

## CS Options

### Events: Core Strategy Options for Consideration – Chapter 6 Christchurch Urban Extension

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
480260	Mr Philip Glover		<a href="#">CSO76</a>	6	Object		I object to any urban extension to Christchurch, especially on a green field site. The infrastructure is overloaded. The area is already over populated.	Abandon the Christchurch Urban Extension. If the land is not required for agriculture, why not use the site to plant native deciduous trees on? Model it on 'ancient woodland' and prove the Council's 'green' credentials!		406
484174	Ms Avril B Simpson		<a href="#">CSO491</a>	6	Object		Large developments [like the one proposed], with limited shops [which looks to be just the one - Sainsbury's], does nothing to enhance a community spirit.. It takes several decades to form one that is stable and secure within itself. And for those communities to develop you will need more than one shop! And more than one bus route. To have a stable environment and community the Council needs to look towards regeneration. By developing within an existing community you have the following to offer - several established transport links to various areas, a choice of shops, community centres, schools, and established recreation areas. It is a fact that people integrate better within an existing group. Development of 'Green Belt' actually endangers the environment. Green space will be needed for generations to come and there is little in that immediate area now anyway.	Christchurch has some very run down areas which do nothing to enhance the charm of our town. Barrack Road is probably the most visual area. There are large expanses of derelict land and industrial areas which if [in some cases] are joined by a few dwellings can make quite sizeable sites suitable for most of the required number of dwellings. There are existing, several established bus routes, schools, shops, community centres, pubs restaurants and recreational areas. Not to mention a strong established community spirit. Lymington Road has already had some sympathetic redevelopment carried out, however there still remains several blocks of Edwardian and Victorian shops with flats over, which are falling into decay. These blocks can be demolished and new shops and housing rebuilt in their place. They all have quite large areas behind them which are even more decayed and some are quite dangerous. There are areas in Purewell which would benefit from regeneration/development. PLEASE make good use of the land we		406

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								already have, in particular those which through neglect and decay are causing an eyesore or social problems. Also insist that ALL developers incorporate sufficient off road parking and the planting of trees and shrubs every time a development is passed.		
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		<a href="#">CSO9 39</a>	6	Object		Whilst I support the need for an urban extension, it should be on the green field site east of Burton			406
359514	Mr Edward Gerry	Planning Policy Manager New Forest District Council	<a href="#">CSO1 8778</a>	6		General Comment	<p>The proposals regarding the urban extension in the area defined as 'north of Christchurch' raises a number of issues. While these matters are for Christchurch BC to resolve careful consideration and assessment will be required to decide how the development can be provided for in a way that will minimise the impacts on the local and surrounding areas.</p> <p>In particular, the traffic impacts within New Forest District of the proposed development north of Christchurch must be properly assessed. These impacts are likely to be mainly on the B3347 (Avon Valley road) and the A35 (including through Lyndhurst). The development north of Christchurch should not be progressed if these impacts are shown to be unacceptable.</p> <p>The proposals to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs) to attract people away from the Dorset Heathlands are outlined in options UE1 to UE4. All four options propose that the SANG is located to the north of the railway line on land within the New Forest District. The proposal to create a SANG is broadly supported as it is hoped that the proposal, whilst aiming to reduce pressure on the Dorset Heathlands will also reduce pressure on sensitive areas of the New Forest. NFDC would like to be kept informed of proposals regarding the SANG</p>			406

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>given its location within the New Forest District. Careful consideration will need to be given to proposals for the SANG and possible future minerals extraction in the area north of the railway line. Careful consideration will also have to be given to proposals to move the Roeshot Hill Allotments north of the railway line under Option UE1 and UE2.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that reference is made in the consultation document to the need for a co-ordinated approach between Christchurch, East Dorset and the National Park regarding mitigating the negative impacts of development on sensitive sites. This is an issue that NFDC raised at the Issues and Options Stage.</p>			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">CSO1 8666</a>	6		General Comment	<p>The options for an urban extension for 600 dwellings north of Christchurch raise significant environmental issues.</p> <p>We note recognition that substantial, targeted mitigation measures may be required, including provision of a SANG to mitigate adverse effects on European sites (paragraph 6.29) both within and outside the Councils' area, notably the New Forest SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. It is worth stating that the efficacy of SANGs as a measure to address urban pressures on heathlands is still unproven.</p>			406
359350	Mr Jim Biggin	Chairman West Christchurch Residents Assoc & J.R.A.	<a href="#">CSO1 582</a>	6.2		General Comment	<p>There isn't a high level of need if you think of Christchurch as a suburb of Bournemouth rather than as a site to be considered in isolation. The town already has the feel of an urban sprawl and you should be planning to correct that, not adding to the problem</p>			409
360653	Mr M A Hodges		<a href="#">CSO2 395</a>	6.2	Object		<p>Location is east not north. The Highcliffe Residents Association area is east of the River Mude, south of the railway, so it includes the proposed development area</p>			409

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							north of the A35. The cost of removing the power cables (£10,000,000) the need for drains of sufficient diameter, adequate provision of medical facilities, schools, recreation space, traffic access, all needs to be added to the development costs.			
359350	Mr Jim Biggin	Chairman West Christchurch Residents Assoc & J.R.A.	<a href="#">CSO1 583</a>	6.3	Object			Questions of infrastructure surely outweigh all others. To build without improving the roads, the provision of schooling, of medical facilities, of public transport and so on would be crazy. Consider the impact on Christchurch of this proposal plus the Parley Cross proposals - a recipe for chaos.	Comments relating to objection to Para 6.3	410
498027	Mr Mark Keighley	Business Development Manager Bournemouth Transport Ltd	<a href="#">CSO3 304</a>	6.3	Support		It is important to make sure that the transport infrastructure of the urban extension considers the provision of public transport from day one.			410
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">CSO1 7471</a>	6.3		General Comment	6.3 We suggest that biodiversity and geological conservation, enhancement and restoration should be included here alongside the location and requirements for the provision of SANG. Overall, the chapter identifies the ecological constraints to development in this area and we support the need to both assess and incorporate features of biodiversity interest within the development area and to assess and mitigate against impacts on biodiversity in adjacent areas.			410
498027	Mr Mark Keighley	Business Development Manager Bournemouth Transport Ltd	<a href="#">CSO3 305</a>	6.6	Support					413
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">CSO1 9121</a>	6.14		General Comment	It should be noted that since the previous Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment showed that parts of the wider development			422

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							area and a small portion of our client's site was in an area of flood risk. This has since been reviewed through the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and has greatly reduced the amount of land in the wider development area that is within zones 2 - 3a and b in flood risk. This could be used for open space within any layout for an urban extension in this area. All of our client's land now falls within Flood Risk Zone 1 (little or no risk of flooding).			
360597	Mr Gordon Wheeler		<a href="#">CSO3 283</a>	6.15	Object		To move the Allotments to the other side of the railway would be a travesty for the following reasons; # Poor road access # Poor connectivity to community that the allotment serves # The area is subject to flood risk, which is not conducive to gardening culture # there is a likelihood that the Allotments would be moved again due to potential mineral extraction location # Adverse impact on sensitive landscape due to the increase in traffic and the size of the site as the demand for Allotments has grown so the number of Allotments will have to increase # The move would deny the older gardeners the right to a healthier life style, as they could not contemplate starting again	The Allotments at Roeshot Hill are located south of the railway line within the area identified for the Christchurch urban extension but now excluded.		423
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">CSO1 9122</a>	6.19		General Comment	Given the need to maximise the delivery of affordable housing it is extremely concerning that the Council's preferred site for the urban extension is heavily constrained by overhead electricity cables. The Council have suggested either burying the cables underground or design the site around them. Both of these options could have unacceptable consequences on the delivery of affordable housing. We understand that burying the cables will			427

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>cost £10 million. The National Grid report entitled 'Undergrounding high voltage electricity transmission' states that there are no easy cost savings as the biggest expense is the cable itself and the insulation required. They go on to state that linking underground cabling to over ground can also be land intensive and require unattractive associated structures to be built. These buildings may also have an impact on land values.</p> <p>Even with the large increases in land values, this will have a very significant impact on the viability of the site and consequently the level of affordable housing that can be provided. We are doubtful that the target of 40% affordable housing could be achieved on this site given these abnormal construction costs.</p> <p>The alternative is to build around the overhead cables, but this would reduce the total developable land and the amount of units that can be built on site and thus the level of affordable housing delivered. We understand that this option could only deliver half as many units as burying the cables underground. This option would also reduce house prices on completed units, further eroding the viability of the scheme and the level of affordable housing. Not only would this option deliver fewer affordable homes than burying the underground cables, but the increase in land values may not support a 40% affordable housing requirement.</p> <p>We therefore strongly recommend that the Council re-examine the area to South of Burton Village as the location of the urban extension. This site does not have the same barriers to delivering affordable housing as the Council's preferred option. At the very least we would like to see the Council examine how much affordable housing can be delivered by an urban</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							extension at Land to the South of Burton Village and compare this to the likely level of affordable housing to be delivered through the different options on the Council's preferred option.			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">CSO1 9120</a>	6.20		General Comment	<p>We note the Council's intention to ensure that the urban extension provides adequate levels of affordable housing. Over the page it states that providing affordable housing is a key priority. Having reviewed the Council's SHLAA it is clear that the majority of the housing supply will come from small sites of less than 20 dwellings. A very large proportion of these are below the level of the Council's on-site affordable housing provision, meaning that it will not deliver many units 'on-the-ground'. We expect the lower affordable housing threshold to lead to more appeals and resistance from developers. This has been the case in Bournemouth where they have no affordable housing threshold. Furthermore, the strategy of relying on a very large number of small non allocated sites to cumulatively deliver affordable housing at the right time and on a large scale is untested in practice. This strategy cannot be expected to provide a reliable supply of affordable housing units.</p> <p>Excluding the urban extension, we understand that there are only two large sites over 50 units expected to come forward over the Core Strategy period and deliver a significant number of affordable housing units, these are Amesbury Lane (90 units in total) and Hoburne Farm (135 units in total). Even if they both delivered 40% affordable housing they would only provide 54 units and 36 units respectively. The newly arising need for affordable housing in the district stands at 243 units per year. This emphasises the need to ensure that the urban extension to</p>			428

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Christchurch delivers the most number of affordable housing units possible.			
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		<a href="#">CSO9 40</a>	6.28	Object		I believe that both North and South of the railway are wrong. I believe that it is inevitable that we have to build on a green field site. If we develop housing and employment opportunities to the east of Burton we will turn Burton into a vibrant community and closer to employment opportunities at the Airport with an improved route along Avon Causeway. This will take some of the pressure off the A35. The proposed development would be an isolated community stuck between the A35 and the railway.			436
498027	Mr Mark Keighley	Business Development Manager Bournemouth Transport Ltd	<a href="#">CSO3 306</a>	6.28	Support		Land north of the railway would be difficult to serve by public transport due to lower demand.			436
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">CSO1 9123</a>	6.28	Object		Location of development within the area of search We note the Broadway Malyan comparison of the 'Land to the North of the Railway' with 'Land South of the Railway'. However, we consider this comparison to be rather subjective and misleading. First of all the assessment list all of the combined disadvantages of the three potential sites North of the railway line then lists only the advantages of one site. The criticisms of 'Land to the North of the Railway Line' broadly relate to the two other sites to the east and west of our client's site – these are: Land contained within Summers Lane and Preston Lane and Salisbury Road and Hawthorn Road and Land to the North of the Railway Line and to the East of Burton. We respond to each point made by the Council in turn below: 1. Poor/limited connectivity to the town			436



**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>centre/local centre                      This may be true of the other two sites, but Land to the South of Burton Village has two direct links to the town centre. The quality of the footpaths could be improved through a package of planning contributions as would be expected of any urban extension. Land to the South of Burton Village is actually closer to Christchurch town centre than the current preferred option at Roeshot Hill. Furthermore, the local centre for Roeshot Hill is a Sainsbury's, so it would not help to support services within the town centre of Christchurch. Development to the South of Burton Village would also help to support more services in Burton village.</p> <p>2. Poor connectivity to other community and social facilities                      Again, this may be true of the other two sites, but we do not consider it applies to our client's. The site is well connected to Christchurch town centre and Burton Village. It also has a frequent bus service.</p> <p>3. Poor road access                      The wider development area is bordered by two main roads, both connect straight on to the by-pass. Improvements to the surrounding junctions would be supported by development of the wider development area. The other sites north of the Railway Line are not well connected to the local road network.</p> <p>4. Possible impact on the Burton Conservation Area.                      Whilst the other two options are clearly visible from the Salisbury Road and Stony Lane, our client's site would be screened by buildings and with sensitive landscaping would not be clearly visible.</p> <p>5. Potential Minerals extraction location                      We understand that the land proposed for gravel extraction is at Land to the North of the Railway Line and to the East of Burton. This will have implications for adjoining</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>sites, but this includes the Council's preferred option.</p> <p>6. Potential coalescence issues relating to Burton All options for an urban extension, including the preferred option will lead to some level of coalescence. We do not consider that Land to South of Burton Village will bring about an unacceptable level of coalescence and will retain some land between Burton and Christchurch.</p> <p>7. A lack of defensible boundary to prevent urban sprawl This can only apply to the other two sites which would spread out to the east and west of our site and encroach on open countryside. Land to the South of Burton Village would be bounded by two main roads; Stony Lane and the Salisbury Road. This will contain urban sprawl and create a defensible boundary.</p> <p>8. Adverse impact on sensitive landscape We consider that this applies to other sites around Burton on rising land. The land to the South of Burton is generally flat and already well screened. As with the impact on the conservation area, further screening could also be provided to minimise any impact.</p> <p>9. Land to the North could be used for a Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) Whilst any new development will require adequate open space, we question why land to the north of the railway line would be preferable. Equally, land to the south could be used and in any case it is unclear if the land owner would permit a SANGS on their land. The Council does not explain which area of land to the North of the railway line could be used. If it is the area immediately to the North then we would be interested to hear how the proposed urban extension south of the railway line will be</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							linked to land to the north of the railway. If there are not existing links then it will be an extremely costly process to create them. We therefore disagree with the conclusion that all land to north of the railway line should not be developed. We note the advantages of development 'South of the Railway Line'. However, we consider that Land to the South of the Railway line also has good connectivity and road access. We also note that the Council consider its proximity to Sainsbury's as a local centre to be an advantage. However, this will do nothing for local independent shops and services in Christchurch, particularly in the town centre.			
361028	Ms Helen Patton	Head of Policy and Plans New Forest National Park Authority	<a href="#">CSO1 8928</a>	6.29	Support		The Authority welcomes the proposal for putting in place measures, including providing a suitable alternative greenspace (SANG), in order to minimise any increase in recreational pressure on the Dorset Heathlands and the New Forest National Park (paragraph 6.29) Nearby Burton Common SSSI, located on the south western boundary of the National Park and less than 400 metres from the nearest part of the proposed urban extension, is a high quality heathland, not well visited and numbers of breeding birds (nightjar, woodlark and Dartford warbler) are high. It is essential that pressure on this area is kept to a minimum. In order to reflect the importance of this approach, the Authority considers that the section heading should be expanded to include reference to the National Park and each of the four options should be expanded to include reference to the National Park, as at present only the Dorset Heathlands are referred to. For example Option UE2 states; "...there is a requirement to provide a SANG to reduce the recreational impact on the heathlands			439

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							generated by new development in this location." As you are aware, a possible future site for mineral extraction has been identified north of the railway line which straddles the county boundary. It is essential that careful consideration should be given to the location of and access to the SANG in order to avoid possible conflict between the two. The National Park Authority has attended meetings in the past on this issue and would welcome the opportunity to continue to be involved with discussions with Natural England and Christchurch Borough Council on the future development of the SANG.			
498027	Mr Mark Keighley	Business Development Manager Bournemouth Transport Ltd	<a href="#">CSO3 307</a>	6.30	Support					440
498027	Mr Mark Keighley	Business Development Manager Bournemouth Transport Ltd	<a href="#">CSO3 308</a>	6.31	Support					441
498027	Mr Mark Keighley	Business Development Manager Bournemouth Transport Ltd	<a href="#">CSO3 309</a>	6.32	Support					442
361028	Ms Helen Patton	Head of Policy and Plans New Forest National Park Authority	<a href="#">CSO1 8935</a>	6.32		General Comment	The Authority is pleased to note that the document acknowledges the fact that the urban extension will generate additional traffic which will have an impact on the capacity of the existing highway network. The Authority is concerned however that Para 6.32 states that the South East Dorset Multi Modal Study and the A35 Route Management Study are examining the			442

