement in its own right.	Include DGTP in the settlement hierarchy and identify it as a suitable location for new development.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC045:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> The comments concern the relationship between Dorset Green Technology Park (DGTP) and the settlement of Wool.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The Council does not consider DGTP to either constitute a settlement itself, nor to form an integral part of the settlement of Wool.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC047</b>		
Birchmere Ltd	<b>Unsound</b> Map 7 takes information from Table 3 and shows it on a map base. The word 'estimated' has been added to the "remaining availability" column of Table 3. Map 7 should be updated accordingly, in particular in relation to Holton heath	Update Map 7 to include the word 'estimated' in relation to available employment land.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
	and Admiralty Park.	
<b>Council Response to comments on PC047:</b>		
<b>ISSUE:</b> The comment concerns the information shown in Table 3 and depicted within Map 7 and suggests that the estimated figures should also be indicated on the map.		

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** Agree with suggested change.

**ACTIONS:** Update title of Map 7 to read 'Distribution of Existing Employment Land - Estimated Remaining Availability (ha) (at 1st April 2011)' and ensure consistency with Table 2.

#### Proposed Change: PC048

Arne Parish Council	<b>Unsound</b>	The wording struck out from "The Core Strategy provides ..... conservation value." is required to protect this site. Whilst not suggesting the owner is likely to fell trees or clear for large scale factory development, clearly the nature conservation of this site is important and therefore should remain in the Core Strategy.	Reinstate the sentence "The Core Strategy .....conservation value." in 6.5.3.2.
Wareham St Martin Parish Council	<b>Unsound</b>	The wording struck out from "The Core Strategy provides ..... conservation value." is required to protect this site. Whilst not suggesting the owner is likely to fell trees or clear for large scale factory development, clearly the nature conservation of the site is important and should remain in text.	Reinstate the sentence "The Core Strategy .....conservation value" in 6.5.3.2.

**Council Response to comments on PC048:**

**ISSUE:** Objection made to the removal of wording which related to protecting and enhancing the nature conservation value of Admiralty Park.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** This wording was originally included in association with a reference to the opportunity to formally allocate the site in order to allow refurbishment and redevelopment of the existing buildings. This reference has also been removed since the Core Strategy does not allocate sites.

**ACTIONS:** None required.

#### Proposed Change: PC051

ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	The emerging masterplan should remain in the Core Strategy.
--------------------	----------------	---

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC051:</b> <b>ISSUE:</b> Suggestion that the masterplan produced by Rolf Judd for the Dorset Green Technology Park should be given careful consideration as a key strategic site in the Core Strategy.  <b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The growth levels identified within the Core Strategy do not require Dorset Green Technology Park to be identified as a key strategic site for development.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC052</b>		
Trustes of W H Drax 1962	<b>Unsound</b> The Core Strategy does not deal adequately with the allocation of employment land for the future.	Rather than carry forward the existing local plan allocations the Core Strategy should seek to reallocate these employment sites. Allocations should provide flexibility in terms of land use permitted in the policy and in relation to the size of the site in order to meet changing needs and market conditions.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC052:</b> <b>ISSUE:</b> Suggestion that there is an inadequate allocation of employment land.  <b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The Core Strategy does not allocate future employment land, but instead provides a strategic steer. The Council considers that there is sufficient flexibility in the identified employment land supply to meet future market requirements.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC056</b>		
The Charborough Estate	Support new sentence "In rural areas.....communities". Object to assessment and employment land supply being deleted from Core Strategy and delayed to await the Employment Land Review Part 3. New employment is desirable to improve sustainability of villages, especially as part of an overall development package. PC56 is in accord with national policy in favour of sustainable development. Whilst Charborough Estate welcomes possibility of some employment land coming forward through subsequent plans, deferring this process to	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	<p>the ELS and subsequent plans fails to recognise that some appropriate employment land should come forward as part of mixed development. An example is land adjoining Westminster Estate in Wareham which would come forward as part of mixed development for North Wareham incorporating housing employment and extensive SANGS.</p> <p>Deferring decisions to a subsequent plan(s) is not in accordance with paragraph 4 of PPS12, which requires Core Strategies to set out how much development is intended to happen, where, when and by what means it will be delivered. The NPPF also encourages identification of strategic sites for local and inward investment. Policy ELS should identify DGTP.</p>	Identify DGTP in Policy ELS as the preferred location for focusing economic development.
<p><b>Council Response to comments on PC056:</b></p> <p><b>ISSUE: Suggestion that Policy ELS: Employment Land Supply should identify Dorset Green Technology Park (DGTP) as a strategic site for focussing economic development.</b></p> <p><b>COUNCIL's RESPONSE: The Council does not consider that it is necessary for the DGTP to be identified as a strategic site, as only a modest area (5ha) has been identified to be required to meet local needs and this is already specified in the Core Strategy.</b></p>			
<b>ACTIONS: None required.</b>			
<b>Proposed Change: PC060</b>			
Wareham Town Trust	<b>Unsound</b>	There is no justification to say that choice could be improved.	Remove 'however, choice could be improved'.
Wareham Town Council	<b>Unsound</b>		Delete from "However, choice could be improved." because there is no need or adequate justification for this text.
Wheatley D	<b>Unsound</b>	Para 6.7.3.1 states 'choice could be improved'. Retail Impact Assessment is weak on this point, evidence is based on local consultation carried out some time ago which is out-dated and undertaken when the economic climate was different. Current evidence suggests that people are reducing their requirements not expanding their choices.	

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound?</i>	<i>Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
<p><b>Council Response to comments on PC060:</b></p> <p><b>ISSUE:</b> Objection to the statement 'that choice could be improved through provision of a new large food store'. Suggestion that the evidence base is out of date and produced in a different economic climate.</p> <p><b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The Council agrees that the statement concerning choice should be removed as should the entire paragraph. The original household survey was undertaken in 2007 and is becoming dated. However the retail evidence base has been updated in 2010. In late 2011, we asked NLP to re-assess the the food floorspace requirements is light of the latest population data based on the Core Strategy housing target. Their letter is included in the evidence base. Some changes are needed to supporting text of Policy RFS to reflect recent changes.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b> Delete para 6.7.3.1. Amend para 6.7.3.2 to provide brief summary of how the retail strategy has evolved. Insert new para summarising latest NLP update letter and subsequent changes to food floorspace requirements.</p>			
<b>Proposed Change: PC061</b>			
Purbeck Society		More emphasis is needed to strengthen town and village centres.	
Wareham Town Trust	<b>Unsound</b>	Paragraph understates local concerns. The evidence suggesting car trips to Poole would be reduced is flawed and it fails to highlight the true likely impact on Wareham town centre.	Amend text: 'there is considerable local concern about the impact of an out-of-town supermarket on the vitality and viability of Wareham and Swanage town centres.
Salter A & T	<b>Unsound</b>	Many local people, local businesses and Swanage and Wareham town councils are concerned about out-of-town supermarket & negative impact on character of Wareham.	Increased mention of adverse effect of out-of-town supermarket on local jobs & businesses. Greater clarity to ensure Wareham can resist such development.
Scott Estate	<b>Unsound</b>	There is no evidence to suggest a new out of town food store would have a negative impact on the character and setting of Wareham town centre.	Identify a location for a food store.
Wareham Town Council	<b>Unsound</b>	The changes to this paragraph suggest that it is only "Swanage and Wareham Town Councils and some local businesses" concerned that an out-of-town supermarket would have a negative impact upon the character and setting of Wareham and Swanage town centres. However, during the consultation last year and at the Purbeck District Council meeting in October 2010, a petition signed by 1500 residents/visitors was received and representations given by a wide range of local residents and organisations including	Suggested amendment to reflect the true weight of local opinion : "There is considerable local concern regarding the impact of an out-of-town supermarket on the vitality and viability of Wareham and Swanage town centres."

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
	Wareham and District Chamber of Trade and Commerce, Purbeck Environmental Action Team, Wareham Town Trust and the Council for the Protection of Rural England.	
<b>Council Response to comments on PC061:</b>		
<b>ISSUE:</b> Objections/support for an out of town supermarket at Wareham depending upon the interests of the representor.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The Core Strategy does not include proposals for an out of town supermarket. The policy requires new retail floorspace to be found in town centres. However, the Core Strategy would benefit from an update to the supporting text of Policy RFS.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Delete para 6.7.3.1. Amend para 6.7.3.2 to provide brief summary of how the retail strategy has evolved. Insert new para summarising latest NLP update letter and subsequent changes to food floorspace requirements.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC063</b>		
Weld Estate	<b>Unsound</b> Support the emphasis of improving the retail offer in key service villages consistent with Wool parish's list of new or improved community facilities. However, greater facilities require a greater number of users and this is not consistent with the amendments to the LD Policy which dismisses further development at Wool.	Ensure policies are consistent within the strategy.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC063:</b>		
<b>ISSUE:</b> One comment that the intention to improve the retail offer within Wool is inconsistent with Policy LD: Location of Development		
<b>COUNCIL RESPONSE:</b> The opportunity to improve the retail offer at Wool would serve existing residents in the village and across surrounding area and this would not require strategic growth at Wool.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC064</b>		
Calver S	Inclusion of 4000sqm provides stronger case for developers to build supermarket on Wareham Middle School playing fields.	Exclude policy RFS from the plan.
Humphries R	Minutes of open meeting 5/10/2010 state proposal for a 2000m2 supermarket at Worgret Road be removed from draft CS & CS be revised where necessary to reflect this	All reference to supermarket and retail space, both 2000m2 & 4000m2 be removed from CS



<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
		decision.	
James C		Proposals for 4000m2 of food & non-food retail space in CS may lead the council exposed to legal challenge for a supermarket planning application.	
Miller M		Concerned about plans to build 4000sqm supermarket in Wareham.	
Salter A & T	<b>Unsound</b>	Insufficient sites within Wareham to achieve 4,000m2 of retail floor space. Policy LD only refers to settlement boundaries and not to town centres as required by PPS4.	Greater legal clarity required to protect town centre from out-of-town retail development. Boundaries of town centre should be kept as 2004 Purbeck Local Plan.
Scott Estate	<b>Unsound</b>	Supports the recognition for a need for retail floor space, but where this will be should be identified in the plan.	Identify where a new food store should be provided.
Spiller B	<b>Unsound</b>	Although policy states that floor space will be in centres in accordance with Policy LD, there are insufficient sites within Wareham Town centre to achieve this and developers will argue for use of the middle school playing fields. Policy LD states that development should be accommodated within settlement boundaries and does not insist that retail development must be accommodated within Town Centre as required by PPS4. The 2010 RIA is flawed and inflates the benefits of additional retail floorspace and underplays the likely impact on the town centre. The existing RIA and supplementary statement admit there is no quantitative need for additional convenience floor space.	The flawed version of the RIA should be removed from the evidence base and be rewritten to give due balance to all issues at stake. The pre-submission draft should be changed to exclude any requirement for new retail floor space.
Spiller C		Although policy states that floor space will be in centres in accordance with Policy LD, there are insufficient sites within Wareham Town centre to achieve this and developers will argue for use of the middle school playing fields. Policy LD states that development should be accommodated within settlement boundaries and does not insist that retail development must be accommodated within Town Centre as required by PPS4. The 2010 RIA is flawed and inflates the benefits of additional retail floorspace and underplays the likely impact on the town centre. The existing RIA and	The flawed version of the RIA should be removed from the evidence base and be rewritten to give due balance to all issues at stake. The pre-submission draft should be changed to exclude any requirement for new retail floor space.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Stagg M		<p>supplementary statement admit there is no quantitative need for additional convenience floor space.</p> <p>Objects on the grounds that Policy RFS will lead to an out-of-town supermarket because there is no space in Wareham town centre.</p>	
Wareham Chamber of Trade	<b>Unsound</b>	Revised policy will still allow out of town retailing at appeal, contrary to wishes of Council decision in October 2010	Remove mention of extra retail floorspace
Wareham Town Council	<b>Unsound</b>	<p>There is no need to indicate 2,000sqm of food &amp; 2,000sqm of non-food floor space because the reasons set out in the RIA are unsound, without comprising a credible evidence base and underestimating the impact of new retail floor space and a new supermarket in particular on existing town centres. The Study also overestimates the environmental benefits of potentially less car trips to the conurbation. The RIA and the supplementary statement by NLP dated 19th October 2010 make clear that there is no quantitative need for additional convenience floor space in Wareham. Policy RFS states that sites will be provided "in centre" (which presumably means town centres) and that such "sites will be identified through a subsequent plan(s)". However it is clear that no such sites sufficient to accommodate this level of retail floor space are or are likely to be available in Wareham town centre in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>The approach being taken in the Strategy is to allocate where a need has been identified, whereas government guidance on retailing PPS4 lays more emphasis on impact.</p>	Policy RFS should be deleted in its entirety from the Core Strategy and the Retail Impact Assessment currently included in the evidence base removed
Watson K		Continued proposal to keep retail space in the strategy despite a clear message from the community that they don't need a large out of town supermarket in Wareham. The 2010 Retail Impact Assessment was flawed with findings omitted. It disregarded the findings of the 2005 RIA which outlined the potential negative impacts of a large supermarket on Wareham town's retail and service businesses.	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Williams Y	<b>Unsound</b>	Questions the legality of deferring controversial development to subsequent plans i.e. retail floor space.	
<b>Council Response to comments on PC064:</b>			
<b>ISSUE:</b> Objections made to the 2000 square metres target for food floorspace. Suggestion that the September 2010 Retail Impact Assessment is flawed and underplays the impact upon Wareham town centre.			
<b>COUNCIL RESPONSE:</b> The Core Strategy does not include proposals for an out of town supermarket. The policy requires new retail floorspace to be found in centres, i.e. Wareham, Swanage and Upton. This could be made clearer through reference to 'town and village retail centres'. In late 2011, we asked NLP to re-assess the the food floorspace requirements is light of the latest population data based on the Core Strategy housing target. They conclude that a lower target of 1,300sqm net food floorspace is required over the plan period. This need could be met by a number of smaller food shops in town or village retail centres, rather than one large supermarket. The NLP letter is included in the evidence base. Changes to Policies RFS and LD are needed to clarify the position.			

