

Events: Core Strategy Pre-Submission Chapter 11 Verwood, Three Legged Cross, St Leonards, St Ives and West Moors Housing, Employment and Centres

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3330	11.4		No				No	The site has not been the subject of biological survey. Development will need to take account of the fact that it has been mapped by the RSPB as having heathland restoration potential. Being contiguous with N2K heathland in the West Moors Petroleum Depot, it could make a useful contribution to delivering coherent ecological networks (NPPF para 109). The larger area has remained undisturbed for many years. There is known biodiversity interest in the publicly accessible area alongside the Castleman Trailway. Gas and water mains would preclude that area from development. Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species Scoring should be negative not neutral/unknown. The land is adjacent to N2K heathland and presents opportunities for heathland restoration and expansion. The extent of that opportunity should be informed by survey.					523	
652701	Mr Peter Knight		CSPS568	11.5	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The area of SANG is small in relation to the population at the eastern end of Verwood considering that in the E.D. New Neighbourhoods Stage 1 baseline report-Additional sites, it stated under 3.1.3 that the site had been suggested by the Trustees and Developers of the land that ('They stated that all other sites considered for Verwood were in the west of the settlement and the accompanying SANG provision would therefore' only serve residents to the west and not relieve pressure on the heathland to the East') then a larger SANG area must be needed. Natural England in there guidance to SANG's quote pathways and routes for walkers and dogs of between 2.5 to 5 kilometres I doubt that these distances can be achieved on this site. I making the provision of this SANG why have the designers tucked it away to the back of the site if it is to be accessed by the local residents?	If this site is to be adopted within the Core Strategy then surely the site layout would have to be rotated through 90degrees moving the houses to the Northern corner of the site to enable the SANG to run from east to west across the south side to enable easy public access and increase the overall size of the SANG to attempt to meet the minimum criteria.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			524	
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS1534	11.5		No	No				The para should refer to both Bugdens Copse which is SSSI woodland and Bugdens Meadows, SSSI neutral grassland. The NE citation is at http://www.english-nature.org.uk/citation/citation_photo/1006027.pdf	Amend to: The woodland and neutral grassland SSSI Bugdens Copse and Meadows lie within the urban area.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			524	
360113	Mr Kenneth Parsons		CSPS56	11.7	Yes	No					hi i was born in Verwood 1950 in manor road in the 40 years i lived there i have never known the river crane to flood.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			526	
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS1535	11.7		No	No				The River Crane (part of the Moors River system SSSI) runs along the western and southern boundaries of the town. This has implications for any development proposals that lie within its catchment.	Amend para to: The River Crane (part of the Moors River system SSSI) that runs along the western and southern boundaries of the	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			526	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
												town is subject to flooding				
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Dorset County Council	CSPS2026	11.7							As the Lead Local Flood Authority, Dorset County Council has responsibility to develop a strategy to tackle local flood risks and to ensure that other plans and policies accord with it. A number of references in the Core Strategy need updating and new ones included to ensure that it reflects the County Council's responsibilities in respect of flood risk management.	Amend text to read: "The River Crane that runs along the southern boundary of the town is subject to main river and local flooding."	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		526	
649505	Miss Dawn Leader		CSPS301	11.10	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	This statement is unsound. I know receptionists at both surgeries and the wait for a routine appointment is anywhere from 10 to 14days	The station road surgery needs to be expanded with extra parking	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		529	
652701	Mr Peter Knight		CSPS521	11.10	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Currently there are two medical practices in Verwood ,the average waiting time to see your own doctor is running at 7-10 days, urgent cases are seen by a triage system .Whilst this works at present I doubt that the system will manage a further increase in population of the order proposed within the core strategy without an additional practice or an increase of full time doctors at the existing practices.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		529	
652710	Mr Gary Balmer		CSPS473	11.10	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	the wait is over a week for a routine appointment at Station Road and there is no way to get from VTSW5 to either the doctors or the day care centre without having a car. I have to go to a dentist in Fordingbridge to get a NHS dentist, are the people who you expect to use the affordable housing going to be able to afford a private dentist as well as the cost of a car to get there?	a doctors and NHS dentist should be built before an extra housing, affordable or otherwise.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		529	
649505	Miss Dawn Leader		CSPS234	11.11	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Verwood is not well served by Doctors, there are 2 surgeries and in both a routine appointment with your own doctor means an average wait for 10-14 days because they are so busy.	Better doctors facilities would be needed before the population increases any further.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		530	
644728	Mr Ronald Johnstone		CSPS37	11.13	Yes	No	Yes				The document fails to take into account the volume of cars which currently convey children to school. The local roads supplying the First school and Emmanuel are choked every morning and afternoon at present.No consideration has been given to the future in this respect. Parents are banned at present from the schools campus because of their bad behaviour and this attitude continues.A new feeder road at Springfield is not the answer as they will merely treat it as another car park.To insist that children walk or cycle to school is not good enough as parents will continue as now.Parking at present can be on pavements ,double parked in narrow roads or across driveways .This has been the case for several years now and getting worse. I have taken this up with local councillors and a traffic officer from Dorset all to no avail.Emails are available for you to see if required. If you are to beat the present problem with childhood obesity something must be done NOW	The new school must be built on a site where sufficient space is available for pick up and drop offs and it must be controlled or it will get out of hand .If that is not feasible then sufficient yellow paint must be purchased to create safe passage for drivers and residents alike.There must be a visible presence by Traffic Wardens which are non existent at present.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		532	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
652710	Mr Gary Balmer		CSPS474	11.16	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Congestion is particularly bad in Verwood, especially in the town centre when Tesco lorries are parked on one side of the road and Baileys lorries on the other and the school busses stopping all along that part of the road. Something needs to be done about the lorry loading or conjestion will get worse in Verwood.	Loading restrictions and school bus lay bys need to be made.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		535	
652994	Mrs Kathleen Leader		CSPS543	11.16	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes Verwood does suffer with congestion significantly. Around the schools, around the town centre when lorries are parked both sides of the road servicing Tescos and Baileys. All the station doctors car park and coming into verwood and leaving Verwood via the B3081 each weekday.	this sentence should be left out	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		535	
588532	Mr and Mrs Nick Hunt		CSPS47	Policy VTSW1			No			No	New housing in Verwood should not be permitted unless it is required to meet local needs. More housing would not be sustainable unless it is related to local employment opportunities.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		541	
649505	Miss Dawn Leader		CSPS302	Policy VTSW1	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	more hairdressers, estate agents and banks are not neccessary, any extra capacity should be varied and most importantly more car parking needs to be provided as there is not enough now in the mornings let along with more units. Shops are all very well but these only provide very few jobs, perhaps we should be thinking about trying to keep people in Verwood rather than everyone disappearing to Bournemouth, Poole and Southampton to work each day.	More office space and car parking as well as more varied shops.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		541	
507546	Mr Nigel Pugsley	BNP Paribas Real Estate	CSPS705	Policy VTSW1							Royal Mail has a number of land holdings in the District of East Dorset and the Borough of Christchurch all of which are strategically important, these are as follows: Verwood Delivery Office, 2 Bessemer Close, Verwood, BH32 6RY As such should any of the land surrounding Royal Mail's sites be redeveloped, it would be vital that any new uses be designed and managed so that they are both cognisant and sensitive to Royal Mail's operations.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		541	
654030	Mr Jim Lumley		CSPS659	Policy VTSW1	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	The town centre does need to be improved to provide for more residents but the council really needs to consider the extra car in the car parks. There is a need for more disabled spaces both at the car park at the doctors and in Potters Wheel. .	More parking areas must be found in the location	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		541	
654512	Ms Jane Russell		CSPS787	Policy VTSW1		Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	This policy makes no reference to the fact that Verwood has two town centres - the historic centre at Ferret Green and the new complex where Morrisons are applying to rebuild what could become our 'anchor' store. I understand that there is no potential to develop the link between the two centres - Bugden's Copse SSSI. However it takes just over 5 minutes to walk from Morrisons to Ferret Green (via the direct path, not the winding part of the circular walk). Good signage could be used to raise awareness of the link between the centres and encourage its use. Strangers and car users		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		541	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											must be completely unaware how close they are, as it's much further by road. Unless the link between the two centres is promoted, the Morrisons development cannot possibly contribute to the vibrancy of the town.					
359547	Mrs V Bright	Verwood Town Council	CSPS1728	Policy VTSW1	Yes	Yes					Verwood Town Council would like to point out that if redevelopment took place of any residential properties, the Council could insist on retail development as a replacement with flats above.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		541	
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS1536	Policy VTSW1		No	No				<p>Retail provision</p> <p>1. The Joint Retail Assessment by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners identifies problems of high numbers of service units eg hairdressers, beauty salons and estate agents and the low proportion of comparison retail units (about half the national average). Over two thirds of the units in the historic centre of Verwood are service units. New offices both at the northern end of Station Road and above the shops at Ferrets Green remain unoccupied 3 years after completion. They cannot be converted to residential use because they are within 400m of N2K heathland.</p> <p>2. Verwood's lack of retail space (compared with Wimborne and Ferndown) contributes to the low degree of sustainability of the settlement. It is understood that the redevelopment of the Morrisons site will increase the comparative shopping floor space available but that will also reduce the potential for existing and new smaller local businesses to compete and so limit local choice. The aspiration of increased vibrancy of the town centre will depend on attracting specialist shops /restaurants that are able to corner a niche market.</p> <p>Retail space (sq.ft.) Population Catchment population Pedestrian foot count financial year 2010/11 Verwood 44,458 14,820 15,100 14,175 Wimborne 118,000 6,690 18,100 29,200 Ferndown 103,000 18,090 28,100 37,992 (Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, 2008)</p> <p>3. Any vision for the Town Centre will need to be totally radical and move away from a traditional "high street" approach.</p> <p>Traffic and transport</p> <p>1. The problems of sustainability of Verwood as a location were noted by the Inspector at the time of the last Local Plan. In his report (October 2000), he stated, ...I do not consider Verwood as offering a particularly sustainable location for significant new growth. He was scathing in his remarks about the development that had already taken place.</p> <p>2. The BroadwayMalyan Verwood Masterplan report (2011) concludes that because of the impact of traffic from Verwood towards the conurbation and New Forest, Verwood may be less favourable than development elsewhere. Travel to work distances for those that out-commute from Verwood can be expected to be longer</p>	<p>1. Point 5. Delete reference to residential development.</p> <p>2. Final para. Delete reference to higher density residential development.</p> <p>3. Criteria should be agreed to establish the sustainability (or otherwise) of Verwood</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have specialist knowledge of environmental and sustainability issues. To ensure propriety, this policy/para was not included in the ETAG response	541	2239109_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>than those from sites in other potential new neighbourhood settlements elsewhere in the District. This has significant consequences for carbon emissions and other air pollutants and the need to conserve both energy and our road surfaces.</p> <p>3. The Atkins Report (SEDMMTS) recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the shorter term, within East Dorset only sites to the south of the A31, such as Ferndown and Corfe Mullen, should be considered in the first phase of development as these have stronger travel demand links with the conurbation; • Given the uncertainty surrounding capacity enhancements on the A31, it is proposed that the sites to the north of the A31 are considered for longer term provision: and not until such a time as capacity issues are addressed on the A31 <p>4. LTP3 has advised that there will be no road improvements north of the A31 even beyond 2020.</p> <p>5. While Verwood does not suffer from traffic congestion, 8,400 vehicles drive through the centre of Verwood daily (DCC Environment Directorate, July 2011). In responses to inform the emerging Town Plan, 70% of residents said they want to see a reduction in the HGV traffic through Verwood and Three Legged Cross to improve safety, and to reduce noise levels and air borne particles. There is also a significant demand for reduction in the speed of traffic particularly where there are no pavements (such as the section of Edmondsham Road within the present urban area). The county-wide Local Transport Plan (LTP3) recommends that low noise road surfacing should be considered in problem areas and as part of routine resurfacing work. This would add to the attractiveness of the Town Centre and early opportunities for this should be sought.</p> <p>6. Traffic management and calming is proposed in Policy VTSW1 but it is unclear how this would be achieved. This should be clarified rather than simply being a somewhat intangible vision. Although E-W traffic has been diverted from the Town Centre, far from enabling traffic calming, the construction of Home Farm Way and Champtoceaux Avenue has encouraged speeding. In discussions during the consultation on the Local Transport Plan (LTP3), DCC officers admitted that the design of this Distributor Road was a mistake and such wide roads that encourage traffic and speed would not be used in Dorset again. (Verwood has suffered from hindsight far too often!)</p> <p>7. Acorn socio-economic data (2011) show that 64% of Verwood Residents are Wealthy Achievers compared with 40% in Dorset as a whole and 23% nationally. (Graph provided of data to show this - please see page 9 of the attached pdf.)</p> <p>8. 6,800 people are employed in Verwood & Three Legged Cross in 690 firms. Verwood is a net exporter of labour with about 2,850 coming in and 3,800 commuting</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>elsewhere. In-commuters (including the workforce at Ebblake Industrial Estate) are largely from other parts of East Dorset, Hampshire, Bournemouth and Poole. The destinations of our commuters are similar though many commute longer distances (eg to London) either daily or weekly. The conflicting data on employment in the town (33% in para 11.20 based on 2001 Census data and 20% identified by Broadway Malyan) should be resolved.</p> <p>9. Currently there is an hourly bus service, up to 5pm, operating from Verwood to Bournemouth from Monday to Saturday. There is also a bus service between Verwood and Poole from Monday to Saturday, although this also stops in the evening. Both journeys take about an hour: going directly by car takes less than 20 minutes. There is a very limited Sunday service (3 buses each way) between Bournemouth and Ferndown via Ringwood, Verwood & Three Legged Cross and no evening bus service</p> <p>10. Established patterns of transport are notoriously difficult to change. Summarised responses to the Town Plan survey question on what would encourage them to use public transport more are: 25% nothing 50% more frequent and more direct bus services 33% an evening service or a better service at weekends 25% lower fares and a more reliable service.</p> <p>11. Bus operators have indicated (at a Traffic and Transport TAG meeting) that it is unlikely that they would be able to extend their service to make it more attractive to users because it would be unviable. This puts our young people at a considerable disadvantage compared with their peers in other locations in the District: Verwood does not offer the social opportunities that they seek. Worst of all it commits those in most need (particularly those likely to occupy affordable homes) to car ownership, adding an unnecessary financial burden.</p> <p>12. Parking provision in the Town Centre (at the Potters Wheel, Medical Centre are the Hub) is inadequate.</p> <p>13. Given the proximity of the N2K heathland to the Town Centre, additional residential accommodation here is not deliverable. With the exception of the Hub and Opportunities Centre, it all appears to be within 400m of Stephens Castle. Textual changes should be made to a) the objectives of point 5 of the Vision and b) the reference to higher density residential development in the final paragraph.</p> <p>14. County Council premises are currently underused and consideration should be given to extending their use by the community. The catering standard kitchen facilities at the Opportunities (Day Care) Centre are not used and there is a significant reduction in the use of the Police Station. Both were newly built following the last</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Local Plan. Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species New housing within the Town Centre would be within 400m of N2K heathland so is not deliverable. SA Objective 3 Minimise pollution Growth of traffic particularly HGVs through the town centre will add to GHG emissions. Increased noise should be mitigated by low noise surfacing of roads. Score negative not positive. SA Objective 4 Minimise factors contributing to climate change Score neutral/unknown not positive SA Objective 5 Provide access to meet people's needs Score neutral possibly negative: the provision of enhanced public transport is unlikely.					
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Dorset County Council	CSPS2001	11.24							In general, current school facilities provision meets the needs of the area. However future population increase and residential development will put pressure on some education facilities. Where new schools are required in association with new development, as in the Cranborne Road and Leigh Road New Neighbourhoods in Wimborne and the Lockyer's School site in Corfe Mullen this is identified. In Verwood a new senior school is proposed towards the end of the Plan period. Elsewhere education needs may be met through expansion or re-organisation of existing facilities. The costs and responsibilities for the funding of these improvements and new facilities are identified in the Draft IDP. County Council officers have worked closely with local planning officers in developing the plan. The Core Strategy and Draft IDP reflect the County Council's future requirements in terms of school provision in the area and are supported.	No proposed changes to this policy			545	
588532	Mr and Mrs Nick Hunt		CSPS48	Policy VTSW2			No			No	New housing in Verwood should not be permitted unless it is required to meet local needs. More housing would not be sustainable unless it is related to local employment opportunities.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		546	
654828	Mr Martin Aldridge		CSPS844	Policy VTSW2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	VTSW2 New Upper School Verwood There is only one access road to the existing schools at the end of Margards Lane and the traffic is at saturation levels during school access times. It makes no infrastructure sense to concentrate three schools in one location. The upper school, if built, should be next to the main distributor road. Long queues already build up on Margards Lane. Local people should have a say in what affects them. It is unfair to create a situation where I cannot reverse out of my drive during school access times. The area around Trinity First school is right next to the distributor road and would be ideal for an Upper School.	Remove the proposal to build an Upper School at the end of Margards Lane.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I wish to explain in person how difficult it is to drive out of my property during school access times. Traffic flows down the road and then back up again so both sides of the road stay fully busy with fast or queuing traffic. No-one wants to stop and let you join the highway because they are all in a desperate rush to get to school on time.	546	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											I suspect because planners and decision makers do not live in Verwood they do not take local people's view into enough consideration.					
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1350	Policy VTSW2		No		No		No	Ecological survey information for this site is not available therefore it is not possible to fully assess the potential environmental impacts of development on this site. NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment.	We recommend ecological survey to inform this proposal and ensure the site can be developed sustainably.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		546	
359547	Mrs V Bright	Verwood Town Council	CSPS1730	Policy VTSW2	Yes	Yes					Key point: There is a need established here. The Policy is sound. Despite many local genuine concerns, this site is currently the only one available for a New Upper School. If this site goes forward for an Upper School then the Springfield Distributor Road would be essential. An improved Traffic Management Plan has already proved essential to improve and make safe traffic flows even with existing building use and this would be even more important to be addressed well before any new proposals are considered.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		546	
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS1537	Policy VTSW2		No	No			No	The proposal has not been informed by biological survey. No mitigation of light and water pollution has been proposed. Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species The potential for added recreational pressure on Dewlands Common (N2K heathland) should be assessed and mitigated. The proposal has not been informed by ecological survey although it is believed that the proposed development site includes biodiverse grassland and there is significant badger activity in the area. SA Objective 3 Minimise pollution The potential diffuse pollution of the R Crane SSSI has not been addressed. Risk of light pollution (from windows (particularly upper storeys), security lighting, street lights and floodlighting of sports facilities to both the River Crane and Dewlands Common should be assessed and mitigated. Habitats Regulations Assessment It is stated that mitigation will deal with these issues but none has been proposed	Potential loss of or damage to biodiversity should be assessed and mitigated or compensated. The potential for light and water pollution should be assessed and mitigated.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		546	
612430	Mr Nick Squirrell	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS1946	Policy VTSW2	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Policies; CN 1, CN 2, CN 3, WMC 3, WMC 4, WMC 5, WMC 6, FWP 3, FWP 4, FWP 6, FWP 7, FWP 8, VTSW 2, VTSW3, VTSW 4, VTSW 8 etc are all proposing development and or mitigation in the form of SANGs on greenfield locations. In order to avoid a conflict with policy ME1 at a later stage in the planning process Natural England advise the authorities to bring to the attention of those with an interest in these locations the need to carry out a basic biodiversity survey eg Phase 1 habitat survey including assessment of the likely	The policies may need to include specific paragraphs about features of biodiversity importance which are to be secured or enhanced.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Natural England has provided extensive advice to a number of the parties concerned with these policies and may be able to offer advice and reassurance to the Inspector about the reliance he may have on the effectiveness of the policy	546	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>presence or evidence of other features likely to restrict or delay development eg badger setts, priority species such as reptiles, water voles etc in time for consideration at the EIP. In many cases this will simply be a statement as the proposer has already engaged an ecological advisor.</p> <p>These policies appear to have been brought forward in an absence of adequate information and assessment on the biodiversity features held by the policy land. There is reason to suspect that on some there may be a significant biodiversity interest owing to close proximity with designated sites and or other biodiversity sites. The NPPF requires that planning policies should be based on up-to date information on the natural environment (paragraph 165). These policies are not shown to be compliant with this requirement. Thus, irrespective of the above matters concerning other nearby designated sites, it is not possible to identify whether the policies are compliant with policy considerations in the NPPF on sustainable development for the sites alone, especially the aspect on sustainable development set out in paragraph 9 of moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains (for example on priory habitats and species).</p>			and any modification proposed.		
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Dorset County Council	CSPS1999	Policy VTSW2							<p>In general, current school facilities provision meets the needs of the area. However future population increase and residential development will put pressure on some education facilities. Where new schools are required in association with new development, as in the Cranborne Road and Leigh Road New Neighbourhoods in Wimborne and the Lockyer's School site in Corfe Mullen this is identified. In Verwood a new senior school is proposed towards the end of the Plan period. Elsewhere education needs may be met through expansion or re-organisation of existing facilities. The costs and responsibilities for the funding of these improvements and new facilities are identified in the Draft IDP. County Council officers have worked closely with local planning officers in developing the plan. The Core Strategy and Draft IDP reflect the County Council's future requirements in terms of school provision in the area and are supported.</p>	No proposed changes to this policy			546	
360082	Mr and Mrs K Healy		CSPS2447	Policy VTSW2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>We would like to support this policy and feel that the school should be given priority as it is so badly needed. Bussing the children to Ringwood, Ferndown and Wimborne is not a good option.</p> <p>The proposed site would need to be subject to an ecological survey and flood risk assessment.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		546	
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2129	11.28		Yes					<p>The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have</p>				551	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.						