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							impact of the urban extension on the highway network and that these studies will determine the specific improvements required to junctions. The Authority hopes that the wider implications of an increase in traffic are assessed, for example the likely increase in traffic on the A35 including through Lyndhurst, an Air Quality Management Area, and will not be confined to looking at the necessary junction improvements. Furthermore, the Authority understands that these concerns are consistent with those raised by New Forest District Council on this issue.			
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	<a href="#">CSO10804</a>	6.36	Object		<p>The series of tables following Paragraph 6.36 summarises many of the representations submitted at the Issues and Options stage. A brief mention is made to the land owned by Bournemouth &amp; West Hampshire Water at Marsh Lane. It is submitted that this site should be given further consideration as a development option; for the reasons as now set out:</p> <p>Housing Land Supply The Christchurch BC Annual Monitoring Report 2008 - 9 (AMR) states that there is a five year housing land supply shortfall within the borough. The lack of an adequate supply of housing sites is a matter that the CS must positively address. It is submitted that additional and appropriate green field sites (such as Marsh Lane) are required, as supply from within the urban area is unlikely to yield sufficient housing numbers.</p> <p>Housing Completion Trends Past trends give some indication as to future supply. However, for the purposes of predicting the potential contribution from 'brownfield' land, the existing published information needs substantial refinement before it can be relied upon. There are a number of reasons for this.</p>	Add new policy allocating land for the development of up to 120 dwellings at Marsh Lane. It could refer to other relevant policies of the Core Strategy (such as affordable housing) as well as the on site provision of a SANG.		446

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>First, restrictions imposed on developing dwellings within 400 metres of protected heathland means that a comparison cannot be made with the net completion figures prior to 2006, when the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework (DHIPF) was introduced. Before this date, residential development was permissible on many sites that would now be subject to policy restrictions.</p> <p>In the period 2006 – 2009, 419 (net) dwellings were completed; an average of 140 per annum. However, this cannot be relied upon as a reliable trend as some dwellings would have been constructed from planning permissions granted prior to implementation of the 2006 DHIPF. Given that detailed permissions extend to a five year period, the impact of the heathlands policy on residential development will only become apparent in the monitoring year 2010 - 2011. Even then it will be a number of years before a trend is established.</p> <p>Second, there is a need to assess the impact of other CS policies on future land supply. Here, specific reference is made to Preferred option LN11. This seeks to require all new residential development to contribute to the provision of affordable housing. There are likely to be two specific impacts.</p> <p>In some instances sites will not come forward for development. A good indication of the likely response from the development industry is to assess how many schemes of, say, 15 – 25 dwellings have come forward for development since the introduction of the 15 unit threshold in 2007. This will indicate the potential 'void' from the non development of sites just above the new net threshold of one dwelling.</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>In other circumstances applications may come forward where scheme viability is questioned, but where planning permission is granted on the basis that a modest financial contribution is made to providing affordable housing off of the site. It is suggested that advice is taken from one of your neighbouring council's, Bournemouth Borough, on the impact of their policy (which has been in operation since April 2010).</p> <p>Third, the government has recently announced restrictions on the development of residential gardens; i.e. 'garden grabbing'. This will further reduce the contribution made to housing land supply from sites within the existing urban areas. In this respect it is noted in Paragraph 4.47 that the Christchurch Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) predicts that approximately 1,950 dwellings could be built on sites within the urban area. Given the 'garden grabbing' restrictions, this figure will now be lower.</p> <p>Location of Development            Following Paragraph 6.36 of the CS, a summary is set out of the matters raised when the Issues and Options report was published in the spring of 2008. At that time the RSS predetermined that the proposed urban extension should be in the general location of Roeshot Hill. Other potential locations suitable to accommodate urban extensions were not considered. The CS summary only refers to the submission of representations in respect of three additional sites, including the water company land at Marsh Lane. There is no detailed evaluation of the suitability of the Marsh Lane site to accommodate residential development.</p> <p>In view of the matters raised earlier in these</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>representations it is submitted that the Marsh Lane site is re-evaluated as a potential small scale urban extension. This will assist the housing strategy achieve its aim of delivering sufficient dwellings to fulfil the housing needs of the borough. Our 2008 representations evaluated the site against absolute and discretionary constraints. For ease of reference this evaluation is reproduced below:                      (Not possible to reproduce Table of Absolute and Discretionary Constraints here - please refer to original reps)                      It can be seen that that there are no absolute or discretionary constraints that apply to the Marsh Lane site. It is therefore suitable as a candidate urban extension. This conclusion is consistent with our earlier representations, albeit the site area is now reduced due to the recent construction of an additional filter bed. The site is now considered suitable to accommodate up to 120 dwellings, as well as providing an on site SANGS. The latter would be of considerable benefit to future and existing residents in comprising a substantial and attractive recreational area as an alternative to nearby heathland and the Avon Valley.</p>			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	<a href="#">CSO17652</a>	6.37	Support		<p>The proposed urban extension at Christchurch raises less concern to the Agency than the other strategic extension sites in the sub region, for the reasons including the distance of the site from the SRN. However the Agency would still expect the proposals to be supported by evidence, which demonstrates the likely impact on the SRN through the SEDMMTS work.                      We would reiterate the importance of public transport and welcomes the recognition at the meeting of the Christchurch Urban</p>			448



**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Extension Advisory Group on 29 January 2010 that there remains potential for a new station on the adjoining rail line. While the CS refers to the role of improved links to the nearby stations at Hinton St Andrew and Christchurch, there appears to be no reference to the potential for a new rail serving the site. The Agency would also encourage some employment provision where possible to enhance self containment.			
507546	Mr Nigel Pugsley	Senior Planner BNP Paribas Real Estate	<a href="#">CSO1 7984</a>	6.37		General Comment	<p>OPTIONS UE 1 TO UE 4 – CHRISTCHURCH URBAN EXTENSION</p> <p>The abovementioned policy options relate to the delivery of a new urban extension to Christchurch, differentiated by the amount of new residential development and its location.</p> <p>Whichever of the options the Council is minded to progress with (following further consultation and examination), it would be essential that the infrastructure needed to support the planned growth is provided for in a timely manner.</p>			448
360074	Mr D DIXON		<a href="#">CSO1 24</a>	Option UE 1	Object		<p>This is supposed to be a proper consultation. This consultation is ridiculous as it is like asking someone if they would rather be shot, hanged, stabbed or poisoned. Obviously the reply would be none of those options.</p> <p>In this document we are offered four options each involving more building, when what is wanted is no more building. The reason people choose to live in Christchurch is because it has not been 'urbanised', it has a low crime level, it is reasonably prosperous and it is a place where 'time is pleasant'. More building and development will only mean an increase in population, a fall in property prices, an increased burden on Council services and environmental detriment. The area will</p>			449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							attract less high net worth individuals who are not a burden on the existing rate payers and who can support more up market shops in Christchurch and Highcliffe shopping centres. We like it the way it is. stop encouraging the developers to ruin the town.			
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		<a href="#">CSO9 41</a>	Option UE 1	Object		This is the worst of the 4 options. The community would be isolated between the railway line and A35 with no employment opportunities within walking distance. The shop would not be viable - the one at Hoburne was not due to the proximity to Sainsburys. The community centre would not be viable - the one at Hoburne was never built and the one at Mudeford Wood is facing the axe. It would be far better to develop land to the east of Burton to provide housing and employment opportunities so that Burton becomes a Distract Centre like Highcliffe. Burton already has a community and would certainly benefit from better shops. Burton is closer to the airport where most new jobs will be created and with a better access along Avon Causeway will reduce the pressure on the A35. Increasing the size of Burton will lead to better bus service provision to Christchurch and Bournemouth.	Locate housing, open space and retail / community facilities east of Burton		449
359636	Mr Chris Bartlett		<a href="#">CSO2 612</a>	Option UE 1	Object		Too many houses with little green space for them and no suggestions of additional road improvements or links to A338. Cost of underground electricity cables is too high.			449
497394	Ms Sue Melbourne		<a href="#">CSO2 297</a>	Option UE 1	Object		Object to building on land near Burton Railway. Land usually has horse grazing there. It is a flood plain since it is covered in rain water each year. Previously the Council built on meadows	Suggest an area of rough ground on Purewell (vacant land) or land where there used to be a petrol station should be used instead.		449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							near Purewell. This land had the same problem and the properties subsequently subsided. Recognise that Christchurch has a need for housing but the long term issues of subsidence, insurance and flooding need to be considered. It is a green area and is beautiful and needs to be preserved.			
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	<a href="#">CSO1 0786</a>	Option UE 1	Object		Please see our principal representations in respect of Option UE 4	Delete policy option		449
508198	Mr Lorraine		<a href="#">CSO1 1620</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
508218	Mr P Heaton		<a href="#">CSO1 1626</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
508254	Mr R B Holloway		<a href="#">CSO1 1650</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
508353	Mr J Codling		<a href="#">CSO1 1671</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
508360	Ms Jocelyn Britton		<a href="#">CSO1 1679</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
508369	Mr A Hill		<a href="#">CSO1 1687</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
359836	Mr & Mrs L Jackson		<a href="#">CSO1 3665</a>	Option UE 1	Object		We don't need more homes the schools and doctors can not cope now the road gets jammed now do we need a further 500 cars + and services. If you must build leave that area as it is and tidy up other areas and pos build there. E.g. op Somerford Estate.			449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360524	Miss Rosemary Bentley		<a href="#">CSO1 2783</a>	Option UE 1	Support		The designated area is a “no-go” region for indigenous population because of “unseemly behaviour” along disused lane. Bringing this area back into the community would be fantastic. “Allotments” – is there any provision for seeking land amenity from private landholders. Although still “economically active” I would, willing, hand my garden over to any indigenous “tenant”.			449
361308	Mr John Tandy		<a href="#">CSO1 2609</a>	Option UE 1	Object		I do not believe building on greenbelt land to be the answer to this problem. If there is a shortage of housing it cannot be avoided or cured by building on this area of greenbelt. If Christchurch is “full”, then extra capacity needs to be met by regeneration of Brownfield sites. These sites may well be in other areas or towns. The availability of dwellings in Christchurch is finite and should regulate the population. It is not possible to keep increasing housing stock, it would be better to control the population of the area to a level that fits available services and facilities.			449
507414	Mr L Wijesinghe		<a href="#">CSO1 0980</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
507452	Jill Turvey		<a href="#">CSO1 0992</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
508518	Mr Warren Brown		<a href="#">CSO1 2728</a>	Option UE 1	Support		I choose this option because Christchurch needs more affordable housing.			449
508542	Mr H Cramer		<a href="#">CSO1 1889</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
508679	Mr A O'Connor		<a href="#">CSO1 2078</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508689	Mr Andy Jones		<a href="#">CSO1 2154</a>	Option UE 1	Support		In the present economic climate when the threat of negative equity and high rents are a reality for many families the importance of affordable housing and social housing is greater than it has been for many decades. I believe that this has to be a fundamental part of the core strategy and that the options selected above will best achieve this.			449
508847	Mr V Cromer		<a href="#">CSO1 2259</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
508885	Mr J Heath		<a href="#">CSO1 2333</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
508936	Mr M Brawner		<a href="#">CSO1 2370</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
509082	Mr Richard		<a href="#">CSO1 2494</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
509235	Mr M Kenny		<a href="#">CSO1 2590</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
509383	Mr Clive Richardson		<a href="#">CSO1 2638</a>	Option UE 1	Object		I have Lived here all of my life and I recall my mother saying all around the Somerford Estate was under water, I realise people need somewhere to live but I can see for myself there are many Brownfield sites available, with probably no hope of any new business locating here (high council rates etc). Safe to say I am against any more building on our lovely green spaces.			449
509426	Mr & Mrs K Roberts		<a href="#">CSO1 2650</a>	Option UE 1	Object		We do not agree with any of the above options. We strongly disagree with and do not like any options that would put large numbers of affordable (& social?) housing in close proximity to the largest housing			449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							estate in Christchurch. We feel affordable (& social) housing should be dispersed throughout the borough, not all together in east, or west, Christchurch. The roads are congested enough without adding to the problem by building in the east of the area. We suggest building smaller numbers of houses on plots of unsightly land i.e. the old gas works in Bridge Street, the site of the New Inn on Fairmile, the area in front of the new post office sorting office in Fairmile. There must be many more unsightly plots that could be utilised in this way. It may cost more to do it this way, but the quality of life and integration of affordable housing will benefit the town and residents in the long term.			
509556	Mr David Mason		<a href="#">CSO1 2733</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
509568	Mrs Carrie Wijesinghe		<a href="#">CSO1 2738</a>	Option UE 1	Support					449
509810	Mr J E Giltrap		<a href="#">CSO1 2828</a>	Option UE 1	Support		If it is felt necessary option 'UE1' as there is little merit building around the existing pylons, bury & relocate them. I do ask is this urban expansion planned/proposed to cater for 'local' Christchurch people with definite area connection, not out of towners, retirees, opportunists &/or would be investors & speculators.			449
509898	Ms Elizabeth Sabey		<a href="#">CSO1 2886</a>	Option UE 1	Support		Assurance that a high percentage of housing would be social housing plus this gives the opportunity to look at housing for supported and sheltered (housing) with some units for younger vulnerable adults in a supervised community.			449
510544	Mr		<a href="#">CSO1</a>	Option	Object		Strongly oppose to all options especially			449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	I Morton		<a href="#">3370</a>	UE 1			strongly to the first three, but also to option 4. You have not said anything about specifically how you will meet the additional transport needs and traffic, what will happen about the pylons, and also your additional proposed grab of green space. There are plenty of other spaces in Christchurch to build on. Christchurch would be better served by bringing more work to the town, simultaneously building prosperity and outing traffic miles.			
510768	Mr & Mrs Weatherer		<a href="#">CSO1 3482</a>	Option UE 1	Object		Keep the green belt intact. Amenities cannot support further development. We already have a traffic problem in Christchurch.			449
510779	Ms Muriel Catry		<a href="#">CSO1 3495</a>	Option UE 1	Object		None of the above – keep the green belt, Christchurch is already over-populated, no more houses and increased traffic!			449
510796	Mr R Reid		<a href="#">CSO1 3508</a>	Option UE 1	Object		Keep all the green belt unvandalised.			449
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">CSO1 7472</a>	Option UE 1	Support		DWT have not objected to options UE1, 2 and 3 but have the following concerns:- DWT have concerns that this development could impact on the adjacent designated sites, and in particular Burton Common SSSI with its mature dry heath and luxuriant bryophytes and lichens and populations of nightjar, Dartford warbler, woodlark and woodcock, which is within 400m of the developable area. We have considerable concerns that new development and provision of new open space to the north of the railway could encourage people onto Burton Common. As identified in the options, the quantity of SANG provision will need to be agreed with Natural England and DWT would object to this option if agreement could not be reached on sufficient provision of SANG to			449

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							prevent damage to the designated sites. DWT consider the area identified for the SANG should be surveyed for wildlife to inform decisions as we believe the farmland supports species such as skylark, yellowhammer and lapwing. We would expect the SANG to include significant enhancements for biodiversity and that opportunity should be taken to protect and enhance biodiversity within the developed area, retaining linkages between open areas to provide corridors and stepping stones for wildlife to move through the site. This is particularly important along watercourses. From the north, the River Mude flows through the site and on through the Mude Valley Nature Reserve SNCI (SZ19/39), thus protection and enhancement of this feature is vital, with opportunity to enhance and extend habitat for species along the river corridor. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems should be implemented to protect the watercourses and other sensitive features.			
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">CSO1 8665</a>	Option UE 1		General Comment	These options could be detrimental to designated nature conservation sites in the locality, as identified in the evidence to this chapter, but the development also offers an opportunity for significant green infrastructure that could remove this detriment and increase the value of the locality for biodiversity. Our opinion on this option will therefore be shaped by the strength and detail of policy on delivery of the green infrastructure as an integral part of the development and the requirements to be met by the green infrastructure. The following requirements for the green infrastructure are essential: Suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG) of a scale and design to divert pressures generated by the residential development away from near-by heathland			449