**ACTIONS:** Delete target of 4,000 sqm retail floorspace in Policy RFS. Amend food floor space target to '1,300 sqm (net) of food floor space'. Amend final paragraph to read 'This new floor space will be focussed in town centres and local centres in accordance with Policy LD: General Location of Development and Policy RP: Retail Provision. Sites will be allocated through subsequent plan(s), including the Swanage Area Action Plan.' Add to Policy LD 'New retail development must be concentrated within town centres or local centres as shown on the Proposals Map.'

#### **Proposed Change: PC066**

The Charborough Estate	Support change. Although Purbeck District may be able to make a modest contribution to the housing, employment and recreational needs of wider South East Dorset sub region, the primary focus must be meeting the needs of the local population for housing, jobs and recreation.
------------------------	--

#### **Council Response to comments on PC066:**

**ISSUES:** None

**ACTIONS:** None required

#### **Proposed Change: PC067**

RSPB	Welcome emphasis in the vision on the important role of habitats & landscapes on the character of villages implying they are an asset to the local community.
------	---

**Council Response to comments on PC067:**

**ISSUES:** None

**ACTIONS:** None required

**Proposed Change: PC069**

Highways Agency	<b>Unsound</b>	In our response to the pre-consultation core strategy we highlighted our concern about provision for housing within Bere Regis without provision of employment, as that strategy would be likely to encourage additional out-trips by car, especially given the poor level of public transport and high levels of out commuting to Dorchester and Poole. We do not believe that the removal of provision of new employment in Bere Regis in the core strategy is the most appropriate strategy for Bere Regis.	Keep the previous wording
Trustees of W H Drax 1962	<b>Unsound</b>	While it is understood that the new employment site could be delayed and therefore brought forward by a subsequent plan, it is considered regrettable that following the work carried out on the core strategy to date, that employment sites are not allocated through the core strategy.	It is suggested that pending the production of the employment land review document, that the allocations formerly put forward within the core strategy are reinstated. This should include an allocation of 1 hectare at Bere Regis.

**Council Response to comments on PC069:**

**ISSUES:** Concern raised by Highways Agency and a landowner about removal of employment allocation at Bere Regis.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The existing employment allocation will remain safeguarded and carried forward by the Core Strategy as explained in Policy ELS. This is to allow proper review through Employment Land Review Part 3 followed by deletion or allocation in a subsequent plan. In the event that a planning application for the housing allocation is submitted before this, a minor change to the policy will ensure that employment is also considered.

**ACTIONS:** Amend fourth paragraph of Policy NW to state "Proposals should also investigate the opportunity to provide a larger health centre, employment site and community meeting space." Add to para 7.1.8 Employment after ELR Part 3 "In the interim the existing North Street allocation as set out in the Purbeck Local Plan Final Edition will be carried forward on the Proposals Map and safeguarded for employment uses"

**Proposed Change: PC071**

Trustees of W H Drax 1962	<b>Unsound</b>	While the formal allocation of development at Bere Regis can be brought forward under subsequent plans. We	Paragraph discussing bringing forward a cycle of 50 houses in advance of the formal allocation through a
---------------------------	----------------	--	--

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
	suggest the policy should be more flexible in relation to overall housing numbers with the view to discuss proposals for a larger health centre and community space. This may require residential development in excess of 50 units, neighbourhood plans should have the flexibility in this area.	subsequent plan be amended to recognise that some flexibility on housing numbers may be needed in relation to their delivery and the new school, new health centre and community space.

**Council Response to comments on PC071:**

**ISSUES:** One comment from a landowner seeking flexibility to increase housing target to ensure delivery of community facilities.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The settlement extension target of 50 dwellings could be raised through the preparation of a neighbourhood plan, provided it is accompanied by adequate mitigation of European protected sites.

**ACTIONS:** None required

**Proposed Change: PC072**

Trustees of W H Drax 1962	<b>Unsound</b> Deletion of employment allocations is not supported.	Deleted text relating to new employment site be reinstated.
---------------------------	---	---

**Council Response to comments on PC072:**

**ISSUE:** Landowner objects to removal of employment allocation at Bere Regis.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The existing employment allocation will remain safeguarded and carried forward by the Core Strategy as explained in Policy ELS. This is to allow proper review through Employment Land Review Part 3 followed by deletion or allocation in a subsequent plan. In the event that a planning application for the housing allocation is submitted before this, a minor change to the policy will ensure that employment is also considered.

**ACTIONS:** Amend fourth paragraph of Policy NW to state "Proposals should also investigate the opportunity to provide a larger health centre, employment site and community meeting space." Add to para 7.1.8 Employment after ELR Part 3 "In the interim the existing North Street allocation as set out in the Purbeck Local Plan Final Edition will be carried forward on the Proposals Map and safeguarded for employment uses"

**Proposed Change: PC073**

Dorset AONB Partnership	In addition to new development it is suggested that the increasing volumes of traffic also have an adverse impact upon protected sites.	
RSPB	Recommend that mitigation measures in HRA will be closely adhered to in final Core Strategy, particularly that allocated	Cross reference mitigation in policy DH and PH

Name	Plan sound? Comment on soundness	Proposed Amendment
	<p>dwellingings can only be taken forward with the implementation of specified high quality SANGS with Natural England's endorsement and partnership working.</p> <p>Support reference to Dorset Heathlands SAC/SPA Ramsar site, PH SPA/Ramsar site and suitable mitigation as recommended in HRA.</p>	
<b>Council Response to comments on PC073:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> Comments from RSPB seeks cross references and AONB partnership seeks reference to adverse impact on European protected sites from traffic.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> All policies in the Core Strategy must be read alongside each other and cross references are unnecessary. The current wording is general enough to include all adverse impacts to protected sites and doesn't need specific reference to traffic.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required		
<b>Proposed Change: PC074</b>		
RSPB	<p>Supports the additional Green Infrastructure (GI) but would have greater weight if included in Policy and cross referenced to Policies DH and PH</p>	
Trees for Dorset	<b>Sound</b>	<p>Green Infrastructure Policy has been made clearer. We would wish to see more positive view than just 'consideration'. The provision of Green Infrastructure should include more than just street trees but also group planting of trees and shrubs that will provide visual and sound buffers. Enhancement of existing tree belts and hedges could be part of this policy. We are pleased to see that local communities will be involved in the consideration of green infrastructure.</p>
Woodland Trust	<b>Unsound</b>	<p>Para on Green Infrastructure should include more reference to native woodland. Representor sets out the documents that support good management of ancient trees &amp; woodland.</p> <p>3rd sentence of 'Green Infrastructure Provision' of para 7.1.8 amended to read '.....planning of street trees and native woodland, new play areas.....'.</p>

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC074:</b> <b>ISSUES:</b> Comments seek to strengthen Green Infrastructure policy.  <b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The current wording includes examples and not every possibility needs to be listed. However, some minor changes could be made. All policies in the Core Strategy must be read alongside each other and cross references are unnecessary.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Amend para 7.1.8 Green Infrastructure Provision to read "...allotments, planting of street trees, groups of trees/shrubs, hedges and woodland, new play areas.."		
<b>Proposed Change: PC075</b>		
Dorset County Council	<b>Sound</b>	It is requested that this paragraph should also acknowledge the aims of reducing greenhouse gas emissions & reducing traffic & congestion.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC075:</b> <b>ISSUE:</b> Strengthening of policy suggested in respect of reducing greenhouse gases and congestion.  <b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Agreed a change would improve the Core Strategy		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Amend transport section of paras 7.1.8, 7.2.8, 7.3.8, 7.4.8 and 7.5.10 to read "providing alternative forms of transport to the car, reducing gas emissions and traffic congestion, and to improve and help minimise air quality..."		
<b>Proposed Change: PC077</b>		
Weld Estate	<b>Unsound</b>	Wool Parish wish to maintain village status which is not consistent, rightly, with being a key service village. Residents wish to see new and improved facilities and enhancements to train station - not achievable without development to sustain and perhaps contribute. Improvements in facilities and services essential to maintain Wools position as a hub for south-west Purbeck.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC077:</b> <b>ISSUE:</b> Landowner seeks housing growth to deliver Parish Plan actions  <b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The level of growth in Core Strategy is supported by Wool Parish Council		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required		

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
<b>Proposed Change: PC079</b>		
RSPB	Support the vision's commitment to enhance those rural heaths under pressure from mineral extraction & military operations, & recognition of the importance of the cliff, grassland & wetland habitats.	
Weld Estate	<b>Sound</b> Consider the amendments to be sound, but the vision has glaring omissions particularly Lulworth Cove and Durdle Door and their importance to local tourism and employment. Wool is an important hub for Lulworth in providing local facilities and housing for employment, as well as being a key transport interchange for the district (para 7.2.1).	Include the wider area served by Wool, not just the immediate surrounding area. Wool is often preferable to Wareham because of car parking issues in the latter.
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b> South West Purbeck (specifically around DGTP and Wool) appears to be the only suitable location to accommodate significant housing and economic growth within Purbeck. Therefore, the Vision for South West Purbeck should recognise this.	The Vision for South West Purbeck and Core Strategy as a whole should explicitly support and reference the opportunity for a mixed use residential and employment development at DGTP.

**Council Response to comments on PC079:**

**ISSUES:** Comments requiring the vision to have more recognition of housing and employment potential, and reference to tourism destinations

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** Agree that important tourism sites should be included in vision. The Core Strategy has decided that Wool should not support further housing growth and the future of the Dorset Green Technology Park will be re-assessed through the Employment Land Review Part 3.

**ACTIONS:** Amend Vision for South West Purbeck to read "...the maritime cliffs including Durdle Door and Lulworth Cove, and the open chalk..."

<b>Proposed Change: PC081</b>		
RSPB	Support inclusion of provision for heathland mitigation at MOD Bovington.	
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b> Objects to deletion of reference to further development at DGTP.	Recognise Rolfe Judd's proposed masterplan approach towards securing the regeneration of DGTP.



<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC081:</b> <b>ISSUES:</b> A landowner objects to deletion of reference to Dorset Green Technology Park.  <b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The existing employment allocation will remain safeguarded and carried forward by the Core Strategy as explained in Policy ELS. This is to allow proper review through Employment Land Review Part 3 followed by deletion or allocation in a subsequent plan.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Add to para 7.2.8 Employment "The existing allocation at Dorset Green as set out in the Purbeck Local Plan Final Edition will be carried forward on the Proposals Map and safeguarded for employment uses. The site will be re-assessed through Employment Land Review part 3 and the allocation will be reviewed in a subsequent plan."		
<b>Proposed Change: PC084</b>		
Dorset AONB Partnership	Addressing impacts on protected habitats and wildlife • In addition to new development it is suggested that the increasing volumes of traffic also have an adverse impact upon protected sites.	
Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b> Support the additional text relating to the Habitats Regulations.	
RSPB	Recommend that mitigation measures in HRA will be closely adhered to in final Core Strategy, particularly that allocated dwellings can only be taken forward with the implementation of specified high quality SANGS with Natural England's endorsement and partnership working. Welcome reference to relevant EU sites, masterplans & dev briefs, DHJDPD & GI provision and that suitable mitigation is included. Would be afforded greater weight if included within policy. Support amendments to employment land allocations Dorset Green Technology Park but would have greater weight if included in Policy ELS.	Cross reference mitigation in policies DH, PH and ELS

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC084:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> Comments from RSPB seeks cross references and AONB partnership seeks reference to adverse impact on European protected sites from traffic.		

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** All policies in the Core Strategy must be read alongside each other and cross references are unnecessary. The current wording is general enough to include all adverse impacts to protected sites and doesn't need specific reference to traffic.

<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required
-------------------------------

#### Proposed Change: PC085

Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the additional text relating to Green Infrastructure	
Trees for Dorset	<b>Sound</b>	Green Infrastructure Policy has been made clearer. We would wish to see more positive view than just 'consideration'. The provision of Green Infrastructure should include more than just street trees but also group planting of trees and shrubs that will provide visual and sound buffers. Enhancement of existing tree belts and hedges could be part of this policy. We are pleased to see that local communities will be involved in the consideration of green infrastructure.	
Woodland Trust	<b>Unsound</b>	Lack of reference to native woodland.	Make reference to native woodland.

#### Council Response to comments on PC085:

**ISSUES:** Comments seek to strengthen Green Infrastructure policy.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The current wording includes examples and not every possibility needs to be listed. However, some minor changes could be made. All policies in the Core Strategy must be read alongside each other and cross references are unnecessary.

