



Core Strategy Submission

Consultation Response Analysis by Topic

RURAL AREAS



Prepared by Christchurch Borough Council and
East Dorset District Council

May 2013

1 Introduction	2
2 Analysis of Responses	2

1 Introduction

1.1 This document sets out a consolidated summary and analysis of the Core Strategy responses received in relation to the rural areas at Pre-Submission stage (Consultation period 2nd April to 25th June 2012) and at the Schedule of Proposed Changes stage (consultation period of 5th November - 21st December 2012.). The analysis relates to chapters 3 and 12.

1.2 The Councils have set out responses to the representations received at the Pre-submission stage which also include where changes have been made to the Core Strategy as a result of representations received. Where changes have not been made to the Core Strategy as a result of representations the reasons for this are explained.

1.3 In response to representations received to the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy, the Councils have set out their position following this consultation stage. No changes have been made to the Core Strategy following this consultation stage for the purposes of the Submission Core Strategy.

2 Analysis of Responses

The Core Strategy Vision

Pre-Submission

2.1 No specific mention of rural areas

2.2 Summary of Responses

- ***Representations on policy for rural areas.***
 - These generic representations considered that there was a lack of vision for the rural areas and that the impact of housing and in-migration of urban dwellers was changing the character and community in rural area.

2.3 Councils' Response - how we have taken into account the consultation responses?

2.4 The Vision will also be amended to include references to development of rural areas, with paragraph 4 referring to development of housing in both towns and villages, and references to diversification of the rural economy added to the 8th paragraph on the economy.

Proposed Changes to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy

....Housing will also continue to be delivered ~~from redevelopment within the existing towns, in our towns and villages~~ but developments will now better reflect the character and type of housing found in each local area, and will make appropriate contributions to infrastructure. Almost all new housing development will contribute to the provision of affordable housing, creating a step change in delivery of affordable dwellings and a significant reduction in waiting lists.

The Green Belt policy will be kept in place to protect the character of the area, subject to limited alterations of boundaries to enable its extension and elsewhere to allow for some housing and employment growth to help meet the needs of the local communities.

Historic towns such as Christchurch and Wimborne will be vibrant centres of commercial and cultural activity, with niche shopping, and varied attractions and facilities for residents and visitors alike. Other key local centres in Ferndown, Verwood, West Moors and Highcliffe will support shops and services for their local communities, with villages and smaller neighbourhood centres providing basic services. New ways of delivering services and facilities in rural areas will be developed.

The economy of the area will grow, both by sustaining its traditional sectors such as tourism, health and education, but also by creating a mixed economy with emphasis on growth in new knowledge based sectors including engineering, creative and technical industries and the green knowledge economy. Economic growth will be sustained by the creation of major high quality employment sites in East Dorset and at Bournemouth Airport, and by the protection of other well located sites for key employment uses. These will have an important role in sustaining the economy of South East Dorset. **Within the rural areas traditional employment will be supported and rural diversification encouraged to create jobs and prosperity...**

2.5 Summary of Responses

2.6 The reference in the vision to rural employment being supported is considered worthless given the proposed allocation of a farm in Burton for housing.

2.7 Councils' Position

2.8 The farm at Burton forms part of a proposed new housing site where any impact on the farm is outweighed by delivery of housing for the village.

Policy KS1: Settlement Hierarchy

Pre-Submission

Settlement Hierarchy

The location, scale and distribution of development should conform with the settlement hierarchy, which will also help to inform service providers about the provision of infrastructure, services and facilities.