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2155	11.28		No	No	No	No	No	Officers' explanation in the Options consultation for excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt was , This option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people. This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. This is illogical. As it is adjacent to N2K heathland (Stephens Castle) all the land lies within 400m and therefore cannot deliver housing. The reasons given for Woodland Walk, Ferndown to be included in the Green Belt were, The land is now covered by woodland and protected by a TPO which means it has limited development potential. This provides the necessary exceptional circumstance to justify the land being included within the Green Belt. Coopers Lane South is also covered by a blanket TPO which should preclude it from development but this only tells half the story in terms of its ecological and historical importance. It is characterised by its tranquillity and lack of light pollution. It should not be assessed simply by viewing as an area of land on a map. It is special to the people of Verwood and acts as a buffer between the truly urban area and the heathland LNR Stephens Castle (SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar). The extent of tree cover (including magnificent mature/veteran oaks) would preclude development as it would compromise their root protection zones. This is clearly visible on aerial photographs on Dorset Explorer. The trees are on substantial old boundary banks that, according to deeds of the properties, were in existence at the time of Nelson's ownership of the land. One property is a private arboretum which is a Dorset gem with many rare specimens. Another area includes secondary woodland/scrub. There is only one small area that is used as a paddock – partly in private ownership and partly leased from EDDC. One elderly horse has limited grazing here. Although the land has not been surveyed formally, I have identified significant biodiversity including good grassland and woodland edge flora (some Dorset Notable species), bats, Red Data book birds: Nightjars have been recorded in the oaks. In essence this is a	Amend Policy VTSW3 to read: New Green Belt boundaries will be drawn to include land at Coopers Lane and Doe's Lane and shown on the proposals map.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have known the area well for many years and have appropriate formal qualifications to represent the residents. The Policy was not included in the ETAG response to ensure propriety.	551		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>wooded area with ecological links to the mature/veteran oaks that border Coopers Lane Meadow and extend to Burrows Lane and properties to the East and West of it. Key planning issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moorlands Road is a bridleway that borders Stephens Castle (N2K heathland) and cannot be widened for access. 2. It is a Bern Convention requirement for no new roads to be built on or near heathlands. 3. No new housing may be built within 400m of Stephens Castle – this area is adjacent to it and all of it is well within the 400m zone. 4. Any development would require an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations to determine the impact on the heathland. 5. Urbanisation of the area would drive dog walkers in particular straight onto Stephens Castle, so reducing use of Coopers Lane Meadow which has already been identified as a potential SANG in the Heathlands IPF and is supported in Core Strategy proposals. 6. Any development would necessitate removal of veteran oaks and historic boundary banks and compromise the root systems of other veteran oaks. There would be significant risk of light pollution of the remaining woodland area and any BAP species that it supports as well as impact on the heathland. 7. No logical argument has been put forward to include this land in the Urban area. In Core Strategy Options it was claimed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (KS4) that the land was able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands. • (KS6) The option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people • (KS6) This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. These arguments are invalid for this site. 8. The land is adjacent to Stephens Castle and is open countryside where it borders Moorlands Road and Coopers Lane Meadow. The inclusion of some buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate. 9. NPPF para 123 states Planning policies and decisions should aim to: ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. Including it within the Urban Area would compromise this highly prized area. 10. Most of the residents affected by the proposal were unaware of the policy as it was within the broader Key Issues section of the Options document rather than the Verwood section. None of them wish to see any development here. <p>The owners of 67, 47 and 49 Moorlands Road wish the</p>						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>whole area to be included in the Green Belt. The owners of 67 have confirmed that they would be happy for their property to be included if that would remove the Council's concerns over any anomalies. The owners of 29, 41 and 63 Moorlands Road confirmed that they want to see the land remain undeveloped but declined any further involvement.</p> <p>On behalf of the named residents, I recommend that the area is included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</p> <p>SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species</p> <p>Proposals for Coopers Lane North and Does Lane score positively.</p> <p>However, excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt would put at risk BAP habitat and species (including foraging areas for Nightjar) and important features such as ancient boundary banks. Any urbanisation of the area would drive people onto adjacent N2K heathland.</p> <p>This area scores negatively.</p> <p>SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc</p> <p>Urbanisation of Coopers Lane South would destroy its tranquillity and impact on adjacent N2K heathland.</p> <p>Score negative</p>					
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2167	11.28		No	No	No	No	No	<p>Officers' explanation in the Options consultation for excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt was</p> <p>'</p> <p>This option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people.</p> <p>This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing.</p> <p>This is illogical. As it is adjacent to N2K heathland (Stephens Castle) all the land lies within 400m and therefore cannot deliver housing.</p> <p>The reasons given for Woodland Walk, Ferndown to be included in the Green Belt were,</p> <p>The land is now covered by woodland and protected by a TPO which means it has limited development potential. This provides the necessary exceptional circumstance to justify the land being included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Coopers Lane South is also covered by a blanket TPO which should preclude it from development but this only tells half the story in terms of its ecological and historical importance.</p> <p>It is characterised by its tranquillity and lack of light pollution. It should not be assessed simply by viewing as an area of land on a map. It is special to the people of Verwood and acts as a buffer between the truly urban area and the heathland LNR Stephens Castle (SSSI,</p>	Amend Policy VTSW3 to read: New Green belt boundaries will be drawn to include land at Coopers Lane and Doe's Lane and shown on the proposals map.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have known the area well for many years and have appropriate formal qualifications to represent the residents. The Policy was not included in the ETAG response to ensure propriety.	551	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>SPA, SAC, Ramsar). The extent of tree cover (including magnificent mature/veteran oaks) would preclude development as it would compromise their root protection zones. This is clearly visible on aerial photographs on Dorset Explorer. The trees are on substantial old boundary banks that, according to deeds of the properties, were in existence at the time of Nelson's ownership of the land.</p> <p>One property is a private arboretum which is a Dorset gem with many rare specimens.</p> <p>Another area includes secondary woodland/scrub. There is only one small area that is used as a paddock – partly in private ownership and partly leased from EDDC. One elderly horse has limited grazing here. Although the land has not been surveyed formally, I have identified significant biodiversity including good grassland and woodland edge flora (some Dorset Notable species), bats, Red Data book birds: Nightjars have been recorded in the oaks. In essence this is a wooded area with ecological links to the mature/veteran oaks that border Coopers Lane Meadow and extend to Burrows Lane and properties to the East and West of it.</p> <p>Key planning issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moorlands Road is a bridleway that borders Stephens Castle (N2K heathland) and cannot be widened for access. 2. It is a Bern Convention requirement for no new roads to be built on or near heathlands. 3. No new housing may be built within 400m of Stephens Castle – this area is adjacent to it and all of it is well within the 400m zone. 4. Any development would require an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations to determine the impact on the heathland. 5. Urbanisation of the area would drive dog walkers in particular straight onto Stephens Castle, so reducing use of Coopers Lane Meadow which has already been identified as a potential SANG in the Heathlands IPF and is supported in Core Strategy proposals. 6. Any development would necessitate removal of veteran oaks and historic boundary banks and compromise the root systems of other veteran oaks. There would be significant risk of light pollution of the remaining woodland area and any BAP species that it supports as well as impact on the heathland. 7. No logical argument has been put forward to include this land in the Urban area. In Core Strategy Options it was claimed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (KS4) that the land was able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands. • (KS6) The option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people • (KS6) This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>of appropriate housing. These arguments are invalid for this site. 8. The land is adjacent to Stephens Castle and is open countryside where it borders Moorlands Road and Coopers Lane Meadow. The inclusion of some buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate. 9. NPPF para 123 states Planning policies and decisions should aim to: ... • Identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. Including it within the Urban Area would compromise this highly prized area. 10. Most of the residents affected by the proposal were unaware of the policy as it was within the broader Key Issues section of the Options document rather than the Verwood section. None of them wish to see any development here. The owners of 67, 47 and 49 Moorlands Road wish the whole area to be included in the Green Belt. The owners of 67 have confirmed that they would be happy for their property to be included if that would remove the Council's concerns over any anomalies. The owners of 29, 41 and 63 Moorlands Road confirmed that they want to see the land remain undeveloped but declined any further involvement. On behalf of the named residents, I recommend that the area is included within the Green Belt. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species Proposals for Coopers Lane North and Does Lane score positively. However, excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt would put at risk BAP habitat and species (including foraging areas for Nightjar) and important features such as ancient boundary banks. Any urbanisation of the area would drive people onto adjacent N2K heathland. This area scores negatively. SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc Urbanisation of Coopers Lane South would destroy its tranquillity and impact on adjacent N2K heathland. Score negative</p>					
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2151	11.28		Yes					<p>The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should</p>				551	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane id also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.					
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2138	11.28		Yes					The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site shuld ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane id also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.				551	
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2158	11.28	No	No		No	No	No	Officers' explanation in the Options consultation for excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt was , This option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people. This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. This is illogical. As it is adjacent to N2K heathland (Stephens Castle) all the land lies within 400m and therefore cannot deliver housing. The reasons given for Woodland Walk, Ferndown to be included in the Green Belt were, The land is now covered by woodland and protected by a TPO which means it has limited development potential. This provides the necessary exceptional circumstance to justify the land being included within the Green Belt. Coopers Lane South is also covered by a blanket TPO which should preclude it from development but this only tells half the story in terms of its ecological and historical importance. It is characterised by its tranquillity and lack of light pollution. It should not be assessed simply by viewing as an area of land on a map. It is special to the people of Verwood and acts as a buffer between the truly urban area and the heathland LNR Stephens Castle (SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar). The extent of tree cover (including magnificent mature/veteran oaks) would preclude development as it would compromise their root protection zones. This is clearly visible on aerial photographs on Dorset Explorer. The trees are on substantial old boundary banks that, according to deeds of the properties, were in existence at the time of Nelson's ownership of the land. One property is a private arboretum which is a Dorset gem with many rare specimens. Another area includes secondary woodland/scrub.	Amend Policy VTSW3 to read: New Green Belt boundaries will be drawn to include land at Coopers Lane and Doe's Lane and shown on the proposals map.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have known the area well for many years ans have appropriate formal qualifications to represent the residents. The Policy was not included in the ETAG response to ensure propriety.	551	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>There is only one small area that is used as a paddock – partly in private ownership and partly leased from EDDC. One elderly horse has limited grazing here. Although the land has not been surveyed formally, I have identified significant biodiversity including good grassland and woodland edge flora (some Dorset Notable species), bats, Red Data book birds: Nightjars have been recorded in the oaks. In essence this is a wooded area with ecological links to the mature/veteran oaks that border Coopers Lane Meadow and extend to Burrows Lane and properties to the East and West of it.</p> <p>Key planning issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moorlands Road is a bridleway that borders Stephens Castle (N2K heathland) and cannot be widened for access. 2. It is a Bern Convention requirement for no new roads to be built on or near heathlands. 3. No new housing may be built within 400m of Stephens Castle – this area is adjacent to it and all of it is well within the 400m zone. 4. Any development would require an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations to determine the impact on the heathland. 5. Urbanisation of the area would drive dog walkers in particular straight onto Stephens Castle, so reducing use of Coopers Lane Meadow which has already been identified as a potential SANG in the Heathlands IPF and is supported in Core Strategy proposals. 6. Any development would necessitate removal of veteran oaks and historic boundary banks and compromise the root systems of other veteran oaks. There would be significant risk of light pollution of the remaining woodland area and any BAP species that it supports as well as impact on the heathland. 7. No logical argument has been put forward to include this land in the Urban area. In Core Strategy Options it was claimed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (KS4) that the land was able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands. • (KS6) The option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people • (KS6) This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. 8. The land is adjacent to Stephens Castle and is open countryside where it borders Moorlands Road and Coopers Lane Meadow. The inclusion of some buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate. 9. NPPF para 123 states Planning policies and decisions should aim to: ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Including it within the Urban Area would compromise this highly prized area.</p> <p>10. Most of the residents affected by the proposal were unaware of the policy as it was within the broader Key Issues section of the Options document rather than the Verwood section. None of them wish to see any development here.</p> <p>The owners of 67, 47 and 49 Moorlands Road wish the whole area to be included in the Green Belt. The owners of 67 have confirmed that they would be happy for their property to be included if that would remove the Council's concerns over any anomalies. The owners of 29, 41 and 63 Moorlands Road confirmed that they want to see the land remain undeveloped but declined any further involvement.</p> <p>On behalf of the named residents, I recommend that the area is included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species Proposals for Coopers Lane North and Does Lane score positively.</p> <p>However, excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt would put at risk BAP habitat and species (including foraging areas for Nightjar) and important features such as ancient boundary banks. Any urbanisation of the area would drive people onto adjacent N2K heathland.</p> <p>This area scores negatively. SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc Urbanisation of Coopers Lane South would destroy its tranquillity and impact on adjacent N2K heathland. Score negative</p>					
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2162	11.28		No	No	No	No	No	<p>Officers' explanation in the Options consultation for excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt was</p> <p>This option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people.</p> <p>This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing.</p> <p>This is illogical. As it is adjacent to N2K heathland (Stephens Castle) all the land lies within 400m and therefore cannot deliver housing.</p> <p>The reasons given for Woodland Walk, Ferndown to be included in the Green Belt were,</p> <p>The land is now covered by woodland and protected by a TPO which means it has limited development potential. This provides the necessary exceptional circumstance to justify the land being included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Coopers Lane South is also covered by a blanket TPO</p>	Amend Policy VTSW3 to read: New Green Belt boundaries will be drawn to include land at Coopers Lane and Doe's Lane and shown on the proposals map.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have known the area well for many years and have appropriate formal qualifications to represent the residents. The Policy was not included in the ETAG response to ensure propriety.	551	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>which should preclude it from development but this only tells half the story in terms of its ecological and historical importance.</p> <p>It is characterised by its tranquillity and lack of light pollution. It should not be assessed simply by viewing as an area of land on a map. It is special to the people of Verwood and acts as a buffer between the truly urban area and the heathland LNR Stephens Castle (SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar). The extent of tree cover (including magnificent mature/veteran oaks) would preclude development as it would compromise their root protection zones. This is clearly visible on aerial photographs on Dorset Explorer. The trees are on substantial old boundary banks that, according to deeds of the properties, were in existence at the time of Nelson's ownership of the land.</p> <p>One property is a private arboretum which is a Dorset gem with many rare specimens.</p> <p>Another area includes secondary woodland/scrub. There is only one small area that is used as a paddock – partly in private ownership and partly leased from EDDC. One elderly horse has limited grazing here. Although the land has not been surveyed formally, I have identified significant biodiversity including good grassland and woodland edge flora (some Dorset Notable species), bats, Red Data book birds: Nightjars have been recorded in the oaks. In essence this is a wooded area with ecological links to the mature/veteran oaks that border Coopers Lane Meadow and extend to Burrows Lane and properties to the East and West of it.</p> <p>Key planning issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moorlands Road is a bridleway that borders Stephens Castle (N2K heathland) and cannot be widened for access. 2. It is a Bern Convention requirement for no new roads to be built on or near heathlands. 3. No new housing may be built within 400m of Stephens Castle – this area is adjacent to it and all of it is well within the 400m zone. 4. Any development would require an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations to determine the impact on the heathland. 5. Urbanisation of the area would drive dog walkers in particular straight onto Stephens Castle, so reducing use of Coopers Lane Meadow which has already been identified as a potential SANG in the Heathlands IPF and is supported in Core Strategy proposals. 6. Any development would necessitate removal of veteran oaks and historic boundary banks and compromise the root systems of other veteran oaks. There would be significant risk of light pollution of the remaining woodland area and any BAP species that it supports as well as impact on the heathland. 7. No logical argument has been put forward to include this land in the Urban area. In Core Strategy Options it 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>was claimed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (KS4) that the land was able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands. • (KS6) The option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people • (KS6) This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. <p>These arguments are invalid for this site.</p> <p>8. The land is adjacent to Stephens Castle and is open countryside where it borders Moorlands Road and Coopers Lane Meadow. The inclusion of some buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate.</p> <p>9. NPPF para 123 states Planning policies and decisions should aim to: ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. Including it within the Urban Area would compromise this highly prized area. <p>10. Most of the residents affected by the proposal were unaware of the policy as it was within the broader Key Issues section of the Options document rather than the Verwood section. None of them wish to see any development here.</p> <p>The owners of 67, 47 and 49 Moorlands Road wish the whole area to be included in the Green Belt. The owners of 67 have confirmed that they would be happy for their property to be included if that would remove the Council's concerns over any anomalies. The owners of 29, 41 and 63 Moorlands Road confirmed that they want to see the land remain undeveloped but declined any further involvement.</p> <p>On behalf of the named residents, I recommend that the area is included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species Proposals for Coopers Lane North and Does Lane score positively. However, excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt would put at risk BAP habitat and species (including foraging areas for Nightjar) and important features such as ancient boundary banks. Any urbanisation of the area would drive people onto adjacent N2K heathland. This area scores negatively. SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc Urbanisation of Coopers Lane South would destroy its tranquillity and impact on adjacent N2K heathland. Score negative</p>					
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2144	11.28		Yes					The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and				551	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename		
											Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.							
588532	Mr and Mrs Nick Hunt		CSPS49	Policy VTSW3			No			No	New housing in Verwood should not be permitted unless it is required to meet local needs. More housing would not be sustainable unless it is related to local employment opportunities.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		552			
648124	Mrs Lesley Eve		CSPS128	Policy VTSW3					Yes		Because we need low cost housing - even though its on my doorstep I think Doe's Lane land should go for low-cost housing, 100% low cost housing only.	Release land at Doe's Lane for 100% low cost housing.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		552			
495715	Mr Jeremy Belcher		CSPS715	Policy VTSW3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					552			
650810	Ms Fiona Astin	Synergy Housing	CSPS785	Policy VTSW3	Yes	No		Yes	Yes		The land ring-fenced for inclusion within the green belt at Coopers Lane, Verwood, is owned by a Registered Provider of affordable housing. We have discussed several development proposals for this land in the past, but what can be built there is limited by its proximity to an SSSI. However, we have recently been approached by a Solar PV Farm operator who feels this land may offer a productive location for electricity generation from renewable sources. If the land is included within the green belt we understand that such a use will not then be possible.	The expansion of renewable energy generation is a national priority and is part of this Core Strategy document in line with NPPF. Coopers Lane is already adequately protected from unsuitable development by virtue of the surrounding designations. Therefore we would urge you to drop the proposal to include it within the Green Belt in order that it may be available for renewable energy generation use.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	I am prepared to participate in the oral examination if it felt that my input would be useful.	552			
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1351	Policy VTSW3		No		No		No	DWT supports the inclusion of the northern half of land at Coopers Lane, Verwood (Moorlands Road Meadow SNCI SU00/97, unimproved neutral grassland) and Doe's Lane (adjacent to Dewlands Common SSSI) in the Green Belt. DWT supports the inclusion of the northern half of land at Coopers Lane, Verwood (Moorlands Road Meadow SNCI SU00/97, unimproved neutral grassland) and Doe's Lane (adjacent to Dewlands Common SSSI) in the Green Belt. However, we consider that the southern section of Coopers Lane should also be included in the green belt. We are aware of habitat within this area which is potentially of SNCI quality and believe the area is used by nightjars for feeding. The land cannot be further	Include the southern half of Coopers Lane within the Green Belt.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		552			

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											developed for housing as it lies immediately adjacent to the Dorset Heathlands SPA, SAC and Ramsar site.					
359547	Mrs V Bright	Verwood Town Council	CSPS1734	Policy VTSW3	Yes	Yes					Does Lane Site. The inclusion of this site into the Green Belt was strongly supported by members.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		552	
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS1539	Policy VTSW3		No	No		No	No	Detailed discussion of why the proposals relating to Coopers Lane South are unsound are presented in a response I have submitted (as their 'agent') on behalf of local residents. I confirm that I support their views and arguments.	Amend Policy VTSW3 to read: 'New Green Belt boundaries will be drawn to included land at Coopers Lane and Doe's Lane and shown on the proposals map.'	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have specialist knowledge of environmental and sustainability issues. To ensure propriety, this policy/para was not included in the ETAG response	552	
612430	Mr Nick Squirrell	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS1930	Policy VTSW3	Yes	No	Yes	No		No	<p>Policies; CN 1, CN 2, CN 3, WMC 3, WMC 4, WMC 5, WMC 6, FWP 3, FWP 4, FWP 6, FWP 7, FWP 8, VTSW 2, VTSW3, VTSW 4, VTSW 8 etc are all proposing development and or mitigation in the form of SANGs on greenfield locations. In order to avoid a conflict with policy ME1 at a later stage in the planning process Natural England advise the authorities to bring to the attention of those with an interest in these locations the need to carry out a basic biodiversity survey eg Phase 1 habitat survey including assessment of the likely presence or evidence of other features likely to restrict or delay development eg badger setts, priority species such as reptiles, water voles etc in time for consideration at the EIP. In many cases this will simply be a statement as the proposer has already engaged an ecological advisor.</p> <p>These policies appear to have been brought forward in an absence of adequate information and assessment on the biodiversity features held by the policy land. There is reason to suspect that on some there may be a significant biodiversity interest owing to close proximity with designated sites and or other biodiversity sites. The NPPF requires that planning policies should be based on up-to date information on the natural environment (paragraph 165). These policies are not shown to be compliant with this requirement. Thus, irrespective of the above matters concerning other nearby designated sites, it is not possible to identify whether the policies are compliant with policy considerations in the NPPF on sustainable development for the sites alone, especially the aspect on sustainable development set out in paragraph 9 of moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains (for example on priory habitats and species).</p> <p>Policy VTSW5 Land at Coopers Lane, Natural England support the extension to the Green Belt. Natural England advise that the area to be taken in to the urban area consists of grassland and large oak trees which are likely to be habitats of biodiversity value and potentially supporting SPA birds from the nearby</p>	The area should be deleted and remain Green Belt. The policies may need to include specific paragraphs about features of biodiversity importance which are to be secured or enhanced.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		552	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename					
											protected heathland Stephens Castle. There is no evidence or supporting justification put forward for this approach. The policy appears to have been put forward in an absence of adequate information and assessment on the biodiversity features held by the land. There are reasons 9set out above) to suspect that there may be a significant biodiversity interest owing to its close proximity with designated sites and the history of non-intensive agricultural management. The NPPF requires that planning policies should be based on up-to date information on the natural environment (paragraph 165). The policy is not shown to be compliant with this requirement. Thus, irrespective of the above matters concerning adjacent designated sites, it is not possible to identify whether the policy is compliant with policy considerations in the NPPF on sustainable development for the site alone, especially the aspect on sustainable development set out in paragraph 9 of moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains (for example on priory habitats and species). Natural England advise that it would be unsound to include this area in the urban area.										