<b>ACTIONS:</b> Amend para 7.2.8 Green Infrastructure Provision to read "...allotments, planting of street trees, groups of trees/shrubs, hedges and woodland, new play areas..."
---

#### Proposed Change: PC086

Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Supports the additional text relating to the Habitats Regulations.
-----------------------	--------------	--

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC086:</b>		
<b>ISSUES: None.</b>		
<b>ACTIONS: None required.</b>		
<b>Proposed Change: PC088</b>		
Arne Parish Council	Wareham St Martin is not part of Wareham Community Plan and should be placed in its own paragraph as Arne Parish.	Alter numbering so that Wareham St Martin has its own reference.
Wareham St Martin Parish Council	Wareham St Martin is not part of Wareham Community Plan and should be placed in its own paragraph as Arne Parish is.	Alter numbering so that Wareham St Martin has own reference.
Humphrey G	<b>Unsound</b> "The plan supports the use of brownfield sites for affordable housing" and PDC's earlier plans proposed that new housing should be "spread around the District", yet the new proposals leap to 200 houses on one site on one road in the town. There is no indication any thought has been given to brownfield sites first before encroaching onto Green Belt.	
<b>Council Response to comments on PC088:</b>		
<b>ISSUES: Objection that Wareham St Martin should be placed in its own paragraph as it does not fall within Wareham Community Plan. Objection that no thought has been given to brownfield sites before encroaching on Green Belt.</b>		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE: Agree with comment regarding Wareham St Martin Parish. The Council has given thought to housing supply from brownfield sites and has prepared evidence of such sites through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and a Character Area Development Potential Assessment.</b>		
<b>ACTIONS: Alter paragraph numbering so that Wareham St Martin is placed within its own paragraph for consistency.</b>		
<b>Proposed Change: PC091</b>		
RSPB	Support vision's recognition of habitats and landscapes and the commitment to enhance, restore, manage and conserve the heathland, the shores of Poole Harbour and botanically rich areas in Wareham.	
The Charborough Estate	Support first proposed new sentence "Central Purbeck ..... Purbeck" and support proposed second paragraph,	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
	reference to strong spatial links to the Poole-Bournemouth conurbation, and wide range of facilities and services available in Wareham. Object to failure to recognise the case for more housing and employment in central Purbeck at Wareham Town and Wareham St Martin (Sandford).	
Scott Estate	The vision does not recognise the need for a new food store.	Include provision for a food store up to 2000sqm net floor space at Wareham.

**Council Response to comments on PC091:**

**ISSUES: Objection to failure of vision to recognise case for more housing, retail and employment in central Purbeck.**

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The level of growth at Wareham is considered appropriate to balance the provision of housing with the conservation of nearby heathlands. There is already a substantial oversupply of employment land across the District and no need for an out of town supermarket.

**ACTIONS: None required.**

**Proposed Change: PC092**

CPRE	<b>Unsound</b>	The first sentence is sufficient to cover the subject. The addition at line three supposes changes not specified. i.e. the developments on Purbeck & Middle School sites can be accommodated without a boundary change, & as stated the retail provision will be in the town centre.	Change to read (line 2) 'subsequent plan(s) for the allocation of a ----' 1.e. delete the changed wording on line 3.
The Charborough Estate		Object to lack of clarity with regard to settlement boundary review.	
Williams Y	<b>Unsound</b>	Unjustified because it takes in playing fields. Objects to deletion of text regarding Sandford Primary sharing its campus with Sandford Middle School. A separate sixth form would have been separate and self-contained, whereas the arts centre will mean children walking across a busy main road.	Keep in separate sixth form college. Protect the playing fields by leaving them in Green Belt. No public buildings on surplus land and definitely not a supermarket.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC092:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> Concern that the amendment to the Wareham settlement boundary could allow retail development to take place on the edge of Wareham.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The settlement boundary has been altered to ensure that the housing allocated at Worgret Road, Wareham is within the settlement boundary. The site is not allocated for retail development.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required		
<b>Proposed Change: PC093</b>		
Williams Y	<b>Unsound</b> Map is ill defined and questions whether PDC can take land out of Green Belt. The SANGS have not been identified on Map 11 - map is unclear.	Discuss with people of Purbeck
<b>Council Response to comments on PC093:</b>		
<b>ISSUE:</b> Map 11 is unclear and questions whether land can be taken out of Green Belt. The SANGS have not been identified.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Map identifies all land proposed to be taken out of Green Belt and included within the settlement boundary. Two areas of Heathland Mitigation (SANGS) are identified. To increase certainty, extra detail should be added to the mixed use allocation to indicate where the focus for housing development will be.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Add extra detail to map 11 to show focus for housing development within the Worgret Road allocation.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC094</b>		
CG Fry & Son Ltd	<b>Unsound</b> The Council has indicated that the briefs are currently the subject of consultation, whereas the consultation is, in fact, a series of workshops to gain ideas from the local community regarding what should go in the development briefs. It is understood that the development briefs will then be developed and included as part of the evidence base. There would appear to be no further opportunity to comment on the documents. It is not clear what status the development briefs will hold and their relationship to the Core Strategy. They will not have been the subject of consultation and the weight that can be attributed will be very limited. Their role needs to be made clear and the draft briefs made subject of formal consultation. The current process is unsound and potentially not legally compliant.	Core Strategy needs to set out clearly the intended role and use of the proposed briefs and relationship to the Core Strategy. The briefs need to be subject of formal consultation.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
<p><b>Council Response to comments on PC094:</b></p> <p><b>ISSUE:</b> Concern that development briefs will not undergo consultation and it is unclear what their status will be. Current process is unsound and potentially not legally compliant.</p> <p><b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Agree that further clarification on the purpose of the briefs, status, consultation process (past and future) and relationship to the Core Strategy can be clarified.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b> Ensure that all references to the development briefs provide clear explanation of their purpose, status, consultation process (past and future) and relationship to the Core Strategy.</p>		
<b>Proposed Change: PC095</b>		
Bloor Homes Ltd	<b>Sound</b>	Bloor Homes Limited supports the statement that the surplus school playing fields should be protected for local community use in the first instance.
Rempstone Estate		Concerned that there would be a supermarket on redundant playing fields.
Baggs A	<b>Unsound</b>	SANGs must be put forward by landowner if surplus land is re-used for housing. Building on Wareham Middle School playing field as well as 200 dwellings at Worgret Road will increase visitor impacts on Wareham Common and could have detrimental impact upon SSSI on Common.
Calver S		Oppose supermarket on middle school playing fields.
Cousins J	<b>Unsound</b>	Remove alteration that surplus land be reused as new sites for public buildings or housing. Unless qualified in as much as alternative suitable SANGS land be provided.
Craig J		Objects to retail development at Worgret Road
Fox E		Middle school playing field should be retained for recreation purposes and certainly not for out of town supermarket.
Hagans J		Objects to retail development at Worgret Road
Hill V		Objects to retail development at Worgret Road
Humphrey G	<b>Unsound</b>	Policy states 'the remaining playing fields should be protected for community use' but in same paragraph states

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
	<p>'surplus land reused as new sites for public buildings or housing development'. Contradictory. Not clear that much of this is greenbelt, nor is it clear on the maps.</p> <p>Encroachment into greenbelt will be viewed as a precedent for developers.</p>	
Humphries R	<p>Playing fields at Middle School are required by Wareham as playing fields and should not be made available for housing development. National Playing Fields Association guidance sets minimum standard of 5 acres per 1000 residents, 4 acres of which should be set aside as space for team games and children's play areas.</p>	
Hunt D	<p><b>Unsound</b> It is not consistent with national policy because: SANGS land must be put forward by the landowner as suitable alternative natural green space if surplus land is to be re-used for housing.</p> <p>Building on Wareham Middle School playing fields in addition to the proposed 200 dwelling settlement extension at Worgret Road will increase visitor impact on Wareham Common which is adjacent to the playing fields &amp; could have a detrimental effect on the designated River Piddle SSSI water meadows &amp; habitats.</p>	<p>The remaining playing field should be protected for use by the local community. Remove alteration that surplus land be re-used as new sites for public buildings or housing unless alternative SANGS land can be provided.</p>
James C	<p>Proposal to remove middle school playing field from greenbelt may leave the council vulnerable to challenge of supermarket planning application. Proposal does not support intention to provide a 'more robust and justifiable boundary'(CS p38)</p> <p>Change to greenbelt boundary without designating the site for alternative use leaves CS vulnerable to challenge.</p> <p>Support alternative use for playing field for sport/community use for benefit of new housing development but intention needs to be firmer not reliant on approval from other bodies (Sport England).</p>	
Mist J	<p>Objects to retail development at Worgret Road</p>	
Mist S	<p>Objects to retail development at Worgret Road</p>	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Plumpton J		Objects to retail development at Worgret Road	
Salter A & T	<b>Unsound</b>	Wareham Middle School playing field should be kept as recreational area. Wording not sufficiently robust to protect use in view of DCC's current wishes. Increase in need for recreation. Need to protect the several community groups that currently use field. Increased numbers to Purbeck School means greater need for fields. Reference to Stoborough & Holme Lane strange in view of fact that there are plenty of places to walk in these areas & that playing fields would be next to new development which could benefit.	Revise wording so field is retained as community playing field & protected from commercial development.
Wheatley D	<b>Unsound</b>	Proposed use of land removed from the greenbelt is conditional on Sport England. Land removed from the Green Belt must be earmarked for a specific social or community use that is clearly deliverable and not reliant of approval from other bodies. Proposal is vague and needs to be firmed up before approval can be given.	No change to greenbelt boundaries without a specific social or community use for the site.
Williams Y	<b>Unsound</b>	Development of the Purbeck School playing field and field would likely contravene Statutory Instrument 1999 Schedule 2, as it would reduce the available space for team games. Option A in the 2009 consultation was for a field for development and did not include a wider area. Questions the legality of removing the middle school, first school, Purbeck School/sports centre out of the green belt.	Make wording and maps clearer

#### **Council Response to comments on PC095:**

**ISSUES:** Considerable concern that a supermarket will built on Wareham Middle School playing fields, which should be protected as open space or SANGS

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The Core Strategy states that the playing fields should be protected for community use as there is a shortage in the Wareham area. However in the event that the playing fields be deemed surplus to requirements by government, then the Council's preferred re-use would be housing or public buildings, not a supermarket. The playing fields do not provide a suitable heathland mitigation and that is why land at Stoborough has been allocated.

**ACTIONS:** None required.



<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound?</i>	<i>Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
<b>Proposed Change: PC098</b>			
Arne Parish Council	<b>Unsound</b>	Concern that pilot SANGs sites are an injudicious use of good agricultural land. in a Parish that considers itself to be rural. We fear traffic disruption, more urban ingress without the advantages that Natural England hopes for in decreasing the pressure on heathland. Reference to the 2 SANGS proposed by the landowner for the development at Worgret Road should not limit the possibilities as there are other pieces of land that can be considered in the same ownership. For instance, the field between the bypass and Corfe Road would be ideal. The Parish Plan Review also shows more allotments are needed and this site is large enough to have recreational facilities such as a football pitch and play area, site for extension of allotments and create dog walking area separately. This would not impact on the local farmer as much.	Change the wording to reflect that other sites than those proposed should be considered to lessen the impact on local farmers, residents, infrastructure and the environment.
Ashvilla Estates Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	Support inclusion of SANGs in Core Strategy but believe not effective for the housing proposed at Wareham & therefore not compliant with Habitat Regs & is not deliverable. Travel distances in excess of 1.7km from proposed new housing to mitigation sites, therefore need to drive. Suggested SANG sites no more accessible than other heathland sites and limited in size therefore function severely compromised. Based on the limitations of the proposed SANGs the conclusions of the HRA and Natural England are not justified, and that proposed change 98 is not based on a robust and credible evidence base.	The Core Strategy could be made deliverable, and thus sound, by the inclusion of reference to the potential for, and availability of, large scale SANG at Worgret Manor Farm.
CPRE	<b>Unsound</b>	The paragraph commencing 'At Wareham' refers to the Worgret Road settlement extension, which to the best of my knowledge has not been agreed by or contained within Wareham Town Council plans; & is therefore premature under Localism legislation.	
Dorset AONB Partnership		In addition to new development it is suggested that the increasing volumes of traffic also have an adverse impact	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Dorset County Council	<b>Sound</b>	upon protected sites. To be effective SANGS should be in close proximity to new & existing development & be accessible by those living in such development by non-car modes wherever possible. Care will be needed to ensure that the SANGS will be capable of mitigating pressures upon heathland & be considered as part of the wider spatial strategy for growth.	Delete 'These subsequent plans & briefs will ensure that the nature, scale & location of the development will be such as to enable the Council to ascertain that there will not be an' & insert 'Therefore, further employment development at Holton Heath will be determined following ecological assessment work, which will feed in to subsequent master plans & development briefs to ensure no' adverse effect on the
Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the additional text relating to the Habitats Regulations.	
Natural England		Unconvinced that Nutcrack Lane SANG would be effective. The alternative SANG at Holme Lane has potential, but it depends upon land available and access arrangements. Therefore at this stage doubt still remains about effectiveness of SANG. Potential mitigation of Poole Harbour also needs consideration at same time as SANG provision and change of use of arable field may not be sufficient.	
Rempstone Estate		Concerned that there will be impact upon Wareham Common SSSI from 200 dwellings adjacent to site.	Erect high fence to rear of site to minimise impact upon SSSI.
RSPB		Recommend that mitigation measures in HRA will be closely adhered to in final Core Strategy, particularly that allocated dwellings can only be taken forward with the implementation of specified high quality SANGS with Natural England's endorsement and partnership working. Welcome reference to relevant EU sites, masterplans & dev briefs, DHJDPD & GI provision and that suitable mitigation is included, particularly allocated dwellings can come forward with specific SANGS endorsed by Natural England and partners. Support amendments to employment land allocations Holton Heath & Admiralty Park but would have greater weight if included in Policy ELS.	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
The Charborough Estate		Object to new paragraph, especially two alternative sites for SANGS at Holme Lane, Stoborough and Nutcrack Lane, Stoborough. Fails to recognise need and opportunity for SANGS on north side of town. The SANGS proposals are poorly related to Stoborough, let alone Wareham. Holme Lane is separated from both Stoborough and Wareham by the bypass. Most people will have to use a car to take their dogs to either of the proposed SANGS, and they are only small areas compared with available existing Heathland. They are more likely to drive or walk directly to large areas of heathland as they do at present.	
Wareham St Martin Parish Council	<b>Unsound</b>	Reference to the 2 SANGS proposed by the landowner for the development in Worgret Road should not limit the possibilities as there would be other pieces of land that could be considered in the same ownership which may be more acceptable to the community.	Change wording to reflect that other sites than those proposed should be considered to lessen the impact on local farmers, residents, infrastructure and the environment.
Baggs A	<b>Unsound</b>	SANGs for Worgret Road housing site are located too far away for pedestrain or cycle access. Instead residents will use Wareham Common which has open access increasing pressure from vistors to the site. The Common includes a SSSI within 400m of the housing, which hasn't been given consideration.	In the delivery box for Policy CEN, recognition should be given to the management of visitor pressure at Wareham Common. The landowner should be included in the partnership of statutory bodies and local authority. The 200 dwellings should only be delivered when the landowner puts forward a suitable SANGs site that mitigates the impact on Wareham Common.
Cousins J	<b>Unsound</b>	SANGS sites proposed by the landowner are not close enough to the Worgret Road development to be considered as suitable. The SANGS sites would in effect not be used by the occupants of the new homes as they are a considerable distance away. Wareham Common will become the land of choice for up to 200 families as it is virtually on their doorstep. The SANGS as proposed will place a heavy burden on Wareham Common and its adjacent land and river.	The proposed development at Worgret Rd should only seriously be considered if the landowner provides suitable SANGS that will effectively fulfil the recreational requirements of new residents without increasing the pressure upon Wareham Common.
Hunt D	<b>Unsound</b>	The sites put forward by the landowner at Holme Lane & Nutcrack Lane as SANGS for the Worgret Road settlement	As well as consideration being given to the management of visitor pressure on the Arne