**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							European sites (Dorset Heathlands and the New Forest), Ramsar sites and SSSI and the habitats of European protected species. Provision of a comprehensive package of measures to safeguard the Southern damselfly, a nationally protected species and a UK and Dorset Biodiversity Action Plan priority species, is present on site (and off site, both down and up stream) on the River Mude. Water quality considerations will be particularly important and the provision of Sustainable Urban Drainage Solutions within the developable areas will be necessary to clean water of poor quality from urban surfaces. We believe there are opportunities to integrate the conservation of this species within the development and to enhance its habitat both on and off- site. We agree with general strategy that applies to the 3 options concerning the location of the SANG i.e. north of the railway line, but details on the exact location, size and nature of the SANG to be delivered as part of the urban extension needs to be clearly defined during the process of refining the preferred options.			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">CSO1 8667</a>	Option UE 1	Object		At this stage, given the uncertainty over the likely impacts and over the provision of mitigation measures, we object to options UE1, UE2, UE3 and UE4.			449
361028	Ms Helen Patton	Head of Policy and Plans New Forest National Park Authority	<a href="#">CSO1 8929</a>	Option UE 1	Support		The Authority supports the preferred option for locating new housing south of the railway line. This accords with the Authority's comments to Christchurch Borough Council in the past and is consistent with the conclusions of the Broadway Malvan master planning work. As you are aware, the Authority has stated in the past that housing development north of the railway line would have a far greater	In order to reflect the importance of this approach, the Authority considers that the section heading should be expanded to include reference to the National Park and each of the four options should be expanded to include reference to the National Park, as at present only the Dorset Heathlands are referred to. For example Option UE2 states; "...there is a requirement to		449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							impact in terms of visual and landscape impact on the National Park where long distance views are offered from Burton Common, when compared to development south of the railway line.	provide a SANG to reduce the recreational impact on the heathlands generated by new development in this location."		
517736	Mr Bob Maddock		<a href="#">CSO1 7113</a>	Option UE 1		General Comment	I would suggest 1 move the power lines to a route north of the railway-much cheaper than underground 2 move the allotments to the west end of the site			449
517737	Lee Stevens		<a href="#">CSO1 7118</a>	Option UE 1		General Comment	I vote to keep our greenbelt land. We do not want more outsiders buying up second homes and ruining our beautiful land. No plan of road network shown for increase to already busy area. Is this going to impact more? Greed??			449
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	<a href="#">CSO1 7540</a>	Option UE 1	Support		We do not have any significant issues with this urban extension. All 4 options show that the built development will be located in Flood Zone 1 (low risk), which we are pleased to read. Preferred Option UE1 – 4, pages 110 -121 Fisheries Recreation and Biodiversity We support the land identified within the maps on pages P112 - 121 as 'land suitable for open space' as this will ensure the provision of a wetland corridor if future development occurs. The importance of a wetland corridor adjacent to the River Mude should also be highlighted in addition to the benefits of Flood/Water Attenuation. Overall issues for consideration are: flood risk / surface water drainage; SuDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; groundwater and contaminated land; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution			449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter.</p> <p>General comments on the preferred options document</p> <p>Flood Risk/ Surface Water Drainage</p> <p>This is a very high level document, and as such where individual sites 'considered for development' are detailed within the document we have checked these against our published Flood Map. However, it is important to remember that should any of the sites detailed in the document be considered further it is imperative East Dorset District and Christchurch Borough Councils consult our recently published 'Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding' maps to ascertain whether any of the sites, or part of a site, should not be considered further for development on grounds of flood risk (from surface water flooding).</p> <p>It may be necessary to carry out more detailed investigations for any site which is identified as being within an area susceptible to surface water flooding prior to making such a decision. This is because the maps are indicative in nature and therefore are only intended to prompt further investigation.</p> <p>Groundwater and Contaminated Land</p> <p>Any development needs to take into account Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control (PPS23). PPS23 has imposed a more precautionary approach to development proposals on land affected by contamination. Our Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice document (GP3) should also be taken into account.</p> <p>The following points should be considered for any new development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development proposals located within a groundwater Source Protection Zone will</li> </ul>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>require consideration and risk assessment to show that the risk to controlled water from any new development will be low.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developments in close proximity to abstraction boreholes will require a Hydrogeological Assessment to assess both the impact of the construction and from drainage. The suitability of SuDS at these sites would need to be established.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge, flows and levels.</li> <li>• If detrimental consequences to the water environment are likely, then agreed mitigation measures would be necessary.</li> <li>• Developers should adhere firmly to the Environment Agency's stance on SuDS.</li> <li>• The applicant should bear in mind that it is their responsibility to ensure that the development does not adversely affect any existing legal water interests in the area.</li> <li>• Local water interests in the area such as wells, springs, etc, and private abstractions must not be adversely affected either.</li> </ul> <p><b>Foul Drainage</b> The proposed developments, both residential and commercial, should connect to a mains foul sewer, where possible. Wessex Water will need to be consulted at an early stage to confirm that there is sufficient capacity to cope with the additional demand. Any additional major road building should incorporate mitigation to accommodate storm flows and minimise pollution risk. New car parks will require adequate pollution prevention infrastructure to minimise pollution risk from run-off.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity</b> We note that the Core Strategy supporting document '03 – Managing and safeguarding the Natural Environment Key issue Paper Oct 2010' advises 'Councils already have powers to provide policy</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>protection to sites of biodiversity importance which are under significant pressure' and that 'this can be done later through site specific documents in the LDF'. We look forward to being consulted on these documents in due course.</p> <p>Sustainable Construction Sustainable design and construction should be implemented across the proposed development. This is important in limiting the effects of and adapting to climate change. Running costs for occupants can also be significantly reduced.</p> <p>The Code for Sustainable Homes should be complied with, achieving the highest level possible. For details on compliance with the Code the applicant is advised to visit: <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/codesustainabilitystandards">http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/codesustainabilitystandards</a></p> <p>All non-residential buildings should comply with BREEAM, the Environmental Assessment Method for Buildings. This sets the standard for best practice in sustainable design. More information can be found at : <a href="http://www.breeam.org/">http://www.breeam.org/</a></p> <p>Water Efficiency Water efficiency measures should be incorporated into all development. This conserves water and allows cost savings for future occupants.</p> <p>This should include water efficient systems and fittings e.g. dual-flush toilets, water butts, water-saving taps, showers and baths, and appliances with the highest water efficiency rating (as a minimum). Grey water recycling and rainwater harvesting should be considered.</p> <p>For further guidance please see the following links: <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/drought/31755.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/drought/31755.aspx</a> <a href="http://www.savewatersavemoney.co.uk/">http://www.savewatersavemoney.co.uk/</a></p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)                      Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible with sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). This reduces flood risk through the use of soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, grassed swales, ponds etc. SuDS can also increase groundwater recharge, improve water quality and provide biodiversity amenity opportunities (inline with PPS9). A SuDS approach is encouraged by Approved Document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000. Further information on SUDS can be found in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS25 Annex F: Managing Surface Water  <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/planningpolicystatement25.pdf">http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/planningpolicystatement25.pdf</a></li> <li>- 'A Practice Guide Companion to PPS25'  <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/developmentflood">http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/developmentflood</a></li> <li>- CIRIA C522 document Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems-design manual for England and Wales.</li> <li>- Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems (advice on design, adoption and maintenance issues, available at: <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Business/cop_final_0704_872183.pdf">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Business/cop_final_0704_872183.pdf</a>)</li> </ul> <p>Demolition and Construction                      To help the construction and demolition industry manage their activities to prevent pollution, sites should adhere to our Pollution Prevention Guidelines PPG 6: Working at Construction and Demolition Sites. This can be found at:  <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/pollution/39083.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/pollution/39083.aspx</a>.</p> <p>Waste                      In accordance with the waste hierarchy, all</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>development should consider reduction, reuse and recovery of waste in preference to off site incineration and disposal to landfill during site construction. Adequate space should be provided within developments for waste facilities e.g. recycling bins, composting etc. It must be ensured that there would be sufficient capacity at household recycling centres to cope with any additional demand.</p> <p>Infrastructure We understand that an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being undertaken. We look forward to being consulted on this in due course.</p>			
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		<a href="#">CSO1 9279</a>	Option UE 1	Object		<p>The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most</p>			449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options. However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported.			
521508	Ms Lisa Jackson	Jackson Planning Ltd	<a href="#">CSO1 7877</a>	Option UE 1	Support		<p>Comments in detail on Policies UE1 - UE4 are made jointly with Taylor Wimpey under a separate representation. Meyrick Estate Management could facilitate the provision of land for an alternative site for allotments and SANG outside the development site to allow the proper and comprehensive development of the urban extension and are willing enter into dialogue with Christchurch Borough Council on these matters.</p> <p>Of the four options offered Meyrick Estate Management Ltd support UE1 as this offers the opportunity to create a properly planned neighbourhood and makes best use of the land available. However, Meyrick Estate Management wish to reserve their position with regard to the overhead power cables and pylons whose removal will be subject to viability testing.</p> <p>Despite Christchurch Borough Council's objection to mineral working north of the railway my client's believe the Core Strategy will need to acknowledge the significant potential for the working of sand and gravel adjacent to the urban extension within the life of the Core Strategy. The site has previously been identified as a preferred site for mineral working. In fact,</p>			449



Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							minerals can only be worked where they are found and the resources available outside statutorily protected areas are finite. This is significant in the spatial strategy for both its impact on the urban extension and the after use of the site post extraction. By the submission stage of the Core Strategy the timing of any minerals operation should be clearer.			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">CSO19124</a>	Option UE 1	Object		<p>Option UE 1 – UE 4</p> <p>The preferred policy option states that it is 'not viable' to consider setting an affordable housing requirement above the 40% district-wide proposal in Section 14. However, there does not appear to be any evidence to support this view. We are concerned that the site will not even be able to support this 40% requirement given the constraints of the site. Furthermore, whilst the preferred option may not be able to support an affordable housing requirement above 40% Land to the South of Burton Village may be able to. Given the importance the Council attaches to providing the maximum level of affordable housing possible in the district over the Core Strategy period and the lack of other significant opportunities, this issue must be explored further. We recommend that the scope of the viability assessment is widened to include Options UE1 – UE4 and the realistic alternatives to the preferred options. This would include Land to the South of Burton Village.</p> <p>Until the issues relating to the viability of providing affordable housing on the preferred option for the urban extension can be satisfactorily resolved and other potential alternatives properly explored, we do not consider the preferred option to be sound. Providing significant affordable housing is purportedly one of the top priorities in the Core Strategy and failure to</p>			449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>pursue the highest possible levels of affordable housing does not amount to an 'effective' policy, as set out in the tests of soundness in PPS12.</p> <p>Our client's site is located to the South of Burton and covers 3.8 hectares. There is an existing access off Salisbury Road which connects the site with Christchurch and the A35 Christchurch by-pass. To the south the site is bordered by the railway line. The site's boundary is shown in red on the site location enclosed with these representations.</p> <p>The client is currently exploring the possibility of delivering a rural exception scheme on the site with Raglan Housing Association and Christchurch Borough Council. Notwithstanding the outcome of these discussions, we still consider Land to the South of Burton Village to be the best location for the urban extension to Christchurch.</p> <p>The Wider Area We consider that our client's site would work best as part of a wider development area to the South of Burton. The remaining area that could be used as part of the urban extension is shown in blue on the enclosed site location plan. It covers the area contained between the railway line to the south, the settlement boundary of Burton to the north and Stony Lane and Salisbury Road to the east and west. This was considered as one of the options for the urban extension to Christchurch in the March 2008 Issues and Options consultation paper. We consider that it has been erroneously rejected as the preferred option.</p> <p>Estimated Site Capacity The total area of the Land to the South of Burton Village is 17.8 hectares; this could easily accommodate 600 dwellings. Our client's site makes up 3.8 hectares of the</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							wider area; this site could therefore accommodate approximately 150 dwellings, when working at density level of 35 dph.			
524088	Mr Ken Parke	Ken Parke Planning Consultants	<a href="#">CSO1 8458</a>	Option UE 1		General Comment	<p>The following are observations and comments made in respect of proposed urban extension in Christchurch where certain principles have been considered acceptable whereas the same principles, when applied to options in and around Wimborne and Colehill, have not been deemed to be acceptable.</p> <p>7.2.5.2 In discussing the urban extension options for Wimborne, the Core Strategy discusses sustainability, proximity to the town centre, facilities and so forth. In discussing the Christchurch option, the Core Strategy does not mention such matters. Option WMC4, for example, refers to 'a good location in terms of accessibility to important services, facilities and work opportunities' as part of the justification for promoting the land to the east and west of Cranborne Road. The land being promoted in Christchurch does not enjoy such a location but yet is still considered a viable option. It is acknowledged that Christchurch has a different set of constraints and dynamics however the preference for this option within the Core Strategy demonstrates that there is an ability and willingness to promote sites further from town centre locations.</p> <p>7.2.5.3 The text to option UE1 suggests that the urban extension benefits from being located adjacent to a Sainsbury's store and Stewarts Garden Centre which contains a number of smaller retail units. The Sainsbury's store is well known as operating at least 25% above capacity and the retail units adjoining the garden include an aquatics centre and other specialised type units. These are not the same facilities that one would anticipate finding within a</p>			449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							town centre location. I would further add that Colehill does not enjoy even these basic facilities.			
527818	Mr Nigel Lester	Synergy Housing Association	<a href="#">CSO1 8952</a>	Option UE 1	Support		Having looked at the proposals for each of the geographical areas and the proposed sites within those areas we can see no reason to disagree with the Local Authorities assessment and findings in each case, and would be very keen to become involved in the provision of affordable housing on any of these sites.			449
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">CSO1 9000</a>	Option UE 1		General Comment	Chapter 6 Christchurch Urban Extension Options UE 1 - 4 Development in this location and the transportation considerations outlined in these options are supported. Provision of walking and cycling links to surrounding facilities, particularly to Hinton Admiral rail station as well as improvement to station facilities should also be included. Under 'Transport Infrastructure Requirements' the following wording is proposed: "multi-modal study, the A35 Route Management Project and a detailed Transport Assessment." Details will be progressed through the next stage of the master planning work informed by SEDMMTS and the A35 RMS. DCC Transport Planning officers have been involved in the stage 1 master planning work for this site and look forward to an ongoing involvement in the more detailed design stages.			449
527907	Mr Hugh Merrett	President Roeshot Hill Allotment Association	<a href="#">CSO1 9088</a>	Option UE 1	Object		Core Strategy – Urban Development Response to Consultation A meeting of members held on 28th October last unanimously endorsed a response to the several proposals put forward by the Council for the development of land at Roeshot Hill. We regret that we are unable to fully endorse any of the 4			449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>options as set out in the Christchurch Courier, or the 6 options to be found on the Council's website. To avoid any confusion stemming from inconsistencies in these two publications, the Association states its position as follows:</p> <p>1. We wish to continue occupation of the allotments as it is presently enjoyed. In deciding this matter we are aware that the allotments may be bounded by a residential development of a significant density.</p> <p>2 Should the Council permit building development on any land adjoining the allotments, the Council should have regard to the privacy, security and other amenities presently enjoyed by the allotment holders, and in particular it should ensure that:</p> <p>a) there is adequate open space between the development and the allotment site.</p> <p>b) the allotment site will be suitably walled or fenced and gated.</p> <p>3 In the event that the Council permits building development on any of the land adjoining the allotments we support the prospect of the overhead power cables being buried underground. Land thus freed up for development would compensate for land retained as allotments.</p> <p>This Association has no mandate to comment on the wider implications of any development although there is general concern among members as to the adequacy of the present road network to serve such as large number of potential users.</p>			
534508	Mr & Mrs Hugh and Jane Merrett		<a href="#">CSO1</a> <a href="#">9373</a>	Option UE 1	Object		<p>We have had an allotment from the beginning (1970s) and now grow most of our own fruit and vegetables. Having worked with and seen the progress of the site for over 30 years we would like to convey to you how important the present site is to us and most of our other allotment holders.</p>			449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Object to the relocation of the allotments site for the following reasons:-                      An allotment site for over 30 years (at that time no longer required for a cemetery.                      A Statutory Site                      The Allotment holders have an Association which provides items to enable them to improve their allotments, lets plots, does maintenance, pays for toilets, arranges insurance for plot holders (all self-financing except approx £1000 p.a. for maintenance from CBC (approx £6 per plot). 2010 full allotment annual fee - £36 for which the Council sends bills, pays Associations approx £1000 pa and they pay the water bill.</p> <p>Since the Association was formed, we now have all plots let and we have a waiting list of over 1000 people – some fill plots have now been divided into two to enable more people to work an Allotment.                      Some allotment holders call their plot their “2nd home” and visit most days and hours and hours are spent working their plots. We are sure that tears will be shed if all is destroyed by diggers.                      Our Allotments are a good Grade 2 Agricultural land and should not be built on. We understand that our Allotments may have recently been reclassified as a “brownfield” site from Green Belt. Why? As allotment holders (as custodians) for over 30 years they have improved our site land and it now grows many pounds / kilos. Provides exercise and fresh air for young – see recent Daily Mail article (attached to this representation)                      Less need to buy imported fruit and vegetables, with air miles.                      There is a derelict piece of land adjoining which would provide for many on the waiting list.                      If houses are really necessary adjacent to our allotments, the electricity supply to the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>north should be buried (pylons removed) to increase numbers of houses.</p> <p>Our allotments are in the centre of need (see above point re waiting list) and on a bus route. Many allotment holders walk (these is a worn path on the grass verge between Stewart / Sainsbury /A35 roundabout to the allotment gate)</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>To move us, it would break up a community of like-minded people from all walks of life and incomes who enjoy helping themselves and helping others with surplus crops and advice. No doubt some older allotment holders would not move to a barren site and as such the continuity of knowledge of growing vegetables and fruit would be lost. We should all care as importing out food may not be quite as easy in the future.</p>			
534018	Mr David John Phillips		<a href="#">CSO19255</a>	Option UE 1	Object		<p>Re Proposals for possible development of open country space adjacent to A35 from Stoney Cross to Roeshot Belt (Taken as UE1 - UE4 options)</p> <p>I have lived in Burton for almost 40 years during which time major home development took place in the 1970's / 1980's subsequently having an adverse impact on the atmosphere of village life. Vandalism and crime increased at a time when policing and services were reduced. Regular policing in the village no longer exists.</p> <p>Ill-advised adjustments to the Stoney Lane junctions creates constant traffic congestion, taking up to 20 minutes to travel 1.5 miles from my home into Christchurch at certain times of the day. The filter onto the A35 is virtually redundant. Due to this the village has become a by-pass for motorists mostly driving at beyond the speed limit past two infant schools. Villagers are concerned that a serious accident is imminent.</p>			449