Settlement Type	Function
Main Settlements	The settlements which will provide the major focus for community, cultural, leisure, retail, utility, employment and residential development. This will include infill development as well as options for some greenfield development.
	Christchurch, Wimborne Minster, Ferndown and West Parley, Verwood, Corfe Mullen
District Centres	Settlements which will provide for smaller scale community, cultural, leisure, retail, employment and residential development within the existing urban areas.
	West Moors, Highcliffe
Suburban Centres	Settlements with no existing centres that will provide for some residential development along with community, leisure and retail facilities to meet day to day needs within the existing urban areas.
	Colehill, St Leonards and St Ives
Rural Service Centres	Main providers for the rural areas where residential development will be allowed of a scale that reinforces their role as providers of community, leisure and retail facilities to support the village and adjacent communities.
	Alderholt, Cranborne, Sixpenny Handley, Sturminster Marshall, Three Legged Cross
Villages	Settlements where only very limited development will be allowed that supports the role of the settlement as a provider of services to its home community.
	Burton, Hurn, Edmondsham, Furzehill, Gaunts Common, Gussage All Saints, Gussage St Michael, Hinton Martell, Holt, Horton, Longham, Shapwick, Wimborne St Giles, Witchampton, Woodlands/Whitmore

Settlement Type	Function
Hamlets	Settlements where development would not be allowed unless it was functionally required to be in the rural area.
	All other settlements

Table 2.1

2.9 Consultation Response

Legally Compliant		Sound		Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:								No Indication of legal compliance or soundness
				Positively Prepared		Justified		Effective		Consistent with National Policy		
Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
10	3	6	19	11	4	16	7	13	7	11	6	9

Table 2.2

2.10 List of Consultee Reference Numbers

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Comment ID
220620	Miss S Thorpe	Gleeson Developments Ltd	CSPS903
359261	Mr Doug Cramond	DC Planning Ltd	CSPS2092
359295	Mrs Maria Humby	Alderholt Parish Council	CSPS4006
359503	Mrs Lisa Goodwin	Knowlton Parish Council	CSPS2939
359529	Mrs Lisa Goodwin	Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council	CSPS2418
359585	Mr Robert Finn		CSPS3071

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Comment ID
360245	Mr Richard Burden	Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB	CSPS1560
360692	Mrs Wendy Britton		CSPS677
361170	Mr Tim Harvey		CSPS3985
490815	Mrs Trish Jamieson	Burton Parish Council	CSPS3664
490823	Mr Ian Jones	Ferndown Town Council	CSPS2963
499596	Sir Roger Palin		CSPS2517
499596	Sir Roger Palin		CSPS2518
503554	Mr D Verguson		CSPS3990
512360	Mr Richard Acres		CSPS3986
521383	Mr Graham Paisley	Scottish and Southern Energy	CSPS38
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	CSPS3642
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSPS2117
523531	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Savills	CSPS3185
523627	David Lowin	WYG Planning & Design	CSPS1576
524088	Mr Ken Parke	Ken Parke Planning Consultants	CSPS3633
524723	Mr John Worth	Wimborne Civic Society	CSPS3984
654392	Mr Geoffrey Chopping		CSPS671
654506	Mr John Showell		CSPS808
654660	Ms Anne Mason	Transition Town Christchurch	CSPS935
655009	Mr D Mure		CSPS3991
655876	Mr James Moran		CSPS3983

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Comment ID
656249	Ms Gemma Care	Barton Willmore LLP	CSPS1086
656493	Cllr Tony Gibb	Eastern Area DAPTC	CSPS1470
656678	Mr James Cleary	Pro Vision Planning and Design	CSPS3490
656692	Mr Robin Henderson	Ken Parke Planning Consultants	CSPS3626
657341	Mr & Mrs K Perry		CSPS3979
657372	Mr A.J Linehan	Brookside Manor Residents Association	CSPS3980
664634	Mr C Benham	Turley Associates	CSPS3830
669847	Mrs Christine McNulty	Ken Parke Planning Consultants	CSPS3972