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
		extension are unsuitable as they are located too far from the development site for people to access easily on foot being at least a twenty minute walk & ten minute cycle ride. Consideration has not been given to the impact on Wareham Common from the immediate proximity of a new large residential development.	<p>peninsula, Wareham Forest, Sandford Heath &amp; Worgret Heath, Wareham Common will be given protection to mitigate against any adverse impact of the Worgret Road extension on the SSSI meadows &amp; the River Piddle.</p> <p>The private landowner of Wareham Common will be included in the partnership with the statutory bodies &amp; the local authority with regard to managing access to their land as a result of the increased visitor pressure arising from the proposed 200 dwelling settlement extension at Worgret Road, Wareham.</p> <p>The proposed site extension of 200 dwellings at Worgret Road should only be delivered when the landowner puts forward a SANGS site that is suitable to accommodate the recreational requirements of the residents &amp; will fulfill the need to mitigate the visitor pressure on Wareham Common.</p>
Salter A & T	<b>Unsound</b>	Wareham Middle School playing field should be kept as recreational area. Reference to Stoborough & Holme Lane strange in view of fact that there are plenty of places to walk in these areas & that playing fields would be next to new development which could benefit.	Revise wording so field is retained as community playing field & protected from commercial development.

Name	Plan sound? Comment on soundness	Proposed Amendment
<b>Council Response to comments on PC098:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> Significant concern raised that the heathland mitigation is too far from the new housing development. Arne Parish Council is concerned about loss of agricultural land. Suggestions have been made for other sites or including flexibility to find alternative sites for SANGS. Landowners promoting alternative sites have also objected suggesting their sites provide better mitigation. Natural England highlights the need for further work to ensure the SANG is effective. Comments from Dorset County Council suggests amended wording, RSPB seeks cross references and AONB partnership seeks reference to adverse impact on European protected sites from traffic.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Agree with comments by DCC and the Core Strategy will be amended accordingly. To ensure that housing doesn't have an impact upon European protected sites, mitigation in the form of new open space is needed. The new open space would intercept people who may otherwise go by car from Wareham to visit heathland in and around Arne and Stoborough. The landowner has suggested two alternative sites which need further work with Natural England to ensure that one or the other will be suitable. The fact that the housing site and mitigation is within single ownership vastly increases the deliverability of the proposals. All policies in the Core Strategy must be read alongside each other and cross references are unnecessary. The current wording is general enough to include all adverse impacts to protected sites and doesn't need specific reference to traffic.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Amend para 7.3.8 to read '...development briefs, to ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of any protected site' as per Dorset County Council's comments.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC099</b>		
Bloor Homes Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	<p>The need for green infrastructure to be provided as part of new development should be justified with regard to evidence base and Circular 05/05 (as amended by CIL regulations), rather than arbitrarily being dependent on the wishes of the local community when a planning application is submitted. If the wishes and requirements of the community are unrealistic or undeliverable then delivery of the Core Strategy could be jeopardised.</p> <p>Any green infrastructure required in conjunction with the development of land at Worgret Road should be identified as part of Policy CEN so that it can be incorporated within the development brief. The specific phrase "depending on the wishes and requirements of the local community" should be deleted.</p>
Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the additional text relating to Green Infrastructure
RSPB		<p>Welcome text which states that allocated dwellings can only be taken forward with the implementation of high quality SANGS, plus GI provision. This should be included in policy and cross referenced to policy DH &amp; PH.</p> <p>Text should be included in policy and cross referenced to policy DH &amp; PH.</p>
Woodland Trust	<b>Unsound</b>	<p>Lack of reference to native woodland.</p> <p>Make reference to native woodland.</p>

**Council Response to comments on PC099:**

**ISSUES:** Comments seek to strengthen green infrastructure policy. Concern from the developer of the Wareham settlement extension that 'wishes of the community' for provision of green infrastructure could make site undeliverable.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The current wording includes examples of green infrastructure and not every possibility needs to be listed. However, some minor changes could be made. All policies in the Core Strategy must be read alongside each other and cross references are unnecessary. The wishes of the community for settlement extensions will be considered through the development briefs and will need to be balanced against other requirements to ensure the development is deliverable.

**ACTIONS:** Amend para 7.3.8 Green Infrastructure Provision to read "...allotments, planting of street trees, groups of trees/shrubs, hedges and woodland, new play areas..."

**Proposed Change: PC100**

Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the additional text relating to the Habitats Regulations.	
Andrews P	<b>Unsound</b>	<p>Insufficient to deliver transportation needs of Core Strategy because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Aims should include objectives identified in Section 7.1.1 of PTS;</li> <li>2. Sections 8.3.1, 8.3.3, and 8.6.3 of PTS show that viable means of meeting objectives re A351 through Sandford has yet to be devised;</li> <li>3. Signage strategy (PC100) far short of improvements considered in 8.3.3 of PTS, which themselves were considered inadequate.</li> </ol>	<p>Transport improvements will be provided through development contributions to eliminate traffic delays, to ameliorate environmental disbenefits in settlements, to provide alternative forms of transport, to improve and minimise air quality impacts on heathland and coast. Support following schemes: improvements to X43, workplace travel plans, signing strategy to divert traffic away from A351, railway reconnection Swanage - Wareham. Contributions to be collected by PDC and passed to DCC for implementation. All development that places additional stress on A351 &amp; affected settlements to be conditional on implementation of improvements that adequately address problems</p>

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC100:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> A query whether the transport strategy goes far enough compared to the original Purbeck Transport Strategy (PTS)		
<b>COUNCIL RESPONSE:</b> The schemes in the PTS have been updated to reflect the level of contributions that will be generated to mitigate new development. Since the original PTS contributions are no longer sought on residential extensions and regional funding bids for major road infrastructure have been unsuccessful, the package of measures in the PTS has been slimmed down. This is suitable to mitigate development in the Core Strategy.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC106</b>		
RSPB	Support the inclusion of importance of greenbelt as a contribution to protection of wildlife, and the provision of public open space and SANGS	
Wyatt Homes	<b>Unsound</b> The threat to Purbeck from the western edge of Poole necessitating a strong greenbelt is exaggerated.	Re-write paragraph to make it less alarmist.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC106:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> Comment that the threat on the 'strong greenbelt' west of Poole is alarmist		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> A green belt study prepared for the RSS highlighted the significant value of the greenbelt west of Poole. This green belt is under threat from the expansion of Poole and this is reflected in the Vision for North East Purbeck.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC107</b>		
CG Fry & Son Ltd	<b>Unsound</b> Proposals for heathland mitigation linked to the development at Huntick Road are vague and uncertain. The provision of a new public way along the eastern boundary of the site to form part of a longer term plan to create a circular network around the village has now been linked as a specific part of the heathland mitigation proposal. Whilst a footpath could be provided along the eastern boundary of the site, it would be a very short stretch which couldn't be extended without third party ownership, and will require land to the north to extend the footpath between Huntick Road and Wimborne Road. The public open space needs to be a	It is difficult to suggest alternative wording that would address the objections raised. The amendments proposed at the pre-submission stage remain valid to overcome the objections raised.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
		size which offers alternative to destinations currently favoured for recreation and dog walking. Map 14 is unclear and there is no evidence to indicate why these proposals are considered adequate. Unclear what is meant by improving community facilities and how they will be delivered. How can one development be expected to deliver all the required benefits and contributions? The proposed settlement extension and revision of green belt boundary has been increased through inclusion of land to the east which must be questioned unless it is made clear that this land is specifically for employment development.	
Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	<b>Sound</b>	Supports deletion of the reference to The Greenridge Public House.	
Hampshire J	<b>Unsound</b>	Support the provision of B1 employment opportunities in the settlement extension. Mixed development that provides both homes and employment is considered to be more sustainable than simply providing either housing or employment. However, the proposal needs to be made firm. 50 dwellings do not justify provision of alternative natural green space to mitigate damage to heathland. The provision of green space should be considered on a wider basis within the settlement and should not relate solely to the settlement extension. There is no evidence to substantiate a contribution towards education. There is an omission concerning delineation of the settlement boundary. The settlement boundary should be extended to the east to enable reconfiguration of existing employment land at Selbys Yard. There is reference to realignment of the Lytchett Matravers settlement boundary. Since there is no adopted Local Plan on which a settlement boundary exists, it is not possible to realign.	Under heading "Lytchett Matravers", on the first line delete "realignment" and insert "definition". Below the opening paragraph in the first sub-paragraph delete the word "possible". In the third sub-paragraph insert after "within the Parish" "taking into account the benefit to existing residents and subject to Viability Assessment". In the final sub-paragraph delete "education". Map 14 should be amended to define the settlement boundary in accordance with the appended plan.
RSPB		Heathland mitigation at French's Farm and screening/signage on the fringe of Poole Harbour, will need to be sensitively managed to protect heathlands & harbour.	
The Charborough		Support PC107 but by continuing the restriction to	Change PC107 to read: "Elsewhere in North East



<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Estate		affordable housing, the change fails to bring the emerging Core Strategy into accord with National Planning Policy Framework (para 112).	Purbeck (including Lytchett Matravers and Morden): Proposals will be encouraged for rural economic regeneration, community facilities and new housing, where these are of a scale and form which will help sustain the community.
Wyatt Homes	<b>Sound</b>	Supports the realignment of the settlement boundary. Accepts that the addition of 'education' to potential contributions is reasonable in principle.	
Mason M	<b>Unsound</b>	Insufficiently flexible to recognise that small scale market housing developments adjoining the outside of the settlement boundary can act as a catalyst for affordable housing.	Reword: Realignment of the settlement boundary to 'both accommodate small scale market housing developments to enable the provision of affordable housing' and the allocation of a settlement extension.....

#### **Council Response to comments on PC107:**

**ISSUES:** Objection from the landowner of the Lytchett Matravers settlement extension about the requirement for heathland mitigation, green space and an education contribution and to the restrictions posed by the re-aligned settlement boundary. The developer of a site that wasn't allocated has highlighted uncertainty over the heathland mitigation proposals, the delivery of community facilities and extension of the site into green belt. The developer of the Upton settlement extension supports the changes. Other landowners object to restrictions on new housing on the edge of settlements.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The landowner of the Lytchett Matravers site will need to provide mitigation for the impacts of the development. The potential for a new footpath to the east of the site is being explored with a neighbouring landowner that would connect with footpaths through the development site and link into the wider footpath network. There is also land within the ownership of the settlement extension that could be considered for mitigation and this needs to be agreed with Natural England through the development brief process. The site has been extended to bring forward new employment development linked to the housing, through regeneration of a brownfield employment depot. Precise siting will be left to the development brief to allow flexibility. Carrying forward settlement boundaries from the Local Plan on the Proposals Map is the only rational option available. The emergence of the NPPF will encourage more development outside of settlement boundaries to deliver affordable housing and this will be considered through subsequent plans.

**ACTIONS:** None required

#### **Proposed Change: PC108**

Trustees of Sir TE Lees Estate Settlement	<b>Unsound</b>	Welcomes the Policeman's Lane settlement extension and heathland mitigation but the proposed realignment of the settlement boundary does not go far enough and should include Frenches Farm buildings. This is built land and	Alternative settlement boundary suggested.
---	----------------	---	--

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Wyatt Homes	<b>Unsound</b>	<p>does not contribute to the Green Belt. Additional development will help to ensure delivery of the mitigation provisions proposed.</p> <p>The realignment of the settlement boundary does not go far enough. There will be unmet housing requirements during the plan period, so land to the south west of the settlement extension site at Policeman's Lane should be identified as 'white land' to add flexibility during the life of the plan.</p>	Revise the settlement boundary to include land to the south west of the site as 'white land' for future development.

**Council Response to comments on PC108:**

**ISSUES:** The landowner and developer of the Upton settlement extension request that the realignment of settlement boundary goes further to include French's Farm buildings and land to the south.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** There is no justification to alter the settlement boundary and green belt boundary to bring forward additional development to that already planned through the Core Strategy. French's Farm buildings will be considered when the settlement boundary is reviewed through the Site Allocations DPD or neighbourhood plan.

**ACTIONS:** None required.

**Proposed Change: PC109**

CG Fry & Son Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	It is not clear what status the development briefs will hold and their relationship to the Core Strategy. They will not have been the subject of consultation and the weight that can be attributed will be very limited. Their role needs to be made clear and the draft briefs made subject of formal consultation.	Core Strategy needs to set out clearly the intended role and use of the proposed briefs and relationship to the Core Strategy. The briefs need to be subject of formal consultation.
------------------	----------------	---	--

**Council Response to comments on PC109:**

**ISSUE:** Status of development briefs and relationship to Core Strategy unclear. They will not have been subject to consultation and can only be attributed limited weight.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** Agree that further clarification on the purpose of the briefs, status, consultation process and relationship to the Core Strategy can be clarified.