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2133	Policy VTSW3	Yes						The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site shuld ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane id also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.					552					
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2156	Policy VTSW3	No	No	No	No	No	No	Officers' explanation in the Options consultation for excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt was , This option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people. This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. This is illogical. As it is adjacent to N2K heathland (Stephens Castle) all the land lies within 400m and therefore cannot deliver housing. The reasons given for Woodland Walk, Ferndown to be included in the Green Belt were, The land is now covered by woodland and protected by a TPO which means it has limited development potential. This provides the necessary exceptional circumstance to justify the land being included within the Green Belt.	Amend Policy VTSW3 to read: New Green Belt boundaries will be drawn to include land at Coopers Lane and Doe's Lane and shown on the proposals map.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have known the area well for many years and have appropriate formal qualifications to represent the residents. The Policy was not included in the ETAG response to ensure propriety.		552					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>Coopers Lane South is also covered by a blanket TPO which should preclude it from development but this only tells half the story in terms of its ecological and historical importance.</p> <p>It is characterised by its tranquillity and lack of light pollution. It should not be assessed simply by viewing as an area of land on a map. It is special to the people of Verwood and acts as a buffer between the truly urban area and the heathland LNR Stephens Castle (SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar). The extent of tree cover (including magnificent mature/veteran oaks) would preclude development as it would compromise their root protection zones. This is clearly visible on aerial photographs on Dorset Explorer. The trees are on substantial old boundary banks that, according to deeds of the properties, were in existence at the time of Nelson's ownership of the land.</p> <p>One property is a private arboretum which is a Dorset gem with many rare specimens.</p> <p>Another area includes secondary woodland/scrub.</p> <p>There is only one small area that is used as a paddock – partly in private ownership and partly leased from EDDC. One elderly horse has limited grazing here.</p> <p>Although the land has not been surveyed formally, I have identified significant biodiversity including good grassland and woodland edge flora (some Dorset Notable species), bats, Red Data book birds: Nightjars have been recorded in the oaks. In essence this is a wooded area with ecological links to the mature/veteran oaks that border Coopers Lane Meadow and extend to Burrows Lane and properties to the East and West of it.</p> <p>Key planning issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moorlands Road is a bridleway that borders Stephens Castle (N2K heathland) and cannot be widened for access. 2. It is a Bern Convention requirement for no new roads to be built on or near heathlands. 3. No new housing may be built within 400m of Stephens Castle – this area is adjacent to it and all of it is well within the 400m zone. 4. Any development would require an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations to determine the impact on the heathland. 5. Urbanisation of the area would drive dog walkers in particular straight onto Stephens Castle, so reducing use of Coopers Lane Meadow which has already been identified as a potential SANG in the Heathlands IPF and is supported in Core Strategy proposals. 6. Any development would necessitate removal of veteran oaks and historic boundary banks and compromise the root systems of other veteran oaks. There would be significant risk of light pollution of the remaining woodland area and any BAP species that it supports as well as impact on the heathland. 7. No logical argument has been put forward to include 						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>this land in the Urban area. In Core Strategy Options it was claimed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (KS4) that the land was able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands. • (KS6) The option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people • (KS6) This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. <p>These arguments are invalid for this site.</p> <p>8. The land is adjacent to Stephens Castle and is open countryside where it borders Moorlands Road and Coopers Lane Meadow. The inclusion of some buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate.</p> <p>9. NPPF para 123 states Planning policies and decisions should aim to: ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. Including it within the Urban Area would compromise this highly prized area. <p>10. Most of the residents affected by the proposal were unaware of the policy as it was within the broader Key Issues section of the Options document rather than the Verwood section. None of them wish to see any development here.</p> <p>The owners of 67, 47 and 49 Moorlands Road wish the whole area to be included in the Green Belt. The owners of 67 have confirmed that they would be happy for their property to be included if that would remove the Council's concerns over any anomalies. The owners of 29, 41 and 63 Moorlands Road confirmed that they want to see the land remain undeveloped but declined any further involvement.</p> <p>On behalf of the named residents, I recommend that the area is included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</p> <p>SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species</p> <p>Proposals for Coopers Lane North and Does Lane score positively.</p> <p>However, excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt would put at risk BAP habitat and species (including foraging areas for Nightjar) and important features such as ancient boundary banks. Any urbanisation of the area would drive people onto adjacent N2K heathland.</p> <p>This area scores negatively.</p> <p>SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc</p> <p>Urbanisation of Coopers Lane South would destroy its tranquillity and impact on adjacent N2K heathland.</p> <p>Score negative</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
360082	Mr and Mrs K Healy		CSPS2449	Policy VTSW3	Yes	No	Yes			Yes	We support the policy to expand the Green Belt in Coopers Lane as it cannot be built on due to its proximity to St Stephen's Castle Nature Reserve. However we do have reservations about the land to be re-designated as urban. If the land is not developable due to its proximity to heathland then what is the reasoning? We consider the land should remain as Green Belt if the residents agree.	Consideration should be given to keeping the land, proposed as urban, in the Green Belt.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		552	
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2168	Policy VTSW3		No	No		No	No	Officers' explanation in the Options consultation for excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt was , This option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people. This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. This is illogical. As it is adjacent to N2K heathland (Stephens Castle) all the land lies within 400m and therefore cannot deliver housing. The reasons given for Woodland Walk, Ferndown to be included in the Green Belt were, The land is now covered by woodland and protected by a TPO which means it has limited development potential. This provides the necessary exceptional circumstance to justify the land being included within the Green Belt. Coopers Lane South is also covered by a blanket TPO which should preclude it from development but this only tells half the story in terms of its ecological and historical importance. It is characterised by its tranquillity and lack of light pollution. It should not be assessed simply by viewing as an area of land on a map. It is special to the people of Verwood and acts as a buffer between the truly urban area and the heathland LNR Stephens Castle (SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar). The extent of tree cover (including magnificent mature/veteran oaks) would preclude development as it would compromise their root protection zones. This is clearly visible on aerial photographs on Dorset Explorer. The trees are on substantial old boundary banks that, according to deeds of the properties, were in existence at the time of Nelson's ownership of the land. One property is a private arboretum which is a Dorset gem with many rare specimens. Another area includes secondary woodland/scrub. There is only one small area that is used as a paddock – partly in private ownership and partly leased from EDDC. One elderly horse has limited grazing here. Although the land has not been surveyed formally, I have identified significant biodiversity including good grassland and woodland edge flora (some Dorset Notable species), bats, Red Data book birds: Nightjars	Amend Policy VTSW3 to read: New Green belt boundaries will be drawn to include land at Coopers Lane and Doe's Lane and shown on the proposals map.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have known the area well for many years and have appropriate formal qualifications to represent the residents. The Policy was not included in the ETAG response to ensure propriety.	552	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>have been recorded in the oaks. In essence this is a wooded area with ecological links to the mature/veteran oaks that border Coopers Lane Meadow and extend to Burrows Lane and properties to the East and West of it. Key planning issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moorlands Road is a bridleway that borders Stephens Castle (N2K heathland) and cannot be widened for access. 2. It is a Bern Convention requirement for no new roads to be built on or near heathlands. 3. No new housing may be built within 400m of Stephens Castle – this area is adjacent to it and all of it is well within the 400m zone. 4. Any development would require an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations to determine the impact on the heathland. 5. Urbanisation of the area would drive dog walkers in particular straight onto Stephens Castle, so reducing use of Coopers Lane Meadow which has already been identified as a potential SANG in the Heathlands IPF and is supported in Core Strategy proposals. 6. Any development would necessitate removal of veteran oaks and historic boundary banks and compromise the root systems of other veteran oaks. There would be significant risk of light pollution of the remaining woodland area and any BAP species that it supports as well as impact on the heathland. 7. No logical argument has been put forward to include this land in the Urban area. In Core Strategy Options it was claimed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (KS4) that the land was able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands. • (KS6) The option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people • (KS6) This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. These arguments are invalid for this site. 8. The land is adjacent to Stephens Castle and is open countryside where it borders Moorlands Road and Coopers Lane Meadow. The inclusion of some buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate. 9. NPPF para 123 states Planning policies and decisions should aim to: ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. Including it within the Urban Area would compromise this highly prized area. 10. Most of the residents affected by the proposal were unaware of the policy as it was within the broader Key Issues section of the Options document rather than the Verwood section. None of them wish to see any development here. 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>The owners of 67, 47 and 49 Moorlands Road wish the whole area to be included in the Green Belt. The owners of 67 have confirmed that they would be happy for their property to be included if that would remove the Council's concerns over any anomalies. The owners of 29, 41 and 63 Moorlands Road confirmed that they want to see the land remain undeveloped but declined any further involvement.</p> <p>On behalf of the named residents, I recommend that the area is included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</p> <p>SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species</p> <p>Proposals for Coopers Lane North and Does Lane score positively.</p> <p>However, excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt would put at risk BAP habitat and species (including foraging areas for Nightjar) and important features such as ancient boundary banks. Any urbanisation of the area would drive people onto adjacent N2K heathland.</p> <p>This area scores negatively.</p> <p>SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc</p> <p>Urbanisation of Coopers Lane South would destroy its tranquillity and impact on adjacent N2K heathland.</p> <p>Score negative</p>					
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2152	Policy VTSW3		Yes					<p>The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity.</p> <p>Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.</p>				552	
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2160	Policy VTSW3		No	No	No	No	No	<p>Officers' explanation in the Options consultation for excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt was</p> <p>This option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people.</p> <p>This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing.</p> <p>This is illogical. As it is adjacent to N2K heathland (Stephens Castle) all the land lies within 400m and therefore cannot deliver housing.</p> <p>The reasons given for Woodland Walk, Ferndown to be included in the Green Belt were,</p> <p>The land is now covered by woodland and protected by</p>	<p>Amend Policy VTSW3 to read:</p> <p>New Green Belt boundaries will be drawn to include land at Coopers Lane and Doe's Lane and shown on the proposals map.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>I have known the area well for many years and have appropriate formal qualifications to represent the residents. The Policy was not included in the ETAG response to ensure propriety.</p>	552	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>a TPO which means it has limited development potential. This provides the necessary exceptional circumstance to justify the land being included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Coopers Lane South is also covered by a blanket TPO which should preclude it from development but this only tells half the story in terms of its ecological and historical importance.</p> <p>It is characterised by its tranquillity and lack of light pollution. It should not be assessed simply by viewing as an area of land on a map. It is special to the people of Verwood and acts as a buffer between the truly urban area and the heathland LNR Stephens Castle (SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar). The extent of tree cover (including magnificent mature/veteran oaks) would preclude development as it would compromise their root protection zones. This is clearly visible on aerial photographs on Dorset Explorer. The trees are on substantial old boundary banks that, according to deeds of the properties, were in existence at the time of Nelson's ownership of the land.</p> <p>One property is a private arboretum which is a Dorset gem with many rare specimens.</p> <p>Another area includes secondary woodland/scrub. There is only one small area that is used as a paddock – partly in private ownership and partly leased from EDDC. One elderly horse has limited grazing here.</p> <p>Although the land has not been surveyed formally, I have identified significant biodiversity including good grassland and woodland edge flora (some Dorset Notable species), bats, Red Data book birds: Nightjars have been recorded in the oaks. In essence this is a wooded area with ecological links to the mature/veteran oaks that border Coopers Lane Meadow and extend to Burrows Lane and properties to the East and West of it.</p> <p>Key planning issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moorlands Road is a bridleway that borders Stephens Castle (N2K heathland) and cannot be widened for access. 2. It is a Bern Convention requirement for no new roads to be built on or near heathlands. 3. No new housing may be built within 400m of Stephens Castle – this area is adjacent to it and all of it is well within the 400m zone. 4. Any development would require an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations to determine the impact on the heathland. 5. Urbanisation of the area would drive dog walkers in particular straight onto Stephens Castle, so reducing use of Coopers Lane Meadow which has already been identified as a potential SANG in the Heathlands IPF and is supported in Core Strategy proposals. 6. Any development would necessitate removal of veteran oaks and historic boundary banks and compromise the root systems of other veteran oaks. 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>There would be significant risk of light pollution of the remaining woodland area and any BAP species that it supports as well as impact on the heathland.</p> <p>7. No logical argument has been put forward to include this land in the Urban area. In Core Strategy Options it was claimed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (KS4) that the land was able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands. • (KS6) The option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people • (KS6) This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. <p>These arguments are invalid for this site.</p> <p>8. The land is adjacent to Stephens Castle and is open countryside where it borders Moorlands Road and Coopers Lane Meadow. The inclusion of some buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate.</p> <p>9. NPPF para 123 states Planning policies and decisions should aim to: ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. Including it within the Urban Area would compromise this highly prized area. <p>10. Most of the residents affected by the proposal were unaware of the policy as it was within the broader Key Issues section of the Options document rather than the Verwood section. None of them wish to see any development here.</p> <p>The owners of 67, 47 and 49 Moorlands Road wish the whole area to be included in the Green Belt. The owners of 67 have confirmed that they would be happy for their property to be included if that would remove the Council's concerns over any anomalies. The owners of 29, 41 and 63 Moorlands Road confirmed that they want to see the land remain undeveloped but declined any further involvement.</p> <p>On behalf of the named residents, I recommend that the area is included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</p> <p>SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species</p> <p>Proposals for Coopers Lane North and Does Lane score positively.</p> <p>However, excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt would put at risk BAP habitat and species (including foraging areas for Nightjar) and important features such as ancient boundary banks. Any urbanisation of the area would drive people onto adjacent N2K heathland.</p> <p>This area scores negatively.</p> <p>SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Urbanisation of Coopers Lane South would destroy its tranquillity and impact on adjacent N2K heathland. Score negative					
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2139	Policy VTSW3		Yes					The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.				552	
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2146	Policy VTSW3		Yes					The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.				552	
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2165	Policy VTSW3		No	No	No	No	No	Officers' explanation in the Options consultation for excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt was This option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people. This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. This is illogical. As it is adjacent to N2K heathland (Stephens Castle) all the land lies within 400m and therefore cannot deliver housing. The reasons given for Woodland Walk, Ferndown to be included in the Green Belt were, The land is now covered by woodland and protected by a TPO which means it has limited development potential. This provides the necessary exceptional circumstance to justify the land being included within the Green Belt. Coopers Lane South is also covered by a blanket TPO which should preclude it from development but this only tells half the story in terms of its ecological and historical importance. It is characterised by its tranquillity and lack of light pollution. It should not be assessed simply by viewing as an area of land on a map. It is special to the people of	Amend Policy VTSW3 to read: New Green Belt boundaries will be drawn to include land at Coopers Lane and Doe's Lane and shown on the proposals map.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have known the area well for many years and have appropriate formal qualifications to represent the residents. The Policy was not included in the ETAG response to ensure propriety.	552	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Verwood and acts as a buffer between the truly urban area and the heathland LNR Stephens Castle (SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar). The extent of tree cover (including magnificent mature/veteran oaks) would preclude development as it would compromise their root protection zones. This is clearly visible on aerial photographs on Dorset Explorer. The trees are on substantial old boundary banks that, according to deeds of the properties, were in existence at the time of Nelson's ownership of the land.</p> <p>One property is a private arboretum which is a Dorset gem with many rare specimens.</p> <p>Another area includes secondary woodland/scrub. There is only one small area that is used as a paddock – partly in private ownership and partly leased from EDDC. One elderly horse has limited grazing here. Although the land has not been surveyed formally, I have identified significant biodiversity including good grassland and woodland edge flora (some Dorset Notable species), bats, Red Data book birds: Nightjars have been recorded in the oaks. In essence this is a wooded area with ecological links to the mature/veteran oaks that border Coopers Lane Meadow and extend to Burrows Lane and properties to the East and West of it.</p> <p>Key planning issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moorlands Road is a bridleway that borders Stephens Castle (N2K heathland) and cannot be widened for access. 2. It is a Bern Convention requirement for no new roads to be built on or near heathlands. 3. No new housing may be built within 400m of Stephens Castle – this area is adjacent to it and all of it is well within the 400m zone. 4. Any development would require an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations to determine the impact on the heathland. 5. Urbanisation of the area would drive dog walkers in particular straight onto Stephens Castle, so reducing use of Coopers Lane Meadow which has already been identified as a potential SANG in the Heathlands IPF and is supported in Core Strategy proposals. 6. Any development would necessitate removal of veteran oaks and historic boundary banks and compromise the root systems of other veteran oaks. There would be significant risk of light pollution of the remaining woodland area and any BAP species that it supports as well as impact on the heathland. 7. No logical argument has been put forward to include this land in the Urban area. In Core Strategy Options it was claimed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (KS4) that the land was able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands. • (KS6) The option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people • (KS6) This option is assessed as positive in relation to 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing.</p> <p>These arguments are invalid for this site.</p> <p>8. The land is adjacent to Stephens Castle and is open countryside where it borders Moorlands Road and Coopers Lane Meadow. The inclusion of some buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate.</p> <p>9. NPPF para 123 states Planning policies and decisions should aim to: ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. Including it within the Urban Area would compromise this highly prized area. <p>10. Most of the residents affected by the proposal were unaware of the policy as it was within the broader Key Issues section of the Options document rather than the Verwood section. None of them wish to see any development here.</p> <p>The owners of 67, 47 and 49 Moorlands Road wish the whole area to be included in the Green Belt. The owners of 67 have confirmed that they would be happy for their property to be included if that would remove the Council's concerns over any anomalies. The owners of 29, 41 and 63 Moorlands Road confirmed that they want to see the land remain undeveloped but declined any further involvement.</p> <p>On behalf of the named residents, I recommend that the area is included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</p> <p>SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species</p> <p>Proposals for Coopers Lane North and Does Lane score positively.</p> <p>However, excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt would put at risk BAP habitat and species (including foraging areas for Nightjar) and important features such as ancient boundary banks. Any urbanisation of the area would drive people onto adjacent N2K heathland.</p> <p>This area scores negatively.</p> <p>SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc</p> <p>Urbanisation of Coopers Lane South would destroy its tranquillity and impact on adjacent N2K heathland.</p> <p>Score negative</p>					
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2163	Policy VTSW3		Yes					Supported in part				552	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of ME1 (Policy ME3 in Core Strategy Options). Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI. (Please see 2nd response)						
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2135	Map 11.3		Yes					The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.				554		
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2157	Map 11.3		No	No	No	No	No	Officers' explanation in the Options consultation for excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt was , This option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people. This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. This is illogical. As it is adjacent to N2K heathland (Stephens Castle) all the land lies within 400m and therefore cannot deliver housing. The reasons given for Woodland Walk, Ferndown to be included in the Green Belt were, The land is now covered by woodland and protected by a TPO which means it has limited development potential. This provides the necessary exceptional circumstance to justify the land being included within the Green Belt. Coopers Lane South is also covered by a blanket TPO which should preclude it from development but this only tells half the story in terms of its ecological and historical importance. It is characterised by its tranquillity and lack of light pollution. It should not be assessed simply by viewing as an area of land on a map. It is special to the people of Verwood and acts as a buffer between the truly urban area and the heathland LNR Stephens Castle (SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar). The extent of tree cover (including magnificent mature/veteran oaks) would preclude development as it would compromise their root protection zones. This is clearly visible on aerial photographs on Dorset Explorer. The trees are on substantial old boundary banks that, according to deeds	Amend Policy VTSW3 to read: New Green Belt boundaries will be drawn to include land at Coopers Lane and Doe's Lane and shown on the proposals map.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have known the area well for many years and have appropriate formal qualifications to represent the residents. The Policy was not included in the ETAG response to ensure propriety.	554		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>of the properties, were in existence at the time of Nelson’s ownership of the land. One property is a private arboretum which is a Dorset gem with many rare specimens. Another area includes secondary woodland/scrub. There is only one small area that is used as a paddock – partly in private ownership and partly leased from EDDC. One elderly horse has limited grazing here. Although the land has not been surveyed formally, I have identified significant biodiversity including good grassland and woodland edge flora (some Dorset Notable species), bats, Red Data book birds: Nightjars have been recorded in the oaks. In essence this is a wooded area with ecological links to the mature/veteran oaks that border Coopers Lane Meadow and extend to Burrows Lane and properties to the East and West of it. Key planning issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moorlands Road is a bridleway that borders Stephens Castle (N2K heathland) and cannot be widened for access. 2. It is a Bern Convention requirement for no new roads to be built on or near heathlands. 3. No new housing may be built within 400m of Stephens Castle – this area is adjacent to it and all of it is well within the 400m zone. 4. Any development would require an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations to determine the impact on the heathland. 5. Urbanisation of the area would drive dog walkers in particular straight onto Stephens Castle, so reducing use of Coopers Lane Meadow which has already been identified as a potential SANG in the Heathlands IPF and is supported in Core Strategy proposals. 6. Any development would necessitate removal of veteran oaks and historic boundary banks and compromise the root systems of other veteran oaks. There would be significant risk of light pollution of the remaining woodland area and any BAP species that it supports as well as impact on the heathland. 7. No logical argument has been put forward to include this land in the Urban area. In Core Strategy Options it was claimed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (KS4) that the land was able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands. • (KS6) The option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people • (KS6) This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. These arguments are invalid for this site. 8. The land is adjacent to Stephens Castle and is open countryside where it borders Moorlands Road and Coopers Lane Meadow. The inclusion of some buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate. 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>9. NPPF para 123 states Planning policies and decisions should aim to: ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. Including it within the Urban Area would compromise this highly prized area. <p>10. Most of the residents affected by the proposal were unaware of the policy as it was within the broader Key Issues section of the Options document rather than the Verwood section. None of them wish to see any development here.</p> <p>The owners of 67, 47 and 49 Moorlands Road wish the whole area to be included in the Green Belt. The owners of 67 have confirmed that they would be happy for their property to be included if that would remove the Council's concerns over any anomalies. The owners of 29, 41 and 63 Moorlands Road confirmed that they want to see the land remain undeveloped but declined any further involvement.</p> <p>On behalf of the named residents, I recommend that the area is included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species Proposals for Coopers Lane North and Does Lane score positively. However, excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt would put at risk BAP habitat and species (including foraging areas for Nightjar) and important features such as ancient boundary banks. Any urbanisation of the area would drive people onto adjacent N2K heathland. This area scores negatively. SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc Urbanisation of Coopers Lane South would destroy its tranquillity and impact on adjacent N2K heathland. Score negative</p>					
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2169	Map 11.3		No	No		No	No	<p>Officers' explanation in the Options consultation for excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt was</p> <p>This option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people. This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. This is illogical. As it is adjacent to N2K heathland (Stephens Castle) all the land lies within 400m and therefore cannot deliver housing. The reasons given for Woodland Walk, Ferndown to be included in the Green Belt were, The land is now covered by woodland and protected by</p>	Amend Policy VTSW3 to read: New Green belt boundaries will be drawn to include land at Coopers Lane and Doe's Lane and shown on the proposals map.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have known the area well for many years and have appropriate formal qualifications to represent the residents. The Policy was not included in the ETAG response to ensure propriety.	554	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>a TPO which means it has limited development potential. This provides the necessary exceptional circumstance to justify the land being included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Coopers Lane South is also covered by a blanket TPO which should preclude it from development but this only tells half the story in terms of its ecological and historical importance.</p> <p>It is characterised by its tranquillity and lack of light pollution. It should not be assessed simply by viewing as an area of land on a map. It is special to the people of Verwood and acts as a buffer between the truly urban area and the heathland LNR Stephens Castle (SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar). The extent of tree cover (including magnificent mature/veteran oaks) would preclude development as it would compromise their root protection zones. This is clearly visible on aerial photographs on Dorset Explorer. The trees are on substantial old boundary banks that, according to deeds of the properties, were in existence at the time of Nelson's ownership of the land.</p> <p>One property is a private arboretum which is a Dorset gem with many rare specimens.</p> <p>Another area includes secondary woodland/scrub. There is only one small area that is used as a paddock – partly in private ownership and partly leased from EDDC. One elderly horse has limited grazing here.</p> <p>Although the land has not been surveyed formally, I have identified significant biodiversity including good grassland and woodland edge flora (some Dorset Notable species), bats, Red Data book birds: Nightjars have been recorded in the oaks. In essence this is a wooded area with ecological links to the mature/veteran oaks that border Coopers Lane Meadow and extend to Burrows Lane and properties to the East and West of it.</p> <p>Key planning issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moorlands Road is a bridleway that borders Stephens Castle (N2K heathland) and cannot be widened for access. 2. It is a Bern Convention requirement for no new roads to be built on or near heathlands. 3. No new housing may be built within 400m of Stephens Castle – this area is adjacent to it and all of it is well within the 400m zone. 4. Any development would require an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations to determine the impact on the heathland. 5. Urbanisation of the area would drive dog walkers in particular straight onto Stephens Castle, so reducing use of Coopers Lane Meadow which has already been identified as a potential SANG in the Heathlands IPF and is supported in Core Strategy proposals. 6. Any development would necessitate removal of veteran oaks and historic boundary banks and compromise the root systems of other veteran oaks. 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>There would be significant risk of light pollution of the remaining woodland area and any BAP species that it supports as well as impact on the heathland.</p> <p>7. No logical argument has been put forward to include this land in the Urban area. In Core Strategy Options it was claimed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (KS4) that the land was able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands. • (KS6) The option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people • (KS6) This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. <p>These arguments are invalid for this site.</p> <p>8. The land is adjacent to Stephens Castle and is open countryside where it borders Moorlands Road and Coopers Lane Meadow. The inclusion of some buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate.</p> <p>9. NPPF para 123 states Planning policies and decisions should aim to: ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. Including it within the Urban Area would compromise this highly prized area. <p>10. Most of the residents affected by the proposal were unaware of the policy as it was within the broader Key Issues section of the Options document rather than the Verwood section. None of them wish to see any development here.</p> <p>The owners of 67, 47 and 49 Moorlands Road wish the whole area to be included in the Green Belt. The owners of 67 have confirmed that they would be happy for their property to be included if that would remove the Council's concerns over any anomalies. The owners of 29, 41 and 63 Moorlands Road confirmed that they want to see the land remain undeveloped but declined any further involvement.</p> <p>On behalf of the named residents, I recommend that the area is included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species Proposals for Coopers Lane North and Does Lane score positively. However, excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt would put at risk BAP habitat and species (including foraging areas for Nightjar) and important features such as ancient boundary banks. Any urbanisation of the area would drive people onto adjacent N2K heathland. This area scores negatively. SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											Urbanisation of Coopers Lane South would destroy its tranquillity and impact on adjacent N2K heathland. Score negative						
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2153	Map 11.3		Yes					The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.					554	
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2161	Map 11.3		No	No	No	No	No	Officers' explanation in the Options consultation for excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt was This option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people. This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. This is illogical. As it is adjacent to N2K heathland (Stephens Castle) all the land lies within 400m and therefore cannot deliver housing. The reasons given for Woodland Walk, Ferndown to be included in the Green Belt were, The land is now covered by woodland and protected by a TPO which means it has limited development potential. This provides the necessary exceptional circumstance to justify the land being included within the Green Belt. Coopers Lane South is also covered by a blanket TPO which should preclude it from development but this only tells half the story in terms of its ecological and historical importance. It is characterised by its tranquillity and lack of light pollution. It should not be assessed simply by viewing as an area of land on a map. It is special to the people of Verwood and acts as a buffer between the truly urban area and the heathland LNR Stephens Castle (SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar). The extent of tree cover (including magnificent mature/veteran oaks) would preclude development as it would compromise their root protection zones. This is clearly visible on aerial photographs on Dorset Explorer. The trees are on substantial old boundary banks that, according to deeds of the properties, were in existence at the time of Nelson's ownership of the land. One property is a private arboretum which is a Dorset gem with many rare specimens. Another area includes secondary woodland/scrub.	Amend Policy VTSW3 to read: New Green Belt boundaries will be drawn to include land at Coopers Lane and Doe's Lane and shown on the proposals map.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have known the area well for many years and have appropriate formal qualifications to represent the residents. The Policy was not included in the ETAG response to ensure propriety.		554	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>There is only one small area that is used as a paddock – partly in private ownership and partly leased from EDDC. One elderly horse has limited grazing here. Although the land has not been surveyed formally, I have identified significant biodiversity including good grassland and woodland edge flora (some Dorset Notable species), bats, Red Data book birds: Nightjars have been recorded in the oaks. In essence this is a wooded area with ecological links to the mature/veteran oaks that border Coopers Lane Meadow and extend to Burrows Lane and properties to the East and West of it.</p> <p>Key planning issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moorlands Road is a bridleway that borders Stephens Castle (N2K heathland) and cannot be widened for access. 2. It is a Bern Convention requirement for no new roads to be built on or near heathlands. 3. No new housing may be built within 400m of Stephens Castle – this area is adjacent to it and all of it is well within the 400m zone. 4. Any development would require an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations to determine the impact on the heathland. 5. Urbanisation of the area would drive dog walkers in particular straight onto Stephens Castle, so reducing use of Coopers Lane Meadow which has already been identified as a potential SANG in the Heathlands IPF and is supported in Core Strategy proposals. 6. Any development would necessitate removal of veteran oaks and historic boundary banks and compromise the root systems of other veteran oaks. There would be significant risk of light pollution of the remaining woodland area and any BAP species that it supports as well as impact on the heathland. 7. No logical argument has been put forward to include this land in the Urban area. In Core Strategy Options it was claimed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (KS4) that the land was able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands. • (KS6) The option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people • (KS6) This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. <p>These arguments are invalid for this site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. The land is adjacent to Stephens Castle and is open countryside where it borders Moorlands Road and Coopers Lane Meadow. The inclusion of some buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate. 9. NPPF para 123 states Planning policies and decisions should aim to: ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Including it within the Urban Area would compromise this highly prized area.</p> <p>10. Most of the residents affected by the proposal were unaware of the policy as it was within the broader Key Issues section of the Options document rather than the Verwood section. None of them wish to see any development here.</p> <p>The owners of 67, 47 and 49 Moorlands Road wish the whole area to be included in the Green Belt. The owners of 67 have confirmed that they would be happy for their property to be included if that would remove the Council's concerns over any anomalies. The owners of 29, 41 and 63 Moorlands Road confirmed that they want to see the land remain undeveloped but declined any further involvement.</p> <p>On behalf of the named residents, I recommend that the area is included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species Proposals for Coopers Lane North and Does Lane score positively. However, excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt would put at risk BAP habitat and species (including foraging areas for Nightjar) and important features such as ancient boundary banks. Any urbanisation of the area would drive people onto adjacent N2K heathland. This area scores negatively. SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc Urbanisation of Coopers Lane South would destroy its tranquillity and impact on adjacent N2K heathland. Score negative</p>					
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2140	Map 11.3		Yes					<p>The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.</p>				554	
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2148	Map 11.3		Yes					<p>The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred</p>				554	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane id also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.					