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Development at Stoney Cross will significantly add to the volume of traffic through the village creating up to an additional 2500 cars affecting the environment and the quality of village life. Whilst we accept the need for new houses and reasonable change during the past 20/30 years the Christchurch area has been developed beyond recognition. What used to be pleasant open space are now crammed with mostly budget type housing. To build a further 1250 homes – I assume mostly for the benefit of people out of this area – would result in an additional 3000 plus people and 2000 plus cars in a location that already has the most saturated traffic congestion in Dorset. To proceed with this proposal the Council would be acting in a most irresponsible manner. Needless to say, services such as policing and schooling for up to 2000 additional children in a few years time will continue to be cut. This is also at a time when the closure of Christchurch Hospital is planned. Perhaps the Council should concentrate on the existing people currently living in Christchurch – the people who pay increased taxes year on year, but continue to get less value for their money. Some areas in Christchurch town centre i.e. Fairmile and Avon Beach are in decline. In particular the Somerford Road from Purewell Cross to the junction with the A337 for years has suffered from serious neglect with various businesses coming and going without stability or improvement. If the Council thinks saturating the area with a further 1250 houses to meet spurious targets is necessary the existing sites in Somerford would be a better alternative for some new housing development than spoiling surrounding open countryside. In any event considerable improvement will need to be made to our existing road</p>			



**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							structure which as a top priority would include the urgent construction of a Christchurch town by-pass.			
538360	Mrs Ann Broomfield		<a href="#">CSO2 2733</a>	Option UE 1	Object		Have you all gone round the twist, 600 houses at Roeshot Hill. You can't get to work now without a car jam, and you can't get in the Doctors and Dentists, I think you've all lost the plot.			449
360074	Mr D DIXON		<a href="#">CSO1 25</a>	Option UE 2	Object		<p>This is supposed to be a proper consultation. This consultation is ridiculous as it is like asking someone if they would rather be shot, hanged, stabbed or poisoned. Obviously the reply would be none of those options.</p> <p>In this document we are offered four options each involving more building, when what is wanted is no more building.</p> <p>The reason people choose to live in Christchurch is because it has not been 'urbanised', it has a low crime level, it is reasonably prosperous and it is a place where 'time is pleasant'. More building and development will only mean an increase in population, a fall in property prices, an increased burden on Council services and environmental detriment. The area will attract less high net worth individuals who are not a burden on the existing rate payers and who can support more up market shops in Christchurch and Highcliffe shopping centres.</p> <p>We like it the way it is. stop encouraging the developers to ruin the town.</p>			452
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		<a href="#">CSO9 43</a>	Option UE 2	Object		<p>This is the second worst of the 4 options. The community would be isolated between the railway line and A35 with no employment opportunities within walking distance. The shop would not be viable - the one at Hoburne was not due to the proximity to Sainsburys. The community centre would not be viable - the one at</p>	Locate housing, open space and retail / community facilities east of Burton		452

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Hoburne was never built and the one at Mudford Wood is facing the axe. It would be far better to develop land to the east of Burton to provide housing and employment opportunities so that Burton becomes a district Centre like Highcliffe. Burton already has a community and would certainly benefit from better shops. Burton is closer to the airport where most new jobs will be created and with a better access along Avon Causeway will reduce the pressure on the A35. Increasing the size of Burton will lead to better bus service provision to Christchurch and Bournemouth.			
359636	Mr Chris Bartlett		<a href="#">CSO2 613</a>	Option UE 2	Object		Still too many houses without improved transport links or green space for them.			452
497394	Ms Sue Melbourne		<a href="#">CSO2 298</a>	Option UE 2	Object		Object to building on land near Burton Railway. Land usually has horse grazing there. It is a flood plain since it is covered in rain water each year. Previously the Council built on meadows near Purewell. This land had the same problem and the properties subsequently subsided. Recognise that Christchurch has a need for housing but the long term issues of subsidence, insurance and flooding need to be considered. It is a green area and is beautiful and needs to be preserved.	Suggest an area of rough ground on Purewell (vacant land) or land where there used to be a petrol station should be used instead.		452
359264	Mr Peter Affield	Director Goadsby Ltd	<a href="#">CSO1 0787</a>	Option UE 2	Object		Please see our principal representations in respect of Option UE 4	Delete policy option		452
508135	E P Wright		<a href="#">CSO1 1610</a>	Option UE 2	Support					452
508241	Mr L		<a href="#">CSO1 1642</a>	Option UE 2	Support					452

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Hibbard									
508402	Mr J Priest		<a href="#">CSO1 1771</a>	Option UE 2	Support					452
359836	Mr & Mrs L Jackson		<a href="#">CSO1 3692</a>	Option UE 2	Object		We don't need more homes the schools and doctors can not cope now the road gets jammed now do we need a further 500 cars + and services. If you must build leave that area as it is and tidy up other areas and pos build there. E.g. op Somerford Estate.			452
360575	Mr Roy Avery		<a href="#">CSO1 1873</a>	Option UE 2	Support					452
361308	Mr John Tandy		<a href="#">CSO1 2612</a>	Option UE 2	Object		I do not believe building on greenbelt land to be the answer to this problem. If there is a shortage of housing it cannot be avoided or cured by building on this area of greenbelt. If Christchurch is "full", then extra capacity needs to be met by regeneration of Brownfield sites. These sites may well be in other areas or towns. The availability of dwellings in Christchurch is finite and should regulate the population. It is not possible to keep increasing housing stock, it would be better to control the population of the area to a level that fits available services and facilities.			452
507591	Mr Mark		<a href="#">CSO1 1174</a>	Option UE 2	Support					452
507599	Mr M Avnir		<a href="#">CSO1 1195</a>	Option UE 2	Support					452
508661	Mr Burton		<a href="#">CSO1 2053</a>	Option UE 2	Support					452
509220	Mrs U		<a href="#">CSO1 2582</a>	Option UE 2	Support					452

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Richard									
509383	Mr Clive Richardson		<a href="#">CSO1 2639</a>	Option UE 2	Object		I have Lived here all of my life and I recall my mother saying all around the Somerford Estate was under water, I realise people need somewhere to live but I can see for myself there are many Brownfield sites available, with probably no hope of any new business locating here (high council rates etc). Safe to say I am against any more building on our lovely green spaces.			452
509426	Mr & Mrs K Roberts		<a href="#">CSO1 2690</a>	Option UE 2	Object		We do not agree with any of the above options. We strongly disagree with and do not like any options that would put large numbers of affordable (& social?) housing in close proximity to the largest housing estate in Christchurch. We feel affordable (& social) housing should be dispersed throughout the borough, not all together in east, or west, Christchurch. The roads are congested enough without adding to the problem by building in the east of the area. We suggest building smaller numbers of houses on plots of unsightly land i.e. the old gas works in Bridge Street, the site of the New Inn on Fairmile, the area in front of the new post office sorting office in Fairmile. There must be many more unsightly plots that could be utilised in this way. It may cost more to do it this way, but the quality of life and integration of affordable housing will benefit the town and residents in the long term.			452
509541	Mr & Mrs J H Elliott		<a href="#">CSO1 2725</a>	Option UE 2	Support					452
509663	Adrian Thorne		<a href="#">CSO1 2776</a>	Option UE 2	Support		Like UE2, but would like power cables underground as UE1 has to many houses for site.			452

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
510544	Mr I Morton		<a href="#">CSO1 3371</a>	Option UE 2	Object		Strongly oppose to all options especially strongly to the first three, but also to option 4. You have not said anything about specifically how you will meet the additional transport needs and traffic, what will happen about the pylons, and also your additional proposed grab of green space. There are plenty of other spaces in Christchurch to build on. Christchurch would be better served by bringing more work to the town, simultaneously building prosperity and outing traffic miles.			452
510768	Mr & Mrs Weatherer		<a href="#">CSO1 3486</a>	Option UE 2	Object		Keep the green belt intact. Amenities cannot support further development. We already have a traffic problem in Christchurch.			452
510779	Ms Muriel Catry		<a href="#">CSO1 3502</a>	Option UE 2	Object		None of the above – keep the green belt, Christchurch is already over-populated, no more houses and increased traffic!			452
510796	Mr R Reid		<a href="#">CSO1 3516</a>	Option UE 2	Object		Keep all the green belt unvandalised.			452
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">CSO1 7473</a>	Option UE 2	Support		DWT have not objected to options UE1, 2 and 3 but have the following concerns:- DWT have concerns that this development could impact on the adjacent designated sites, and in particular Burton Common SSSI with its mature dry heath and luxuriant bryophytes and lichens and populations of nightjar, Dartford warbler, woodlark and woodcock, which is within 400m of the developable area. We have considerable concerns that new development and provision of new open space to the north of the railway could encourage people onto Burton Common. As identified in the options, the quantity of SANG provision will need to be agreed with Natural England and DWT would object to this option if agreement could not be			452

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							reached on sufficient provision of SANG to prevent damage to the designated sites. DWT consider the area identified for the SANG should be surveyed for wildlife to inform decisions as we believe the farmland supports species such as skylark, yellowhammer and lapwing. We would expect the SANG to include significant enhancements for biodiversity and that opportunity should be taken to protect and enhance biodiversity within the developed area, retaining linkages between open areas to provide corridors and stepping stones for wildlife to move through the site. This is particularly important along watercourses. From the north, the River Mude flows through the site and on through the Mude Valley Nature Reserve SNCI (SZ19/39), thus protection and enhancement of this feature is vital, with opportunity to enhance and extend habitat for species along the river corridor. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems should be implemented to protect the watercourses and other sensitive features.			
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">CSO1</a> <a href="#">8671</a>	Option UE 2		General Comment	These options could be detrimental to designated nature conservation sites in the locality, as identified in the evidence to this chapter, but the development also offers an opportunity for significant green infrastructure that could remove this detriment and increase the value of the locality for biodiversity. Our opinion on this option will therefore be shaped by the strength and detail of policy on delivery of the green infrastructure as an integral part of the development and the requirements to be met by the green infrastructure. The following requirements for the green infrastructure are essential: Suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG) of a scale and design to divert pressures generated by the residential			452

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							development away from near-by heathland European sites (Dorset Heathlands and the New Forest), Ramsar sites and SSSI and the habitats of European protected species. Provision of a comprehensive package of measures to safeguard the Southern damselfly, a nationally protected species and a UK and Dorset Biodiversity Action Plan priority species, is present on site (and off site, both down and up stream) on the River Mude. Water quality considerations will be particularly important and the provision of Sustainable Urban Drainage Solutions within the developable areas will be necessary to clean water of poor quality from urban surfaces. We believe there are opportunities to integrate the conservation of this species within the development and to enhance its habitat both on and off- site. We agree with general strategy that applies to the 3 options concerning the location of the SANG i.e. north of the railway line, but details on the exact location, size and nature of the SANG to be delivered as part of the urban extension needs to be clearly defined during the process of refining the preferred options.			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<a href="#">CSO1 8668</a>	Option UE 2	Object		At this stage, given the uncertainty over the likely impacts and over the provision of mitigation measures, we object to options UE1, UE2, UE3 and UE4.			452
361028	Ms Helen Patton	Head of Policy and Plans New Forest National Park Authority	<a href="#">CSO1 8931</a>	Option UE 2	Support		The Authority supports the preferred option for locating new housing south of the railway line. This accords with the Authority's comments to Christchurch Borough Council in the past and is consistent with the conclusions of the Broadway Malyan master planning work. As you are aware, the Authority has stated in the past that housing development north	In order to reflect the importance of this approach, the Authority considers that the section heading should be expanded to include reference to the National Park and each of the four options should be expanded to include reference to the National Park, as at present only the Dorset Heathlands are referred to. For example Option UE2		452

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							of the railway line would have a far greater impact in terms of visual and landscape impact on the National Park where long distance views are offered from Burton Common, when compared to development south of the railway line.	states; "...there is a requirement to provide a SANG to reduce the recreational impact on the heathlands generated by new development in this location."		
517736	Mr Bob Maddock		<a href="#">CSO1 7114</a>	Option UE 2		General Comment	I would suggest 1 move the power lines to a route north of the railway-much cheaper than underground 2 move the allotments to the west end of the site			452
517737	Lee Stevens		<a href="#">CSO1 7119</a>	Option UE 2		General Comment	I vote to keep our greenbelt land. We do not want more outsiders buying up second homes and ruining our beautiful land. No plan of road network shown for increase to already busy area. Is this going to impact more? Greed??			452
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	<a href="#">CSO1 7541</a>	Option UE 2	Support		We do not have any significant issues with this urban extension. All 4 options show that the built development will be located in Flood Zone 1 (low risk), which we are pleased to read. Preferred Option UE1 – 4, pages 110 -121 Fisheries Recreation and Biodiversity We support the land identified within the maps on pages P112 - 121 as 'land suitable for open space' as this will ensure the provision of a wetland corridor if future development occurs. The importance of a wetland corridor adjacent to the River Mude should also be highlighted in addition to the benefits of Flood/Water Attenuation. Overall issues for consideration are: flood risk / surface water drainage; SuDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; groundwater and contaminated land; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green			452



**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter.</p> <p>General comments on the preferred options document</p> <p>Flood Risk/ Surface Water Drainage</p> <p>This is a very high level document, and as such where individual sites 'considered for development' are detailed within the document we have checked these against our published Flood Map. However, it is important to remember that should any of the sites detailed in the document be considered further it is imperative East Dorset District and Christchurch Borough Councils consult our recently published 'Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding' maps to ascertain whether any of the sites, or part of a site, should not be considered further for development on grounds of flood risk (from surface water flooding).</p> <p>It may be necessary to carry out more detailed investigations for any site which is identified as being within an area susceptible to surface water flooding prior to making such a decision. This is because the maps are indicative in nature and therefore are only intended to prompt further investigation.</p> <p>Groundwater and Contaminated Land</p> <p>Any development needs to take into account Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control (PPS23). PPS23 has imposed a more precautionary approach to development proposals on land affected by contamination. Our Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice document (GP3) should also be taken into account.</p> <p>The following points should be considered for any new development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development proposals located within a</li> </ul>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>groundwater Source Protection Zone will require consideration and risk assessment to show that the risk to controlled water from any new development will be low.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developments in close proximity to abstraction boreholes will require a Hydrogeological Assessment to assess both the impact of the construction and from drainage. The suitability of SuDS at these sites would need to be established.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge, flows and levels.</li> <li>• If detrimental consequences to the water environment are likely, then agreed mitigation measures would be necessary.</li> <li>• Developers should adhere firmly to the Environment Agency's stance on SuDS.</li> <li>• The applicant should bear in mind that it is their responsibility to ensure that the development does not adversely affect any existing legal water interests in the area.</li> <li>• Local water interests in the area such as wells, springs, etc, and private abstractions must not be adversely affected either.</li> </ul> <p>Foul Drainage The proposed developments, both residential and commercial, should connect to a mains foul sewer, where possible. Wessex Water will need to be consulted at an early stage to confirm that there is sufficient capacity to cope with the additional demand. Any additional major road building should incorporate mitigation to accommodate storm flows and minimise pollution risk. New car parks will require adequate pollution prevention infrastructure to minimise pollution risk from run-off.</p> <p>Biodiversity We note that the Core Strategy supporting document ' 03 – Managing and safeguarding the Natural Environment Key issue Paper Oct 2010' advises 'Councils</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>already have powers to provide policy protection to sites of biodiversity importance which are under significant pressure' and that 'this can be done later through site specific documents in the LDF'. We look forward to being consulted on these documents in due course.</p> <p>Sustainable Construction Sustainable design and construction should be implemented across the proposed development. This is important in limiting the effects of and adapting to climate change. Running costs for occupants can also be significantly reduced.</p> <p>The Code for Sustainable Homes should be complied with, achieving the highest level possible. For details on compliance with the Code the applicant is advised to visit: <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/codesustainabilitystandards">http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/codesustainabilitystandards</a></p> <p>All non-residential buildings should comply with BREEAM, the Environmental Assessment Method for Buildings. This sets the standard for best practice in sustainable design. More information can be found at : <a href="http://www.breeam.org/">http://www.breeam.org/</a></p> <p>Water Efficiency Water efficiency measures should be incorporated into all development. This conserves water and allows cost savings for future occupants.</p> <p>This should include water efficient systems and fittings e.g. dual-flush toilets, water butts, water-saving taps, showers and baths, and appliances with the highest water efficiency rating (as a minimum). Grey water recycling and rainwater harvesting should be considered. For further guidance please see the following links: <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/drought/31755.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/drought/31755.aspx</a></p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p><a href="http://www.savewatersavemoney.co.uk/">http://www.savewatersavemoney.co.uk/</a> Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible with sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). This reduces flood risk through the use of soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, grassed swales, ponds etc. SuDS can also increase groundwater recharge, improve water quality and provide biodiversity amenity opportunities (inline with PPS9). A SuDS approach is encouraged by Approved Document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000. Further information on SUDS can be found in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS25 Annex F: Managing Surface Water</li> <li><a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/planningpolicystatement25.pdf">http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/planningpolicystatement25.pdf</a></li> <li>- 'A Practice Guide Companion to PPS25'</li> <li><a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/developmentflood">http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/developmentflood</a></li> <li>- CIRIA C522 document Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems-design manual for England and Wales.</li> <li>- Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems (advice on design, adoption and maintenance issues, available at: <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Business/iop_final_0704_872183.pdf">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Business/iop_final_0704_872183.pdf</a>)</li> </ul> <p>Demolition and Construction To help the construction and demolition industry manage their activities to prevent pollution, sites should adhere to our Pollution Prevention Guidelines PPG 6: Working at Construction and Demolition Sites. This can be found at: <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/pollution/39083.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/pollution/39083.aspx</a>.</p> <p>Waste</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>In accordance with the waste hierarchy, all development should consider reduction, reuse and recovery of waste in preference to off site incineration and disposal to landfill during site construction. Adequate space should be provided within developments for waste facilities e.g. recycling bins, composting etc. It must be ensured that there would be sufficient capacity at household recycling centres to cope with any additional demand.</p> <p>Infrastructure We understand that an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being undertaken. We look forward to being consulted on this in due course.</p>			
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		<a href="#">CSO1 9280</a>	Option UE 2	Object		<p>The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential</p>			452