**ACTIONS:** Ensure that all references to the development briefs provide clear explanation of their purpose, status, consultation process (past and future) and relationship to the Core Strategy.

**Proposed Change: PC112**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
CG Fry & Son Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	Proposals for heathland mitigation linked to the development at Huntick Road are vague and uncertain. The provision of a new public way along the eastern boundary of the site to form part of a longer term plan to create a circular network around the village has now been linked as a specific part of the heathland mitigation proposal. Whilst a footpath could be provided along the eastern boundary of the site, it would be a very short stretch which couldn't be extended without third party ownership, and will require land to the north to extend the footpath between Huntick Road and Wimborne Road. The public open space needs to be a size which offers alternative to destinations currently favoured for recreation and dog walking. Map 14 is unclear and there is no evidence to indicate why these proposals are considered adequate.	It is difficult to suggest alternative wording that would address the objections raised. The amendments proposed at the pre-submission stage remain valid to overcome the objections raised.
Dorset AONB Partnership		In addition to new development it is suggested that the increasing volumes of traffic also have an adverse impact upon protected sites.	
Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the additional text relating to the Habitats Regulations.	
Hampshire J	<b>Unsound</b>	The respondents have no objection to a fenced public footpath. The respondents object to a field being allocated for dog walking when the land will continue to be used for grazing. Provision of part of the proposed circular walk would contribute towards mitigating harm to heathland, not only from the development but other residents. This should be sufficient to meet the developer's obligation. There are other areas around Lytchett Matravers which are not being used for any purpose which might be more suitable for providing natural greenspace if it is considered necessary.	Delete the last sentence of this paragraph.
JS Bloor (Newbury) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	The amended text identifies the exploration for further SANGS through the heathland DPD between Bere Regis and Lytchett Matravers and at Upton Farm. This overlooks potential offered by land around Lytchett Minster as strategic green space mitigation delivered in conjunction	Amend text wording as follows: "The DPD will also investigate the RELATIVE BENEFITS and potential ASSOCIATED WITH OPTIONS FOR further SANGS IN THE NORTH EAST PURBECK AREA BETWEEN Bere Regis AND POOLE".

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
		with housing / mixed use development at / around this settlement.	
Natural England		SANG at Upton seems well located and have no reason to believe it wont be effective, subject to further work. At Lytchett Matravers, footpath links could divert some heathland users, however the package is less convincing and doubt remains as whether it is sufficient.	
RSPB		Recommend that mitigation measures in HRA will be closely adhered to in final Core Strategy, particularly that allocated dwellings can only be taken forward with the implementation of specified high qulaity SANGS with Natural England's endorsement and partnership working. Supports the incorporation of mitigation, but believe this should be in policy & cross referenced with policy DH & PH	Cross reference mitigation in policy DH and PH
Wyatt Homes	<b>Sound</b>	Supports the identification of heathland mitigation measures	

#### **Council Response to comments on PC112:**

**ISSUES:** The landowner of the Lytchett Matravers settlement extension does not support the proposed heathland mitigation. The developer of a site that wasn't allocated mitigation of settlement extension is not suitable or deliverable. Natural England believes the heathland mitigation needs to go further. For the Policemans Lane, Upton settlement extension there is support for the proposed heathland mitigation from Natural England and the developer. Comments from RSPB seeks cross references and AONB partnership seeks reference to adverse impact on European protected sites from traffic. Area of search for SANGS should be extended to include land between Lytchett Matravers and Upton.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** Regarding mitigation of the Huntick Road settlement extension, there is still some uncertainty over the proposals. The landowner must recognise that they will need to work with Natural England to provide suitable mitigation through the development brief process. There is sufficient land within the ownership to do this and we are exploring the provision of a footpath with an adjacent landowner. Agree that area of search for SANGS is unduly restrictive and should be expanded. All policies in the Core Strategy must be read alongside each other and cross references are unnecessary. The current wording is general enough to include all adverse impacts to protected sites and doesn't need specific reference to traffic.

**ACTIONS:** Amend para 7.4.8 to '...investigate potential for further SANGS between Bere Regis and Upton.'

#### **Proposed Change: PC113**

Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the additional text relating to Green Infrastructure	
Hampshire J	<b>Unsound</b>	Green Infrastructure provision is for the benefit of the whole	Delete second sentence "provision of such green

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
		community not just the settlement extension. It should not be linked solely to when development comes forward. The land identified as a settlement extension contains a pond which is considered to be of some nature conservation interest and a number of trees which are subject to Tree Preservation Orders. It is the intention of the landowner that the area around the pond should form part of a greenspace within the development. The respondents would also be happy to mitigate the loss of any trees on site by planting additional trees elsewhere within their ownership.	infrastructure will be considered when development comes forward at Lytchett Matravers and Upton, depending on the wishes and requirements of the local community". Add "Green infrastructure will be provided within the settlement extension to satisfy the needs of that development".
Trees for Dorset	<b>Sound</b>	Green Infrastructure Policy has been made clearer. We would wish to see more positive view than just 'consideration'. The provision of Green Infrastructure should include more than just street trees but also group planting of trees and shrubs that will provide visual and sound buffers. Enhancement of existing tree belts and hedges could be part of this policy. We are pleased to see that local communities will be involved in the consideration of green infrastructure.	
Wyatt Homes	<b>Sound</b>	Supports the aspirations of the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Strategy	
Woodland Trust	<b>Unsound</b>	Lack of reference to native woodland.	Make reference to native woodland.

#### **Council Response to comments on PC113:**

**ISSUES:** Comments seek to strengthen Green Infrastructure policy. Concern from the landowner of the Lytchett Matravers settlement extension that 'wishes of the community' for provision of green infrastructure could make the site undeliverable.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The current wording includes examples of green infrastructure and not every possibility needs to be listed. However, some minor changes could be made. All policies in the Core Strategy must be read alongside each other and cross references are unnecessary. The wishes of the community for settlement extensions will be considered through the development briefs and will need to be balanced against other requirements to ensure the development is deliverable.

**ACTIONS:** Amend para 7.4.8 Green Infrastructure Provision to read "...allotments, planting of street trees, groups of trees/shrubs, hedges and woodland, new play areas.."

#### **Proposed Change: PC114**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Arne Parish Council		Remove reference to Holton Heath Station improvements. This should be in Central and not North East. This area is within Wareham St Martin Parish.	Remove Holton Heath reference.
Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the additional text relating to the Habitats Regulations.	
Hampshire J	<b>Unsound</b>	Settlement extension at Lytchett Matravers should not be responsible for transport infrastructure which is not necessary to enable the development. Only the proposed cycleway is directly related to Lytchett Matravers. In discussion with Dorset County Council Highways, the respondents' agents have proposed provision of a cycleway/footpath along the frontage to Huntick Road. DCC Officers accepted that this would make a contribution towards enhanced transportation infrastructure commensurate with the scale of development.	Insert "The design proposal for the settlement extension will only incorporate green infrastructure to meet the needs of that development".
Wareham St Martin Parish Council		Remove the reference to Holton Heath Station improvements. This should be in Central and not North East. Area is within Wareham St Martin Parish.	Remove Holton Heath reference.

**Council Response to comments on PC114:**

**ISSUES:** References to Holton Heath Station improvements should be included under Central not North East Policy. Landowner of the Lytchett Matravers settlement extension has objected to the requirement to make a contribution for transport mitigation.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** Agree that references to Holton Heath Station improvements should be moved. Transport infrastructure improvements in North East Purbeck are necessary to enable the development to go ahead.

**ACTIONS:** Delete 'Holton Heath station improvements and Park and Ride' from transport section in para 7.4.8.

**Proposed Change: PC115**

Hampshire J	<b>Unsound</b>	The eastern boundary of the site should be moved further to the east to enable greater flexibility with the layout of the proposed 50 dwellings and to enable rationalisation of the employment area to provide the most efficient layout and maximise additional high quality employment opportunities. Respondents will not give up a field so residents of the village can walk dogs on their land which they use for	Delete the annotation of Heathland Mitigation on Map 14.
-------------	----------------	--	--

Name	Plan sound?	Comment on soundness	Proposed Amendment
		grazing and wish to continue to use for that purpose. There are alternative areas around Lytchett Matravers which are not being used for any purpose which might provide a suitable alternative if additional space is required.	
Council Response to comments on PC115:			
ISSUES: Landowner of the Lytchett Matravers settlement extension has objected to the notation on the map for heathland mitigation and the position of the settlement boundary to the east of site.			
COUNCIL'S RESPONSE: Provision on heathland mitigation adjacent to the site is essential, unless the landowner can provide an alternative location elsewhere in the village to the satisfaction of Natural England. The eastern boundary of site has been extended to include depot area. This forms a defensible boundary for the Green Belt and there is no justification to extend further eastwards.			
ACTIONS: None required.			
Proposed Change: PC120			
SW Housing Association Registered Providers	Unsound	Important that changes are also made to the Affordable Housing Policy on how the local authority will deal with affordable rent. Especially as central government intend to use affordable rent for the next round of funding post 2015.	
Council Response to comments on PC120:			
ISSUES: Important that changes are made to Affordable Housing Policy on how local authority will deal with affordable rent.			
COUNCIL'S RESPONSE: The affordable rent product is not mentioned in paragraph 8.3.3 or Policy AHT and these need updating accordingly. The product will form part of the range of options available to Registered Providers and it would not be appropriate for the Core Strategy to be prescriptive in giving a split between social rent/affordable rent.			
ACTIONS: Update paragraph 8.3.3 to say '...67% social rented/affordable rented...' and Policy AHT to say '90% social rented/affordable rented housing...'			
Proposed Change: PC121			
Langton Matravers Parish Council	Unsound	Reference to Langton Matravers Parish Plan should be under separate heading, not grouped under Worth Matravers. Wording not true representation of known views of parishioners.	Amend text to read: "Langton Matravers Parish Plan identifies need for more affordable rented housing for local people to be built in small developments integrated throughout village. Speeding at top and bottom of village, as well as parking & congestion problems in High St have also been identified as

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
<p><b>Council Response to comments on PC121:</b></p> <p><b>ISSUES:</b> Reference to Langton Matravers Parish Plan should not be grouped under Worth Matravers. Wording not true representation of known views of parishoners.</p> <p><b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Agree Langton Matravers Parish Plan should be included within own paragraph. Figures and wording referred to are taken directly from Langton Matravers Parish Plan 2005.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b> Provide Langton Matravers Parish Plan with its own paragraph.</p>		
<b>Proposed Change: PC122</b>		
Dorset County Council	<b>Sound</b>	It is suggested that this is changed to read 'challenges & opportunities presented by coastal change' This is more positive & recognises opportunities to work with natural processes.
RSPB	Support commitment to enhance & protect Poole Harbour heaths. Support management of coastline in accordance with Shoreline Management Plan.	
<p><b>Council Response to comments on PC122:</b></p> <p><b>ISSUES:</b> Suggestion that additional wording of 'challenges &amp; opportunities presented by coastal change' would be more positive and recognise opportunities to work with natural processes.</p> <p><b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Agree with suggested amendment.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b> Amend Vision for South East Purbeck to refer to 'Challenges and opportunities presented by coastal change, particularly in ....'.</p>		
<b>Proposed Change: PC124</b>		
CPRE	<b>Unsound</b>	Pending a new method of funding affordable housing, developers should be left in no doubt that they will be required to deliver at least 50/50 affordable/market housing outside of a settlement boundary. 'Appropriate' is too vague, a ratio or at least 'high' is preferable
Education Swanage	<b>Sound</b>	Supports free school in Swanage
		Replace 'appropriate' level of affordable housing' with 'high' - last word on the penultimate line.