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2166	Map 11.3	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Officers' explanation in the Options consultation for excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt was</p> <p>This option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people. This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. This is illogical. As it is adjacent to N2K heathland (Stephens Castle) all the land lies within 400m and therefore cannot deliver housing. The reasons given for Woodland Walk, Ferndown to be included in the Green Belt were, The land is now covered by woodland and protected by a TPO which means it has limited development potential. This provides the necessary exceptional circumstance to justify the land being included within the Green Belt. Coopers Lane South is also covered by a blanket TPO which should preclude it from development but this only tells half the story in terms of its ecological and historical importance. It is characterised by its tranquillity and lack of light pollution. It should not be assessed simply by viewing as an area of land on a map. It is special to the people of Verwood and acts as a buffer between the truly urban area and the heathland LNR Stephens Castle (SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar). The extent of tree cover (including magnificent mature/veteran oaks) would preclude development as it would compromise their root protection zones. This is clearly visible on aerial photographs on Dorset Explorer. The trees are on substantial old boundary banks that, according to deeds of the properties, were in existence at the time of Nelson's ownership of the land. One property is a private arboretum which is a Dorset gem with many rare specimens. Another area includes secondary woodland/scrub. There is only one small area that is used as a paddock – partly in private ownership and partly leased from EDDC. One elderly horse has limited grazing here. Although the land has not been surveyed formally, I have identified significant biodiversity including good grassland and woodland edge flora (some Dorset Notable species), bats, Red Data book birds: Nightjars have been recorded in the oaks. In essence this is a wooded area with ecological links to the mature/veteran oaks that border Coopers Lane Meadow and extend to Burrows Lane and properties to the East and West of it.</p>	Amend Policy VTSW3 to read: New Green Belt boundaries will be drawn to include land ar Coopers Lane and Doe's Lane and shown on the proposals map.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have known the area well for many years and have appropriate formal qualifications to represent the residents. The Policy was not included in the ETAG response to ensure propriety.	554	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Key planning issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moorlands Road is a bridleway that borders Stephens Castle (N2K heathland) and cannot be widened for access. 2. It is a Bern Convention requirement for no new roads to be built on or near heathlands. 3. No new housing may be built within 400m of Stephens Castle – this area is adjacent to it and all of it is well within the 400m zone. 4. Any development would require an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations to determine the impact on the heathland. 5. Urbanisation of the area would drive dog walkers in particular straight onto Stephens Castle, so reducing use of Coopers Lane Meadow which has already been identified as a potential SANG in the Heathlands IPF and is supported in Core Strategy proposals. 6. Any development would necessitate removal of veteran oaks and historic boundary banks and compromise the root systems of other veteran oaks. There would be significant risk of light pollution of the remaining woodland area and any BAP species that it supports as well as impact on the heathland. 7. No logical argument has been put forward to include this land in the Urban area. In Core Strategy Options it was claimed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (KS4) that the land was able to provide new housing without compromising the heathlands. • (KS6) The option would reduce the opportunity to provide housing to meet the needs of local people • (KS6) This option is assessed as positive in relation to the natural environment and sustainable use of resources but would clearly be negative for the provision of appropriate housing. These arguments are invalid for this site. 8. The land is adjacent to Stephens Castle and is open countryside where it borders Moorlands Road and Coopers Lane Meadow. The inclusion of some buildings in the Green Belt is not inappropriate. 9. NPPF para 123 states Planning policies and decisions should aim to: ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. Including it within the Urban Area would compromise this highly prized area. 10. Most of the residents affected by the proposal were unaware of the policy as it was within the broader Key Issues section of the Options document rather than the Verwood section. None of them wish to see any development here. <p>The owners of 67, 47 and 49 Moorlands Road wish the whole area to be included in the Green Belt. The owners of 67 have confirmed that they would be happy for their property to be included if that would remove the</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Council's concerns over any anomalies. The owners of 29, 41 and 63 Moorlands Road confirmed that they want to see the land remain undeveloped but declined any further involvement.</p> <p>On behalf of the named residents, I recommend that the area is included within the Green Belt.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</p> <p>SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species</p> <p>Proposals for Coopers Lane North and Does Lane score positively.</p> <p>However, excluding Coopers Lane South from the Green Belt would put at risk BAP habitat and species (including foraging areas for Nightjar) and important features such as ancient boundary banks. Any urbanisation of the area would drive people onto adjacent N2K heathland.</p> <p>This area scores negatively.</p> <p>SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc</p> <p>Urbanisation of Coopers Lane South would destroy its tranquillity and impact on adjacent N2K heathland.</p> <p>Score negative</p>					
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2136	Map 11.4	Yes						<p>The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity.</p> <p>Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.</p>				555	
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2154	Map 11.4	Yes						<p>The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity.</p> <p>Does Lane is also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.</p>				555	
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2141	Map 11.4	Yes						<p>The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and</p>				555	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane id also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.						
656737	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS2149	Map 11.4		Yes					The reasoning for including Coopers Lane North and Does Lane in the Green Belt is supported. The land at Coopers Lane North is an SNCI. It is an area of neutral grassland adjacent to Stephens Castle, SSSI and is bordered by mature/veteran oaks that for decades have been regular feeding territory for Nightjar. The trees and hedgerows are also bat foraging corridors. As an SNCI it should be protected under the provisions of Preferred Option ME3. Its proximity to a Heathland N2K site should ensure its protection from development in perpetuity. Does Lane id also undevelopable heathland adjacent to Dewlands Common, SSSI.				555		
652994	Mrs Kathleen Leader		CSPS544	11.29	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Verwood is the second largest town in East Dorset already but cannot be expanded anyfurther with such a poor town centre. There are no shops of any real worth there and the car parks are generally full these days with doctors patients or people working in the centre. There is no where for a more shoppers to park and no bus service to speak of aouns most of Verwoods smaller roads to bring people without cars in.	East Dorset should be thinking about building around a centre that can expand in the future	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		556		
496473	Mr Brian Morgan		CSPS35	Policy VTSW4	No	No		Yes		Yes	The reasons are for the most part set out in my attached copy letter to Christopher Chope MP dated 17th February 2012 (actual letter dated 8th February), in addition to which I consider there to be little or no need (as opposed to demand) for new housing here, and certainly not enough to override green belt protection.	Complete deletion of FWP5, FWP6 and FWP7. Exactly the same comments as those in 3, 4, 5 and 6 above apply to many other policies in the document with similar deletion considered necessary - these include:- FWP3 and 4, WMC3 and 5, and VTSW4 and 5. The only proviso to this is that it in so far as any of these sites are not now green belt, then that factor would obviously not apply to those sites.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	1. I consider a well-argued oral and public presentation of the case outlined above would be much more effective than mere written argument. 2. The opportunities for open public debate on this matter have so far been far too limited, having regard especially to the long term importance of the Green Belt heritage, as opposed to the short term 'needs' to promote economic growth, both locally and nationally.	559	2158987 0 1.pdf 2158985 0 1.pdf 2158984 0 1.pdf	
507931	Mr and Mrs R S W Spicer		CSPS76	Policy VTSW4							By our address you will know that we live opposite Trinity First School and therefore opposite the paddock which has had horses grazing for many years. In your Core Strategy as we understand it, you are proposing to allow allotments. If this was to be implemented into Policy we think it will raise a number of serious problems. 1. ACCESS: To access this paddock you will have to either create an entrance off the tarred part of Coopers Lane, i.e. where the parents park their cars for children		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		559		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>to be taken into school. Or, allow the same access road that the present tenants use which means the same access road as the children to Trinity First School. This not noly happens twice a day but in the afternoon it can go on for a number of hours, depending on the different times the variuos age groups go home. Not forgetting also this school has a nursery department where very small children are walking or being pushed in pushchairs to and from school.</p> <p>2. VEHICLES: One has to imagine there will be many and various types of vehicles needing to park and leave their cars, sometimes for many hours at a time. Also people vacating their cars will often let litter fly out of their cars and not bother about picking it up.</p> <p>3. LITTER: We feel very strongly about litter of any sort and this is very likely to occur with so many people accessing their allotments, possibly getting out the deck chair sitting in the sun sipping tea and eating biscuits and not having any regard about rubbish they leave behind.</p> <p>4. FIRE HAZARD: As far as we are aware one is no longer allowed to light a bonfire as and where you please. With our limited knowledge of allotments we believe people will light fires with no regard to any neighbours nearby, because the allotment holders do not live here.</p> <p>5. UNSIGHTLY: Our concern is the incredible unsightly mess that these proposed allotments would bring. It is a fact that eventually when the enthusiasm wears off people will not take the time or trouble to keep their individual allotment in a tidy order.</p> <p>7. SHEDS: As with most allotments one presumes that the said allotment holder will be allowed to put up a shed, which will most probably be built with a jumbled creation of any bits of corrugated iron, asbestos, bits of old timber etc.</p> <p>8. PROTECTED HEATHLAND: We are very much aware of the 400 metres of protected heathland, which in our opinion will get accessed from the area designated for the allotments. When you have allotments one individual or the entire family can come for an hour, a morning, an afternoon or indeed the entire day. Older chhildren will ultimately get bored and be allowed to wander off to leave the parents with their vegetables etc. Who is going to supervise the protected heathland in those cases? In conclusion we object to the proposal of building allotments on the said site for the many and varied reasons listed above.</p>					
588532	Mr and Mrs Nick Hunt		CSPS50	Policy VTSW4			No			No	New housing in Verwood should not be permitted unless it is required to meet local needs. More housing would not be sustainable unless it is related to local employment opportunities.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		559	
646381	Mrs		CSPS61	Policy	Yes	No		No	No	No	Building homes for 230 families can not be justified	A significant reduction in the	No, I do not		559	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
	Michelle Jameson			VTSW4							based on the current infrastructure in Verwood. The availability of existing healthcare, school, leisure and public services can not cater for this volume of homes - especially in conjunction with policy VTSW5 for another 50 homes.	quantity of homes could be supported with existing healthcare, school, leisure and public service facilities.	wish to participate at the oral examination			
523262	Mr & Mrs Jonathan Jones		CSPS237	Policy VTSW4	No	No		No		No	I have a letter from my MP confirming the arbitrary re-drawing of the Green Belt boundaries is not consistent with Government policy. This proposal, therefore, is not consistent with national policy and should be legally challenged.	Development must not violate the Green Belt boundary.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		559	
648124	Mrs Lesley Eve		CSPS130	Policy VTSW4	Yes	No		Yes	Yes		Credible evidence base - great need for 100% affordable housing stock - not necessarily based on housing list (council) as many don't bother as they know they have no chance of a council house. You should make builders only build low cost housing (100%) until the need is met - don't give planning permission for anything else.	Government funding - to get the economy going / jobs / services etc. Councils - free up brown belt / edge green belt / cheap farmland. Councils - planning permission only for 100% low cost homes. Councils - allow hard working low earning singles and couples same rights as non workers on DHSS / immigrants / one parent families. Ring fence returns on part rent / part buy or packages - council pay 1/4 buyer pays back when selling on or before.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		559	
649505	Miss Dawn Leader		CSPS236	Policy VTSW4	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	I consider this document to be unsound for the following reasons: Presently there is not enough parking in the Potters Wheel car park for existing residents. Presently there is not enough parking at Potterne Park for people who want to go and enjoy the park Presently there is not enough preschool places for 3 year olds and only just enough first school places Presently there is no senior school for older children to attend Presently there is nothing within the town for teenagers to do or go. There is a 10-14 day wait to see a doctor at either surgery There is no room on most of the roads to put in any form of cycle path.	More schools, parking, better bus services, cycle routes, youth clubs. The neighbourhood reports didn't seem to provide answers for these problems	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	Dawn	559	
654618	Mr Peter Tanner	Tanner & Tilley Planning Consultants	CSPS883	Policy VTSW4	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Whilst we support North Western Verwood New Neighbourhood being identified as suitable for redevelopment for housing, we consider that the provisos set out in the first two bullet points under the heading 'Layout and Design' are unnecessarily prescriptive.	We suggest that the criteria for Policy VTSW4 set out under the heading "Layout and Design" be amended to the following "...Layout and Design	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	We wish to participate at the oral part of the examination with the Government Inspector to further consider the criteria for development of this	559	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											We consider that the requirement for the layout and design "...will be set out according to the principles of the masterplan...." and that " ...A design code will be agreed by the Council, setting out the required high standards..." could result in the design policy being unnecessarily prescriptive and over detailed, rather than guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout and materials, as advocated in the NPPF.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The layout and design should have general regard to the principles set out in the Masterplan reports. The development should achieve a high quality and inclusive design that responds to the local character and reflects the identity of local surroundings and materials whilst not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation." 		proposed allocated site and to ensure that any criteria that is adopted does not unduly constrain the optimisation of housing development on this site or otherwise frustrate innovative design.		
656741	Mr and Mrs Terrence Groves		CSPS1434	Policy VTSW4							<p>With reference to the Christchurch and East Dorset core strategy response form.</p> <p>We do not want to comment on whether the VTSW4 and VTSW5 documents are legally compliant or sound, but more housing just increases the problems already in Verwood.</p> <p>The traffic on the B3081 is a problem for vehicles during the rush hour, but it is also very difficult to cross the roads during these periods.</p> <p>For example during rush hour it is nearly impossible to cross the road using rule 7 of the highway code, to the bus stop near Lake Road or to go up Noon Hill.</p> <p>I am sure there are similar problems in other areas so maybe more zebra crossings would help, although it would probably make it more difficult for car users.</p> <p>When we go into the centre of Verwood we normally walk from Lake Road, but occasionally we have to use the car and find it difficult or impossible to get a space in the Potter's Wheel or surgery car parks.</p> <p>Other people have different problems.</p> <p>If more housing is to be built some improvements to the problem areas are needed before the projects go ahead.</p>				559	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1352	Policy VTSW4		No	No	No	No	No	<p>Ecological survey information for this site is not available therefore it is not possible to fully assess the potential environmental impacts of development on this site.</p> <p>NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment. Dorset Wildlife Trust has several concerns over development of this site which lies in a tranquil area of AGLV with views to the AONB.</p> <p>1. This proposal brings new housing in close proximity to the Romford Bridge Copse SNCI (SU00/58), which is not acknowledged in the text or maps. The SNCI is a broadleaved semi-natural woodland and pond, without public access, immediately to the southwest of the site. This development would lead to the SNCI being surrounded by urban development on 3 sides, increasing pressure on its biodiversity for example from noise, disturbance, predation by cats and light pollution and reducing its connectivity to surrounding open</p>	<p>Dorset Wildlife Trust would like to see full ecological survey information inform the allocation.</p> <p>We recommend that under Green Infrastructure additional wording to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of significant landscape and ecological buffers alongside the countryside edges of the site, which protect the Site of Nature Conservation Interest and other biodiversity features, complimenting surrounding habitats and enhancing the 	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county, are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership.</p>	559	2256010_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>countryside. The SNCI currently suffers from fly tipping and disposal of garden waste from nearby properties, which is also in evidence along the hedgerow along Eastworth Road on the boundary of the proposed housing site. Thus the lack of a continuous buffer between the SNCI and the development is cause for concern as the urban pressures on the site will only become worse.</p> <p>To mitigate these impacts and comply with NPPF (109, 117) DWT consider provision of a significant natural buffer against the whole SNCI at least as wide as that indicated against the old railway line and Eastworth Road is essential to afford the SNCI some protection. Additionally to compensate for lost ecological connectivity, and follow NPPF guidance on providing net biodiversity gains where possible (109), we recommend that planting of native trees and shrubs could provide linkages to nearby woodland to the north and west, strengthen corridors along the old railway and provide good habitat within the SANG appropriate to the historical biodiversity of the area. Any planting schemes should be subject to ecological assessment of the existing grassland biodiversity to ensure there is no biodiversity loss of good quality grassland.</p> <p>2. The VTSW4 site has a good number of mature trees, hedgerows and grassland, which is of unknown quality for biodiversity. Survey at appropriate time of year will allow assessment of the impacts of this scheme and identify any priority habitats and species to inform a decision on this site. For example, the site is near a known badger sett and badger paths are in evidence leading away from the site, so it is likely to be a foraging area, which would need consideration in site design. Bats may also be utilising the site, and feeding corridors should be established to inform site design. The site may well support other protected species such as reptiles and birds.</p> <p>3. Eastworth Farm lies adjacent to a tributary of the River Crane, which feeds into the Moors River SSSI and will require Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and adequate buffering to protect the quality and biodiversity of the watercourse.</p> <p>4. There is also concern over the potential for this development to cause light pollution to the open countryside areas and AONB beyond, which could have significant impacts on local wildlife and the tranquillity of this area. DWT supports the views and recommendations made by Hilary Chittenden in her response to this policy and considers that if mitigation is not possible then this policy will conflict with the Core Strategy Vision and Objective 1 which protects the AONB and hence will not be deliverable.</p>	<p>ecological network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wildlife strategy to be agreed with the Council to protect and enhance priority habitats and species within the site and SANG, and enhancements to the ecological network. (This should include existing trees and hedgerows, and make provision for protected species such as badgers, bats and reptiles). We recommend a new subsection on drainage to include the provision of a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme and buffer to the tributary of the River Crane. We also recommend inclusion of the need to address light pollution and tranquillity of this area to protect the AONB and AGLV. We suggest that environmental designations are shown on Map 11.5, including the adjacent SNCI and watercourse at Eastworth Farm, and that an increased buffer is shown against the northeastern boundary of the SNCI and the watercourse. 				