2.11 Summary of Responses

- Objection to the classification of Furzehill as a village due to concerns that its identification as such could lead to the pressure for more development. Suggests that the area be allocated as a hamlet instead as it does not function as a village.
- If growth is the objective of the Plan then hamlets should be included in the package. That or go for a New Town approach to meet external demand and use this provision of new supply as the reason why people have to compete for the existing hamlet properties.
- Eastern Area Dorset Association of Parish and Town Councils - Market Towns. The lack of any partnership working within East Dorset reduces the role of the market towns as a focus for their area. The location of market towns in the south of the district does not help. There is a confusion of terminology within the document between Rural Service Centres and Key Settlements. Despite previous comments, the Core Strategy remains urban centric, focusing on the conurbations along the A31 and ignoring the largest part of the District. The size of the rural community is 72.21% of the East Dorset area and the rural population is 14.74% of the East Dorset population. These communities deserve better recognition within the Core Strategy before it can be supported.
- Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council - welcome the intention for Sixpenny Handley to be designated a Rural Service Centre. Such a designation reinforces the village's existing role in the provision of services, including to the surrounding area. However, there is nothing of significance in the rest of the document to say how this will be achieved reinforcing the impression that this is a token gesture. The concept of a settlement hierarchy is agreed, however, the policies require definition and for the rural communities should not be constrained if there is a need for limited diversification, development or expansion.
- Knowlton Parish Council - The needs of communities must be allowed to achieve a higher profile than is currently permitted by the constraints of conservation and the support of the concept of the rural idyll. The Core Strategy as currently written falls short of these objectives.

- Burton Parish Council - The Council notes and agrees with the place of Burton on the suggested Settlement Hierarchy, but notes however that the Strategy states in para 4.21 that limited development is proposed for the village to meet specific local needs. The Parish is concerned that the opportunity to define this housing by means of a local exceptions policy is not taken. In other words, this housing will not be specific to the needs of the village but will be available for general use on alleviating the waiting list, the validity of which the Council has some concerns.
- Mr Robert Finn, local landowner - Alderholt, being a local centre and the largest village in East Dorset, has potential for being more than a Rural Service Centre. He is promoting an area of land on the edge of the village for residential development.

2.12 Councils' Response - how we have taken into account the consultation responses?

2.13 There is a general degree of support for the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy KS1, with only minor amendments suggested by respondents.

2.14 The concerns expressed by the Dorset Association of Parish and Town Councils, echoed by Sixpenny Handley and Knowlton Parish Councils, that the Plan is too urban-centric are noted. However the vast majority of the population living within the Plan area live within urban areas and the Councils have sought to meet the needs of these areas, but not at the expense of the rural areas. The rural economy is addressed in Policy PC3 (chapter 13) which seeks to promote sustainable economic growth in rural areas in and on the edge of the existing larger rural settlements. Policies LN3 and LN4 (chapter 15) set out the Councils' policy on the provision of affordable housing, which are applicable in the rural areas as well as urban areas, and Policy LN6 addresses the provision and protection of community facilities and services, which again applies to Rural Service Centres as well as the larger urban settlements.

2.15 Burton does not function as a rural service centre due to its proximity and connectivity to facilities in Christchurch town centre and also because Burton village does not have the range of facilities that would be associated with a rural service centre. On this basis, the position of Burton within the settlement hierarchy remains unchanged.

Proposed Changes to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy

2.16 No changes proposed.

Policy RA1:

Pre-Submission

Bailie Gate Employment Allocation, Sturminster Marshall

2.17 3.3 hectares of land at Bailie Gate, Sturminster Marshall should be removed from the Green Belt and developed for new employment.

2.18 This should involve:

- The provision of B1 (Office and Light Industry) , B2 (General Industry) and B8 (Warehousing and Distribution) employment uses.

2.19 Prerequisites for development would include:

- Approval of a detailed development brief, subject to public consultation.
- Agreement of a comprehensive travel plan including the support of regular bus services and scope to provide footway/cycleway links towards village facilities.
- Provision of significant landscape buffers alongside the countryside edges of the site.
- A Sustainable Drainage System to mitigate any potential impacts.