<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Purbeck Society		The grammar school landowner must not be allowed to hold the council and Education Swanage to ransom by exerting pressure for excessive development demands in exchange for the land for the school.	
Save Herston Fields	<b>Unsound</b>	The owner of the grammar school site should not be allowed to exert pressure on PDC and Education Swanage to reduce the level of affordable housing on the site.	Clarify an updated position regarding the free school and the requirements which will be placed on developers to this new decision.
Scott Estate	<b>Unsound</b>	Support proposed changes to SE to help to facilitate the delivery of Education Swanage Free School, however text does not adequately identify sites to ensure strategy is deliverable.	Policy SE should include clear reference to the location of the strategic settlement extensions to Swanage that are needed to implement the plan, including re-use of the former grammar school site for a free school, with associated housing development on part of the site.
Welfare Dwellings	<b>Unsound</b>	Inappropriate to refer to "subsequent plans", without being specific. DCC has a clearly adopted policy for education in district. Proposal for free school has no published evidence base, has not been subject to public consultation or with meaningful negotiations with primary stakeholder. Site owner not averse to making land available, with proviso that remainder of land achieves its development potential. The proposed change introduces a degree of uncertainty which is not appropriate in a core strategy. Para 7.5.10 indicates that, there may be buildings and land which are surplus on the current Swanage middle school site.	Delete all references to provision of a free school
Atkinson G	<b>Sound</b>	Supports free school in Swanage	
Chinchen M		Concerned about building of a health centre and /or houses on the Middle School site once St. Mark's School premises have been established and built, due to flooding.	
Drayson C	<b>Sound</b>	Supports free school in Swanage	
Harman N	<b>Sound</b>	Supports free school in Swanage	
O'Connor H	<b>Sound</b>	Supports free school in Swanage	
Pratten D	<b>Sound</b>	Supports free school in Swanage	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Thomas, P	<b>Sound</b>	Supports free school in Swanage	
Tooley S	<b>Sound</b>	Supports free school in Swanage	
Whicker T		Supports free school in Swanage.	
<b>Council Response to comments on PC124:</b>			
<b>ISSUES:</b> A significant number of comments in support of the free school proposal. Some concerns raised that any enabling development should ensure that it incorporates affordable housing. One landowner of a potential site for the free school objects to the lack of justification for inclusion in the Core Strategy.			
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Since the consultation closed government has pledged support for the Swanage Free School and Partnerships for Schools are working with landowners to bring a site forward in line with the Core Strategy. Affordable housing will be a required.			
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.			
<b>Proposed Change: PC125</b>			
Purbeck Society		Information relating to James Day is out of date. The home is about to reopen in a limited capacity. It should be noted that Swanage Medical Centre site may offer the opportunity to be developed whilst maintaining an town centre position. 87% of 500 people surveyed preferred the medical centre to stay in the centre of town.	
Save Herston Fields	<b>Unsound</b>	James Day status is out-dated, the centre is due to re-open in a limited capacity. 87% of people surveyed preferred that the medical centre stays in the centre of town.	Add that the Swanage Medical Centre site could be redeveloped to achieve its needs and remain in a town centre location. 87% of 500 residents surveyed preferred it to remain in the centre of Swanage.
Hobbs C & M	<b>Unsound</b>	Out of date information, regarding the status of James Day of which we now know will re-open all be it in a reduced capacity.	Correct & update data about James Day. Scrap 'The Core Strategy' in it's current form and re-consult.
Whicker T	<b>Sound</b>		

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
Council Response to comments on PC125:		
<b>ISSUES:</b> Information relating to James Day is out of date and should be updated. Swanage Medical Centre may offer the opportunity to be developed whilst maintaining a town centre location.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Agree with need for update regarding the care home. The medical centre will be considered through the Swanage Area Action Plan.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Delete section on James Day care home in para 7.5.10		
<b>Proposed Change: PC126</b>		
Welfare Dwellings	<b>Unsound</b> Proposed change suggest further consultation to identify settlement extension through "subsequent plans". Reference to a neighbourhood plan is particularly unacceptable, a neighbourhood plan must be consistent with the core strategy & in this proposed change there is too much uncertainty to form a reasonable basis for future policies with regard to the allocated urban extension	Delete PC126
Council Response to comments on PC126:		
<b>ISSUES:</b> Landowner objects to the Swanage settlement extension being passed down to a neighbourhood plan.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Swanage is not surrounded by green belt and therefore the settlement extension is not considered strategic for inclusion in the Core Strategy. However a criteria based policy would allow a settlement extension to come forward earlier provided it delivers the free school. Work has started on the Swanage Area Action Plan, which may become a neighbourhood plan should the community request it, as is lawful under the Localism Bill.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC128</b>		
Dorset AONB Partnership	Addressing impacts on protected habitats and wildlife. In addition to new development it is suggested that the increasing volumes of traffic also have an adverse impact upon protected sites.	
Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b> Support the additional text relating to the Habitats Regulations.	
Purbeck Society	It is unclear what space would be available to provide a	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
RSPB		<p>SANG in North Swanage! Certainly not one that could compete with Studland, Godlingston and Rempstone Heaths. Unachievable.</p> <p>Recommend that mitigation measures in HRA will be closely adhered to in final Core Strategy, particularly that allocated dwellings can only be taken forward with the implementation of specified high quality SANGS with Natural England's endorsement and partnership working. Supports suitable mitigation as recommended in HRA &amp; HRA recommendation for SANGS at Swanage, reference to EU sites and GI provision in 7.5.10 but believe this should be in policy &amp; cross referenced with policy DH &amp; PH.</p>	Include information in policy and cross reference to policy DH & PH.
Save Herston Fields	<b>Unsound</b>	Unclear what space would be available to provide a SANG in North Swanage. Unachievable	
Welfare Dwellings	<b>Unsound</b>	<p>Natural England "evidence" of harm from residential development on certain wildlife habitats, is largely self-proclaiming &amp; not independently tested. Development industry has accepted mitigation measures as a pragmatic response to alleged harm. CS makes no reference to fact that heathland is not a stable habitat, that it is a stage in regeneration of cleared woodland.</p> <p>It is not reasonable that developers are expected to make provision to offset harm caused by existing residents. Any contribution to alternative green space should only be proportionate to the houses that they build. Alternative green space should not be seen as another tax on development.</p>	Delete words "suitable mitigation measures including" & insert " contributions towards"
Hobbs C & M	<b>Unsound</b>	Confirmation of where a SANG will be placed is necessary to justify and make this change effective.	Scrap 'The Core Strategy' in it's current form and reconsult. If not then please clarify where this SANG will be.

**Council Response to comments on PC128:**

**ISSUES:** A range of comments on the necessity of heathland mitigation depending upon the interests of the representor.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** Heathland mitigation is required. The precise location and extent of the SANGS will be identified through the Swanage Area Action Plan and linked to the settlement extension sites. All policies in the Core Strategy must be read alongside each other and cross references are unnecessary. The current wording is general enough to include all adverse impacts to protected sites and doesn't need specific reference to traffic.

**ACTIONS:** None required.

**Proposed Change: PC129**

Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the additional text relating to Green Infrastructure
-----------------------	--------------	--

Trees for Dorset	<b>Sound</b>	Green Infrastructure Policy has been made clearer. We would wish to see more positive view than just 'consideration'. The provision of Green Infrastructure should include more than just street trees but also group planting of trees and shrubs that will provide visual and sound buffers. Enhancement of existing tree belts and hedges could be part of this policy. We are pleased to see that local communities will be involved in the consideration of green infrastructure.
------------------	--------------	--

Woodland Trust	<b>Unsound</b>	Lack of reference to native woodland.		Make reference to native woodland.
----------------	----------------	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------

**Council Response to comments on PC129:**

**ISSUES:** Comments seek to strengthen Green Infrastructure policy.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The current wording includes examples and not every possibility needs to be listed. However, some minor changes could be made. All policies in the Core Strategy must be read alongside each other and cross references are unnecessary.

**ACTIONS:** Amend para 7.5.10 Green Infrastructure Provision to read "...allotments, planting of street trees, groups of trees/shrubs, hedges and woodland, new play areas.."

**Proposed Change: PC130**

Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the additional text relating to the Habitats Regulations.
-----------------------	--------------	---

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Gallagher K	<b>Unsound</b>	The withdrawal of the Durlston Country Park shuttle bus and the X43 bus not providing home to work transport illustrate that development will be car dependent.	
Purbeck Society		Many of the new residents in SE Purbeck (up to 1000+ from the 900 homes) will commute on the A351 by private car, despite the restoration of the rail link. Doesn't take into account environmental impacts, cuts in DCC budgets for highways work, reduction in public transport (loss of Durlston shuttle and X43 is an experimental service for day-trippers and does not serve as commuter transport)	
Welfare Dwellings	<b>Unsound</b>	It is not satisfactory to refer simply to improvements to a bus service without stating what those improvement might be. There needs to be real improvements which show the increase in the capacity or frequency of services not cosmetic improvements, such as real time information and alterations to bus stops.	The policy needs to be more specific as to what road improvements are proposed and what improvements are proposed to bus service X43.

**Council Response to comments on PC130:**

**ISSUES:** Comments concern the suitability of transport infrastructure to mitigate the proposed level of development.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The Purbeck Transportation Strategy (PTS) has been prepared jointly with Dorset County Council and is considered suitable to mitigate the level of development proposed. Additional detail will be added as and when feasibility work for each project is completed.

**ACTIONS:** None required.

**Proposed Change: PC131**

The Charborough Estate		Support all of proposed change except restriction to "affordable" housing. Object to word "affordable" which conflicts with the NPPF paragraph 112.	Delete "affordable" and insert instead "appropriate".
Mason M	<b>Unsound</b>	Affordable housing is only likely to come about where there is also market housing to act as a catalyst, albeit at the percentage rates suggested elsewhere in the Core Strategy.	Reword: .and tourism businesses, affordable housing '(where necessary with small scale open market housing to facilitate it)' and gypsy and traveller sites .....

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC131:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> Object to the word 'affordable' which is not in line with the draft NPPF, which allows for market housing to facilitate affordable housing.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The emergence of the NPPF will encourage more development outside of settlement boundaries to deliver affordable housing and this will be considered through subsequent plans.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required		
<b>Proposed Change: PC132</b>		
The Charborough Estate	Support last sentence to proposed new section. Object to emphasis on employment, tourism and affordable housing. This is in conflict with draft NPPF, paragraph 112 and 113.	Delete the proposed Change: "National Policy suggests ...accommodate a new use". Replace with : "In Purbeck, there is a need for more employment, and a shortage of both tourism accommodation and housing exists. Therefore, rather than letting rural buildings decay, proposals will be considered for conversion to employment, tourism or housing appropriate to the location and the property. It may be necessary to alter or extend a building in the countryside in order to maintain its use or to accommodate a new use".
<b>Council Response to comments on PC132:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> A landowner claims that policy on the reuse of rural buildings is not consistent with the draft NPPF, which allows some market housing to cross-subsidise significant affordable housing and the re-use of rural buildings for residential purposes in some circumstances.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Agree that recent draft national policy requires an update to the Core Strategy		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Amend paragraph 8.2.3 to reflect the range of reuses available: 'Re-use of existing buildings, such as traditional agricultural buildings, helps to conserve the District's cultural heritage. The draft NPPF supports the reuse of rural buildings for housing rather than letting special buildings of architectural or historical interest decay. In Purbeck, employment and tourism accommodation may also be supported. It may be necessary to alter or extend a building in the countryside in order to maintain its use or to accommodate a new use.'		
<b>Proposed Change: PC135</b>		
Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b> Support the change to consider adverse ecological impacts up front at the beginning of the policy & to include cumulative impacts.	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
RSPB The Charborough Estate	<p>Support amended first sentence of policy.</p> <p>Support reference to "traffic movements", "An employment use that would intensify or expand" and "which it replace" in respect of replacement buildings. Support deletions under sub-heading "Re-use of Rural Buildings" and all words proposed. Object to changes proposed under sub-heading "Extensions". Changes proposed under the heading "Re-use of Rural Buildings" proposed by PC135 would make things worse and would not accord with National policy in form of draft NPPF paras 112 &amp; 113.</p> <p>Draft NPPF para 112 states that LPA's should consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs. Therefore, re-use of a rural building should include potential for market housing.</p> <p>Draft NPPF para 113 states that isolated homes in the countryside can be considered where there are special circumstances such as: Where the development would ensure the future of buildings of special architectural or historic interest; or where development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting. No reference is made in draft NPPF para 113 to any restriction to affordable housing. Therefore, Policy CO must allow for market housing in order to accord with national policy.</p> <p>With regard to extensions to existing buildings in the countryside, the key issue is the impact on the countryside. It seems illogical to delete the phrase "materially change the impact of the building on the countryside" and substitute "not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building". The latter may be over restrictive in some circumstances and prevent a reasonable expansion of a building in employment use, creating serious difficulties for the business concerned.</p>	<p>Sub-section on re-use for rural buildings should read: "The re-use of rural Buildings of permanent and substantial construction will be permitted provided the new use is appropriate to both the building and to the locality. Where re-use, alteration or extension involves works to a traditional agricultural building, guidelines within the District design guidance will be taken into account .....".</p> <p>The changes proposed under "Extensions" should not be incorporated in the Core Strategy.</p>
Trustees of W H	<b>Unsound</b> The policy should permit residential conversion of rural	Redraft policy in accordance with policies contained