359547	Mrs V Bright	Verwood Town Council	CSPS1747	Policy VTSW4	Yes	Yes					This site is close to an area of Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Housing density on the site should		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral		559	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											reflect its proximity to the sensitive landscape of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Light pollution must be addressed, especially due to the sloping nature of the site. Sufficient provision for children from the new development must be provided by the two nearest first schools: Hillside 1st School and Trinity. Adequate health provision must be made available locally for the increase in population.		examination				
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS1540	Policy VTSW4	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Verwood is an unsustainable location The potential for achieving a high proportion of affordable housing here is high and clearly attractive from the point of view of meeting targets. However, Verwood is not a sustainable location. This view was taken by the Inspector at the time of the last Local Plan and detailed reasoning is given in response to VTSW1. In summary the key issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High reliance on single occupancy private cars to enable people to travel relatively long distances to work. Many travel to Bournemouth, Poole, Southampton, London and other long distance locations. • Poor public transport provision including frequency, availability (there is limited service at weekend and none in the evenings) and journey time. • High proportion of relatively wealthy residents offers little hope of improvement of public transport. • Little comparison shopping: principle destinations are Southampton, Bournemouth and Poole. <p>I question the ethics of committing people on low incomes (and who therefore need affordable housing) to car ownership.</p> <p>Landscape and light pollution issues The areas selected for development are in the AGLV and on unimproved grassland. There has been no biodiversity survey. Background Paper 09 is incorrect in its dismissive approach to the AGLV claiming that it has been compromised by the development of Trinity First School. The school (Local Plan saved policy V8) was designed to take into account the open and important location. The buildings replicated low lying agricultural (chicken) sheds specifically so that they would not have an adverse impact on the AGLV: this objective was achieved very successfully. Landscape sensitivity is high. There are uninterrupted open and long distance views outwards from the whole of the proposed development area across the AGLV and onwards to the AONB and therefore from the AONB and AGLV towards the proposed development sites. (A series of 4 photos were submitted to support this argument please see pages 23 and 23 of the pdf attached.) Fig 1 View of AGLV from NE towards Eastworth Farm (1), the area of proposed housing next to the school (2) and that south of Edmondsham Road (3) Note the openness of the landscape and lack of</p>	<p>1. Delete from Map 11.5 the development area between Eastworth Road and Trinity First School. 2. The remaining housing allocation should be informed by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ecological survey; • criteria that establish the sustainability (or otherwise) of Verwood and the proposed development area including the potential for those in affordable homes to be disadvantaged by having inadequate access to public transport; • the strength of policies to mitigate light pollution and loss of tranquillity in this sensitive area. 	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I have specialist knowledge of environmental and sustainability issues. To ensure propriety, this policy/para was not included in the ETAG response	559	2239098_0_1.PDF 2239109_0_1.pdf	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>potential screening of development or light pollution. Fig 2 View WNW across AGLV showing open rolling countryside that borders AONB Fig 3 Closer focus on the area nearest to the school. Eastworth Farm on R. Note rough pasture and long distance views towards AONB. The oaks here do not provide screening. Additional street lights along the Edmondsham Road or on the rural (nearer side) of Eastworth Farm could not be screened. Fig 4 The land proposed for development southwest of Edmondsham Road looking north towards former railway line. Note topography of land and potential for long distance light trespass. North Verwood is unique in terms of its tranquillity and intrinsically dark skies. Development proposals must demonstrate how they will comply with NPPF para125. The Co-ordinator British Astronomical Association Campaign for Dark Skies (CfDS) has advised that of all the sites proposed in Core Strategy this area is of greatest concern for its potential for damaging light pollution. ETAG's supplementary advice to the Options consultation ("Light Pollution – Issues for consideration in developing the Core Strategy" submitted to EDDC, 5.6.11) , advised that it is essential to bear in mind that the West Wilts and Cranborne Chase AONB is the darkest place in Southern Central England. There is potential for development to have a serious impact on this unique area: it has been mapped by CPRE as tranquillity but includes light pollution. The nearest other dark area is Exmoor. This has been designated as Europe's first International Dark Skies Reserve. The proposed development site falls under environmental zone E1 which requires Zero upward light. Unless the issue can be resolved the policy is undeliverable. I am exploring the possibility of screening (to help mitigate additional light and protect the tranquillity of the area) through substantial restoration of mixed native woodland (as in the maps dating from the mid 19th century, bunding and lowering the road (C106) and I am seeking advice from CfDS on what modelling might be available to inform robust decisions. However, the effectiveness of such screening when trees are not in leaf would depend on how extensive the woodland is and choice of species and provenance to achieve rapid initial growth. It would be essential to achieve significant screening prior to development. This approach would have the added benefit of enhancing existing native woodland and expanding it through stronger links to existing areas at Ladies Copse, Barrows Copse and woodland to the North and North West of Burrows Farm. It would add interest to the SANG for users. The extent of the woodland, as surveyed in 1885, and footpaths at that time are shown on the map which is attached to this submission as a pdf.</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>In addition to mitigating the impact of development on heathland, the SANG has the added benefit of providing residents with another option for accessible land with wildlife interest. Much of it has been used by local residents for decades for dog walking etc when the hay has been harvested : a designated footpath (FP 32) crosses it from Eastworth Farm to Burrows Lane (to the N of Ladies Copse). The SANG will need to provide additional recreational space in real terms.</p> <p>The SANG would also support the aspirations of Verwood residents (Town Plan survey). Two thirds of the respondents said that they would like our local natural environment to include more</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wildlife friendly planting in car parks and public places, • native trees, hedgerows and wildlife, • tranquil places, and • wild, natural spaces, and accessible open green spaces. <p>While the former railway line provides a defensible green belt boundary for the larger proposed development area, there is no such containment for the section to the east of Eastworth Farm.</p> <p>Drainage</p> <p>The BroadwayMalyan report identified water storage attenuation requirements of 3371cu m for the larger (SW area). It is know that the land set aside for open green space next to the former railway line is wet. The site drains directly to the River Crane SSSI. Water attenuation capacity of 821cu.m. would be required for the NE area. This drains directly to a tributary of the R Crane that borders much of the proposed development site and is liable to flood. The stream rises on Pistle Hill and has a flashy flow characteristic due to its drainage of large areas of steeply sloping coniferous forest plantation on ridges and furrows. The water attenuation requirements should take this into account. Possible mitigation might be provided by extending the area of wet woodland at Ladies Copse.</p> <p>Safety</p> <p>The nearest bus stop to that part of the proposed development that is adjacent to Trinity First School is at the former Verwood Crossroads. The most direct route is via the roundabout and along the Edmondsham Road. There is no pavement here and without a compulsory purchase order for land take of existing residents' front gardens there is no prospect of providing one. It was for these same safety reasons that the road was closed at its junction with Ringwood Road/Station Road. This is also the shortest route to the Town Centre, local shops and banks.</p> <p>Land availability</p> <p>It is understood that the owners of the Old Granary do not wish to sell their paddock: if so, that part of the development would not be deliverable.</p> <p>Eastworth Farm</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Verwood’s history is described in Verwood Village to Town (Coulthard, J (2007) and describes in some detail (p92-3) the historical significance of Eastworth Farm. It was originally Heathpoult Inn. Its nucleus is late 18th century: it has been a dairy farm, the Heathpoult Inn, and a marking point for Census enumerators when it lay within the county boundary of Wiltshire. It is believed to have transferred to the Somerley Estate in 1845 and then sold in 1919. Heathpoult Inn lay on the smuggling route inland from the then deserted coves around Bournemouth and Christchurch with tea, silk, brandy and tobacco being carried by packhorse. It continued as a farm into the late 20th century. Development should respect the setting of such historic assets and this is a prime candidate for the proposed Local List.</p> <p>With this fascinating history, the present owners (who already contribute much to the local economy through their other work) have converted the house and some of the outbuildings into holiday homes. They have followed current planning guidance by diversifying disused farm buildings and were required to comply with many planning regulations because of the location of the property within the Green Belt and the AGLV. The proposal to build adjacent to and opposite their property would have a marked impact on their holiday letting business which contributes to East Dorset’s tourist industry. The Key Issue Paper on Tourism (16) shows that there are only 47 self catering units such as these in East Dorset.</p> <p>Development between the Farm and Trinity First School would swamp the single storey cottage which provides much needed accommodation for disabled guests. It is this area of the proposed development that is of most concern in terms of impact on the landscape (it is on rising ground), tranquillity, light pollution and risk to the tributary of the River Crane, lack of a defensible Green Belt boundary, and safety of pedestrians walking to Verwood Town Centre.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species No mitigation has been proposed to buffer woodland SNCIs or protect the R Crane and its tributary. Previously uncultivated grassland will be lost to development.</p> <p>SA Objective 2 Make sustainable use of resources Verwood is an unsustainable location with a totally inadequate bus service and little if any opportunities for improvement.</p> <p>Scoring should be negative not neutral. SA Objective 3 Minimise pollution In Core Strategy Options, this policy was identified by BAA CfDS as giving rise to more damaging light pollution than any other in East Dorset affecting the intrinsically dark skies of the AGLV and beyond to the</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>AONB as well as the woodland SNCIs and veteran trees of the area. The problem has been exacerbated in the Presubmission document by the changes to access and the inevitable requirement for additional street lights at junctions with the Edmondsham Road. No mitigation has been proposed.</p> <p>The area's tranquillity is unique in Verwood and there is nothing comparable in the countryside bordering other East Dorset towns. This will be lost.</p> <p>Scoring is negative not neutral.</p> <p>SA Objective 4 Minimise factors contributing to climate change</p> <p>The need for car ownership as a result of very poor public transport will increase GHG emissions.</p> <p>Scoring is negative not positive.</p> <p>SA Objective 5 Provide access to meet people's needs</p> <p>Using the shortest route, there is no safe pedestrian route from the eastern section (adjacent to Trinity First School) to the nearest bus stop at the junction of Edmondsham Road and Station Road. Edmondsham Road lacks a pavement or the road width to accommodate one.</p> <p>Scoring negative not positive.</p> <p>SA Objective 7 Create conditions to improve health, promoting healthy lifestyles</p> <p>The provision of the SANG will contribute to a healthy lifestyle.</p> <p>SA Objective 8 Help make suitable housing available and affordable for everybody</p> <p>The lack of public transport will increase the need for cars, so adding to the drain on household budgets for those in affordable homes.</p> <p>Scoring neutral not positive.</p> <p>SA Objective 10 Protect and enhance historic buildings etc.</p> <p>The setting of Eastworth Farm (formerly Heathpoult Inn) will be compromised, particularly by development to the southeast.</p> <p>Scoring negative not neutral.</p> <p>SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc</p> <p>The area is distinctive in its tranquillity and intrinsically dark skies: these will be lost.</p> <p>Scoring is negative not positive.</p> <p>Cumulative effects and summary</p> <p>This policy has negative scoring on 6 objectives, 3 neutral/unknown and only 2 that are positive.</p>					
612430	Mr Nick Squirrell	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS1948	Policy VTSW4	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	<p>Policies; CN 1, CN 2, CN 3, WMC 3, WMC 4, WMC 5, WMC 6, FWP 3, FWP 4, FWP 6, FWP 7, FWP 8, VTSW 2, VTSW3, VTSW 4, VTSW 8 etc are all proposing development and or mitigation in the form of SANGs on greenfield locations. In order to avoid a conflict with policy ME1 at a later stage in the planning process Natural England advise the authorities to bring to the</p>	<p>The policies may need to include specific paragraphs about features of biodiversity importance which are to be secured or enhanced.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>Natural England has provided extensive advice to a number of the parties concerned with these policies and may be able to offer advice and reassurance to the</p>	559	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>attention of those with an interest in these locations the need to carry out a basic biodiversity survey eg Phase 1 habitat survey including assessment of the likely presence or evidence of other features likely to restrict or delay development eg badger setts, priority species such as reptiles, water voles etc in time for consideration at the EIP. In many cases this will simply be a statement as the proposer has already engaged an ecological advisor.</p> <p>These policies appear to have been brought forward in an absence of adequate information and assessment on the biodiversity features held by the policy land. There is reason to suspect that on some there may be a significant biodiversity interest owing to close proximity with designated sites and or other biodiversity sites. The NPPF requires that planning policies should be based on up-to date information on the natural environment (paragraph 165). These policies are not shown to be compliant with this requirement. Thus, irrespective of the above matters concerning other nearby designated sites, it is not possible to identify whether the policies are compliant with policy considerations in the NPPF on sustainable development for the sites alone, especially the aspect on sustainable development set out in paragraph 9 of moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains (for example on priory habitats and species).</p>			Inspector about the reliance he may have on the effectiveness of the policy and any modification proposed.		
360082	Mr and Mrs K Healy		CSPS2450	Policy VTSW4	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Despite the reasoning given in Background Paper 2, para 2.78, we feel the choice of Green Belt principles rather arbitrary. East Dorset District chooses to follow the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To prevent neighboring towns from merging into one another and • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas (or in the words of East Dorset, to maintain an area of open land around the conurbation). <p>We feel that one of the original principles: 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' to be of equal importance. By dropping this principle, it allows East Dorset to choose this site to the north west of Verwood to remove from the Green Belt. Verwood will be sprawling ever more into the countryside. East Dorset's planners are quite correct, there will still be an area of open land to the north of Verwood, but this argument, carried to its logical conclusion, would be that open land would exist until Verwood was within site of the next settlement! We do accept that there has been a vast amount of new building already in this area. However the Edmondsham Road is a historic rural approach to the settlement, and is bounded on either side of the road by old buildings, this new proposed settlement will spread out beyond the old Eastworth Farm buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only class B & C roads serve Verwood. The 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The housing numbers should be reduced to about 150 set well back off the road, and should not spread any nearer to the Edmondsham Road than the existing play area. There should be none built between Trinity School and the Edmondsham Farm buildings. This will maintain most of the open sweep of green fields, trees and hedgerows which will help prevent Verwood from encroaching on too much countryside. • We do accept the need for housing in East Dorset District and so recommend further investigation into the proposed site at VTSW5 to see if there is any chance now or in the future of further development onto the Forestry Commission's land. This would be an ideal 	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		559	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Edmondsham Road is very narrow with a bridge over the old railway. It has no footpath and no room to put one in. The Edmondsham road exits onto the roundabout near Trinity school which could pose dangers to pedestrians/children accessing the school. A full Transport Assessment will be required as over 80 units are planned. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Sustainability Appraisal you state that the proposed site is served 'by a variety of transport types'. This must refer to the different makes of the private motor car. The bus services from Verwood to Poole and Ringwood/Bournemouth run only hourly. They are not frequent enough to serve the less well off in the affordable housing so they will be forced to own a private means of transport. We feel that the dismissal of all the objections to this site in the Issues and Options (reference VWM1 &2 indicates that this decision was already taken subject to the Sustainability Appraisal and ecological surveys. For a more detailed and statistical response, please see Issues and Options, December 2010, submitted by Janet Healy, Paul Timberlake and Kevin Healy, policy VWM2 land to the west of Edmondsham Road. 	site as the land is unlikely to be very biodiverse and the expansion would be masked by the remaining conifer plantations				
360949	Mr Stuart Goodwill	Barratt David Wilson Ltd	CSPS2707	Policy VTSW4	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	The allocation of land to the north west of Verwood for about 230 homes as set out within policy VTSW4 is supported as a logical site to select through the LDF process for the delivery of housing in a sustainable manner. The site is well placed to contribute to meeting the housing needs of East Dorset by providing a mix of dwelling types, styles and tenures including family homes at a location that is well related to existing services and facilities and provides a sustainable, viable, well located and deliverable opportunity for high quality development to meet identified housing needs and should be phased to come forward at an early stage in the LDF timeframe. That said Policy VTSW4 as currently worded includes the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The New Neighbourhood to be set out according to the principles of the Masterplan Reports A design code will be agreed by the Council, setting out the required high standard. These criteria were not included in the previous options consultation, and we would question their addition to Policy VTSW4. It is not clear what the principles of the Masterplan Reports referred to in Policy VTSW4 are. The need for high quality design is fully supported, however the requirement within Policy for a design code to be agreed with the Council is considered unnecessary given the scale of the site and the protection provided by Policy HE2, and the guidance provided in the New Neighbourhoods Masterplan Report, particularly if this is adopted as a Amend Policy VTSW4 as set out below: North Western Verwood New Neighbourhood A New Neighbourhood to the north west of Verwood is identified to provide about 230 homes To enable this the Green Belt boundary will be amended to exclude the land identified for new housing. Green Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace strategy is to be implemented as part of the provision of the new housing as required by Policy ME3. Transport and access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicular access is to be provided from Edmondsham Road. Dedicated pedestrian and cycling links are to be provided throughout the housing area and link into the existing networks. 	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	The implications of the issues raised in the representations go to the heart of the soundness of the plan, in respect of the delivery of appropriate housing within the Core Strategy and as such it is imperative that we are present at the hearing sessions to discuss the matter with the Inspector.	559		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											Supplementary Planning Document. The inclusion of this working within the policy is neither justified nor effective and the quality of the development can be appropriately controlled by policy HE2						
502921	Mr and Mrs L Forinton		CSPS2804	Policy VTSW4		No					<p>We should start by saying we don't have a legal mind but that we are proud to call ourselves LAMBYS (looking after my backyard). On 14th December 2010 we wrote a 6 page letter objecting to the Core Strategy Options for Consideration in Verwood. We have considered your latest proposal for the Core Strategy for Verwood and in particular for Policy VTSW4. Our conclusion is that we feel that this Policy is not sound, and we wish to further object to this proposal for the following reasons:-</p> <p>1) Such additional high numbers of houses, close to internationally protected heathland sites, would have a significant and damaging effect to these nature reserves. The provision of a SANG could not mitigate against this. We have personal experience of seeing sand lizards, field mice and deer in the field to be developed.</p> <p>2) VTSW4 is green belt land which has been designated an area of outstanding natural beauty and an area of great landscape value (AGLV). The policy seeks to prohibit development that would harm the landscape quality and character of the area. Site VTSW4 forms an important part of the AGLV in this part of East Dorset. We understand that part of this site is Grade 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>3) Infrastructure in Verwood is woefully inadequate at present, e.g. doctors and dentists appointments have been extended even now without adding a big influx of new residents to their lists. Development would require improvement in the infrastructure which should be in place before any houses are built or at least alongside the construction and before occupation. There is nothing in the pre-submission proposals confirming this will happen.</p> <p>4) There is no reference in the Pre-submission proposal to say that the affordable homes, if built, would be for local people, which should be the case. The percentage of affordable homes (minimum of 50%) is far too high because there are very few jobs in the area and the public transport is very poor. A more sensible figure would be 10%. It is an unfortunate fact learnt in other parts of the country that having such a high proportion of affordable housing brings with it many problems. This will have an adverse affect on the social harmony of the local populace.</p> <p>We do not want to participate in the oral examination.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			559	
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3736	Policy VTSW4							Policy Allocation Dwellings/land area Comment WMC3		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds	559		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Cuthbury allotments and St Margaret's Close New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 260 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC4 Stone Lane 90 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 6 WMC5 Cranborne Road New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 600 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC6 South of Leigh Road New Neighbourhood and Sports Village, Wimborne 75 ha SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 CM1 Lockyer's School and Land North of Corfe Mullen New Neighbourhood 250 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP3 Holmwood House New Neighbourhood, Ferndown 110 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP4 Coppins new Neighbourhood, Ferndown 30 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP6 Land East of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley 320 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP7 West of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley 200 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW4 North West Verwood New Neighbourhood 230 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP8 Blunt's Farm Employment Allocation, Ferndown 30ha A mitigation strategy to be agreed to avoid harm to European sites and SSSI VTSW5 North Eastern Verwood New Neighbourhood 50 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW6 Woolsbridge Employment Allocation, Three Legged</p>			<p>the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.</p>		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Cross 9.7ha</p> <p>A mitigation strategy to be agreed to SSSI</p> <p>The RSPB does not, in principle, object to the residential allocations above. However, the table does illustrate the heavy reliance on SANGs as a mitigation measure. The Councils will be aware of the relatively untested nature of SANGs as effective mitigation, albeit in the context of available measures, it is clear that SANGs offer perhaps the best opportunity of addressing potential adverse impacts on the European sites. SANGs are a principal component of the approach taken by the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework (IPF), and are used as a mitigation vehicle elsewhere in England, notably in the Thames Basin Heaths.</p> <p>Research continues on the effectiveness of SANGs, and it is imperative that this research informs SANGs development anticipated under the Core Strategy. Long-term management and monitoring is also critical (as is identified in policy CN1).</p> <p>Testing of the suitability of SANGs as a mitigation measure for the above policies is essential and has not yet been undertaken. We are concerned that some of the SANGs proposed may be ineffective, particularly SANGs associated with smaller allocations.</p> <p>With respect to employment allocations FWP8 (Blunt's Farm) and VTSW6 (Woolsbridge), we are not familiar with these locations. We do not object to these policies subject to receiving clarification from Natural England of the issues pertinent to these sites, and the likely efficacy of mitigation strategies anticipated by these policies.</p>					
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3549	Policy VTSW4	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Site VTSW 4 is situated to the west of Eastworth Road and north of Edmonsham Road. The area is rural in character, accommodating good quality farmland. The existing adopted East Dorset Local Plan (EDLP) identifies the site as falling within an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).</p> <p>The site is the subject of Policy LSCON 2 of the EDLP. This seeks to prohibit development that would harm the landscape quality and character of the area. It is submitted that this policy should continue to be applied to the site.</p> <p>The purpose of the AGLV is to protect areas of local landscape importance that have a high value as unspoilt countryside. It has a strong historical dimension, containing traditional cottages and farm buildings, forming varied human and natural landscapes. Site VTSW 4 forms an important part of the AGLV in this part of East Dorset District. It gives north west Verwood an established, rural setting. Eastworth and Edmonsham Roads provide a natural transition between the settlement of Verwood, to the south east, and open countryside to the north west. Eastworth Road itself has a semi rural character, with mature hedges and trees</p>	<p>Delete Policy VTSW 4. Add a new policy allocating land for development at Manor Road, in association with a SANGS to the south. Add map based on Appendix 1.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>To critically examine site constraints, development opportunities and SANGS delivery.</p>	559	<p>2260382 0 1.pdf</p> <p>2260384 0 1.pdf</p>

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>providing a natural boundary between the village and the countryside. Edmonsham Road is essentially rural in character. The proposed creation of the points of vehicular access will substantially harm the character of the area, given the need to create junctions of sufficient dimensions and forward visibility.</p> <p>The majority of the allocation comprises Grade 3 agricultural land, as is some of the associated SANGS. This good quality agricultural land would be lost in perpetuity if the site was developed. Although the site has woodland to the south west and the former railway line to the north west, it is very prominent in the landscape, particularly when viewed from the former railway bridge at Edmonsham Road. The prominence of the site is reflected by the need to plant substantial additional landscaping on the south east, south west and north west boundaries. This demonstrates that substantial mitigation measures would be required in order to reduce the adverse visual impact of the potential development.</p> <p>As an alternative, land at Manor Road should be allocated for development. This was previously identified for the construction of 165 dwellings in the Core Strategy Options for Consideration 2010. Since that time land has been identified for the delivery of a Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS).</p> <p>The drawing (Appendix 1) that accompanies these representations comprises an outline masterplan indicating how the site could be developed. Access is from Manor Road leading to a series of development 'cells'. These reduce in density towards the southern boundary of the site. A SANGS extends from manor Road in the east to a point south of Verwood C of E School to the west. It allows for circular walks to be created in this southern part of Verwood, linking from the existing Potterne Park with a potential link to Margards lane. Its provision has been agreed with Natural England and a Statement of Common Ground (Appendix 2) is also submitted as further evidence. Seaward Properties own and control all land required to deliver a comprehensive development on land that is relatively unconstrained. Unlike Site VTSW 4, it is naturally contained. To the south is the Crane River Valley. This provides a logical boundary to round off development at this part of Verwood. Additionally, development of the site can bring forward the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not prominent in the landscape and will have little visual impact when viewed from public land to the south. Tree belts and mature hedges run laterally alongside the River Crane, obscuring views into the site from the south. The site is not easily visible from the B3072. • The agricultural land quality is low; being Grade IV. The site is not intensively farmed. In the main it 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>comprises land used for horse grazing. It has a low grade recreational use and character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no landscape or other significant environmental designation; i.e. the site is not within an Area of Great Landscape Value. It is therefore free from major statutory constraints. • Vehicular access to the site can be obtained direct from Manor Road, where there is good forward visibility. • The site is in a sustainable location. It is situated less than 1 kilometre from the supermarket, shops and leisure centre at Pennine Way, and 1.5 kilometres from Verwood town centre. Residential development of the scale proposed would increase the number of people shopping in Verwood town centre. This would assist in boosting trade and help the town centre to expand; as proposed Policy VTSW 1. • The site is also well situated in terms of accessibility to community services in Verwood town centre as well as work opportunities at the Ebblake Industrial Estate. This is located 1.5 kilometres to the east. Both Verwood C of E First School and Emmanuel Middle C of E Voluntary Aided School are situated 700 metres to the west, in Howe Lane. Given Seaward Properties ownership, there is potential to improve east – west links from Manor Road to Howe Lane for the benefit of pedestrians and cyclists. • Importantly, the site has the potential to provide SANGS that will be available for use by new residents and provide a recreation facility that will be attractive for use by existing residents. This will reduce the pressure on nearby protected heathlands. <p>Given Seaward Properties contractual and freehold land ownership in this location, the company is in a position to deliver the housing early in the plan period, thus meeting the needs of Verwood and this part of East Dorset district, where additional dwellings are required. Existing properties in the locality can be retained within their current curtilage, although provision can be made for their future development if they become available for that purpose.</p> <p>Land south of Manor Road contains a number of existing properties and important tree belts. There is also the River Crane as well as some large ponds. The landscape therefore has a pleasant, varied character. Development here will result in houses built within an established and mature environment. It avoids the more monotonous appearance that would otherwise be created on, for example, the open farmland to the north west of the town.</p> <p>Development of the site has the potential to provide a mixture of house types and densities, with a good quality of design. A flexible approach is required to the ultimate number of dwellings to be constructed, taking into account the need to undertake a topographic survey, identify all features to be retained (including</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											individual trees, tree belts and woodland areas) and establish future pedestrian and cycle linkages across the site. There is considerable potential to provide a network of footpaths through the site, leading from Manor Road to Howe Lane and St. Michael's Road.					