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options. However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported.			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">CSO1 9125</a>	Option UE 2	Object		Option UE 1 – UE 4 The preferred policy option states that it is 'not viable' to consider setting an affordable housing requirement above the 40% district-wide proposal in Section 14. However, there does not appear to be any evidence to support this view. We are concerned that the site will not even be able to support this 40% requirement given the constraints of the site. Furthermore, whilst the preferred option may not be able to support an affordable housing requirement above 40% Land to the South of Burton Village may be able to. Given the importance the Council attaches to providing the maximum level of affordable housing possible in the district over the Core Strategy period and the lack of other significant opportunities, this issue must be explored further. We recommend that the scope of the viability assessment is widened to include Options UE1 – UE4 and the realistic alternatives to the preferred options. This would include Land to the South of Burton Village. Until the issues relating to the viability of providing affordable housing on the preferred option for the urban extension			452

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>can be satisfactorily resolved and other potential alternatives properly explored, we do not consider the preferred option to be sound. Providing significant affordable housing is purportedly one of the top priorities in the Core Strategy and failure to pursue the highest possible levels of affordable housing does not amount to an 'effective' policy, as set out in the tests of soundness in PPS12.</p> <p>Our client's site is located to the South of Burton and covers 3.8 hectares. There is an existing access off Salisbury Road which connects the site with Christchurch and the A35 Christchurch by-pass. To the south the site is bordered by the railway line. The site's boundary is shown in red on the site location enclosed with these representations.</p> <p>The client is currently exploring the possibility of delivering a rural exception scheme on the site with Raglan Housing Association and Christchurch Borough Council. Notwithstanding the outcome of these discussions, we still consider Land to the South of Burton Village to be the best location for the urban extension to Christchurch.</p> <p>The Wider Area We consider that our client's site would work best as part of a wider development area to the South of Burton. The remaining area that could be used as part of the urban extension is shown in blue on the enclosed site location plan. It covers the area contained between the railway line to the south, the settlement boundary of Burton to the north and Stony Lane and Salisbury Road to the east and west. This was considered as one of the options for the urban extension to Christchurch in the March 2008 Issues and Options consultation paper. We consider that it has been erroneously rejected as the preferred</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							option. Estimated Site Capacity The total area of the Land to the South of Burton Village is 17.8 hectares; this could easily accommodate 600 dwellings. Our client's site makes up 3.8 hectares of the wider area; this site could therefore accommodate approximately 150 dwellings, when working at density level of 35 dph.			
527818	Mr Nigel Lester	Synergy Housing Association	<a href="#">CSO1 8953</a>	Option UE 2	Support		Having looked at the proposals for each of the geographical areas and the proposed sites within those areas we can see no reason to disagree with the Local Authorities assessment and findings in each case, and would be very keen to become involved in the provision of affordable housing on any of these sites.			452
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">CSO1 9002</a>	Option UE 2		General Comment	Chapter 6 Christchurch Urban Extension Options UE 1 - 4 Development in this location and the transportation considerations outlined in these options are supported. Provision of walking and cycling links to surrounding facilities, particularly to Hinton Admiral rail station as well as improvement to station facilities should also be included. Under 'Transport Infrastructure Requirements' the following wording is proposed: "multi-modal study, the A35 Route Management Project and a detailed Transport Assessment." Details will be progressed through the next stage of the master planning work informed by SEDMMTS and the A35 RMS. DCC Transport Planning officers have been involved in the stage 1 master planning work for this site and look forward to an ongoing involvement in the more detailed design stages.			452
527907	Mr Hugh	President Roeshot Hill	<a href="#">CSO1 9102</a>	Option UE 2	Object		Core Strategy – Urban Development Response to Consultation			452



**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Merrett	Allotment Association					<p>A meeting of members held on 28th October last unanimously endorsed a response to the several proposals put forward by the Council for the development of land at Roeshot Hill. We regret that we are unable to fully endorse any of the 4 options as set out in the Christchurch Courier, or the 6 options to be found on the Council's website. To avoid any confusion stemming from inconsistencies in these two publications, the Association states its position as follows:</p> <p>1. We wish to continue occupation of the allotments as it is presently enjoyed. In deciding this matter we are aware that the allotments may be bounded by a residential development of a significant density.</p> <p>2 Should the Council permit building development on any land adjoining the allotments, the Council should have regard to the privacy, security and other amenities presently enjoyed by the allotment holders, and in particular it should ensure that:</p> <p>a) there is adequate open space between the development and the allotment site.</p> <p>b) the allotment site will be suitably walled or fenced and gated.</p> <p>3 In the event that the Council permits building development on any of the land adjoining the allotments we support the prospect of the overhead power cables being buried underground. Land thus freed up for development would compensate for land retained as allotments.</p> <p>This Association has no mandate to comment on the wider implications of any development although there is general concern among members as to the adequacy of the present road network to serve such as large number of potential users.</p>			
534508	Mr & Mrs Hugh and		<a href="#">CSO1 9374</a>	Option UE 2	Object		We have had an allotment from the beginning (1970s) and now grow most of			452

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Jane Merrett						<p>our own fruit and vegetables. Having worked with and seen the progress of the site for over 30 years we would like to convey to you how important the present site is to us and most of our other allotment holders.</p> <p>Object to the relocation of the allotments site for the following reasons:-</p> <p>An allotment site for over 30 years (at that time no longer required for a cemetery. A Statutory Site</p> <p>The Allotment holders have an Association which provides items to enable them to improve their allotments, lets plots, does maintenance, pays for toilets, arranges insurance for plot holders (all self-financing except approx £1000 p.a. for maintenance from CBC (approx £6 per plot). 2010 full allotment annual fee - £36 for which the Council sends bills, pays Associations approx £1000 pa and they pay the water bill.</p> <p>Since the Association was formed, we now have all plots let and we have a waiting list of over 1000 people – some fill plots have now been divided into two to enable more people to work an Allotment.</p> <p>Some allotment holders call their plot their “2nd home” and visit most days and hours and hours are spent working their plots. We are sure that tears will be shed if all is destroyed by diggers.</p> <p>Our Allotments are a good Grade 2 Agricultural land and should not be built on. We understand that our Allotments may have recently been reclassified as a “brownfield” site from Green Belt. Why? As allotment holders (as custodians) for over 30 years they have improved our site land and it now grows many pounds / kilos. Provides exercise and fresh air for young – see recent Daily Mail article (attached to this representation)</p> <p>Less need to buy imported fruit and</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>vegetables, with air miles.</p> <p>There is a derelict piece of land adjoining which would provide for many on the waiting list.</p> <p>If houses are really necessary adjacent to our allotments, the electricity supply to the north should be buried (pylons removed) to increase numbers of houses.</p> <p>Our allotments are in the centre of need (see above point re waiting list) and on a bus route. Many allotment holders walk (these is a worn path on the grass verge between Stewart / Sainsbury /A35 roundabout to the allotment gate)</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>To move us, it would break up a community of like-minded people from all walks of life and incomes who enjoy helping themselves and helping others with surplus crops and advice. No doubt some older allotment holders would not move to a barren site and as such the continuity of knowledge of growing vegetables and fruit would be lost. We should all care as importing out food may not be quite as easy in the future.</p>			
534018	Mr David John Phillips		<a href="#">CSO1</a> <a href="#">9256</a>	Option UE 2	Object		<p>Re Proposals for possible development of open country space adjacent to A35 from Stoney Cross to Roeshot Belt (Taken as UE1 - UE4 options)</p> <p>I have lived in Burton for almost 40 years during which time major home development took place in the 1970's / 1980's subsequently having an adverse impact on the atmosphere of village life. Vandalism and crime increased at a time when policing and services were reduced. Regular policing in the village no longer exists.</p> <p>Ill-advised adjustments to the Stoney Lane junctions creates constant traffic congestion, taking up to 20 minutes to travel 1.5 miles from my home into Christchurch at certain times of the day.</p>			452

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>The filter onto the A35 is virtually redundant. Due to this the village has become a by-pass for motorists mostly driving at beyond the speed limit past two infant schools. Villagers are concerned that a serious accident is imminent.</p> <p>Development at Stoney Cross will significantly add to the volume of traffic through the village creating up to an additional 2500 cars affecting the environment and the quality of village life. Whilst we accept the need for new houses and reasonable change during the past 20/30 years the Christchurch area has been developed beyond recognition. What used to be pleasant open space are now crammed with mostly budget type housing. To build a further 1250 homes – I assume mostly for the benefit of people out of this area – would result in an additional 3000 plus people and 2000 plus cars in a location that already has the most saturated traffic congestion in Dorset. To proceed with this proposal the Council would be acting in a most irresponsible manner. Needless to say, services such as policing and schooling for up to 2000 additional children in a few years time will continue to be cut. This is also at a time when the closure of Christchurch Hospital is planned. Perhaps the Council should concentrate on the existing people currently living in Christchurch – the people who pay increased taxes year on year, but continue to get less value for their money.</p> <p>Some areas in Christchurch town centre i.e. Fairmile and Avon Beach are in decline. In particular the Somerford Road from Purewell Cross to the junction with the A337 for years has suffered from serious neglect with various businesses coming and going without stability or improvement. If the Council thinks saturating the area with a further 1250 houses to meet spurious</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							targets is necessary the existing sites in Somerford would be a better alternative for some new housing development than spoiling surrounding open countryside. In any event considerable improvement will need to be made to our existing road structure which as a top priority would include the urgent construction of a Christchurch town by-pass.			
538360	Mrs Ann Broomfield		<a href="#">CSO2 2734</a>	Option UE 2	Object		Have you all gone round the twist, 600 houses at Roeshot Hill. You can't get to work now without a car jam, and you can't get in the Doctors and Dentists, I think you've all lost the plot.			452
360074	Mr D DIXON		<a href="#">CSO1 26</a>	Option UE 3	Object		This is supposed to be a proper consultation. This consultation is ridiculous as it is like asking someone if they would rather be shot, hanged, stabbed or poisoned. Obviously the reply would be none of those options. In this document we are offered four options each involving more building, when what is wanted is no more building. The reason people choose to live in Christchurch is because it has not been 'urbanised', it has a low crime level, it is reasonably prosperous and it is a place where 'time is pleasant'. More building and development will only mean an increase in population, a fall in property prices, an increased burden on Council services and environmental detriment. The area will attract less high net worth individuals who are not a burden on the existing rate payers and who can support more up market shops in Christchurch and Highcliffe shopping centres. We like it the way it is. stop encouraging the developers to ruin the town.			455
359945	Mr Geoff		<a href="#">CSO9 42</a>	Option UE 3	Object		This is the second worst of the 4 options. The community would be isolated between	Locate housing, open space and retail / community facilities east of Burton		455

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Bantock						the railway line and A35 with no employment opportunities within walking distance. The shop would not be viable - the one at Hoburne was not due to the proximity to Sainsburys. The community centre would not be viable - the one at Hoburne was never built and the one at Mudeford Wood is facing the axe. It would be far better to develop land to the east of Burton to provide housing and employment opportunities so that Burton becomes a district Centre like Highcliffe. Burton already has a community and would certainly benefit from better shops. Burton is closer to the airport where most new jobs will be created and with a better access along Avon Causeway will reduce the pressure on the A35. Increasing the size of Burton will lead to better bus service provision to Christchurch and Bournemouth.			
359636	Mr Chris Bartlett		<a href="#">CSO2 614</a>	Option UE 3	Object		Better number of houses. Some green space but in the wrong place. Still no transport link improvements			455
496152	Ms R Iveson	Roeshot Hill Allotment Association	<a href="#">CSO1 603</a>	Option UE 3	Support		My support for option UE3 is because the Roeshot Hill Allotment site must not be relocated under any circumstances. Under government planning policy statement 3 revised in 2005, it reads "that brownfield definition is excluded for land in built up areas such as parks, recreation areas and allotments" as a statutory site, no relocation must be undertaken. Every plot holder has spent very many years improving the fertility of the soil on each plot which takes a generation to achieve which cannot be replicated on new land. Many plot holders would lose their fruit trees and bushes which are too established to move. Costing each plot holder hundreds of pounds and irreplaceable due to their maturity.	No relocation of Roeshot Hill allotment site.		455
497394	Ms		<a href="#">CSO2</a>	Option	Object		Object to building on land near Burton	Suggest an area of rough ground on		455

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Sue Melbourne		<a href="#">299</a>	UE 3			Railway. Land usually has horse grazing there. It is a flood plain since it is covered in rain water each year. Previously the Council built on meadows near Purewell. This land had the same problem and the properties subsequently subsided. Recognise that Christchurch has a need for housing but the long term issues of subsidence, insurance and flooding need to be considered. It is a green area and is beautiful and needs to be preserved.	Purewell (vacant land) or land where there used to be a petrol station should be used instead.		
497403	Miss Angela Chantler		<a href="#">CSO2 302</a>	Option UE 3	Support					455
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	<a href="#">CSO1 0789</a>	Option UE 3	Object		Please see our principal representations in respect of Option UE 4	Delete policy option		455
508440	Mr Angus Macmillan		<a href="#">CSO1 2751</a>	Option UE 3	Support		Offers the best compromise.			455
508456	Rev. Dudley Powell		<a href="#">CSO1 1808</a>	Option UE 3	Support					455
359398	Mr I G TODD		<a href="#">CSO1 2756</a>	Option UE 3	Support					455
359836	Mr & Mrs L Jackson		<a href="#">CSO1 3699</a>	Option UE 3	Object		We don't need more homes the schools and doctors can not cope now the road gets jammed now do we need a further 500 cars + and services. If you must build leave that area as it is and tidy up other areas and pos build there. E.g. op Somerford Estate.			455
360099	Mr		<a href="#">CSO1</a>	Option	Support					455

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	John FOSKETT		<a href="#">1721</a>	UE 3						
360598	Mr Alan Ruck	Hon Secretary Roeshot Hill Allotment Association	<a href="#">CSO1 3136</a>	Option UE 3	Support		I am a plot holder at Roeshot Hill Allotments I fail to see how the Borough Council Which was so opposed to development proposals by the previous government is now proposing the very thing it opposed then! Is there actually any need for development at all in present circumstances?			455
361308	Mr John Tandy		<a href="#">CSO1 2613</a>	Option UE 3	Object		I do not believe building on greenbelt land to be the answer to this problem. If there is a shortage of housing it cannot be avoided or cured by building on this area of greenbelt. If Christchurch is "full", then extra capacity needs to be met by regeneration of Brownfield sites. These sites may well be in other areas or towns. The availability of dwellings in Christchurch is finite and should regulate the population. It is not possible to keep increasing housing stock, it would be better to control the population of the area to a level that fits available services and facilities.			455
507477	Mrs Sally Owen		<a href="#">CSO1 1021</a>	Option UE 3	Support		Comments from Christchurch Urban Extension Leaflet Allotments: These should remain where they are at present, the shortfall could be provided north of the railway line. Overhead power cables could be put underground, much better for all concerned. Christchurch: Where time is pleasant, this is a myth, the A35 is too full of traffic and with the proposed no. of houses the congestion will be even worse! Just over the county boundary gravel extraction is to take place in the not to distant future, adding to the congestion with lorries full of gravel. Schools, doctors, sewage will all need greater capacity.			455