<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Drax 1962		buildings to facilitate their retention. This policy should be framed in accordance with policy PPS7 and NPPF which permits conversion of rural buildings for residential use where that would ensure the future of the building of significant architectural or historic interest. The policy is confusing in seeking to control extension to those buildings. The new policy should be written to allow for a qualitative assessment of the enlarged buildings impact on the openness of the surrounding countryside rather than restricting creation of floor space.	within the NPPF relating to the creation of new developments in the countryside. The policy relating to extensions should be reworded to allow enlargement of buildings where there is minimal effect upon the openness and character of the countryside regardless of the floor space created.
Weld Estate	<b>Unsound</b>	The amendments to the buildings in the countryside even less clear. Often the extension of the buildings are essential for the viability of any new use and the use of the word "disproportionate" could be as effectively used to prevent such extensions as to permit them.	Greater clarification required. This should relate much more closely with the proposed use as well as the existing size of the buildings.
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	The wording of Policy CO (and Policy LD) is unclear with regard to major employment at Dorset Green. PPS4 and the dNPPF require Council's to plan positively for economic growth.	Dorset Green TP and Holton Heath should be identified under Policy LD, not through Policy CO.
Baggs A	<b>Unsound</b>	Objects because the policy does not allow for farms to diversify and be used for camping and caravanning purposes.	Add: 'diversification of existing farms will be supported provided that diversification into caravanning or camping can be considered appropriate development providing it can be shown that there is no significant detriment to the surrounding countryside'.
Mason M	<b>Unsound</b>	Policy needs to recognise that the conversion of an existing rural building to open market housing could facilitate the provision of an affordable unit	Reword: .....affordable housing to meet a local need ' (including an open market dwelling to facilitate an affordable unit)' or community facility uses.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound?</i>	<i>Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC135:</b> <b>ISSUES:</b> Comments that policy on reuse of rural buildings is not consistent with NPPF paragraphs 112 and 113 and the reuse of a rural building should include potential for market housing. Objection to extensions not resulting in disproportionate additions  <b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Agree that the policy wording should allow for the potential for market housing in line with emerging national policy. Not allowing for disproportionate additions is not considered overly restrictive because it is reasonable, yet protects the countryside from inappropriate development.			
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Amend Policy CO to read 'The reuse of rural buildings of permanent and substantial construction (demonstrated through the submission of a structural survey) will be permitted provided they are for employment (use classes B1, B2 or B8), tourist accommodation, community facilities, or housing.'			
<b>Proposed Change: PC137</b>			
SW Housing Association Registered Providers	<b>Unsound</b>	Tenure section should include Council's position on affordable rent.	
<b>Council Response to comments on PC137:</b> <b>ISSUES:</b> A comment that the policy does not reflect affordable rent.  <b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Agree with comment.			
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Amend Policy AHT and supporting text to refer to affordable rent instead of social rent.			
<b>Proposed Change: PC139</b>			
Weld Estate	<b>Sound</b>	The cost of affordable housing and CIL may result in negative land values and subsequent reduction of land being made available for development. The value of development land is an important element of the business of a landowner. The reduction in the value of land may also impact on local investment in businesses and job creation.	The reinstatement of 40% maximum target for affordable housing on any development.
Humphrey G	<b>Unsound</b>	50% affordable housing achievable in settlement extension in Wareham. This should be made binding rather than a target as it was the key in Council agreeing to settlement extension.	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
SW Housing Association Registered Providers	<b>Unsound</b>	Support update of viability assessment to take account of introduction of affordable rent and changes in the market since 2008. Affordable rent likely to make certain schemes viable as developers can expect to receive more money for affordable units. Essential that council sets out its position on affordable rent in Core Strategy.	
<b>Council Response to comments on PC139:</b>			
<b>ISSUES: Arguments for/against levels of affordable housing contributions.</b>			
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE: The targets are ambitious, but flexible and based on sound evidence including up to date viability assessment.</b>			
<b>ACTIONS: None required.</b>			
<b>Proposed Change: PC142</b>			
Bloor Homes Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	Object to identification of settlement extension of Wareham as requiring to provide 50% affordable housing. The proposed change (and Policy AH) is unsound because (1) The affordable housing percentage is not expressed as a target, which is a requirement of national policy (2) The viability assessment that underpins the 50% affordable housing provision has not been verified by Bloor Homes and is considered to be based on a series of unrealistic assumptions.	The Core Strategy needs to identify a percentage of affordable housing at Worgret Road that is deliverable for the plan to be considered sound.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC142:</b>			
<b>ISSUES: An objection to the affordable housing requirement from the developer of the Wareham settlement extension.</b>			
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE: The targets are ambitious, but flexible and based on sound evidence including up to date viability assessment.</b>			
<b>ACTIONS: None required.</b>			
<b>Proposed Change: PC143</b>			
SW Housing Association Registered Providers	<b>Unsound</b>	Draft NPPF makes provision for use of general market housing in rural exception sites to cross-subsidise these schemes.	Amend rural exception policy to give opportunities to use such cross-subsidies to make schemes viable.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
<p><b>Council Response to comments on PC143:</b></p> <p><b>ISSUES:</b> A comment that the draft NPPF allows market housing to cross-subsidise affordable housing on rural exception sites.</p> <p><b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The emergence of the NPPF will encourage more development outside of settlement boundaries to deliver affordable housing and this will be considered through subsequent plans.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b> Add to para 8.5.7 'The draft NPPF suggests that Councils consider allowing the provision of a small amount of market housing to enable the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs in rural areas. This proposal will be reviewed through the preparation of an affordable housing plan.'</p>		
<b>Proposed Change: PC147</b>		
Friends, Families of Travellers	<b>Unsound</b>	Changes to the first criteria represent a considerable hurdle for an applicant to overcome. To require any applicant to demonstrate that the site in consideration is the only alternative is onerous and in practice impossible for an individual to prove. The most realistic and fair solution is to revert to the original wording of the criterion, recognising as it does the practical difficulties which Gypsies and Travellers face in obtaining lands for their needs and reflecting Circular 1/2006. The changes to the fourth criterion is acceptable and reflects our previous concern to opposition of the establishment of traveller sites
RSPB		Support inclusion of need to ensure G & T sites must not have detrimental impact on the natural environment. Concern that the statement, 'the site would not result in an unacceptable impact on the natural environment or landscape' is not robust enough.

**Council Response to comments on PC147:**

**ISSUE:** Suggestion that the criteria is too cumbersome and difficult for applicants to demonstrate that any given site would be the only 'realistic option'.

**COUNCIL RESPONSE:** The policy is intended to allow some flexibility to take account of the circumstances of each proposed site. The wording will be amended to provide additional clarification.

<p><b>ACTIONS:</b> Amend final sentence of first bullet of Policy GT to read: 'However, if the site does not fully comply with the above criteria, evidence will be required in order to demonstrate that the site is a realistic and justified option'.</p>
--

**Proposed Change: PC149**

Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the change to include wording as recommended in our previous comments.
-----------------------	--------------	--

**Council Response to comments on PC149:**

**ISSUES:** None

<p><b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.</p>
---------------------------------------

**Proposed Change: PC153**

Arne Parish Council		The final criterion should include some acknowledgement of the protection of existing residential buildings.	Include "existing residential buildings" after geological features.
Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the changes to the policy wording reflecting previous comments.	
RSPB		Welcome the changes.	
Wareham St Martin Parish Council		The final criterion should include some acknowledgement of the protection of existing residential buildings.	Include "existing residential buildings" after geological features.
Woodland Trust	<b>Unsound</b>	Lack of reference to ancient trees in view of conservation value & historical & cultural interest.	4th bullet point of Policy BIO should say: '..... Ancient woodland and ancient trees, the UK Biodiversity .....

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC153:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> Last criterion should acknowledge protection of residential buildings. There is lack of reference to ancient trees in view of their conservation value and historical and cultural interest.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The policy is specific to biodiversity and geodiversity and therefore reference to residential development is inappropriate. Ancient trees would be covered under 'other'.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.		

#### Proposed Change: PC155

RSPB	Recommend that mitigation measures in HRA will be closely adhered to in final Core Strategy, particularly that allocated dwellings can only be taken forward with the implementation of specified high quality SANGS with Natural England's endorsement and partnership working. Welcome additional supporting text. Allocated dwellings can only be taken forward with the implementation of specified high quality SANGS with the endorsement of Natural England and partnership working.	Recommend mitigation recommendations in HRA (p44) is adhered to closely in the final Core Strategy, particularly that allocated dwellings can only be taken forward with the implementation of specified SANGS with Natural England's endorsement and partnership working.
RSPB	Supports suitable mitigation as recommended in HRA & HRA recommendation for SANGS, reference to EU sites and GI provision but believe this should be in policy & cross referenced with policy DH & PH.	Include wording in policy and cross reference with Policy DH & PH.
The Charborough Estate	Support the need for mitigation requirements of strategic settlement extensions at Lytchett Matravers, Upton and Wareham.	

<b>Council Response to comments on PC155:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> General support for the proposals with request for additional cross referencing.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> All policies in the Core Strategy must be read alongside each other and cross references are unnecessary.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.		

#### Proposed Change: PC157

RSPB	Supports suitable mitigation as recommended in HRA &	Include wording in policy and cross reference with
------	--	--

Name	Plan sound?	Comment on soundness	Proposed Amendment
------	-------------	----------------------	--------------------

HRA recommendation for SANGS, reference to EU sites and GI provision but believe this should be in policy & cross referenced with policy DH & PH.

Policy DH & PH.

**Council Response to comments on PC157:**

**ISSUES:** General support for the proposals with request for additional cross referencing.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** All policies in the Core Strategy must be read alongside each other and cross references are unnecessary.

**ACTIONS:** None required.

**Proposed Change: PC160**

Bloor Homes Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	Increasing levels of nitrogen and other chemicals within Poole Harbour could be due to a number of processes, including run-off from agricultural activities, recreation or deliberate or inadvertent acts of pollution. Mitigation of adverse effects should only be required if the discharges are proven to have an adverse impact on the SPA, and not regardless of whether they are proven, which is what the second paragraph of the change implies. Whilst Bloor Homes accepts that the urban extension of Wareham will add to the quantity of treated effluent discharges to Poole Harbour via sewage treatment works, it remains a fact that Wessex Water has a statutory obligation to cater for the effluent generated by new development as well as ensuring that any effluent discharged meets stringent quality standards laid down by the Environment Agency. For the plan to be sound the final paragraph should make explicit what is expected of developers and landowners.	Unless the uncertainty surrounding the basis for the mechanism for addressing mitigation can be addressed to the satisfaction of Bloor Homes and the development industry in general, the proposed change should be deleted.
Dorset County Council	<b>Sound</b>	Important to note that disturbance is not just an issue in summer – disturbance in winter (by residents & visitors, when large numbers of over-wintering birds are at their most vulnerable) is also an acknowledged problem. The nature of the disturbance can be a bigger issue than the volume of visitors so it is important to consider activity as well as visitor numbers.	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the inclusion of a policy for Poole Harbour, to address the concerns raised in the Habitats Regulations Assessment.	
Natural England		Welcomes inclusion of new section. If Nutrient Management Plan is progressed in coming months it can be used to update Core Strategy. Larger developments should provide mitigation specific to the proposed development.	Include wording in Policy PH to require larger developments to provide mitigation specific to the proposed development.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC160:</b> <b>ISSUES:</b> Support for the new policy from Natural England, Dorset County Council and Dorset Wildlife Trust. Concern from a developer over the justification of the policy and lack of specific requirements.  <b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Natural England has requested the policy and it has also been highlighted as a requirement by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process. Although the specific detail has yet to be published it is hoped that a detailed policy can be incorporated during the examination of the Core Strategy.			
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.			
<b>Proposed Change: PC161</b>			
Bloor Homes Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	Objects to inclusion of Policy PH as set out in response to PC160. As the mechanism for mitigating adverse impacts has not yet been identified or agreed, the implications for the potential viability of the Worgret Road development site remain unknown and uncertain, with consequential concerns about the delivery of the other infrastructure and contributions. The existence of this policy in its current form could therefore undermine other policies in the plan and is neither effective nor justified.	Unless the uncertainty surrounding the basis for the mechanism for addressing mitigation can be addressed to the satisfaction of Bloor Homes and the development industry in general, the proposed change should be deleted.
RSPB		Support new policy recommended by the HRA in order to protect the wildlife of Poole Harbour .	



<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC161:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> Concern from a developer over the lack of specific requirements, which will impact upon the deliverability of the Wareham settlement extension.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Natural England has requested the policy and it has also been highlighted as a requirement by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process. Although the specific detail has yet to be published it is hoped that a detailed policy can be incorporated during the examination of the Core Strategy.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Amend Policy PH, first sentence to read 'may' rather than 'will' for added flexibility.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC165</b>		
Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	<b>Unsound</b> Not clear whether each of the criteria has to be tested in turn. The individual criteria are not sequential, yet it would still appear that all the listed criteria would need to be satisfied before a change of use would, in principle, be allowed. This is still considered overly onerous and as a result premises would be left vacant or derelict as a new viable use could not be secured. Furthermore the individual criteria are not clear in terms of what is intended. One example is under the second criterion which refers to the premises or location being unsuitable, but it is not clear as to what this is intended to address.	For the reasons set out above the following revised wording is proposed in respect of the criteria for addressing the development or change of use of an existing community facility/service: a) it would provide another community facility or service, b) replacement facilities are being proposed elsewhere which are accessible to the catchment population, c) alternative facilities are available locally, d) it can be demonstrated that there is no demand or need for the facility through sufficient and realistic marketing for a period of at least 9 months.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC165:</b>		
<b>ISSUES:</b> Concern that the policy is overly onerous and unclear. Would prefer a list of ors, rather than having to satisfy all the criteria.		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> Agree that the rewording of the policy is still onerous.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Reword Policy CF to make it clearer and less onerous.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC167</b>		
Trees for Dorset	<b>Sound</b> Green Infrastructure Policy has been made clearer. Would wish to see more positive view than just 'consideration'. The provision of Green Infrastructure should include more than just street trees but also group planting of trees and shrubs that will provide visual and sound buffers. Enhancement of existing tree belts and hedges could be part of this policy.	

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
		We are pleased to see that local communities will be involved in the consideration of green infrastructure.	
Weld Estate	<b>Unsound</b>	Exclusion of Wool is inconsistent with its potential as a key service village and the potential to contribute to the green infrastructure as reported in the study "Implications for Additional Growth Scenarios for European Protected Sites" Sept 2010.	Reinstate Wool in this paragraph.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC167:</b>			
<b>ISSUES:</b> Concern that the description of Green Infrastructure is not broad enough.			
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The existing wording is not restrictive and adding more description would be unnecessary.			
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.			
<b>Proposed Change: PC171</b>			
Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the change to wording to cover "the management of a connected, coherent & functional network of new & enhanced open green spaces & corridors in accordance with the Green Infrastructure Strategy standards"	
<b>Council Response to comments on PC171:</b>			
<b>ISSUES:</b> None			
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.			
<b>Proposed Change: PC174</b>			
Environment Agency	<b>Sound</b>	Support additional wording in the policy as it increases protection of water supplies	
RSPB		Welcome additional text "Development should have no impact on licensed supplies or any other private supplies or water features". Recommend policy strengthened to include 'aquatic nature conservation features'.	Strengthen policy to include 'aquatic nature conservation features'.

**Council Response to comments on PC174:**

**ISSUES:** One comment seeking a strengthening of the policy to include aquatic nature conservation features.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** Additional detail is unnecessary as 'water features' already covers this.

**ACTIONS:** None required.

**Proposed Change: PC177**

Dorset County Council	<b>Sound</b>	Policy could be clearer about the intent of CCMAAs – presumably to reduce risk & support adaptation?
-----------------------	--------------	--

**Council Response to comments on PC177:**

**ISSUES:** Suggested that policy could be made clearer about the intent of Coastal Change Management Areas

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** Agree with suggestion.