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3553	Map 11.5	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Site VTSW 4 is situated to the west of Eastworth Road and north of Edmonsham Road. The area is rural in character, accommodating good quality farmland. The existing adopted East Dorset Local Plan (EDLP) identifies the site as falling within an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).</p> <p>The site is the subject of Policy LSCON 2 of the EDLP. This seeks to prohibit development that would harm the landscape quality and character of the area. It is submitted that this policy should continue to be applied to the site.</p> <p>The purpose of the AGLV is to protect areas of local landscape importance that have a high value as unspoilt countryside. It has a strong historical dimension, containing traditional cottages and farm buildings, forming varied human and natural landscapes. Site VTSW 4 forms an important part of the AGLV in this part of East Dorset District. It gives north west Verwood an established, rural setting. Eastworth and Edmonsham Roads provide a natural transition between the settlement of Verwood, to the south east, and open countryside to the north west. Eastworth Road itself has a semi rural character, with mature hedges and trees providing a natural boundary between the village and the countryside. Edmonsham Road is essentially rural in character. The proposed creation of the points of vehicular access will substantially harm the character of the area, given the need to create junctions of sufficient dimensions and forward visibility.</p> <p>The majority of the allocation comprises Grade 3 agricultural land, as is some of the associated SANGS. This good quality agricultural land would be lost in perpetuity if the site was developed. Although the site has woodland to the south west and the former railway line to the north west, it is very prominent in the landscape, particularly when viewed from the former railway bridge at Edmonsham Road. The prominence of the site is reflected by the need to plant substantial additional landscaping on the south east, south west and north west boundaries. This demonstrates that substantial mitigation measures would be required in order to reduce the adverse visual impact of the potential development.</p> <p>As an alternative, land at Manor Road should be allocated for development. This was previously identified for the construction of 165 dwellings in the Core Strategy Options for Consideration 2010. Since that time land has been identified for the delivery of a Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS).</p>	Delete Policy VTSW 4. Add a new policy allocating land for development at Manor Road, in association with a SANGS to the south. Add map based on Appendix 1.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine site constraints, development opportunities and SANGS delivery.	560	2260382_0_1.pdf 2260384_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>The drawing (Appendix 1) that accompanies these representations comprises an outline masterplan indicating how the site could be developed. Access is from Manor Road leading to a series of development 'cells'. These reduce in density towards the southern boundary of the site. A SANGS extends from manor Road in the east to a point south of Verwood C of E School to the west. It allows for circular walks to be created in this southern part of Verwood, linking from the existing Potterne Park with a potential link to Margards lane. Its provision has been agreed with Natural England and a Statement of Common Ground (Appendix 2) is also submitted as further evidence. Seaward Properties own and control all land required to deliver a comprehensive development on land that is relatively unconstrained. Unlike Site VTSW 4, it is naturally contained. To the south is the Crane River Valley. This provides a logical boundary to round off development at this part of Verwood. Additionally, development of the site can bring forward the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not prominent in the landscape and will have little visual impact when viewed from public land to the south. Tree belts and mature hedges run laterally alongside the River Crane, obscuring views into the site from the south. The site is not easily visible from the B3072. • The agricultural land quality is low; being Grade IV. The site is not intensively farmed. In the main it comprises land used for horse grazing. It has a low grade recreational use and character. • There is no landscape or other significant environmental designation; i.e. the site is not within an Area of Great Landscape Value. It is therefore free from major statutory constraints. • Vehicular access to the site can be obtained direct from Manor Road, where there is good forward visibility. • The site is in a sustainable location. It is situated less than 1 kilometre from the supermarket, shops and leisure centre at Pennine Way, and 1.5 kilometres from Verwood town centre. Residential development of the scale proposed would increase the number of people shopping in Verwood town centre. This would assist in boosting trade and help the town centre to expand; as proposed Policy VTSW 1. • The site is also well situated in terms of accessibility to community services in Verwood town centre as well as work opportunities at the Ebblake Industrial Estate. This is located 1.5 kilometres to the east. Both Verwood C of E First School and Emmanuel Middle C of E Voluntary Aided School are situated 700 metres to the west, in Howe Lane. Given Seaward Properties ownership, there is potential to improve east – west links from Manor Road to Howe Lane for the benefit of pedestrians and cyclists. 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>• Importantly, the site has the potential to provide SANGS that will be available for use by new residents and provide a recreation facility that will be attractive for use by existing residents. This will reduce the pressure on nearby protected heathlands.</p> <p>Given Seaward Properties contractual and freehold land ownership in this location, the company is in a position to deliver the housing early in the plan period, thus meeting the needs of Verwood and this part of East Dorset district, where additional dwellings are required. Existing properties in the locality can be retained within their current curtilage, although provision can be made for their future development if they become available for that purpose.</p> <p>Land south of Manor Road contains a number of existing properties and important tree belts. There is also the River Crane as well as some large ponds. The landscape therefore has a pleasant, varied character. Development here will result in houses built within an established and mature environment. It avoids the more monotonous appearance that would otherwise be created on, for example, the open farmland to the north west of the town.</p> <p>Development of the site has the potential to provide a mixture of house types and densities, with a good quality of design. A flexible approach is required to the ultimate number of dwellings to be constructed, taking into account the need to undertake a topographic survey, identify all features to be retained (including individual trees, tree belts and woodland areas) and establish future pedestrian and cycle linkages across the site. There is considerable potential to provide a network of footpaths through the site, leading from Manor Road to Howe Lane and St. Michael's Road.</p>					
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3551	11.32	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Site VTSW 4 is situated to the west of Eastworth Road and north of Edmonsham Road. The area is rural in character, accommodating good quality farmland. The existing adopted East Dorset Local Plan (EDLP) identifies the site as falling within an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).</p> <p>The site is the subject of Policy LSCON 2 of the EDLP. This seeks to prohibit development that would harm the landscape quality and character of the area. It is submitted that this policy should continue to be applied to the site.</p> <p>The purpose of the AGLV is to protect areas of local landscape importance that have a high value as unspoilt countryside. It has a strong historical dimension, containing traditional cottages and farm buildings, forming varied human and natural landscapes. Site VTSW 4 forms an important part of the AGLV in this part of East Dorset District. It gives north west Verwood an established, rural setting. Eastworth and Edmonsham Roads provide a natural transition between the</p>	Delete Policy VTSW 4. Add a new policy allocating land for development at Manor Road, in association with a SANGS to the south. Add map based on Appendix 1.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine site constraints, development opportunities and SANGS delivery.	561	2260384_0_1.pdf 2260382_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>settlement of Verwood, to the south east, and open countryside to the north west. Eastworth Road itself has a semi rural character, with mature hedges and trees providing a natural boundary between the village and the countryside. Edmonsham Road is essentially rural in character. The proposed creation of the points of vehicular access will substantially harm the character of the area, given the need to create junctions of sufficient dimensions and forward visibility.</p> <p>The majority of the allocation comprises Grade 3 agricultural land, as is some of the associated SANGS. This good quality agricultural land would be lost in perpetuity if the site was developed. Although the site has woodland to the south west and the former railway line to the north west, it is very prominent in the landscape, particularly when viewed from the former railway bridge at Edmonsham Road. The prominence of the site is reflected by the need to plant substantial additional landscaping on the south east, south west and north west boundaries. This demonstrates that substantial mitigation measures would be required in order to reduce the adverse visual impact of the potential development.</p> <p>As an alternative, land at Manor Road should be allocated for development. This was previously identified for the construction of 165 dwellings in the Core Strategy Options for Consideration 2010. Since that time land has been identified for the delivery of a Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS).</p> <p>The drawing (Appendix 1) that accompanies these representations comprises an outline masterplan indicating how the site could be developed. Access is from Manor Road leading to a series of development 'cells'. These reduce in density towards the southern boundary of the site. A SANGS extends from manor Road in the east to a point south of Verwood C of E School to the west. It allows for circular walks to be created in this southern part of Verwood, linking from the existing Potterne Park with a potential link to Margards lane. Its provision has been agreed with Natural England and a Statement of Common Ground (Appendix 2) is also submitted as further evidence. Seaward Properties own and control all land required to deliver a comprehensive development on land that is relatively unconstrained. Unlike Site VTSW 4, it is naturally contained. To the south is the Crane River Valley. This provides a logical boundary to round off development at this part of Verwood. Additionally, development of the site can bring forward the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not prominent in the landscape and will have little visual impact when viewed from public land to the south. Tree belts and mature hedges run laterally alongside the River Crane, obscuring views into the site from the south. The site is not easily visible from the 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>B3072.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agricultural land quality is low; being Grade IV. The site is not intensively farmed. In the main it comprises land used for horse grazing. It has a low grade recreational use and character. There is no landscape or other significant environmental designation; i.e. the site is not within an Area of Great Landscape Value. It is therefore free from major statutory constraints. Vehicular access to the site can be obtained direct from Manor Road, where there is good forward visibility. The site is in a sustainable location. It is situated less than 1 kilometre from the supermarket, shops and leisure centre at Pennine Way, and 1.5 kilometres from Verwood town centre. Residential development of the scale proposed would increase the number of people shopping in Verwood town centre. This would assist in boosting trade and help the town centre to expand; as proposed Policy VTSW 1. The site is also well situated in terms of accessibility to community services in Verwood town centre as well as work opportunities at the Ebblake Industrial Estate. This is located 1.5 kilometres to the east. Both Verwood C of E First School and Emmanuel Middle C of E Voluntary Aided School are situated 700 metres to the west, in Howe Lane. Given Seaward Properties ownership, there is potential to improve east – west links from Manor Road to Howe Lane for the benefit of pedestrians and cyclists. Importantly, the site has the potential to provide SANGS that will be available for use by new residents and provide a recreation facility that will be attractive for use by existing residents. This will reduce the pressure on nearby protected heathlands. <p>Given Seaward Properties contractual and freehold land ownership in this location, the company is in a position to deliver the housing early in the plan period, thus meeting the needs of Verwood and this part of East Dorset district, where additional dwellings are required. Existing properties in the locality can be retained within their current curtilage, although provision can be made for their future development if they become available for that purpose.</p> <p>Land south of Manor Road contains a number of existing properties and important tree belts. There is also the River Crane as well as some large ponds. The landscape therefore has a pleasant, varied character. Development here will result in houses built within an established and mature environment. It avoids the more monotonous appearance that would otherwise be created on, for example, the open farmland to the north west of the town.</p> <p>Development of the site has the potential to provide a mixture of house types and densities, with a good quality of design. A flexible approach is required to the</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											ultimate number of dwellings to be constructed, taking into account the need to undertake a topographic survey, identify all features to be retained (including individual trees, tree belts and woodland areas) and establish future pedestrian and cycle linkages across the site. There is considerable potential to provide a network of footpaths through the site, leading from Manor Road to Howe Lane and St. Michael's Road.					
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3552	11.33	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Site VTSW 4 is situated to the west of Eastworth Road and north of Edmonsham Road. The area is rural in character, accommodating good quality farmland. The existing adopted East Dorset Local Plan (EDLP) identifies the site as falling within an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).</p> <p>The site is the subject of Policy LSCON 2 of the EDLP. This seeks to prohibit development that would harm the landscape quality and character of the area. It is submitted that this policy should continue to be applied to the site.</p> <p>The purpose of the AGLV is to protect areas of local landscape importance that have a high value as unspoilt countryside. It has a strong historical dimension, containing traditional cottages and farm buildings, forming varied human and natural landscapes. Site VTSW 4 forms an important part of the AGLV in this part of East Dorset District. It gives north west Verwood an established, rural setting. Eastworth and Edmonsham Roads provide a natural transition between the settlement of Verwood, to the south east, and open countryside to the north west. Eastworth Road itself has a semi rural character, with mature hedges and trees providing a natural boundary between the village and the countryside. Edmonsham Road is essentially rural in character. The proposed creation of the points of vehicular access will substantially harm the character of the area, given the need to create junctions of sufficient dimensions and forward visibility.</p> <p>The majority of the allocation comprises Grade 3 agricultural land, as is some of the associated SANGS. This good quality agricultural land would be lost in perpetuity if the site was developed. Although the site has woodland to the south west and the former railway line to the north west, it is very prominent in the landscape, particularly when viewed from the former railway bridge at Edmonsham Road. The prominence of the site is reflected by the need to plant substantial additional landscaping on the south east, south west and north west boundaries. This demonstrates that substantial mitigation measures would be required in order to reduce the adverse visual impact of the potential development.</p> <p>As an alternative, land at Manor Road should be allocated for development. This was previously identified for the construction of 165 dwellings in the Core</p>	Delete Policy VTSW 4. Add a new policy allocating land for development at Manor Road, in association with a SANGS to the south. Add map based on Appendix 1.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine site constraints, development opportunities and SANGS delivery.	562	2260384_0_1.pdf 2260382_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Strategy Options for Consideration 2010. Since that time land has been identified for the delivery of a Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS). The drawing (Appendix 1) that accompanies these representations comprises an outline masterplan indicating how the site could be developed. Access is from Manor Road leading to a series of development 'cells'. These reduce in density towards the southern boundary of the site. A SANGS extends from manor Road in the east to a point south of Verwood C of E School to the west. It allows for circular walks to be created in this southern part of Verwood, linking from the existing Potterne Park with a potential link to Margards lane. Its provision has been agreed with Natural England and a Statement of Common Ground (Appendix 2) is also submitted as further evidence. Seaward Properties own and control all land required to deliver a comprehensive development on land that is relatively unconstrained. Unlike Site VTSW 4, it is naturally contained. To the south is the Crane River Valley. This provides a logical boundary to round off development at this part of Verwood. Additionally, development of the site can bring forward the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not prominent in the landscape and will have little visual impact when viewed from public land to the south. Tree belts and mature hedges run laterally alongside the River Crane, obscuring views into the site from the south. The site is not easily visible from the B3072. • The agricultural land quality is low; being Grade IV. The site is not intensively farmed. In the main it comprises land used for horse grazing. It has a low grade recreational use and character. • There is no landscape or other significant environmental designation; i.e. the site is not within an Area of Great Landscape Value. It is therefore free from major statutory constraints. • Vehicular access to the site can be obtained direct from Manor Road, where there is good forward visibility. • The site is in a sustainable location. It is situated less than 1 kilometre from the supermarket, shops and leisure centre at Pennine Way, and 1.5 kilometres from Verwood town centre. Residential development of the scale proposed would increase the number of people shopping in Verwood town centre. This would assist in boosting trade and help the town centre to expand; as proposed Policy VTSW 1. • The site is also well situated in terms of accessibility to community services in Verwood town centre as well as work opportunities at the Ebblake Industrial Estate. This is located 1.5 kilometres to the east. Both Verwood C of E First School and Emmanuel Middle C of E Voluntary Aided School are situated 700 metres to the west, in Howe Lane. Given Seaward Properties ownership, there 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>is potential to improve east – west links from Manor Road to Howe Lane for the benefit of pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Importantly, the site has the potential to provide SANGS that will be available for use by new residents and provide a recreation facility that will be attractive for use by existing residents. This will reduce the pressure on nearby protected heathlands. <p>Given Seaward Properties contractual and freehold land ownership in this location, the company is in a position to deliver the housing early in the plan period, thus meeting the needs of Verwood and this part of East Dorset district, where additional dwellings are required. Existing properties in the locality can be retained within their current curtilage, although provision can be made for their future development if they become available for that purpose.</p> <p>Land south of Manor Road contains a number of existing properties and important tree belts. There is also the River Crane as well as some large ponds. The landscape therefore has a pleasant, varied character. Development here will result in houses built within an established and mature environment. It avoids the more monotonous appearance that would otherwise be created on, for example, the open farmland to the north west of the town.</p> <p>Development of the site has the potential to provide a mixture of house types and densities, with a good quality of design. A flexible approach is required to the ultimate number of dwellings to be constructed, taking into account the need to undertake a topographic survey, identify all features to be retained (including individual trees, tree belts and woodland areas) and establish future pedestrian and cycle linkages across the site. There is considerable potential to provide a network of footpaths through the site, leading from Manor Road to Howe Lane and St. Michael's Road.</p>					
649505	Miss Dawn Leader		CSPS303	11.34	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>This is not legally compliant because we have not been given the opportunity for public consultation over the past 2 years as had all the other sites. It is unsound to say that access is via Ringwood Road because clearly where the pedestrian/cyclist crossing has been marked is on a blind bend</p>	<p>A traffic assessment needs to be done along Ringwood Road to access the safest area to allow children etc to cross. They have to cross as there is no pedestrian footpath on that side of the road presently.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		563	
656205	Mr F Dowton		CSPS1692	11.34	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	<p>Wildlife has not been assessed and the land is home to many endangered birds and other protected creatures. The land often has water laying on it, my neighbour a few doors along has a natural spring right on her boundary with the land and where my garden meets the land there are drains just to cope with the water from a field.</p> <p>I only found out from a neighbour a few weeks ago and no one has asked about the bats that live at the bottom</p>	<p>Full assessment need to be done and the land should be turned into a place protected for wildlife.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		563	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											of my garden which use the field as a feeding ground.					
643480	Mr Ian Strachan		CSPS17	Policy VTSW5		No	Yes			Yes	<p>The stated aims in the Core Strategy document for Verwood are</p> <p>1) To "offer residential development in close proximity to the existing facilities within the town"</p> <p>2) "The proposed neighbourhoods....will reduce the need to travel by car.....with good pedestrian acces to schools and facilities"</p> <p>The proposed VTSW5 site FAILS on both counts as it is at the extreme edge of Verwood - as far away as it could possibly be from Schools, Shops and all other amenities.</p> <p>Closest schools are 2km away - same with shops, so having this development in this location will necessitate travelling by car, rather than reduce it. And with 50 houses, then the number of additional car journeys taking kids to school, going to shops etc will be in the hundreds per day.</p> <p>More worrying is the fact that all these additional hundreds of car journeys per day are going to be entering and exiting the site from the existing junction onto a blind corner with a known speeding problem.</p>	<p>It is impossible to make changes to the location to make it within walking distance to existing facilities. Perhaps it is just the wrong location for additional housing!!</p> <p>It the development does go ahead, it is essential that a new access road for vehicles and pedestrians is created away from the blind corner.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
496473	Mr Brian Morgan		CSPS36	Policy VTSW5	No	No		Yes		Yes	<p>The reasons are for the most part set out in my attached copy letter to Christopher Chope MP dated 17th February 2012 (actual letter dated 8th February), in addition to which I consider there to be little or no need (as opposed to demand) for new housing here, and certainly not enough to override green belt protection.</p>	<p>Complete deletion of FWP5, FWP6 and FWP7.</p> <p>Exactly the same comments as those in 3, 4, 5 and 6 above apply to many other policies in the document with similar deletion considered necessary - these include:- FWP3 and 4, WMC3 and 5, and VTSW4 and 5. The only proviso to this is that it in so far as any of these sites are not now green belt, then that factor would obviously not apply to those sites.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>1. I consider a well-argued oral and public presentation of the case outlined above would be much more effective than mere written argument.</p> <p>2. The opportunities for open public debate on this matter have so far been far too limited, having regard especially to the long term importance of the Green Belt heritage, as opposed to the short term 'needs' to promote economic growth, both locally and nationally.</p>	564	2158984_0_1.pdf 2158985_0_1.pdf 2158987_0_1.pdf
588532	Mr and Mrs Nick Hunt		CSPS51	Policy VTSW5			No			No	<p>New housing in Verwood should not be permitted unless it is required to meet local needs. More housing would not be sustainable unless it is related to local employment opportunities.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
647250	Mrs Shirley Bethell		CSPS69	Policy VTSW5	No	No			No	No	<p>The area is Green Belt.</p> <p>I wish to oppose a current proposal to use a field at the rear of my property for building land. This land is Green Belt in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and I believe it's use cannot be changed without an application to the government. It is currently home to deer, foxes, badgers, rabbits, various small animals and a variety of birds including pheasants which are ground nesting. Deer are generally protected by the crown. I also believe the land has been used by horses</p>	<p>Application re Green belt to the government. Preferably build elsewhere because houses to the rear of my property will make me feel ill.</p> <p>There is an area of green land at the other end of Verwood towards the golf course that does not appear</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>It is necessary due to my reasons above. We have been discriminated against. At this present stage detailed building plans have been drawn and on the 3rd of May 20102 soil sample were taken. It ppears that the whole process was passed before we were</p>	564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>in the past and may have grazing rights. This land is currently designated as a Children's Playing Field by Dorset County Council.</p> <p>I moved to this property eleven years ago to enjoy the quiet environment and the privacy of the open field and forest views. If building were to go ahead on this field it would oversee my property causing a great intrusion of my privacy particularly as the current plan appears to have at least three properties to the rear of my back garden. This would be very claustrophobic and the dust and noise created by builders and contractors would be detrimental to the health and well being of myself, my family and neighbours. The road access past the front of my property is not suitable for such a project and would become crowded with contractors cars and vans causing major disruption and inconvenience to all residents.</p> <p>EDDC have not followed the correct democratic process in relation to VTSW5. Local residents were not consulted in the 2008 "Issues and Options" or the 2010 "Options for Consideration" stage, therefore we were not given the opportunity for public discussion regarding our initial thoughts.</p> <p>I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against. 2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems. 3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion. 4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done 	<p>to be farmed which may be more suited for building land as it is convenient for shops and bus services. My issues only relate to VTSW5 and I don't have enough knowledge with other aspects of the Policy, they are probably sound. The EDDC will have to follow the full process before this area can be considered suitable for development. It would be best used for a graveyard.</p>		<p>given equal opportunity when others have had the opportunity to speak regarding other areas of the policy. The road is unsafe for additional traffic and there are Green Belt, wildlife and other practical issues.</p>		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas.</p> <p>5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals.</p> <p>6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made.</p> <p>7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair.</p> <p>8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>					
648124	Mrs Lesley Eve		CSPS134	Policy VTSW5	No				Yes		<p>Great need for 100% affordable housing in high price / low wage Dorset - not apparent necessarily from Council data as many do not bother to try for 'list' as they know they have no chance therefore the need is for 100%, not 50% low cost housing for the 50 homes you propose.</p>	<p>Government - funding to get economy going - jobs / services etc.</p> <p>Council - free up brown belt / edge green belt / cheap farm land.</p> <p>Council - planning permission only for 100% low cost housing.</p> <p>Council - allow hard working low earning singles or couples same rights as non working / DHSS / immigrants / one parent families.</p> <p>Council - ring fence income</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
												from part rent, part buy or lend 1/4 repay.				