**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507575	Mr M Adams		<a href="#">CSO1 1137</a>	Option UE 3	Support					455
507585	Mrs Angela Everitt		<a href="#">CSO1 1156</a>	Option UE 3	Support					455
508623	Mr Allan Thompson		<a href="#">CSO1 2034</a>	Option UE 3	Support					455
508994	Mr & Mrs L Ruckley		<a href="#">CSO1 2448</a>	Option UE 3	Support		This is to supersede our previous comments on the urban extension. Using the unoccupied sites for housing in the Somerford Road area – as there is enough commercial trading in that area, must consider the traffic problems by “Cat & Fiddle” – N. E. area Highcliffe.			455
509383	Mr Clive Richardson		<a href="#">CSO1 2641</a>	Option UE 3	Object		I have Lived here all of my life and I recall my mother saying all around the Somerford Estate was under water, I realise people need somewhere to live but I can see for myself there are many Brownfield sites available, with probably no hope of any new business locating here (high council rates etc). Safe to say I am against any more building on our lovely green spaces.			455
509426	Mr & Mrs K Roberts		<a href="#">CSO1 2691</a>	Option UE 3	Object		We do not agree with any of the above options. We strongly disagree with and do not like any options that would put large numbers of affordable (& social?) housing in close proximity to the largest housing estate in Christchurch. We feel affordable (& social) housing should be dispersed throughout the borough, not all together in east, or west, Christchurch. The roads are congested enough without adding to the problem by building in the east of the area. We suggest building smaller numbers of houses on plots of unsightly land i.e. the old			455

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							gas works in Bridge Street, the site of the New Inn on Fairmile, the area in front of the new post office sorting office in Fairmile. There must be many more unsightly plots that could be utilised in this way. It may cost more to do it this way, but the quality of life and integration of affordable housing will benefit the town and residents in the long term.			
509634	Mr Ronald Leighton		<a href="#">CSO1 2765</a>	Option UE 3	Support					455
509646	Mr Neil P Buckley		<a href="#">CSO1 2771</a>	Option UE 3	Support		Additional green space and recreational facilities must have good access from all areas particularly from the Somerford / Friars cliff area.			455
510427	Mr K F Hayman		<a href="#">CSO1 3165</a>	Option UE 3	Support		I feel that the allotments at present are accessible at all times & directions. I have an allotment at Roeshot Hill and have been working this plot for over 11 years. To move means that all my work has been in vain. There are many plot holders who have been there far longer than I have, and they have spend their time in bringing their soil up to a very high standard. It has become a small community.			455
510530	Mrs J Simon		<a href="#">CSO1 3266</a>	Option UE 3	Support		Feel UE3 appropriate, 500-650 dwellings more suitable for area, also keeping allotments important for community. Would be concerned that overhead power cables retained near housing though.			455
510544	Mr I Morton		<a href="#">CSO1 3374</a>	Option UE 3	Object		Strongly oppose to all options especially strongly to the first three, but also to option 4. You have not said anything about specifically how you will meet the additional transport needs and traffic, what will happen about the pylons, and also your additional proposed grab of green space. There are plenty of other spaces in			455

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Christchurch to build on. Christchurch would be better served by bringing more work to the town, simultaneously building prosperity and outing traffic miles.			
510768	Mr & Mrs Weatherer		<a href="#">CSO1 3487</a>	Option UE 3	Object		Keep the green belt intact. Amenities cannot support further development. We already have a traffic problem in Christchurch.			455
510779	Ms Muriel Catry		<a href="#">CSO1 3504</a>	Option UE 3	Object		None of the above – keep the green belt, Christchurch is already over-populated, no more houses and increased traffic!			455
510796	Mr R Reid		<a href="#">CSO1 3519</a>	Option UE 3	Object		Keep all the green belt unvandalised.			455
510821	Mrs Joyce Curnock		<a href="#">CSO1 3556</a>	Option UE 3	Support		What about extra school places? Is there going to be extra medical care? How is the extra burden of traffic going to be coped with? If the largest of the schemes is adopted – are these problems going to be addressed, this also applies to the smaller schemes.			455
510835	Ms Jean Kernan		<a href="#">CSO1 3564</a>	Option UE 3	Support		Why more development? - I notice less than half new build homes are classed affordable – so no preference for young/low income families. - Please do not consider building on existing allotments – fertile soil, a result of many years time and toil and the pride and joy of many. It would break the spirit of many to have to start afresh. - Can your infrastructure cope with another surge in population growth – no judging by state of roads.			455
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">CSO1 7474</a>	Option UE 3	Support		DWT have not objected to options UE1, 2 and 3 but have the following concerns:- DWT have concerns that this development could impact on the adjacent designated sites, and in particular Burton Common			455

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>SSSI with its mature dry heath and luxuriant bryophytes and lichens and populations of nightjar, Dartford warbler, woodlark and woodcock, which is within 400m of the developable area. We have considerable concerns that new development and provision of new open space to the north of the railway could encourage people onto Burton Common. As identified in the options, the quantity of SANG provision will need to be agreed with Natural England and DWT would object to this option if agreement could not be reached on sufficient provision of SANG to prevent damage to the designated sites. DWT consider the area identified for the SANG should be surveyed for wildlife to inform decisions as we believe the farmland supports species such as skylark, yellowhammer and lapwing. We would expect the SANG to include significant enhancements for biodiversity and that opportunity should be taken to protect and enhance biodiversity within the developed area, retaining linkages between open areas to provide corridors and stepping stones for wildlife to move through the site. This is particularly important along watercourses. From the north, the River Mude flows through the site and on through the Mude Valley Nature Reserve SNCI (SZ19/39), thus protection and enhancement of this feature is vital, with opportunity to enhance and extend habitat for species along the river corridor. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems should be implemented to protect the watercourses and other sensitive features.</p>			
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and	<a href="#">CSO1 8672</a>	Option UE 3		General Comment	<p>These options could be detrimental to designated nature conservation sites in the locality, as identified in the evidence to this chapter, but the development also offers an opportunity for significant green</p>			455

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Somerset Team					<p>infrastructure that could remove this detriment and increase the value of the locality for biodiversity. Our opinion on this option will therefore be shaped by the strength and detail of policy on delivery of the green infrastructure as an integral part of the development and the requirements to be met by the green infrastructure. The following requirements for the green infrastructure are essential:</p> <p>Suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG) of a scale and design to divert pressures generated by the residential development away from near-by heathland European sites (Dorset Heathlands and the New Forest), Ramsar sites and SSSI and the habitats of European protected species. Provision of a comprehensive package of measures to safeguard the Southern damselfly, a nationally protected species and a UK and Dorset Biodiversity Action Plan priority species, is present on site (and off site, both down and up stream) on the River Mude. Water quality considerations will be particularly important and the provision of Sustainable Urban Drainage Solutions within the developable areas will be necessary to clean water of poor quality from urban surfaces. We believe there are opportunities to integrate the conservation of this species within the development and to enhance its habitat both on and off- site. We agree with general strategy that applies to the 3 options concerning the location of the SANG i.e. north of the railway line, but details on the exact location, size and nature of the SANG to be delivered as part of the urban extension needs to be clearly defined during the process of refining the preferred options.</p>			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society	<a href="#">CSO18669</a>	Option UE 3	Object		At this stage, given the uncertainty over the likely impacts and over the provision of mitigation measures, we object to options			455

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		for the Protection of Birds					UE1, UE2, UE3 and UE4.			
361028	Ms Helen Patton	Head of Policy and Plans New Forest National Park Authority	<a href="#">CSO1 8932</a>	Option UE 3	Support		The Authority supports the preferred option for locating new housing south of the railway line. This accords with the Authority's comments to Christchurch Borough Council in the past and is consistent with the conclusions of the Broadway Malyan master planning work. As you are aware, the Authority has stated in the past that housing development north of the railway line would have a far greater impact in terms of visual and landscape impact on the National Park where long distance views are offered from Burton Common, when compared to development south of the railway line.	In order to reflect the importance of this approach, the Authority considers that the section heading should be expanded to include reference to the National Park and each of the four options should be expanded to include reference to the National Park, as at present only the Dorset Heathlands are referred to. For example Option UE2 states; "...there is a requirement to provide a SANG to reduce the recreational impact on the heathlands generated by new development in this location."		455
517736	Mr Bob Maddock		<a href="#">CSO1 7115</a>	Option UE 3		General Comment	I would suggest 1 move the power lines to a route north of the railway-much cheaper than underground 2 move the allotments to the west end of the site			455
517737	Lee Stevens		<a href="#">CSO1 7120</a>	Option UE 3		General Comment	I vote to keep our greenbelt land. We do not want more outsiders buying up second homes and ruining our beautiful land. No plan of road network shown for increase to already busy area. Is this going to impact more? Greed??			455
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	<a href="#">CSO1 7542</a>	Option UE 3	Support		We do not have any significant issues with this urban extension. All 4 options show that the built development will be located in Flood Zone 1 (low risk), which we are pleased to read. Preferred Option UE1 – 4, pages 110 -121 Fisheries Recreation and Biodiversity We support the land identified within the maps on pages P112 - 121 as			455

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>'land suitable for open space' as this will ensure the provision of a wetland corridor if future development occurs. The importance of a wetland corridor adjacent to the River Mude should also be highlighted in addition to the benefits of Flood/Water Attenuation. Overall issues for consideration are: flood risk / surface water drainage; SuDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; groundwater and contaminated land; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter.</p> <p>General comments on the preferred options document</p> <p>Flood Risk/ Surface Water Drainage</p> <p>This is a very high level document, and as such where individual sites 'considered for development' are detailed within the document we have checked these against our published Flood Map. However, it is important to remember that should any of the sites detailed in the document be considered further it is imperative East Dorset District and Christchurch Borough Councils consult our recently published 'Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding' maps to ascertain whether any of the sites, or part of a site, should not be considered further for development on grounds of flood risk (from surface water flooding).</p> <p>It may be necessary to carry out more detailed investigations for any site which is identified as being within an area susceptible to surface water flooding prior to making such a decision. This is because the maps are indicative in nature and therefore are only intended to prompt further investigation.</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Groundwater and Contaminated Land Any development needs to take into account Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control (PPS23). PPS23 has imposed a more precautionary approach to development proposals on land affected by contamination. Our Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice document (GP3) should also be taken into account.</p> <p>The following points should be considered for any new development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development proposals located within a groundwater Source Protection Zone will require consideration and risk assessment to show that the risk to controlled water from any new development will be low.</li> <li>• Developments in close proximity to abstraction boreholes will require a Hydrogeological Assessment to assess both the impact of the construction and from drainage. The suitability of SuDS at these sites would need to be established.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge, flows and levels.</li> <li>• If detrimental consequences to the water environment are likely, then agreed mitigation measures would be necessary.</li> <li>• Developers should adhere firmly to the Environment Agency's stance on SuDS.</li> <li>• The applicant should bear in mind that it is their responsibility to ensure that the development does not adversely affect any existing legal water interests in the area.</li> <li>• Local water interests in the area such as wells, springs, etc, and private abstractions must not be adversely affected either.</li> </ul> <p>Foul Drainage The proposed developments, both residential and commercial, should connect to a mains foul sewer, where possible. Wessex Water will need to be consulted at an early stage to confirm that there is</p>			



**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>sufficient capacity to cope with the additional demand.</p> <p>Any additional major road building should incorporate mitigation to accommodate storm flows and minimise pollution risk. New car parks will require adequate pollution prevention infrastructure to minimise pollution risk from run-off.</p> <p>Biodiversity We note that the Core Strategy supporting document ' 03 – Managing and safeguarding the Natural Environment Key issue Paper Oct 2010' advises 'Councils already have powers to provide policy protection to sites of biodiversity importance which are under significant pressure' and that 'this can be done later through site specific documents in the LDF'. We look forward to being consulted on these documents in due course.</p> <p>Sustainable Construction Sustainable design and construction should be implemented across the proposed development. This is important in limiting the effects of and adapting to climate change. Running costs for occupants can also be significantly reduced. The Code for Sustainable Homes should be complied with, achieving the highest level possible. For details on compliance with the Code the applicant is advised to visit: <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/codesustainabilitystandards">http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/codesustainabilitystandards</a></p> <p>All non-residential buildings should comply with BREEAM, the Environmental Assessment Method for Buildings. This sets the standard for best practice in sustainable design. More information can be found at : <a href="http://www.breeam.org/">http://www.breeam.org/</a></p> <p>Water Efficiency Water efficiency measures should be incorporated into all development. This conserves water and allows cost savings</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>for future occupants.                      This should include water efficient systems and fittings e.g. dual-flush toilets, water butts, water-saving taps, showers and baths, and appliances with the highest water efficiency rating (as a minimum).                      Grey water recycling and rainwater harvesting should be considered.                      For further guidance please see the following links:  <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/drought/31755.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/drought/31755.aspx</a>  <a href="http://www.savewatersavemoney.co.uk/">http://www.savewatersavemoney.co.uk/</a>                      Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)                      Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible with sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). This reduces flood risk through the use of soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, grassed swales, ponds etc.                      SuDS can also increase groundwater recharge, improve water quality and provide biodiversity amenity opportunities (inline with PPS9). A SuDS approach is encouraged by Approved Document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000.                      Further information on SUDS can be found in:                      - PPS25 Annex F: Managing Surface Water  <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/planningpolicystatement25.pdf">http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/planningpolicystatement25.pdf</a>                      - 'A Practice Guide Companion to PPS25'  <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/developmentflood">http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/developmentflood</a>                      - CIRIA C522 document Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems-design manual for England and Wales.                      - Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems (advice on design, adoption and maintenance issues, available at: <a 301="" 81="" 917="" 939"="" data-label="Page-Footer" href="http://www.environment-&lt;/a&gt;&lt;/p&gt; &lt;/td&gt; &lt;td&gt;&lt;/td&gt; &lt;td&gt;&lt;/td&gt; &lt;td&gt;&lt;/td&gt; &lt;/tr&gt; &lt;/tbody&gt; &lt;/table&gt; &lt;/div&gt; &lt;div data-bbox="> <p>Chapter 6 Christchurch Urban Extension</p> </a></p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Business/i cop_final_0704_872183.pdf Demolition and Construction To help the construction and demolition industry manage their activities to prevent pollution, sites should adhere to our Pollution Prevention Guidelines PPG 6: Working at Construction and Demolition Sites. This can be found at: <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/pollution/39083.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/pollution/39083.aspx</a>.</p> <p>Waste In accordance with the waste hierarchy, all development should consider reduction, reuse and recovery of waste in preference to off site incineration and disposal to landfill during site construction. Adequate space should be provided within developments for waste facilities e.g. recycling bins, composting etc. It must be ensured that there would be sufficient capacity at household recycling centres to cope with any additional demand.</p> <p>Infrastructure We understand that an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being undertaken. We look forward to being consulted on this in due course.</p>			
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		<a href="#">CSO19281</a>	Option UE 3	Object		<p>The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to</p>			455

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options.</p> <p>However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported.</p>			
360137	Mr Michael Green		<a href="#">CSO1 9266</a>	Option UE 3	Support		<p>Probably for most of us we would obviously go for Option 3. No doubt some residents would wish for nothing to happen. That is not really an Option. Christchurch must accept development of some sort.</p> <p>My immediate concerns which have been raised in parts of the Core Strategy:</p> <p>1) The existing A35 road which provides a segregation, and could make transport and access a problem.</p> <p>2) The Electricity Power pylons, whilst being unsightly, would effect efficient use of space for dwellings and thirdly might be considered a potential health hazard to any residents.</p>			455

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>3) The railway line provides a very solid separation of the areas for proposed development, plus there is only one access/egress road/railway bridge in the vicinity. This does provide challenges in respect of easy access and transport to the North side of the railway. Any chance of another railway bridge and road located closer to Roeshot hill</p> <p>For whatever dwelling development is approved, as commented earlier in my e-mail, there must be serious consideration given to sufficient open space and amenities for sport and leisure to not only service this area, but also make up for the current shortfall in other areas of the Borough.</p> <p>Young peoples needs must be given high priority, which must ensure safe and easy accessibility. Must be mindful that this will also apply to the allotments if they end up North of the railway.</p>			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">CSO1 9126</a>	Option UE 3	Object		<p>Option UE 1 – UE 4</p> <p>The preferred policy option states that it is 'not viable' to consider setting an affordable housing requirement above the 40% district-wide proposal in Section 14. However, there does not appear to be any evidence to support this view. We are concerned that the site will not even be able to support this 40% requirement given the constraints of the site. Furthermore, whilst the preferred option may not be able to support an affordable housing requirement above 40% Land to the South of Burton Village may be able to. Given the importance the Council attaches to providing the maximum level of affordable housing possible in the district over the Core Strategy period and the lack of other significant opportunities, this issue must be explored further. We recommend that the scope of the viability assessment is</p>			455