2.20 Consultation Response

Legally Compliant		Sound		Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:								No Indication of legal compliance or soundness
				Positively Prepared		Justified		Effective		Consistent with National Policy		
Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
2	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	4

Table 2.3

2.21 List of Consultee Reference Numbers

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Comment ID
359541	Mr Roger Lucas	Sturminster Marshall Parish Council	CSPS1897
360692	Mrs Wendy Britton		CSPS683
524723	Mr John Worth	Wimborne Civic Society	CSPS1927
641635	Mr Ernest Turner		CSPS10
656462	Mrs Lynne Vipond		CSPS1186
657451	Mr George Goodbody		CSPS1885
657747	Mr Craig Boxshall	Marshall Fisheries	CSPS2326

2.22 Summary of Responses

- Housing**

- Mrs Wendy Britton (local land owner) is promoting 7.2ha of land to the south of Bailie Gate for a mix of residential development and open space and community facilities. It is argued that the site is close to local facilities and will provide housing to meet the needs resulting from the proposed expansion of the Industrial Estate proposed in policy RA1.

Environment

- Concern about the impact the proposed development could have on the wildlife which uses the adjoining lakes (Marshall Fishery) and requires confirmation that a co-ordinated and comprehensive pollution prevention plan is in place and that an environmental impact assessment is undertaken before planning permission is granted for the proposal.
- Sturminster Marshall Parish Council – the environmental impact of this expanded industrial estate would need careful consideration, in particular the noise pollution in relation to the village school. There are issues with the disposal of surface water from the site that will need to be addressed before approval or inclusion. A full environmental survey is essential before the next stage of the Core Strategy.
- Marshall Fisheries – object to the industrial estate being extended as it could compromise the Green Belt. Development such as car spray workshops could cause pollution to the lakes, killing fish and not being a pleasant place for fishermen, local golfers, school children, walkers and horse riders to use. Also has concerns about possible noise pollution from the site. This area is prone to flooding, and more buildings will compromise the safety of nearby roads. Questions about the meaning of 'significant landscape buffers', where the access will be and what provision there will be for additional drainage from the site.

Transport

- There is no vehicular access directly from the A31 causing traffic congestion and danger to pedestrians near the village shop and primary school. This proposal will increase these factors.
- Sturminster Marshall Parish Council – whilst we would like to think that this would give village residents employment opportunities, we envisage that the additional traffic on our already congested roads could be potentially a hazard. In particular the site is adjacent to the village school.
- Access is by a narrow residential road unsuitable for the type of traffic which would be generated. The roads are used by walkers and horse riders and these users are not compatible with industrial traffic.

Employment

- Bailie Gate has many empty units. There is a large area at the front which could provide a shop or skate park which is needed.
- Not justified, no local need – there are many empty units on the site at present.
- Wimborne Civic Society – support 3.3ha of Green Belt land at Bailie Gate to be developed for new employment.

2.23 Councils' Response - how we have taken into account the consultation responses?

2.24 *Environment*

2.25 A number of responses have referred to national Green Belt policy and an understanding that seeking to amend existing Green Belt boundaries is illegal and contrary to national policy. This is not the case. Paragraphs 82 – 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework, published by the Government in March 2012, make it clear that Local Planning Authorities can amend existing Green Belt boundaries in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of a Local Plan or when planning for larger scale developments.

2.26 A Development Brief will need to be agreed with the Council for this site. This will deal with all detailed matters of delivery of the site, such as general layout, significant landscape buffers alongside the countryside edges of the site, and other detailed site requirements.

2.27 *Transport*

2.28 A significant number of people have stated that the transport issues which they believe will result from the proposed development are not covered by the proposals set out in the policy. Dorset County Council has carried out transport assessments in general and the assessments show that development can take place. Following the adoption of the Core Strategy a developer will be required to carry out further assessments which will show the specific issues relating to the site and the improvements which will be required as part of the planning application process.