648783	Mrs Valerie Wakefield		CSPS157	Policy VTSW5	No						Having the industrial estate opposite there is too much traffic already on this stretch of road - and Verwood is already over developed with housing - and not enough facilities i.e. doctors surgeries, shops etc. Roads not adequate for extra traffic.	By pass is needed to spread the load of traffic.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
648930	Mrs Margaret Hankin		CSPS200	Policy VTSW5	No	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>On Green Belt land (not legal). Destroying protected wildlife (not legal). A very dangerous access road (health hazard). Would cause much pollution and noise (health hazard). A separate letter dated 07.05.12 states: We wish to make known to you our very serious concerns about the proposed policy VTSW5 (Verwood) contained in the Core Strategy. It was inserted rather late in proceedings (hence we did not know about it) we don't know why this was the case. Our most major concern about this is the access to such a development from B3081. It is now definitely a main road because of over building in Verwood. Many commuters use it and frequently exceed the speed limit. We live in the service road and risk our lives every time we drive or walk out. Beng a retired Dorset Police Traffic Officer I know only too well the tragic and serious consequences of roads like this especially when it involves children as I have dealt with it many times. Another very important reason to oppose this idea is the wonderful wildlife this site contains as it back onto forest i.e. deer, badgers, foxes, woodpeckers, adders, bats, smooth snakes, butterflies and many more. It is a haven for them and also Green Belt land and should remain so. Some of these we thought were protected species and we thought Government wanted to protect endangered species not destroy them. The owner doesn't care he just naturally enough wants the money and ploughs it up to destroy as much as possible i.e. ground nesting birds etc. Another reason to oppose is this area floods. We have a ranch style fence at the bottom of our garden backing onto this field. Underneath it is a hidden spring. When heavy rain falls the bottom of our garden floods. So we suggest this field is not suitable for building. The next obvious point is there are no facilities in this area i.e. schools, shops, buses etc (which is why we moved here for peace and quiet), so why would you build here. We stand to have our way of life destroyed totally, and safety put at risk from extra traffic and our health undermined from even more pollution; also our property heavily devalued. Also we will completely lose our view and love of wildlife. However, we were told by your representative at the exhibition we do not have to be considered. How arrogant, what a democracy. We would therefore ask you to please take our very real concerns seriously.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
648933	Mr Bernard Hankin		CSPS201	Policy VTSW5	No	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>An area of valuable Green Belt land. This land is home to protected species of wildlife.</p> <p>I consider this policy unsound, as this is a most dangerous main road, quite inappropriate for more development. It will put lives at risk.</p> <p>A separate letter dated 07.05.12 states: We wish to make known to you our very serious concerns about the proposed policy VTSW5 (Verwood) contained in the Core Strategy. It was inserted rather late in proceedings (hence we did not know about it) we don't know why this was the case.</p> <p>Our most major concern about this is the access to such a development from B3081. It is now definitely a main road because of over building in Verwood. Many commuters use it and frequently exceed the speed limit. We live in the service road and risk our lives every time we drive or walk out. Beng a retired Dorset Police Traffic Officer I know only too well the tragic and serious consequences of roads like this especially when it involves children as I have dealt with it many times.</p> <p>Another very important reason to oppose this idea is the wonderful wildlife this site contains as it back onto forest i.e. deer, badgers, foxes, woodpeckers, adders, bats, smooth snakes, butterflies and many more. It is a haven for them and also Green Belt land and should remain so. Some of these we thought were protected species and we thought Government wanted to protect endangered species not destroy them. The owner doesn't care he just naturally enough wants the money and ploughs it up to destroy as much as possible i.e. ground nesting birds etc.</p> <p>Another reason to oppose is this area floods. We have a ranch style fence at the bottom of our garden backing onto this field. Underneath it is a hidden spring. When heavy rain falls the bottom of our garden floods. So we suggest this field is not suitable for building. The next obvious point is there are no facilities in this area i.e. schools, shops, buses etc (which is why we moved here for peace and quiet), so why would you build here.</p> <p>We stand to have our way of life destroyed totally, and safety put at risk from extra traffic and our health undermined from even more pollution; also our property heavily devalued. Also we will completely lose our view and love of wildlife. However, we were told by your representative at the exhibition we do not have to be considered. How arrogant, what a democracy.</p> <p>We would therefore ask you to please take our very real concerns seriously.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
649505	Miss Dawn Leader		CSPS235	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>I believe that the document is not legally compliant and unsound because of the following reasons: 1. There has been not public consultation on VTSW5, we are only being given legal consultation. 2. This strategy was put forward 3 years ago and in the first 2 rounds of consultation VTSW5 was not mentioned</p>	<p>1. A period of public consultation will be needed with focus groups etc. 2. Studies on the wildlife and environment to ensure wildlife and local SSSI to</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>So far the views of the people that live with this site and in this location have been swept under the carpet, no one knows the site or location like it's</p>	564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>or consulted on.</p> <p>3. The site was not included in any of the focus group discussions or any of the reviews done by Natural England.</p> <p>4. The Proposed SANG is not actually a big enough size for the amount of housing proposed.</p> <p>5. As pointed out in April 2012 Neighbourhood report on VTSW5 the development too far away from schools/doctors/supermarket/town centre</p> <p>6. The existing pathway could not be expanded to enable walkers, children cycling and adult cyclists to share the path</p> <p>7. A cycle path could not be implemented because the road is not wide enough, each land must be greater than 4.5metres.</p> <p>8. A cycle path could not be put onto the pedestrian path to the town centre as it would not leave enough room for pedestrians. A cycle path must be at least .8metres in order to allow for cycles pulling trailers and disabled tricycles etc.</p> <p>9. The planned pedestrian and cycle exit enters Ringwood Road on a blind bend on the side of the road with no path.</p> <p>10. The proposed vehicle exit involves a 90 degree turn followed by a 360 degree turn to the town against the prevailing traffic within 20 yards of Parklands close exit.</p> <p>11. The increase in traffic/pollution/carbon emissions that the vehicles from these houses will cause making car trips to the above destinations, especially 2 trips per day to school and back for each household.</p> <p>12. The interruption that traffic leaving the development will cause to the rush hour traffic flowing out of Verwood towards the A31.</p> <p>13. Access to and from the B3081 onto the A31 is already at breaking point and Hampshire have cancelled plans to improve this junction.</p> <p>14. The traffic congestion at the junction between Black Hill and Ringwood Road with school run traffic</p> <p>15. The possibility of making a path through the forest is unsound because of proximity to protected heathland. Its isolated location will stop parents allow children to use alone. Unless the path is tarmac it will be to wet/dirty to use in the winter months. Plus in the winter time it will be in darkness unless electric lighting is put in.</p> <p>16. The huge amount of wildlife that is using this land including Bats, Badgers, slow worms, adders, deer and many more. Which have not yet been assessed by Natural England.</p> <p>17. The sight is a flood zone level 1 and water does sit on the land, this issue is known as there is a drain in the far corner of the development. Recent rains have caused water to lay in the field.</p> <p>18. The impact of excess water flowing into Ebblake Stream and into an SSSI has not been commented on</p>	<p>determine the impact and mitagants neccessary to safe guard the endangered animals.</p> <p>3.A study of the bats habitat to find out where else they will be able to find an open feeding ground in the area.</p> <p>4.A detailed transport review to assess whether there is a safe exit for pedestrians / cyclists onto Ringwood Road</p> <p>5. A detailed transport review to show how the infastructure can be improved to access the town and other vital services</p> <p>6. a study on the impact to the extra traffic turning right into oncoming commuter traffic accelerating out of Verwood.</p> <p>7.A study of the polution/carbon emission increase which will be caused by the hundreds of extra journeys aday to reach schools etc.</p> <p>8. A flood risk assessment to determine how much more water logged the ground with get with so much extra development.</p>		neighbours.		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											or assessed. 19. The forestry commission are committed to returning the managed forest back into heathland. Presently building is not permitted within 400metres of Heathland, should this be taken into account.					
650249	Mr Albert Lidbury		CSPS328	Policy VTSW5	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	The stated aims in the Core Strategy document for Verwood are 1) To "offer residential development in close proximity to the existing facilities within the town" 2) "The proposed neighbourhoods....will reduce the need to travel by car.....with good pedestrian access to schools and facilities" My Objections to the proposed VTSW5 are as follows I believe the proposed VTSW5 is unsound on both counts as it is at the opposite end of Verwood - as far away as it could possibly be from schools, shops and all other amenities. Therefore the proposal is not within close proximity to existing facilities, and will increase the need to travel by car Schools and shops are approximately 1.5 miles away, this means that car travel is a necessity, and therefore will not reduce car travel as stated in your policy. More worrying is the fact that all these additional car journeys per day are going to be entering and exiting the site from the existing junction onto a blind corner on the Ringwood Road with a known speeding problem. As an area of Green Belt ,this land is home to numerous species of wildlife including deer, badgers, foxes, woodpeckers, adders, bats, smooth snakes, butterflies, to name but a few. There are currently insufficient amenities to satisfy the needs of the residents living in Verwood, building more dwellings will only increase this imbalance To my knowledge there has been no public consultation on VTSW5 I would seriously suggest that you reconsider the suggested proposal. No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
650420	Mrs Lynn Lidbury		CSPS320	Policy VTSW5				Yes	Yes	Yes	Proposed development is not in close proximity to existing facilities and therefore significant increase in car travel will result. Access to / from the development using existing road is too fraught with danger - rush hour congestion to speeding traffic on a blind bend. Green belt land currently provides home to numerous protected wildlife.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
651093	Mrs Beryl Capacci		CSPS406	Policy VTSW5	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	I consider a proposal for building as in VTSW5 is too far from the present facilities and totally unsuitable for families needing to walk to school, doctors etc. Our house is on the market and one couple turned it down because it is too far to walk to school. There is no room for a cycle path on the B3081 either and any child trying		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											to cycle to school on the road would put it's life at risk as there are just 9 seconds from the bend in the road to get out if the driver is observing the speed limit which many aren't. Therefore cars would be making many trips a day thus increasing the carbon footprints for this area. The field is a haven for wildlife and should therefore be allowed to remain fallow.					
651289	Mrs Helen Seddon		CSPS413	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	No	No	The proposed plan to build 50 homes on VTSW5 is barmy. The B3081 is a busy road no matter what time of day, this planned buildings will treble if not quadruple traffic. Also it is a fair distance from schools. I would be interested to know if the people who decide these stupid ideas actually live in the vicinity, or is it "not in my backyard" syndrome! Verwood has enough houses ok do not build anymore. It is bad enough that we have travellers, plus also the lorries from the proposed Purple Haze land / gravel extraction. Spare land is being swallowed up left, right and centre and in the end there will be no land to build anything on or to go on walks or ride bikes or horses for our future generation.	Do not go ahead with the proposed building of the houses. Leave us with space to enjoy mother nature.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
651831	Mrs Arlene Williamson		CSPS433	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	No	No	VTSW5. No opportunity for people to comment on this plan. B3081 is already overloaded. Another 500 cars a day would make things more difficult. There is not sufficient infrastructure in Verwood to support another 280 homes. No swimming pool, no cinema, doctors surgeries full etc. Air pollution to homes on Ringwood Road already high. Loss of wildlife habitat.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
649505	Miss Dawn Leader		CSPS760	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	The Rt Hon Greg Clark MP stated in the National Policy Planning framework, published in Jan 2012 and this must be taken into account when making neighbour plans. There are 12 key principles, 3 of which are: 1)Protect the diversity of different areas of England, protecting Green Belts and recognising the "intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside" 2)Support the transition to a low-carbon future, take account of flood risk and coastal change and encourage the reuse of existing and renewable resources 3)Manage development to make full use of public transport, walking and cycling VTSW5 fails on all 3 counts due to being green belt, having flood risk, too far from anywhere to fulfil No.3 plus no public transport. Are the council grasping at straws putting this land into the proposal. I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close. We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are: 1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic	The governments National Planniing Policy framework has been put in place to instruct councils what to look for when trying to find space for new homes, perhaps the council should consider the NPPF fully and find areas that fit the criteria	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I believe the people that know this land should be consulted about it, we have not been given any other chances to air our views	564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against.</p> <p>2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems.</p> <p>3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion.</p> <p>4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas.</p> <p>5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals.</p> <p>6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made.</p> <p>7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair.</p> <p>8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly. Yours faithfully					
652701	Mr Peter Knight		CSPS567	Policy VTSW5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<p>VTSW5 states that traffic access to the new development will be from Ringwood Road and shows the access via the existing service road. At the main road entry point traffic travelling from Verwood town centre has to negotiate a turn of some 360degrees,as the service road is narrow any queue of traffic awaiting to exit can obstruct this entry point. At present local traffic is light and prepared for this problem,once the new neighbour hood is constructed with parents on school runs /shopping etc. we can foresee back ups,that can inevitably cause traffic hold ups on the Ringwood Road especially at peak times</p> <p>A further consideration is that heavy vehicles ie. Recycling/waste lorries, builders merchants, furniture deliveries and large vans all on entering the junction from Ringwood Road then have to reverse down the service road, as they are unable to turn in what is a narrow road with a turning head only large enough for small vans and cars.</p> <p>This Junction is some 80 meters from a BLIND BEND in the NW. direction traffic exiting Verwood approaching the bend,has a visual slow sign on the road surface but the site of large trees on either side of the carriageway seems to create the feeling that the 30mph limit no longer exists and speeds increase making the exit from the junction hazardous on many occasions. The prospect of a further 50 houses with the expectation of probably 70+ vehicles on top of the existing ones will put a considerable strain on an exiting hazardous junction with an increase risk of accidents particularly at peak times.</p> <p>From a carbon foot print view this site is hardly ideal, a point made by Broadway Malyan in their conclusions (part 6 Neighbourhood Report) when they stated:- "The site does not fare well from an accessibility point of view. Ringwood Road is close to an Industrial Area and Ringwood Forest, but distant from the town centre. Also Verwood is distant from a number of employment destinations."</p> <p>As I pointed out in submission CSPS526 there are great impracticalities in creating a satisfactory cycle way from this end of the village on such a heavily used road as the B3081, and walking to the village centre with young children will take best part of one hour,well outside the desired and preferred maximum walking distances. As a result of these points the pressure to use a car for school runs, shopping, doctors, social etc. is considerable.</p> <p>The final point relates to employment again loaded in</p>	This is not an ideal site and at the very least, a reappraisal of this documents details to show a safer exit to the site, preferably at the NW corner, would gain better visibility and safety. The possibility of a crossing point for adults and children to improve safety must also be considered.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											favour of the car vacancies in Verwood are not considerable and the majority work outside of the village and it would be expected that most working people within the proposed neighbourhood will again use cars exiting this same Ringwood Road junction, with a high percentage leaving and returning at the peak time slots.					
652701	Mr Peter Knight		CSPS526	Policy VTSW5	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Within VTSW5 you quote that "dedicated pedestrian and cycle links will be provided to link into existing networks" the link indicated is on a blind bend and there is no pavement to the northern side of Ringwood road(B3081) there is no cycleway on Ringwood road nor would it be safe to try to install one as the road is too narrow and carries very heavy traffic flows at peak times and also carries a considerable number of large articulated lorries at all times of the day and night.</p> <p>Th pavement to the southern side of Rinwood road in the vicinity of the development adjacent to the Cemetery is also very narrow, young children in buggies would fill the pavement width precluding other pedestrians /cycles.</p>	<p>The only solution to access the site for pedestrians/cyclists has to be at a point clear of the bend where visibility is improved ie somewhere to the North West end of the development with a revised exit route.</p> <p>As far as cycleways to the town centre are concerned the only possible solution is with shared and improved pavements or creating new pavements to the northern side of the Rinwood road but again this I feel would not be practical on cost grounds.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
652701	Mr Peter Knight		CSPS522	Policy VTSW5	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<p>This site was never disclosed during the ' options for consideration 'public consultation in fact it did not come to light until 2 weeks prior to the committee meeting on the 1st of February 2012 We are now forced to comment on an accepted document where our comments can only be applied under justification and soundness. This has denied us the opportunity afforded to to Verwood residents when they were able to make there feeling felt as to all the other parts of the core strategy as displayed between the 4th October 2010t o the 24th December 2010 .</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
652710	Mr Gary Balmer		CSPS475	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>This developemt has been added to the core strategy at the last minute, giving everyone who commented in the previous consulatation no opportunity to comment on this. At this stage we are only being given legal consultation. The local residents were not engaged at an early stage as the government recommends, in fact it was only by chance that most people found out about its addition and some only them the consulatation paper was delivered a few weeks ago.</p> <p>This sight has been added in by the council at the last minute in a desperate attempt to bring up numbers. The site is too far away from the town centre and will only prove to add to the traffic conjestion with extra cars and the odd intrepid cyclist who might brave the B3081. 50 homes could mean 100 car trips away to the local schools, plus more to the shops and more to work. There are no bus services in that part of town and the</p>	<p>development needs to be placed in areas that can offer residents a save environment where local service are easily accessible and car use is not increased.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											entrance to the sight is on a bend that would be impossible for pedestrians and cyclists to cross. The vehicle access to the sight is proposed down a service road that even now the rubbish lorries have to back down to empty bins. More importantly that all of those things are the wildlife that call the land home. Up until the land owner submitted the land for use in early 2011 the land had been left derelict and all the residents have photos of the grass waist high and assorted wildlife including deer,badgers, bats, slow worms, adders not to mention the varied bird life. Since the land has been included he has ploughed the land 4 times in a feeble attempt to frighten off any animals but if the land was committed to green belt the wildlife would soon thrive again. PLease check with DERC records to see the wildlife recorded in the area.					
652805	Mr Douglas Gregory		CSPS506	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	No	No	There is no consideration to improve the road out of Verwood (another lane perhaps) increasing traffic on existing roads must be out of the question. Verwood has been developed too fast over the last ten years with amenities slow to catch up. Doctors and dentist appointments have been extended even now without adding a big influx of new residents to their lists. You cant call this planning to build more without a thought to our existing populace.	Surely full consultation for approval is required.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To be able to present my views on this.	564	
652810	Mr Alfred Hall		CSPS507	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	No	No	There has been no consultation (public) on this issue. Rush hour traffic between the A31 and Verwod would be slowed further by traffic turning into Verwood to reach amenities, more cars would cause congestion in reaching the A31.	Consultation needed with the public explaining and putting forward evidence that would determine the proposals were sound.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
652994	Mrs Kathleen Leader		CSPS545	Policy VTSW5	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	It is totally unfair of the council to add this land into the core strategy at the 11th hour. No assessment of the wildlife has been carried out, no flood risk assessment of the land now or in the future when the nearest blue haze pod is capped. The land is too far out of Verwood to make ecologic sense. The nearest 1st school is nearly 2 miles away and the 2nd school is further still. This would only encourage inhabitants to have more cars not less. The forest commision have agreed that once their forest ar farmed they will be returning the land to heathland, having dense housing here would only jepardise any heathland wildlife, that is why the 400metre rule has been put in place.	a better more viable site needs to be found once the wildlife reports show how important this land is	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
650714	Mr Norman Bethell		CSPS814	Policy VTSW5	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	I consider the document to be illegal as the original wording of the Core Strategy did not include VTSW5 until the last minute. This was therefore not included in any Public Consultation I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against. 2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems. 3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion. 4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas. 5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals. 6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made. 7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair. 8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>					
652710	Mr Gary Balmer		CSPS803	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>There is very little natural environment left in Verwood and now you are trying to steal the remains of very important Green Belt fields. VTSW5 plays a very important role in many ways being a natural wet meadow thriving in natural habitat insects and wildlife many protected by law. I was stunned to learn that your HRA report is only a desktop review and is totally untrue. The site absorbs run off water from the steep forest behind it. This will play an even bigger role with climate change and once bluehaze landfill in very close proximity is capped. Let's hope Ebblake stream and the B3081 will cope with this, the prospect of Purplehaze gravel extraction and a landfill leachate treatment plant in Bluehaze. The only thing needed at this end of town is some fresh dust and smell free air, less traffic and noise. Covering this land in concrete and tarmac drawing rats and vermin from the landfill even closer to homes would be total madness,</p>	<p>The area of SANG is not large enough, Correct studies and reports on the environment need to be done with very careful consideration.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
654030	Mr Jim Lumley		CSPS660	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	<p>I visit this part of Verwood regularly and am disabled and have to use a mobility vehicle. I was shocked to hear that the council is looking to put more houses in here and I believe that no one has looked at this from the point of view of the disabled. We are often the people that need affordable housing but if I were to live in a home on VTSW5 I would feel very " cut off". Presently I have to sit in my mobility vehicle in the middle of the road in order to cross the road onto the only place in the path that has a dropped kerb where Parklands Close meets Ringwood Road. When I get halfway over and have to slow down to get up the kerb I feel very vulnerable to the fast traffic on this busy road. I could not even imagine trying to cross the road on the bend where the plan suggests there will be pedestrian access. There are no buses coming past that could take me to the doctors or to the shops. I would have to rely on someone driving me up there and unpacking my mobility chair for me. My mobility vehicle has a long range but it is 2 miles to the town centre and the hub, I would worry about my battery lasting especially as the journey to town is up an incline. Plus in some places it is not wide enough for a mobility vehicle and a pushchair to mother and child.</p>	<p>A regular bus service, a pedestrian crossing, drop kerbs around industrial estate and a path on both sides near the bus stop. widening of the path in places to allow for use of pedestrians and disabled vehicles.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Even for the younger disabled, if they were to be able to find employment on the Ebblake industrial estate, there are no dropped kerbs on the estate, I cannot drive my mobility chair even down to the post box because of 2 high kerbs that I cannot get up or down.					