**ACTIONS:** Include further information in Policy CE on the intent of Coastal Change Management Areas.

**Proposed Change: PC180**

RSPB		Note text for developers to demonstrate support for biodiversity through sensitive landscaping and built in features has moved from policy SD to policy D.	Recommend that general information on how to achieve this is provided in the supporting text.
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	Criteria are overly prescriptive, rather than overarching design objectives. It should follow paragraph 36 of PPS1.	Adopt the criteria of paragraph 36 of PPS1 and set out detailed matters, such as overlooking and overshadowing to a subsequent DPD.

**Council Response to comments on PC180:**

**ISSUES:** Concern that policy is overly prescriptive and should follow PPS1 paragraph 36.

Request for information on how to achieve biodiversity through sensitive landscaping in preamble.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The policy conforms to PPS1. It would be inappropriate for the Core Strategy to enter into detail on sensitive landscaping; this would be appropriate level of detail for design guidance.

**ACTIONS:** None required.

**Proposed Change: PC186**

CG Fry & Son Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	The new second bullet point is considered to be ambiguous	Review the extent to which the bullet points repeat
------------------	----------------	---	---

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
		and potentially meaningless. It does not add any locally specific advice and offers nothing beyond government guidance. The referral of each issue to viability assessment has the potential to delay and frustrate much needed development from coming forward.	national guidance and delete where possible. Delete the second bullet point. Repword the third bullet point to encompass a wider range of options to secure the state objective.
Environment Agency	<b>Sound</b>	Support standard design for commercial development, however policy fails to identify minimum standard for residential development under Code for Sustainable Homes. This is a missed opportunity to ensure development is truly sustainable in design and resource use.	Include minimum criteria for water efficiency for new residential development to meet minimum Code 3

**Council Response to comments on PC186:**

**ISSUES:** Comments that Policy SD is restrictive and repeats national policy.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The policy should be reviewed to ensure it does not repeat national guidance.

**ACTIONS:** Review Policies D and SD to ensure they do not repeat national guidance.

**Proposed Change: PC190**

Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the change to strengthen wording in relation to ecological impacts on protected sites.
-----------------------	--------------	--

**Council Response to comments on PC190:**

**ISSUES:** None.

**ACTIONS:** None required.

**Proposed Change: PC194**

Trees for Dorset	<b>Sound</b>	We are pleased to see that plans should enhance and improve conservation of landscape and historic environment. We are encouraged by the clear statement of PDC's position on the importance of the landscape, historic environment and heritage which is the core of the "Keep Purbeck Special" slogan.
------------------	--------------	--

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC194:</b>		
<b>ISSUES: None.</b>		
<b>ACTIONS: None required.</b>		
<b>Proposed Change: PC195</b>		
Dorset AONB Partnership		With ref to point 8.17.5 Dorset Rural Roads Protocol should be listed.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC195:</b>		
<b>ISSUES: The Dorset Rural Roads Protocol should be listed.</b>		
<b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE: Agree.</b>		
<b>ACTIONS: List the Dorset Rural Roads Protocol in paragraph 8.17.5.</b>		
<b>Proposed Change: PC196</b>		
RSPB	Support amended policy	
Trees for Dorset	<b>Sound</b> We are pleased to see that plans should enhance and improve conservation of landscape and historic environment. We are encouraged by the clear statement on the importance of the landscape, historic environment and heritage which is the core of the "Keep Purbeck Special" slogan.	
Weld Estate	<b>Unsound</b> These amendments could effectively prevent the utilisation of heritage assets, particularly listed buildings and thereby ensure the destruction through gradual decay and eventual collapse. The policy is far too restrictive.	Reinstate the "unnecessary wording" which isn't unnecessary as it stipulates exceptions which ensure the survival of heritage assets which might otherwise be lost.
Woodland Trust	<b>Unsound</b> Lack of reference to ancient & native woodland in Policy LHH.	'....health and vitality of landscape (including ancient and native woodland, trees and hedgerows and heritage assets....'

<i>Name</i>	<i>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</i>	<i>Proposed Amendment</i>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC196:</b> <b>ISSUES:</b> Policy is far too restrictive and will prevent the use of heritage assets. No mention of ancient and native woodland.  <b>COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:</b> The policy must be strict in order to protect heritage assets. Including text on ancient and native woodland could help strengthen the policy.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> Insert 'woodland,' before 'trees and hedgerows' in Policy LHH.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC199</b>		
Dorset AONB Partnership	Strengthen wording regarding larger employment developments providing travel plans	Change from 'may' to 'should' be required to implement sustainable travel plans."
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd <b>Unsound</b>	Objects to the failure to identify sites where new employment growth could go and the intention to undertake a further employment land review at a later date is a significant omission from the Core Strategy. There is no clear guidance as to how development at DGTP and Holton Heath will be assessed. The policy is too focussed on B class uses, rather than all sectors, so is not in line with PPS4. Non B class development, either on or close to employment land, should be recognised.	Clearly identify DGTP as the preferred location for focusing economic development.
<b>Council Response to comments on PC199:</b> <b>ISSUES:</b> Suggestion that there is a failure to identify where sites for new employment growth should be located and that the policy is too focussed upon B class use.  <b>COUNCIL RESPONSE:</b> The preference for location is set out in Policy LD: Location of Development. B class uses represent the main focus for activity at the employment areas in Purbeck.		
<b>ACTIONS:</b> None required.		
<b>Proposed Change: PC201</b>		
RSPB	Welcome additional supporting text in 8.19.2 with references to Policy DH and PH.	Recommend additional supporting text should be included in policy alongside reference to policy CO.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound? Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
<b>Council Response to comments on PC201:</b>		
<b>ISSUES: None</b>		
<b>ACTIONS: None required.</b>		
<b>Proposed Change: PC202</b>		
Baggs A	<b>Unsound</b> Objects to not allowing holiday accommodation in the AONB and Green Belt. Planning conditions could make sites appropriate. This would enable farms to diversify and remain sustainable and assist with appropriate countryside management.	Insert line: 'new sites or extensions to existing holiday chalet and tented camping sites will only be permitted within the AONB and Green Belt providing it can be shown there will be no significant detriment to those areas but will, in certain cases, be permitted outside of the AONB and Green Belt.'
<b>Council Response to comments on PC202:</b>		
<b>ISSUES: Objection to the exclusion of holiday accommodation in the green belt and AONB</b>		
<b>COUNCIL RESPONSE: The restrictions are necessary to protect the landscape quality of the AONB and openness of the green belt.</b>		
<b>ACTIONS: None required.</b>		
<b>Proposed Change: PC204</b>		
RSPB	Welcome the additional mitigation requirements in the policy	
<b>Council Response to comments on PC204:</b>		
<b>ISSUES: None</b>		
<b>ACTIONS: None required.</b>		
<b>Proposed Change: PC210</b>		
Dorset AONB Partnership		Insert in para 8.22.3 after A35 and C6 corridor 'through implementing new approaches to road management in a high quality environment'.

**Council Response to comments on PC210:**

**ISSUES:** Dorset AONB suggest insertion of additional text.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** Agree with proposed additional text.

**ACTIONS:** Amend para 8.22.3 to read 'A35 and C6 corridor through implementing new approaches to road management in a high quality environment'.

**Proposed Change: PC218**

SW Housing Association Registered Providers	<b>Unsound</b>	Essential this policy states that delivery of affordable housing will not be squeezed by introduction of CIL and the charging schedule must take into account development costs.
---	----------------	--

**Council Response to comments on PC218:**

**ISSUES:** The delivery of affordable housing should not be squeezed by the introduction of CIL and the charging schedule must take into account development costs.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** Paragraph 9.6 should be amended to add clarity in accordance with comments.

**ACTIONS:** Amend second sentence of paragraph 9.6 to include the words "costs and" between the words "development" and "viability". Add additional sentences to the end of paragraph 9.6 to read "Preparation of the CIL charging schedule will give full consideration to the delivery of affordable housing (in accordance with Core Strategy Policy AH) as one of the Council's key priorities".

**Proposed Change: PC219**

Arne Parish Council	<b>Unsound</b>	To mitigate pressures on heathland from recreational purposes, it is necessary to put other facilities in place. To remove recreation and open space from the CIL charging schedule is not supporting mitigation. Developers must provide these spaces to prevent anti social behaviour, driving to other recreation areas/heaths/parks and green infrastructure would be ideal for the rural district.	Include Recreation and Open Space in 9.7 and Policy DEV.
Wareham St Martin Parish Council		To mitigate pressures on heathland from recreational purposes, it is necessary to put other facilities in place. To remove recreation and open space from the CIL charging schedule is not supporting mitigation. Developers must provide these spaces to prevent anti social behaviour,	Include Recreation and Open Space in 9.7 and Policy Dev.



Name	Plan sound?	Comment on soundness	Proposed Amendment
------	-------------	----------------------	--------------------

driving to other recreation areas/heaths/parks and green infrastructure would be ideal for the rural District.

**Council Response to comments on PC219:**

**ISSUE:** Recreation and open space must remain in CIL charging schedule to support heathland mitigation.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** Paragraph 9.7 does not propose removal of recreation and open space from the CIL charging schedule. The paragraph sets out which development contributions will be sought prior to implementation of a CIL charging schedule, including affordable housing, transport and heathland mitigation. The provision of recreation and open space has been removed from paragraph 9.7 as the background work/evidence and preparation of an SPD is unlikely to be completed prior to implementation of the CIL. The opportunity to seek development contributions towards the provision of recreation and open space (together with other contributions) will be assessed through preparation of the CIL.

**ACTIONS:** None required.

**Proposed Change: PC222**

Environment Agency	<b>Unsound</b>	CS identifies the need for mitigation for Poole Harbour due to nutrient loading and recreational pressures. Given its international importance and the need for additional development to mitigate additional pressures we feel it necessary this topic is identified for developer contributions.	Need to acknowledge potential contributions for Poole Harbour mitigation policy DEV in accordance with Policy PH.
RSPB		Welcome inclusion of a mechanism to fund for mitigation via CIL and the reference to Policy DH. Note reference to GI provision removed due to new Policy GI.	Recommend inclusion of reference to Policy PH

**Council Response to comments on PC222:**

**ISSUE:** Acknowledge potential need for development contributions to mitigate nutrient loading and recreational pressures on Poole Harbour (in accordance with Policy PH).

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** Agree with comments.

**ACTIONS:** Add to para 9.7 'There may also be a requirement for a contribution towards mitigation of the effects upon Poole Harbour. Further detail is set out in Policy PH: Poole Harbour.'

**Proposed Change: PC224**

Dorset Wildlife Trust	<b>Sound</b>	Support the change to state "SNCI Panel" which is more accurate.
-----------------------	--------------	--

**Council Response to comments on PC224:**

**ISSUES:** None.

**ACTIONS:** None required.

**Proposed Change: PC225**

RSPB	Welcome indicators listed in App 3 & support change in local target for biodiversity.	Should read 'significant increases in biodiversity over the lifetime of the plan, not simply to ensure no change in area'.
------	---	--

**Council Response to comments on PC225:**

**ISSUES:** One comment requesting a target of significant increases in biodiversity

**COUNCIL RESPONSE:** New biodiversity will be delivered through other plans so it would be inappropriate to measure it against the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy will help protect sites and therefore a target can be set that there is no overall decrease.

**ACTIONS:** Review the targets in Appendix 3

**Proposed Change: PC226**

Birchmere Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	Object to Appendix 4 [Inset Map 3: Holton Heath] that shows land to west of Station Road within boundary of Admiralty Park Business Park as Green Belt. Site benefits from a Certificate of Lawful Use for business use. Inclusion in Green Belt would be in direct conflict with lawful use. The land does not meet PPG2 tests for inclusion in Green Belt. Allocation in Green belt would limit any future expansion and be contrary to employment policies.	Remove land classed as part of Admiralty Business Park, to the west of Station Road from the proposed Green Belt.
Gallagher K	<b>Unsound</b>	The map does not directly match the Environment Agency's map, which shows that part of 'site D' falls within an area of flooding.	
Purbeck Society		The inset map 11 of Swanage does not directly match the Environment Agency's flood plain map that shows a section of "site D" does fall within an area of flooding.	
RSPB		Map in Appendix 4 proposed changes to SE Dorset Green Belt is not clear	Map to be amended

<b>Name</b>	<b>Plan sound?</b>	<b>Comment on soundness</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
ZBV (Winfrith) Ltd	<b>Unsound</b>	Flood zone maps on Inset Map 4 are now out of date due to hydraulic modelling of the DGTP site, which has been adopted by the Environment Agency.	Update Inset Map 4 with the Risk Assessment and hydraulic modelling undertaken by Waterman.
Hobbs C & M	<b>Unsound</b>	Misleading, as this inset map of Swanage is not comparable to the Environment Agency's flood plain map which clearly represents a section of 'site D' as categorically falling within an area of flooding.	Scrap 'The Core Strategy' in it's current form and reconsult. Or correct this misinformation with the introduction of a map that would match that of the Environment Agency as such a glaringly important aspect to consider for all concerned.

**Council Response to comments on PC226:**

**ISSUES:** Queries over accuracy and quality of the Proposals maps. Inset Map 3: Holton Heath - Land with a Certificate of Lawful Use for Business (CLU) should not be included in Green Belt. Inset Maps 4 and 11: not up to date flooding information.

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:** The size of maps was considered practical for an A4 document. Flood mapping is updated regularly and the Proposals Map will be updated upon adoption of the Core Strategy with the latest data provided by the Environment Agency. Buildings with a CLU are already outside the Green Belt. Open undeveloped land with a CLU remains in the Green Belt.

**ACTIONS:** Add to Schedule of Changes to Proposals Maps in Appendix 4 'Please note: Flood Zones Illustrated on proposals map are dated August 2011. Flood Zones will be updated on final adopted proposals map subject to most recently sourced mapping from the Environment Agency'.