2.29 *Employment*

2.30 The sites have been selected as sustainable locations close to existing settlements with good access to the road network. We will continue to work with our partner authorities to ensure employment land supply located in Christchurch and East Dorset will contribute in part to meeting the wider strategic requirement across the Bournemouth and Poole Housing Market Area as identified in the 2012 Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Workspace Study, with financial contributions from the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Proposed Changes to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy

2.31 Paragraph 12.1 - Key Characteristics of the East Dorset Rural Area

2.32 Additional text to reflect the role of country landowners and big estates in the rural area.

2.33 *Landscape Character*

2.34 The Wiltshire and Cranborne Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty covers a large proportion of the East Dorset rural area. In total it covers over 40% of the District. A significant area adjoining the Area of outstanding Natural Beauty has been designated an Area of Great Landscape Value. **The large rural estates that make up a significant proportion of these areas have played, and continue to play, an important role in shaping the landscape of the area.**

2.35 Summary of Responses

2.36 No responses received.

Policy RA2: Furzehill Village Envelope

Pre-Submission

Furzehill Village Envelope

The Village Envelope will be amended at Furzehill to include the Council Offices and neighbouring buildings.

Redevelopment of the site for residential, offices, residential institutions, non residential institutions, hotel and/or community uses will be acceptable to support the provision of new Council Offices elsewhere. The following requirements must be met:

- a) Replacement buildings will not exceed the current floorspace of existing buildings and will not exceed their height.
- b) The wooded areas of the site should be retained.
- c) A landscape screen should be provided on the western edge of the site, so that views from the wider countryside, including the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty are not harmed.
- d) Redevelopment of the site should provide a community hall for the village.
- e) Redevelopment should support the implementation of traffic calming measures through the village.

2.37 Consultation Response

Legally Compliant		Sound		Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:								No Indication of legal compliance or soundness
				Positively Prepared		Justified		Effective		Consistent with National Policy		
Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
1	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1

Table 2.4

2.38 List of Consultee Reference Numbers

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Comment ID
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1499
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3332
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3334
474462	Mrs Sheila Bourton		CSPS185
524723	Mr John Worth	Wimborne Civic Society	CSPS1924

2.39 Summary of Responses

• Council Offices

- Object to the proposal to move the Council Offices from Furzehill to the Allendale area of Wimborne as the council already has a modern purpose built building and the partnership with Christchurch BC does not justify a move to the town centre.
- Wimborne Civic Society do not support the move of the Council Offices to the town centre or the amendment of the Furzehill village envelope as a consequence.

Environment

- Dorset Wildlife trust support the retention of the woodland on site.
- The Environment Theme Action Group welcome the recognition of the site's location in the Green Belt, the retention of the woodland and public access to it, and the need for landscape protection for the AONB. They request that any subsequent planning application ensures that the dark skies of the AONB are not affected and that there should be provision for the long term management of the woodland for its contribution to ecological networks.

2.40 Councils' Response - how we have taken into account the consultation responses?

2.41 Council Offices

2.42 The Council notes the comments on the proposal to relocate their offices to Wimborne (explored in more detail in Pre-Submission Policy WMC2 in Chapter 8 of this Plan) to provide a new Community Centre and new District Council Offices. The Council needs to continue investigating opportunities to provide new public facilities, including the operation of its business. The policy provides the flexibility to respond to proposals that could come forward in the lifetime of the plan.

2.43 The Council considers that there is no recognised need to provide community facilities within the Furzehill site, and no support was received in respect of the requirement to provide a community hall for the village. There are existing community halls in the nearby settlements of Holt, Colehill and Wimborne. In light of this situation, requirement (d) of Policy RA2, that the redevelopment of the site should provide a community hall for the village, be deleted.

2.44 *Environment*

2.45 The Council welcomes the nature conservation bodies' support for the environmental protection requirements of the policy. Any re-development of the site would be subject to both national and local policy which will include the impact of the development on the surrounding areas.

Proposed Changes to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy

Furzehill Village Envelope....

...~~d) Redevelopment of the site should provide a community hall for the village.~~

2.46 **Summary of Responses**

2.47 No responses received.