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>widened to include Options UE1 – UE4 and the realistic alternatives to the preferred options. This would include Land to the South of Burton Village.</p> <p>Until the issues relating to the viability of providing affordable housing on the preferred option for the urban extension can be satisfactorily resolved and other potential alternatives properly explored, we do not consider the preferred option to be sound. Providing significant affordable housing is purportedly one of the top priorities in the Core Strategy and failure to pursue the highest possible levels of affordable housing does not amount to an 'effective' policy, as set out in the tests of soundness in PPS12.</p> <p>Our client's site is located to the South of Burton and covers 3.8 hectares. There is an existing access off Salisbury Road which connects the site with Christchurch and the A35 Christchurch by-pass. To the south the site is bordered by the railway line. The site's boundary is shown in red on the site location enclosed with these representations.</p> <p>The client is currently exploring the possibility of delivering a rural exception scheme on the site with Raglan Housing Association and Christchurch Borough Council. Notwithstanding the outcome of these discussions, we still consider Land to the South of Burton Village to be the best location for the urban extension to Christchurch.</p> <p>The Wider Area We consider that our client's site would work best as part of a wider development area to the South of Burton. The remaining area that could be used as part of the urban extension is shown in blue on the enclosed site location plan. It covers the area contained between the railway line to the south, the settlement boundary of Burton to</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the north and Stony Lane and Salisbury Road to the east and west. This was considered as one of the options for the urban extension to Christchurch in the March 2008 Issues and Options consultation paper. We consider that it has been erroneously rejected as the preferred option.</p> <p>Estimated Site Capacity The total area of the Land to the South of Burton Village is 17.8 hectares; this could easily accommodate 600 dwellings. Our client's site makes up 3.8 hectares of the wider area; this site could therefore accommodate approximately 150 dwellings, when working at density level of 35 dph.</p>			
527818	Mr Nigel Lester	Synergy Housing Association	<a href="#">CSO1 8954</a>	Option UE 3	Support		Having looked at the proposals for each of the geographical areas and the proposed sites within those areas we can see no reason to disagree with the Local Authorities assessment and findings in each case, and would be very keen to become involved in the provision of affordable housing on any of these sites.			455
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">CSO1 9003</a>	Option UE 3		General Comment	<p>Chapter 6 Christchurch Urban Extension Options UE 1 - 4 Development in this location and the transportation considerations outlined in these options are supported. Provision of walking and cycling links to surrounding facilities, particularly to Hinton Admiral rail station as well as improvement to station facilities should also be included. Under 'Transport Infrastructure Requirements' the following wording is proposed: "multi-modal study, the A35 Route Management Project and a detailed Transport Assessment." Details will be progressed through the next stage of the master planning work informed by SEDMMTS and the A35 RMS. DCC Transport Planning officers have been</p>			455

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							involved in the stage 1 master planning work for this site and look forward to an ongoing involvement in the more detailed design stages.			
527907	Mr Hugh Merrett	President Roeshot Hill Allotment Association	<a href="#">CSO1 9106</a>	Option UE 3	Object		<p>Core Strategy – Urban Development Response to Consultation</p> <p>A meeting of members held on 28th October last unanimously endorsed a response to the several proposals put forward by the Council for the development of land at Roeshot Hill. We regret that we are unable to fully endorse any of the 4 options as set out in the Christchurch Courier, or the 6 options to be found on the Council's website. To avoid any confusion stemming from inconsistencies in these two publications, the Association states its position as follows:</p> <p>1. We wish to continue occupation of the allotments as it is presently enjoyed. In deciding this matter we are aware that the allotments may be bounded by a residential development of a significant density.</p> <p>2 Should the Council permit building development on any land adjoining the allotments, the Council should have regard to the privacy, security and other amenities presently enjoyed by the allotment holders, and in particular it should ensure that:</p> <p>a) there is adequate open space between the development and the allotment site.</p> <p>b) the allotment site will be suitably walled or fenced and gated.</p> <p>3 In the event that the Council permits building development on any of the land adjoining the allotments we support the prospect of the overhead power cables being buried underground. Land thus freed up for development would compensate for land retained as allotments.</p> <p>This Association has no mandate to comment on the wider implications of any development although there is general</p>			455



**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							concern among members as to the adequacy of the present road network to serve such as large number of potential users.			
534018	Mr David John Phillips		<a href="#">CSO1 9257</a>	Option UE 3	Object		<p>Re Proposals for possible development of open country space adjacent to A35 from Stoney Cross to Roeshot Belt (Taken as UE1 - UE4 options)</p> <p>I have lived in Burton for almost 40 years during which time major home development took place in the 1970's / 1980's subsequently having an adverse impact on the atmosphere of village life. Vandalism and crime increased at a time when policing and services were reduced. Regular policing in the village no longer exists.</p> <p>Ill-advised adjustments to the Stoney Lane junctions creates constant traffic congestion, taking up to 20 minutes to travel 1.5 miles from my home into Christchurch at certain times of the day. The filter onto the A35 is virtually redundant. Due to this the village has become a by-pass for motorists mostly driving at beyond the speed limit past two infant schools. Villagers are concerned that a serious accident is imminent.</p> <p>Development at Stoney Cross will significantly add to the volume of traffic through the village creating up to an additional 2500 cars affecting the environment and the quality of village life. Whilst we accept the need for new houses and reasonable change during the past 20/30 years the Christchurch area has been developed beyond recognition. What used to be pleasant open space are now crammed with mostly budget type housing. To build a further 1250 homes – I assume mostly for the benefit of people out of this area – would result in an additional 3000 plus people and 2000 plus cars in a</p>			455

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							location that already has the most saturated traffic congestion in Dorset. To proceed with this proposal the Council would be acting in a most irresponsible manner. Needless to say, services such as policing and schooling for up to 2000 additional children in a few years time will continue to be cut. This is also at a time when the closure of Christchurch Hospital is planned. Perhaps the Council should concentrate on the existing people currently living in Christchurch – the people who pay increased taxes year on year, but continue to get less value for their money. Some areas in Christchurch town centre i.e. Fairmile and Avon Beach are in decline. In particular the Somerford Road from Purewell Cross to the junction with the A337 for years has suffered from serious neglect with various businesses coming and going without stability or improvement. If the Council thinks saturating the area with a further 1250 houses to meet spurious targets is necessary the existing sites in Somerford would be a better alternative for some new housing development than spoiling surrounding open countryside. In any event considerable improvement will need to be made to our existing road structure which as a top priority would include the urgent construction of a Christchurch town by-pass.			
538360	Mrs Ann Broomfield		<a href="#">CSO2 2735</a>	Option UE 3	Object		Have you all gone round the twist, 600 houses at Roeshot Hill. You can't get to work now without a car jam, and you can't get in the Doctors and Dentists, I think you've all lost the plot.			455
360074	Mr D DIXON		<a href="#">CSO1 27</a>	Option UE 4	Object		This is supposed to be a proper consultation. This consultation is ridiculous as it is like asking someone if they would rather be shot, hanged, stabbed or poisoned. Obviously the reply would be			458

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>none of those options.</p> <p>In this document we are offered four options each involving more building, when what is wanted is no more building.</p> <p>The reason people choose to live in Christchurch is because it has not been 'urbanised', it has a low crime level, it is reasonably prosperous and it is a place where 'time is pleasant'. More building and development will only mean an increase in population, a fall in property prices, an increased burden on Council services and environmental detriment. The area will attract less high net worth individuals who are not a burden on the existing rate payers and who can support more up market shops in Christchurch and Highcliffe shopping centres.</p> <p>We like it the way it is. stop encouraging the developers to ruin the town.</p>			
359945	Mr Geoff Bantock		<a href="#">CSO9 44</a>	Option UE 4	Object		<p>This is the least worst of the 4 options. The community would be isolated between the railway line and A35 with no employment opportunities within walking distance. The shop would not be viable - the one at Hoburne was not due to the proximity to Sainsburys. The community centre would not be viable - the one at Hoburne was never built and the one at Mudeford Wood is facing the axe. It would be far better to develop land to the east of Burton to provide housing and employment opportunities so that Burton becomes a district Centre like Highcliffe. Burton already has a community and would certainly benefit from better shops. Burton is closer to the airport where most new jobs will be created and with a better access along Avon Causeway will reduce the pressure on the A35. Increasing the size of Burton will lead to better bus service provision to Christchurch and Bournemouth.</p>	Locate housing, open space and retail / community facilities east of Burton		458

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359636	Mr Chris Bartlett		<a href="#">CSO2 615</a>	Option UE 4	Support		Of the 4 options this is the least bad. Least number of houses and at least green space South of railway where occupants need it.	Improved transport links to A338 need to be added. Allocation of cycle/pedestrian way along railway boundary of whole area and feeding development and Sainsbury's so that people in development can use it as quiet/safe route to from houses/shops/buses and station.		458
497394	Ms Sue Melbourne		<a href="#">CSO2 300</a>	Option UE 4	Object		Object to building on land near Burton Railway. Land usually has horse grazing there. It is a flood plain since it is covered in rain water each year. Previously the Council built on meadows near Purewell. This land had the same problem and the properties subsequently subsided. Recognise that Christchurch has a need for housing but the long term issues of subsidence, insurance and flooding need to be considered. It is a green area and is beautiful and needs to be preserved.	Suggest an area of rough ground on Purewell (vacant land) or land where there used to be a petrol station should be used instead.		458
500413	Mrs Susan Read		<a href="#">CSO4 289</a>	Option UE 4	Support		I have reviewed the documentation issued for this consultation and my preferred option is UE4.			458
500416	Dr Harry Read		<a href="#">CSO4 294</a>	Option UE 4	Support		I have reviewed the documentation issued for this consultation, on this policy activity, re the urban extension near Mudeford and Highcliffe and my preferred option is UE4.			458
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	<a href="#">CSO1 0784</a>	Option UE 4	Support		Limit dwelling numbers within Option UE 4 to 600. Add new urban extension sites (see separate representations).	Limit dwelling numbers within Option UE 4 to 600. Add new urban extension sites (see separate representations).		458
508467	Mr Trevor Crutcher		<a href="#">CSO1 1816</a>	Option UE 4	Support					458

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359818	Mr W A Roach		<a href="#">CSO1 2793</a>	Option UE 4	Support		A) I am rather concerned that any larger numbers would be too big for the size available. B) Space is too small for all the services required. C) Please leave the allotments alone they are, I understand, liked by all the people that have them. The increase in the numbers of people that would fill the number of dwellings. Would possible be about 1000+ and thus overcrowd Christchurch high St at shopping times and would put off holiday makers / visitors in the summer. D) To expensive to move.			458
359836	Mr & Mrs L Jackson		<a href="#">CSO1 3701</a>	Option UE 4	Object		We don't need more homes the schools and doctors can not cope now the road gets jammed now do we need a further 500 cars + and services. If you must build leave that area as it is and tidy up other areas and pos build there. E.g. op Somerford Estate.			458
360975	Mrs Julia Woodward		<a href="#">CSO1 1994</a>	Option UE 4	Support		Comments from Christchurch Urban Extension leaflet The present infrastructure and road system of Christchurch town is unlikely to be expanded in view of current financial constraints imposed by government and I feel it would be detrimental to our quality of life to carry out any larger development than that contained in UE4, at least for the present. However in principle I am much in favour of locating power cables underground rather than overhead.			458
361308	Mr John Tandy		<a href="#">CSO1 2614</a>	Option UE 4	Object		I do not believe building on greenbelt land to be the answer to this problem. If there is a shortage of housing it cannot be avoided or cured by building on this area of greenbelt. If Christchurch is "full", then extra capacity needs to be met by regeneration of Brownfield sites. These sites may well be			458

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							in other areas or towns. The availability of dwellings in Christchurch is finite and should regulate the population. It is not possible to keep increasing housing stock, it would be better to control the population of the area to a level that fits available services and facilities.			
507458	Mr and Mrs Antill		<a href="#">CSO1 1013</a>	Option UE 4	Support					458
509383	Mr Clive Richardson		<a href="#">CSO1 2642</a>	Option UE 4	Object		I have Lived here all of my life and I recall my mother saying all around the Somerford Estate was under water, I realise people need somewhere to live but I can see for myself there are many Brownfield sites available, with probably no hope of any new business locating here (high council rates etc). Safe to say I am against any more building on our lovely green spaces.			458
509426	Mr & Mrs K Roberts		<a href="#">CSO1 2693</a>	Option UE 4	Object		We do not agree with any of the above options. We strongly disagree with and do not like any options that would put large numbers of affordable (& social?) housing in close proximity to the largest housing estate in Christchurch. We feel affordable (& social) housing should be dispersed throughout the borough, not all together in east, or west, Christchurch. The roads are congested enough without adding to the problem by building in the east of the area. We suggest building smaller numbers of houses on plots of unsightly land i.e. the old gas works in Bridge Street, the site of the New Inn on Fairmile, the area in front of the new post office sorting office in Fairmile. There must be many more unsightly plots that could be utilised in this way. It may cost more to do it this way, but the quality of life and integration of affordable housing will benefit the town and residents in the long term.			458

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
509503	Mr & Mrs C & S Andreotti		<a href="#">CSO1 2702</a>	Option UE 4	Support					458
509584	Mr G Smith		<a href="#">CSO1 2746</a>	Option UE 4	Support					458
509600	Mr R Lake		<a href="#">CSO1 2754</a>	Option UE 4	Support					458
509605	Mrs Gwen Lake		<a href="#">CSO1 2755</a>	Option UE 4	Support					458
509623	Mr M F Chapman		<a href="#">CSO1 2757</a>	Option UE 4	Support					458
509924	Ms Linda Poulter		<a href="#">CSO1 2915</a>	Option UE 4	Support		I think that 1250 dwellings is too much, would the houses be affordable homes, or 3/4 bed roomed executive homes? I believe the overhead power cables should be moved underground anyway! What about the Grange school – will it be able to cope with the amount of new intakes?			458
509937	Miss H Taplin		<a href="#">CSO1 2927</a>	Option UE 4	Support		1) I hope properties built would have parking facilities, public transport is available, but most people have cars and if insufficient parking on site, vehicles will spill over onto other areas. 2) Can the present schools cope with large numbers of extra children? 3) Will there be work available for extra numbers of people? 4) Will you include affordable housing for older people? 5) How many people does the proposed number of houses equate to?			458
510079	Mr		<a href="#">CSO1</a>	Option	Support		Can we have option UE4 with power cables			458

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	C Cunningham		<a href="#">3001</a>	UE 4			underground?			
510083	Mr Alan Trussell		<a href="#">CSO1 3003</a>	Option UE 4	Support		I have chosen the lowest housing density, to allow residents to live in a civilised and peaceful way. I hope for their sakes that no further "rat-runs" are created as in my location.			458
510123	Mr B Mattingly		<a href="#">CSO1 3023</a>	Option UE 4	Support		I prefer a less dense development that goes with this option with the recreational space south of the railway.			458
510437	Mr M J Robson		<a href="#">CSO1 3179</a>	Option UE 4	Support		<p>1. In these straightened times there can be no question but that the least impact option must be chosen: there are no funds to cope with increased demands on schools, health facilities, roads, water, sewerage, and electricity networks. The cost of public transport must be included.</p> <p>2. The existing allotments must be allowed to continue as is: to think otherwise is just to waste time and money, and cause a lot of unnecessary grief to long-term residents of the town. Local residents must be respected.</p> <p>3. It would be sensible to reserve the eastern "pointed" end of the site as a potential extension to the existing allotment area.</p> <p>4. Before any consideration is given to moving the existing allotment site, the full cost to the council of establishing a new site, with new access roads water supply and other normal facilities, and all necessary soil improvement must be established beyond argument, and to the satisfaction of the present allotment holders.</p> <p>5. The quantification of the supposed housing demand needs to be carefully reviewed, to eliminate demand from incomers and otherwise ineligible</p>			458



**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							demanders. Such space as there is must be reserved for natives of the borough, especially where social/rental housing is concerned.			
510540	Mr N Hicks		<a href="#">CSO1 3300</a>	Option UE 4	Support		Some concerns over access from new development onto A35. Will another roundabout be built to the north of Sainsbury's roundabout? The road between Sainsbury's and the Hinton Admiral Station turning is already extremely busy. There have been several accidents near the Cat & Fiddle Pub.			458
510544	Mr I Morton		<a href="#">CSO1 3375</a>	Option UE 4	Object		Strongly oppose to all options especially strongly to the first three, but also to option 4. You have not said anything about specifically how you will meet the additional transport needs and traffic, what will happen about the pylons, and also your additional proposed grab of green space. There are plenty of other spaces in Christchurch to build on. Christchurch would be better served by bringing more work to the town, simultaneously building prosperity and outing traffic miles.			458
510768	Mr & Mrs Weatherer		<a href="#">CSO1 3489</a>	Option UE 4	Object		Keep the green belt intact. Amenities cannot support further development. We already have a traffic problem in Christchurch.			458
510779	Ms Muriel Catry		<a href="#">CSO1 3505</a>	Option UE 4	Object		None of the above – keep the green belt, Christchurch is already over-populated, no more houses and increased traffic!			458
510796	Mr R Reid		<a href="#">CSO1 3523</a>	Option UE 4	Object		Keep all the green belt unvandalised.			458
510808	Mr R Bose		<a href="#">CSO1 3532</a>	Option UE 4	Support		I do not want any of these proposals to go ahead; as I think it would spoil an attractive, traditional green area. I think it would be transformed into yet another ghetto, with its			458

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							social problems and pollution. I know however, that what I think makes no difference to your decision, so I'm opting for the least offensive one.			
511141	Mrs L J Pettersson		<a href="#">CSO1 3871</a>	Option UE 4	Support		Is this area subject to flooding? I have seen west of this plan development flooded on lots of occasions? But I am sure you must know this.			458
359304	Mr Edwin Macknamara	Clerk Bransgore Parish Council	<a href="#">CSO1 7678</a>	Option UE 4	Support		I am writing to confirm that Bransgore Parish Council would prefer Option 4 within the Christchurch Urban Extension proposals. The existing character and appearance of the area adjoining Bransgore and the New Forest National Park boundary should be protected. The Parish Council would, therefore wish to be involved in the ongoing discussion and be consulted on the Development Plan Document as more specific detail becomes available.			458
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">CSO1 7475</a>	Option UE 4	Object		DWT object to this option and support the concern of Natural England that it would not be possible to provide SANG of sufficient quality south of the railway to divert new residents away from the nearby heathlands, and therefore would not meet the requirements of the habitat regulations.			458
359482	Ms Helen Powell	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	<a href="#">CSO1 8673</a>	Option UE 4	Object		This option limits the provision of SANG to the area south of the railway. Locating the SANG south of the railway line will not in our view provide mitigation of suitable quality to divert recreational pressure away from nearby Dorset Heaths and the New Forest.			458
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of	<a href="#">CSO1 8670</a>	Option UE 4	Object		At this stage, given the uncertainty over the likely impacts and over the provision of mitigation measures, we object to options UE1, UE2, UE3 and UE4.			458

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Birds								
361028	Ms Helen Patton	Head of Policy and Plans New Forest National Park Authority	<a href="#">CSO1 8933</a>	Option UE 4	Support		The Authority supports the preferred option for locating new housing south of the railway line. This accords with the Authority's comments to Christchurch Borough Council in the past and is consistent with the conclusions of the Broadway Malyan master planning work. As you are aware, the Authority has stated in the past that housing development north of the railway line would have a far greater impact in terms of visual and landscape impact on the National Park where long distance views are offered from Burton Common, when compared to development south of the railway line.	In order to reflect the importance of this approach, the Authority considers that the section heading should be expanded to include reference to the National Park and each of the four options should be expanded to include reference to the National Park, as at present only the Dorset Heathlands are referred to. For example Option UE2 states; "...there is a requirement to provide a SANG to reduce the recreational impact on the heathlands generated by new development in this location."		458
517736	Mr Bob Maddock		<a href="#">CSO1 7116</a>	Option UE 4		General Comment	I would suggest 1 move the power lines to a route north of the railway-much cheaper than underground 2 move the allotments to the west end of the site			458
517737	Lee Stevens		<a href="#">CSO1 7121</a>	Option UE 4		General Comment	I vote to keep our greenbelt land. We do not want more outsiders buying up second homes and ruining our beautiful land. No plan of road network shown for increase to already busy area. Is this going to impact more? Greed??			458
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	<a href="#">CSO1 7543</a>	Option UE 4	Support		We do not have any significant issues with this urban extension. All 4 options show that the built development will be located in Flood Zone 1 (low risk), which we are pleased to read. Preferred Option UE1 – 4, pages 110 -121 Fisheries Recreation and Biodiversity We support the land identified within the maps on pages P112 - 121 as 'land suitable for open space' as this will ensure the provision of a wetland corridor if			458

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>future development occurs. The importance of a wetland corridor adjacent to the River Mude should also be highlighted in addition to the benefits of Flood/Water Attenuation. Overall issues for consideration are: flood risk / surface water drainage; SuDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; groundwater and contaminated land; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter.</p> <p>General comments on the preferred options document</p> <p>Flood Risk/ Surface Water Drainage This is a very high level document, and as such where individual sites 'considered for development' are detailed within the document we have checked these against our published Flood Map. However, it is important to remember that should any of the sites detailed in the document be considered further it is imperative East Dorset District and Christchurch Borough Councils consult our recently published 'Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding' maps to ascertain whether any of the sites, or part of a site, should not be considered further for development on grounds of flood risk (from surface water flooding).</p> <p>It may be necessary to carry out more detailed investigations for any site which is identified as being within an area susceptible to surface water flooding prior to making such a decision. This is because the maps are indicative in nature and therefore are only intended to prompt further investigation.</p> <p>Groundwater and Contaminated Land Any development needs to take into</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>account Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control (PPS23). PPS23 has imposed a more precautionary approach to development proposals on land affected by contamination. Our Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice document (GP3) should also be taken into account.</p> <p>The following points should be considered for any new development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development proposals located within a groundwater Source Protection Zone will require consideration and risk assessment to show that the risk to controlled water from any new development will be low.</li> <li>• Developments in close proximity to abstraction boreholes will require a Hydrogeological Assessment to assess both the impact of the construction and from drainage. The suitability of SuDS at these sites would need to be established.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge, flows and levels.</li> <li>• If detrimental consequences to the water environment are likely, then agreed mitigation measures would be necessary.</li> <li>• Developers should adhere firmly to the Environment Agency's stance on SuDS.</li> <li>• The applicant should bear in mind that it is their responsibility to ensure that the development does not adversely affect any existing legal water interests in the area.</li> <li>• Local water interests in the area such as wells, springs, etc, and private abstractions must not be adversely affected either.</li> </ul> <p>Foul Drainage</p> <p>The proposed developments, both residential and commercial, should connect to a mains foul sewer, where possible. Wessex Water will need to be consulted at an early stage to confirm that there is sufficient capacity to cope with the additional demand.</p>			

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Any additional major road building should incorporate mitigation to accommodate storm flows and minimise pollution risk. New car parks will require adequate pollution prevention infrastructure to minimise pollution risk from run-off.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity</b> We note that the Core Strategy supporting document ' 03 – Managing and safeguarding the Natural Environment Key issue Paper Oct 2010' advises 'Councils already have powers to provide policy protection to sites of biodiversity importance which are under significant pressure' and that 'this can be done later through site specific documents in the LDF'. We look forward to being consulted on these documents in due course.</p> <p><b>Sustainable Construction</b> Sustainable design and construction should be implemented across the proposed development. This is important in limiting the effects of and adapting to climate change. Running costs for occupants can also be significantly reduced. The Code for Sustainable Homes should be complied with, achieving the highest level possible. For details on compliance with the Code the applicant is advised to visit: <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/codesustainabilitystandards">http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/codesustainabilitystandards</a></p> <p>All non-residential buildings should comply with BREEAM, the Environmental Assessment Method for Buildings. This sets the standard for best practice in sustainable design. More information can be found at : <a href="http://www.breeam.org/">http://www.breeam.org/</a></p> <p><b>Water Efficiency</b> Water efficiency measures should be incorporated into all development. This conserves water and allows cost savings for future occupants. This should include water efficient systems</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>and fittings e.g. dual-flush toilets, water butts, water-saving taps, showers and baths, and appliances with the highest water efficiency rating (as a minimum). Grey water recycling and rainwater harvesting should be considered. For further guidance please see the following links:</p> <p><a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/drought/31755.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/drought/31755.aspx</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.savewatersavemoney.co.uk/">http://www.savewatersavemoney.co.uk/</a></p> <p>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible with sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). This reduces flood risk through the use of soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, grassed swales, ponds etc. SuDS can also increase groundwater recharge, improve water quality and provide biodiversity amenity opportunities (inline with PPS9). A SuDS approach is encouraged by Approved Document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000. Further information on SUDS can be found in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPS25 Annex F: Managing Surface Water <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/planningpolicystatement25.pdf">http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/planningpolicystatement25.pdf</a></li> <li>- 'A Practice Guide Companion to PPS25' <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/developmentflood">http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/developmentflood</a></li> <li>- CIRIA C522 document Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems-design manual for England and Wales.</li> <li>- Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems (advice on design, adoption and maintenance issues, available at: <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Business/iop_final_0704_872183.pdf">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Business/iop_final_0704_872183.pdf</a></li> </ul>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Demolition and Construction To help the construction and demolition industry manage their activities to prevent pollution, sites should adhere to our Pollution Prevention Guidelines PPG 6: Working at Construction and Demolition Sites. This can be found at: <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/pollution/39083.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/pollution/39083.aspx</a>.</p> <p>Waste In accordance with the waste hierarchy, all development should consider reduction, reuse and recovery of waste in preference to off site incineration and disposal to landfill during site construction. Adequate space should be provided within developments for waste facilities e.g. recycling bins, composting etc. It must be ensured that there would be sufficient capacity at household recycling centres to cope with any additional demand.</p> <p>Infrastructure We understand that an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being undertaken. We look forward to being consulted on this in due course.</p>			
359327	Cllr. Mr Peter Hall	Town Centre Ward Christchurch Borough Council	<a href="#">CSO1 9360</a>	Option UE 4	Support		I understand that no development will take place for at least seven years. When development takes place, we must provide the infrastructure to cope with the developments.			458
359875	Dr Lesley Haskins		<a href="#">CSO1 9282</a>	Option UE 4	Object		The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the			458



**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options. However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported.</p>			
359277	Mr Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King	<a href="#">CSO19127</a>	Option UE 4	Object		<p>Option UE 1 – UE 4 The preferred policy option states that it is 'not viable' to consider setting an affordable housing requirement above the 40% district-wide proposal in Section 14. However, there does not appear to be any evidence to support this view. We are concerned that the site will not even be able to support this 40% requirement given the constraints of the site. Furthermore, whilst the preferred option may not be able</p>			458

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>to support an affordable housing requirement above 40% Land to the South of Burton Village may be able to. Given the importance the Council attaches to providing the maximum level of affordable housing possible in the district over the Core Strategy period and the lack of other significant opportunities, this issue must be explored further. We recommend that the scope of the viability assessment is widened to include Options UE1 – UE4 and the realistic alternatives to the preferred options. This would include Land to the South of Burton Village.</p> <p>Until the issues relating to the viability of providing affordable housing on the preferred option for the urban extension can be satisfactorily resolved and other potential alternatives properly explored, we do not consider the preferred option to be sound. Providing significant affordable housing is purportedly one of the top priorities in the Core Strategy and failure to pursue the highest possible levels of affordable housing does not amount to an 'effective' policy, as set out in the tests of soundness in PPS12.</p> <p>Our client's site is located to the South of Burton and covers 3.8 hectares. There is an existing access off Salisbury Road which connects the site with Christchurch and the A35 Christchurch by-pass. To the south the site is bordered by the railway line. The site's boundary is shown in red on the site location enclosed with these representations.</p> <p>The client is currently exploring the possibility of delivering a rural exception scheme on the site with Raglan Housing Association and Christchurch Borough Council. Notwithstanding the outcome of these discussions, we still consider Land to the South of Burton Village to be the best location for the urban extension to</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Christchurch. The Wider Area We consider that our client's site would work best as part of a wider development area to the South of Burton. The remaining area that could be used as part of the urban extension is shown in blue on the enclosed site location plan. It covers the area contained between the railway line to the south, the settlement boundary of Burton to the north and Stony Lane and Salisbury Road to the east and west. This was considered as one of the options for the urban extension to Christchurch in the March 2008 Issues and Options consultation paper. We consider that it has been erroneously rejected as the preferred option.</p> <p>Estimated Site Capacity The total area of the Land to the South of Burton Village is 17.8 hectares; this could easily accommodate 600 dwellings. Our client's site makes up 3.8 hectares of the wider area; this site could therefore accommodate approximately 150 dwellings, when working at density level of 35 dph.</p>			
527818	Mr Nigel Lester	Synergy Housing Association	<a href="#">CSO1 8955</a>	Option UE 4	Support		Having looked at the proposals for each of the geographical areas and the proposed sites within those areas we can see no reason to disagree with the Local Authorities assessment and findings in each case, and would be very keen to become involved in the provision of affordable housing on any of these sites.			458
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	<a href="#">CSO1 9004</a>	Option UE 4		General Comment	Chapter 6 Christchurch Urban Extension Options UE 1 - 4 Development in this location and the transportation considerations outlined in these options are supported. Provision of walking and cycling links to surrounding facilities, particularly to Hinton Admiral rail station as well as improvement to station			458

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>facilities should also be included. Under 'Transport Infrastructure Requirements' the following wording is proposed:                      "multi-modal study, the A35 Route Management Project and a detailed Transport Assessment."                      Details will be progressed through the next stage of the master planning work informed by SEDMMTS and the A35 RMS. DCC Transport Planning officers have been involved in the stage 1 master planning work for this site and look forward to an ongoing involvement in the more detailed design stages.</p>			
527907	Mr Hugh Merrett	President Roeshot Hill Allotment Association	<a href="#">CSO1 9109</a>	Option UE 4	Object		<p>Core Strategy – Urban Development Response to Consultation                      A meeting of members held on 28th October last unanimously endorsed a response to the several proposals put forward by the Council for the development of land at Roeshot Hill. We regret that we are unable to fully endorse any of the 4 options as set out in the Christchurch Courier, or the 6 options to be found on the Council's website. To avoid any confusion stemming from inconsistencies in these two publications, the Association states its position as follows:                      1. We wish to continue occupation of the allotments as it is presently enjoyed. In deciding this matter we are aware that the allotments may be bounded by a residential development of a significant density.                      2. Should the Council permit building development on any land adjoining the allotments, the Council should have regard to the privacy, security and other amenities presently enjoyed by the allotment holders, and in particular it should ensure that:                      a) there is adequate open space between the development and the allotment site.                      b) the allotment site will be suitably walled or fenced and gated.</p>			458

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>3 In the event that the Council permits building development on any of the land adjoining the allotments we support the prospect of the overhead power cables being buried underground. Land thus freed up for development would compensate for land retained as allotments.</p> <p>This Association has no mandate to comment on the wider implications of any development although there is general concern among members as to the adequacy of the present road network to serve such as large number of potential users.</p>			
534018	Mr David John Phillips		<a href="#">CSO1 9258</a>	Option UE 4	Object		<p>Re Proposals for possible development of open country space adjacent to A35 from Stoney Cross to Roeshot Belt (Taken as UE1 - UE4 options)</p> <p>I have lived in Burton for almost 40 years during which time major home development took place in the 1970's / 1980's subsequently having an adverse impact on the atmosphere of village life. Vandalism and crime increased at a time when policing and services were reduced. Regular policing in the village no longer exists.</p> <p>Ill-advised adjustments to the Stoney Lane junctions creates constant traffic congestion, taking up to 20 minutes to travel 1.5 miles from my home into Christchurch at certain times of the day. The filter onto the A35 is virtually redundant. Due to this the village has become a by-pass for motorists mostly driving at beyond the speed limit past two infant schools. Villagers are concerned that a serious accident is imminent.</p> <p>Development at Stoney Cross will significantly add to the volume of traffic through the village creating up to an additional 2500 cars affecting the environment and the quality of village life.</p>			458

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Whilst we accept the need for new houses and reasonable change during the past 20/30 years the Christchurch area has been developed beyond recognition. What used to be pleasant open space are now crammed with mostly budget type housing. To build a further 1250 homes – I assume mostly for the benefit of people out of this area – would result in an additional 3000 plus people and 2000 plus cars in a location that already has the most saturated traffic congestion in Dorset. To proceed with this proposal the Council would be acting in a most irresponsible manner. Needless to say, services such as policing and schooling for up to 2000 additional children in a few years time will continue to be cut. This is also at a time when the closure of Christchurch Hospital is planned. Perhaps the Council should concentrate on the existing people currently living in Christchurch – the people who pay increased taxes year on year, but continue to get less value for their money. Some areas in Christchurch town centre i.e. Fairmile and Avon Beach are in decline. In particular the Somerford Road from Purewell Cross to the junction with the A337 for years has suffered from serious neglect with various businesses coming and going without stability or improvement. If the Council thinks saturating the area with a further 1250 houses to meet spurious targets is necessary the existing sites in Somerford would be a better alternative for some new housing development than spoiling surrounding open countryside. In any event considerable improvement will need to be made to our existing road structure which as a top priority would include the urgent construction of a Christchurch town by-pass.</p>			
538360	Mrs		<a href="#">CSO2</a>	Option	Object		Have you all gone round the twist, 600			458

**Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses**

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support/ Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections - Reasons why you support or object	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Ann Broomfield		<a href="#">2736</a>	UE 4			houses at Roeshot Hill. You can't get to work now without a car jam, and you can't get in the Doctors and Dentists, I think you've all lost the plot.			