654289	Miss Hannah Wood		CSPS685	Policy VTSW5	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	As a resident of Verwood currently paying 'ever increasing' rent, I am in full support of this development. My aim is to get onto the property ladder within 1-2 years. At present I work on Ebblake Industrial Estate, site of Verwood's biggest provider of labour for the town. This location is in close proximity to Ebblake and with the proposed improvements to pedestrian/cycling routes I could save money on the 'ever increasing' cost of car transport.....perfect. This plan looks like a positive move and takes into account the needs/requirements of the younger generation. Hannah Wood		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
654808	Mr Brian Uncle		CSPS822	Policy VTSW5	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	I consider that the proposal of VTSW5 site will have adverse effect on all the wild life that we all enjoy. As the destruction of many of the existing trees on this site will destroy the valuable habitat that exists for birds including Buzzards, Sparrow Hawks.etc. Also bats, deer ,snakes I also consider that the exit from parklands onto the Ringwood Road during rush hour traffic would become even heavier and the risk of a serious accident will be substantially increased. This site was not on the original Core Cstrategy for development. The proposed development of this site is not in close proximity or within walking distance of either Shops, Schools or Drs, therefore the need for a car is a must. I consider that the proposal for building as in VTSW5 of 50 properties is too far out of the town to be suitable for families as this proposed development is not within walking distance or close proximity to the existing facilities within the town and a car will be needed for shopping school trips, Drs etc. This coupled with other proposed sites would add another 280 homes to Verwood this would increase the number of cars by at least double that of homes built, causing yet more pollution this increase in both people and car use would have a detrimental effect on the existing amenities such as Drs appointments as there is already a 1-2 week wait for a routine appointment . I am also concerned about the destruction of habitat of the wildlife on that site.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
654815	Mr P Allen		CSPS824	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	No	No	The Plan is unsound because there has been no public consultation regarding this site. What is disturbing is that Linden Homes have written (ref. letter dated 18th June 2012) to local residents informing us that they have acquired an interest in the land with the view to building		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>50 new houses on it. So much for a consultation process if EDCC has already made a deal with a property developer!</p> <p>The Plan is unsound because the proposed vehicular access to a new estate of 50 houses is totally unsuitable. Access out of Ringwood Road/Parkland Close onto the B3081 is already very hazardous, especially when turning right towards Verwood, as visibility is severely restricted due to the access point being on a blind bend. This problem is compounded by vehicles nearly always travelling much faster than the 30mph speed limit when going towards Ringwood. Most drivers seem to think that once past the cemetery the road is clear all the way to Ringwood. The access point to Ringwood Road/Parkland Close is effectively concealed to traffic, coming from the Verwood town centre direction, until the very last moment.</p> <p>To enter the new estate from the Verwood town centre direction, a vehicle would have to perform a hard left 180 degree turn at the Ringwood Road/Parkland Close access point. As a result there will be a high probability of collisions from vehicles travelling along the B3081 towards Ringwood and collisions with vehicles trying to exit Ringwood Road/Parkland Close. This is an existing problem (for the few existing residents) but with an increase of 50-100 vehicles (belonging to the occupants of the new estate), the problem will be enormously exacerbated.</p> <p>The Plan is unsound because the land is green belt and is home for flora and endangered fauna including smooth snakes. This sanctuary should not be destroyed. What with HCC's Purple Haze proposal and EDCC's VTSW5 Plan, it seems all our local councils are hell bent on environmental destruction.</p> <p>The Plan is unsound because the site is miles from any school. Traversing the B3081 would be very dangerous for school children as the road is subject to very heavy traffic and visibility in both directions is very poor.</p> <p>Additionally there is no footpath on the north side of the B3081 until the Ebblake Industrial Estate traffic lights are reached (where pedestrians can safely cross the road).</p>					
649505	Miss Dawn Leader		CSPS909	Policy VTSW5	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>On the front page of your reponse form is says, quote: " This document is being prepared for the third round of public consultation. The previous consultations on the Core Strategy took place in the spring/summer of 2008 at "Issues and Options" stage, and late in 2010 at the "Options for Consideration" stage. We asked the public to confirm what they felt to be the main issues facing Christchurch and East Dorset which the Core Strategy should address, and their views on policy options for addressing the issues. Quite clearly it may be the third round of public consultation for some of the strategy, but it is not for</p>	<p>Obviously VTSW5 needs to go through a consultation of "issues and Options" and then a consultation of "Options for consideration" otherwise it has been unfairly discriminated against.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>Because I care about the land in VTSW5</p>	564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											VTSW5 which has been missed of the first and second rounds. Therefore the above statement is misleading and illegal. You are misleading the public into thinking that the document has not had any further additions to it from the first round.						
656150	Mr & Mrs Capacci		CSPS1052	Policy VTSW5							<p>I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against. 2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems. 3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion. 4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas. 5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals. 6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made. 7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the 					564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair.</p> <p>8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>						
656166	Mr & Mrs Uncle		CSPS1057	Policy VTSW5							<p>I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <p>1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against.</p> <p>2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems.</p> <p>3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion.</p> <p>4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been</p>					564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>carried out for the other areas.</p> <p>5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals.</p> <p>6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made.</p> <p>7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair.</p> <p>8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>						
656170	Mr & Mrs Penn		CSPS1059	Policy VT5W5							<p>I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <p>1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against.</p> <p>2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on</p>				564		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems.</p> <p>3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion.</p> <p>4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas.</p> <p>5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals.</p> <p>6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made.</p> <p>7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair.</p> <p>8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>					
656192	Mr & Mrs Hankin		CSPS1064	Policy VTSW5							I wish to make an official complaint to the council on				564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against. 2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems. 3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion. 4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas. 5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals. 6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made. 7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair. 8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>					
656197	Mr & Mrs Knight		CSPS1066	Policy VTSW5							<p>I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <p>1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against.</p> <p>2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems.</p> <p>3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion.</p> <p>4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas.</p> <p>5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals.</p> <p>6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early</p>				564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made.</p> <p>7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair.</p> <p>8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>					
654858	Mrs Britt Poyntz	Friends of Ringwood Forest	CSPS910	Policy VTSW5	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	<p>Sites should be appropriately located with walking access to shops, doctors and other local facilities, this site is not.</p> <p>The site is too far away from Verwood Town Centre to support vulnerable families without transport. Most people who purchase or rent a property on this site will need a car to access local facilities because it is a rather long walk along a busy road to get to, for example, the nearest shop for provisions if you are perhaps disabled or a parent/carer accompanied by children.</p> <p>The access for this site could be dangerous. Residents turning right to get to the schools in the town, will impact traffic going out of Verwood during peak hours. There is also a slight bend, limiting the view of oncoming traffic. There is no traffic calming in place on this bend.</p> <p>Cycle links / footpaths through the forest could impact on designated heathland. Lighting the footpaths in the forest could cause light pollution to other properties and impact wildlife.</p> <p>New residents would want to return from an evening in the town safely on well-lit footpaths. There is no information to say who will pay for the footpaths so that they are well maintained and appropriate for buggies and wheelchairs as well as not impacting Noon Hill</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>Friends of Ringwood Forest wish to participate to further explain our members' concerns where such discussion would aid consideration of our view that the inclusion of the proposed VTSW5 site is not sound and that the site should be withdrawn.</p>	564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>SSSI.</p> <p>The SANG will encroach on Ringwood Forest. Protected trees are in this SANG and will require ongoing protection measures.</p> <p>A natural open space located here will allow children to play on a site with no protection from Adders and Ticks, which could be a potential hazard.</p> <p>We would therefore suggest, if the proposal moves forwards including this site, moving the houses further towards the forest as garden fences would provide some protection from snakes, and would keep the open field as a SANG and flood defence. This will allow families and children access to level ground to play more safely away from the stream. It will allow existing residents to enjoy their surroundings and also keep in place the sightlines used by the bats and nightjars.</p> <p>A full survey of the wildlife on the site should be undertaken to determine the protected species on the site, including bats, tree sparrows, badgers, cuckoos, smooth snakes and grass snakes. The site provides a valuable sightline for bats and nightjars.</p> <p>A full hydrology study should be completed to establish any flooding risks to residents and businesses, and any impact to Ebblake Stream, Ebblake Bog and The River Crane – including the impact of capping Blue Haze. The field is a flood plain providing drainage from the runoff from Ringwood Forest and Blue Haze. The study should take into account a wetter climate forecast in the south and other long-term climate change considerations.</p> <p>The government recommends new buildings to be zero carbon. We would wish to see this recommendation supported explicitly within the policy. New homes can, and should, be built in ways which reduce the need for land won sand and gravel.</p> <p>The justification for “adjusting” the greenbelt to enable the development of this site is 20 affordable homes, leaving about 30 market value homes. Due to the vermin and odours from the Blue Haze Landfill site, we have a strong concern whether these market value homes would sell. Consideration should therefore be given to increasing the density of affordable homes on other sites.</p> <p>We also note with considerable concern the lack of detailed information about this site in the policy supporting documents. Greater investigation of the social, transport and environmental issues outlined above, and which are almost certain to arise from the development of this site, should have been undertaken in more depth, and the data so gathered considered in detail and made available for public examination, before it was included in the plan at the last minute.</p> <p>We object strongly to the inclusion of this site in the plan for the above reasons.</p> <p>We believe the Plan to be Unsound with specific regard to the inclusion of this site which is, in our opinion,</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename		
											neither justified nor effective.							
656199	Mr & Mrs A Lidbury		CSPS1067	Policy VTSW5							<p>I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against. 2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems. 3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion. 4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas. 5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals. 6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made. 7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their 							

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair.</p> <p>8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>						
656200	Mr & Mrs Strachan		CSPS1068	Policy VTSW5							<p>I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <p>1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against.</p> <p>2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems.</p> <p>3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion.</p> <p>4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas.</p> <p>5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have</p>					564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>been involved in the strategy proposals.</p> <p>6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made.</p> <p>7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair.</p> <p>8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>					
656203	Mr & Mrs Squire		CSPS1070	Policy VTSW5							<p>I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <p>1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against.</p> <p>2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We</p>				564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems.</p> <p>3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion.</p> <p>4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas.</p> <p>5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals.</p> <p>6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made.</p> <p>7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair.</p> <p>8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>					
656205	Mr F Downton		CSPS1071	Policy VTSW5							<p>I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close. We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land</p>				564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against. 2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems. 3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion. 4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas. 5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals. 6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made. 7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair. 8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either. 						

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>					
656208	Mrs B Bentley		CSPS1072	Policy VTSW5							<p>I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against. 2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems. 3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion. 4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas. 5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals. 6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had 				564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made.</p> <p>7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair.</p> <p>8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>						
656214	Mrs B Lawford		CSPS1075	Policy VTSW5							<p>I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <p>1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against.</p> <p>2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems.</p> <p>3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss</p>					564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion.</p> <p>4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas.</p> <p>5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals.</p> <p>6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made.</p> <p>7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair.</p> <p>8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>					
656741	Mr and Mrs Terrence Groves		CSPS1435	Policy VTSW5							<p>With reference to the Christchurch and East Dorset core strategy response form.</p> <p>We do not want to comment on whether the VTSW4 and VTSW5 documents are legally compliant or sound, but more housing just increases the problems already in Verwood.</p> <p>The traffic on the B3081 is a problem for vehicles during the rush hour, but it is also very difficult to cross the roads during these periods.</p> <p>For example during rush hour it is nearly impossible to cross the road using rule 7 of the highway code, to the bus stop near Lake Road or to go up Noon Hill.</p>				564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											I am sure there are similar problems in other areas so maybe more zebra crossings would help, although it would probably make it more difficult for car users. When we go into the centre of Verwood we normally walk from Lake Road, but occasionally we have to use the car and find it difficult or impossible to get a space in the Potter's Wheel or surgery car parks. Other people have different problems. If more housing is to be built some improvements to the problem areas are needed before the projects go ahead.					
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1353	Policy VTSW5		No	No		No	No	Dorset Wildlife Trust considers that housing on this site has potential to adversely impact on the Ebblake Bog SSSI which forms part of the Dorset Heathlands SPA, SAC and Ramsar site as it would drain to the Ebblake Stream. A Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme and compensatory measures in Ringwood Forest are required. We support comments made by Natural England.	We support comments made by Natural England.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
656214	Mrs B Lawford		CSPS1545	Policy VTSW5	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Whoever drew up the plan/report did not even get the name of the area correct. If attention had been made it would have been known that the road concerned is not Parkland Close but a service road of Ringwood Road at the appropriate dwelling have Ringwood Rd as their address. Parkland Close runs 20yrs the further along. If the people responsible cannot get the location right what chance is there for the rest of the document. Parkland Close does not run parallel to B3081 - it is Ringwood Road- service road. The proposed exit involves a 90 degree turn followed by a 360 degree turn to the town against prevailing traffic. To the right of the exit is a bend in the B3081 and with ever increasing traffic - rarely keeping to the 30mph limit - there is great difficulty already exiting on to the B3081. If further development was allowed a disaster would be waiting to happen on a daily basis there are oak trees on the grass verge. VTSW5 was not included in original strategy which had public consultation in 2010 therefore not giving us the opportunity to comment at the time. The sight ia s flood zone level 1 and water does sit on the land - this issue is known as there is a drain in the far corner of the development and water is lying on the field - at the forest end of the proposed site runs a stream which could be contaninated with further building. Proximity of site to schools/doctors/town centre/supermarket will go against reduction of carbon footprint and the schools/doctors are already full. Nothing is within walking distances. 'Apollo' is not a leisure centre, it is a unit on the Ebblake Est for musical repairs. The nearest leisure centre is near the supermarket.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
359547	Mrs V	Verwood Town Council	CSPS1753	Policy VTSW5	Yes	Yes					A traffic management scheme would need to be put in		No, I do not wish to		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
	Bright										place. Members agreed to support this policy.		participate at the oral examination			
504530	Mrs Christine Phipps		CSPS1724	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	No	No	I consider there is no room for further development in Verwood. It is extremely difficult to park in the various car parks. Traffic is far too heavy for B3081. The heart of Verwood is being changed for the worst. We moved to Verwood 21 years ago, on retiring expecting our latter years to be without hassle in pleasant surroundings.				564	
507136	Mrs S A Segal		CSPS1538	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	No	No	I have been lived in Verwood for 28 years. I have many changes and of course the amazing growth in the area. Although we now have only two banks instead of the original four, we still only have two medical centres. Apart from Morrisons supermarket we have very few shops. The bus service at this time is atrocious. With a very elderly amount of residence all these minuses in a town of 15,000 residents we do not need any more houses or flats. The wait for Doctors appointment is at least two weeks.				564	
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSPS1541	Policy VTSW5		No					It is understood that a Phase 1 Habitat Survey has been carried out but this was a few days after the land had been disc harrowed so results will have been largely inconclusive. There is evidence of acid grassland on the approach to the site but this is now isolated from other similar areas. The land is poorly drained. The primary concern is protection of Ebblake Stream. Mitigation through SUDs and extension of the mire system upstream in Ringwood Forest should be considered as advised by Natural England. Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species There is potential for habitat enhancement through restoration of the mire in Ringwood Forest. Protection and enhancement of Ebblake Stream is essential. Increased flood risk (and overflowing the levees) could affect the quality of Ebblake Bog SSSI SA Objective 5 Provide access to meet people's needs The bus service has recently changed to run along Ringwood Road to Ringwood. SA Objective 11 Maintain and enhance local distinctiveness etc The site is secluded in a low lying area that backs onto Ringwood Forest.	The policy should include specific reference to the need for mitigation to protect Ebblake Stream. The measures required should follow the advice of Natural England.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
656205	Mr F Downton		CSPS1696	Policy VTSW5	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Having lived here for the past sixteen years, I have come to look on the land at the bottom of my garden. as a haven of peace, as opposed to the front of my bungalow onto the B3081, there being no pavement on this side, to post a letter (nearest box Ebblake Est.) means crossing the road with little vision of traffic approaching from the bend on the right, the road is heavily used, not only by residents, but as a through road to Shaftesbury, Gillingham, the A303 and		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Somerset. This end we have heavy lorry's, caravans to a sight in Verwood, steam rollers going to Tarrant Hinton, and Sunseeker Rally's when the people attending park their cars in our narrow service road, so the thought of yet more houses is out of the question, the added vehicles would make it chaos trying to emerge onto the main road, I would even say life threatening, its dangerous now, and any occupants would need cars as we have no shop near, no schools near, no bus, Verwood infrastructure is poor, apart from a supermarket most people go out of town, so yet more cars.</p> <p>The field at the back of the houses has been fallow, uncultivated for years, and has attracted a lot of birds and wild animals, a pleasure to see and watch. I have a ditch at the bottom of my garden, which I was told was in case of flooding, such as at present, it does get wet, and presumably drains into the Ebblake stream, I am very pleased to have the open ground as it would be a good fire break should there be a fire in the forest. Surely Forest Windsor and Upton Park, Poole could have been saved with a few fire breaks.</p>					
657367	Mrs Brenda Grout		CSPS1774	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>I have lived in Verwood for many years. I am very much against further development etc. We do need however bungalows built for the over 55's (not anymore flats). We are a town with over 14,000 residents. A town with inadequate facilities.</p> <p>ie poor bus service (Hourly), traffic problems at times on the roads, Almost impossible for some unknown reason to find a space in the Potters Wheel car park. No Green Belt to be taken, now or in the future. LEAVE VERWOOD ALONE Doctor's all working to capacity.</p>				564	
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS2081	Policy VTSW5		No	No		No	No	<p>The policy is unsound and possibly not legally compliant as it fails to identify a need for hydrological mitigation to avoid harm to the integrity of the Dorset Heathlands SPA, SAC and Ramsar site at Ebblake Bog SSSI. The development would drain to the Ebblake Stream. This stream traverses Ebblake Bog where it adversely impacts on the designated features due to elevated flows arising from drainage in the upstream catchment and inputs of sediment and poor quality urban run-off carried by these flows which, in combination, provide an adverse water environment for the designated wetland habitats. The development could act to exasperate the situation by adding more run-off to the stream flow as a consequence of an increase in the area of hard surfaced land and by adding run-off water with sediment and of poor quality in relation to the natural stream quality. Mitigation on flow and water quality could be provided by SUDS at the development site in combination with compensatory measures to reduce flows draining Ringwood Forest through restoring drained valleys back</p> <p>Add a new sub-section to the policy on drainage which should address both water quantity and quality. For example and derived from the wording in Policy WMC5: 'A Sustainable Drainage Scheme in combination with compensatory measures in Ringwood Forest must be agreed with the Council and Environment Agency, in consultation with Natural England and the Forestry Commission, to prevent elevation of flows, sediment load and reduction of water quality in the Ebblake Stream, thereby protecting</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>The policy raises a complex matter on demonstrating compliance with legislative considerations under the Habitats Regulations. Our wish for participation in oral examination will depend on whether or not the policy is amended in accordance with the above suggestion.</p>	564		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											to heathland mire (which soak up rainfall runoff and moderate downstream flow). The Forestry Commission has commenced such work in relation to government Biodiversity Action Plan commitments but it's scale is limited. The Forestry Commission work demonstrates that compensatory reduction of run-off in the upstream catchment from mire re-creation is practical and deliverable. It is established that urban effects on European protected species such as the rare reptiles, smooth snakes and sand lizards as well as SPA birds such as the nightjar known to occur in Ringwood Forest can occur up to and beyond 400m from an urban area. The policy should make reference to the need to assess the impacts on these features and to provide mitigation or compensatory measures as set out in the NPPF (118) to avoid deterioration to biodiversity as well as enhancements.	the downstream water environment of Ebblake Bog.'				
656347	Mr Ray Wells		CSPS1879	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	No		The proposal for a new estate with up to 200 further cars joining the B3081 on a dangerous bend is not acceptable. The bend in the road by the cemetery is more dangerous than it appears on a map. Despite a 30pmh speed limit as one who lives close to Parklands Close traffic consistently speeds entering and leaving Verwood.	It would require major road works to the bend and speed inhibiting measures to be applied or THERE WILL BE SERIOUS ACCIDENTS at this new junction and access to Parkland Close.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
656348	Mrs Pauline Wells		CSPS1854	Policy VTSW5	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Traffic daners to those joining B3081 fromParklands Close and NEW estate. Consistent speeding traffic entering and leaving Verwood.	Traffic control / speed inhibiting measures / roundabout at new junction. Anything and everything to stop serious accidents.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
656354	Mrs Elizabeth Gross		CSPS1880	Policy VTSW5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Presnt amenities already overloaded. Too much traffic. Loss of green belt plus affecting wild life.				564	
656448	Ms Brigitte Hiller		CSPS1900	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	No	No	Ringwood Road at this point, opposite the industrial estate is not adequate to take more traffic - the road is too narrow and is a constant noise level - we moved from a bungalow backing onto the Ringwood Road because of the road noise. Do we need extra housing in Verwood NO, facilities we have now - do not cover the amount of people here in Verwood - doctors - shops etc - not enough.	By pass needed to spread the load of traffic.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
657382	Mr Michael Evans		CSPS1982	Policy VTSW5	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Too much traffic already entering and or passing through Verwood. I consider that there is at present a good balance of housing and green belt/forest and any major building programmes will have an undesirable effect on the balance. Flood plains should not be developed.	A public consultation is needed for the proposed size of the development. Remove building in the flood plains. No properties to be built close to wild life habitats.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
359492	Mr Stuart Jarvis	Hampshire County Council	CSPS2035	Policy VTSW5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		As a neighbouring Minerals and Waste Authority, Hampshire County Council notes that this allocation is within 630m of the existing landfill site at Blue Haze in	The following text should be added to Policy VTSW5 under the section "Layout	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Hampshire. In addition, the emerging Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan includes an allocation for the extraction of 4.0 mt soft sand and sharp sand and gravel as well as potential to provide reserve landfill capacity at Purple Haze in Hampshire. The proposed development is within 550m of this allocation. Any future development at North Eastern Verwood should take account of the current and proposed minerals and waste uses within Ringwood Forest so as to avoid any future conflict of interests.	and Design": • The design will reflect the nearly existing and potential waste and minerals uses at Blue Haze and Purple Haze in Hampshire.				
360082	Mr and Mrs K Healy		CSPS2465	Policy VTSW5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We support this policy. The housing is not so visible and will be shielded from the open countryside by both the plantation and existing housing. • It would have to be subject to ecological surveys and flood risk assessments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recommend that vehicular access is left to the north east in case in the future it becomes possible to develop further into the Forestry Commission land. This site could make up for the shortfall in housing we suggest for VTSW4, providing it is not too close to Noon Hill and SANGS can be provided. • Public transport would have to be improved if more housing was to be supported on this site. 	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
650215	Mr I Hickman		CSPS2868	Policy VTSW5							<p>I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against. 2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems. 3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss 				564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion.</p> <p>4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas.</p> <p>5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals.</p> <p>6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made.</p> <p>7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair.</p> <p>8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>					
656210	Mr Ronald Swaffield		CSPS2866	Policy VTSW5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>This document is not positively prepared because it has not considered the points outlined below and VTSW5 has been superimposed on a Google Map without local knowledge of the area.</p> <p>It is not justified as plans have been submitted in previous years and have been turned down by East Dorset Council and I understand on appeal because of no credible way traffic could access to and from the B3081 also the land is 'Green Belt'. Nothing has changed since these applications other than traffic has greatly increased on the B3081, so how can this now be considered?</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>It is not effective because there is no infrastructure. i.e. Footways, Cycle ways nor is there room to put these on the B3081.</p> <p>The core strategy mentions footpaths & cycle ways would be put in to link with existing ones. "There are no existing ones". The only path being on land belonging to Forestry commission and Lord Normanton and any such link would have to 'Bridge' the Ebblake Stream.</p> <p>It also states it wishes to encourage more children to walk & cycle to school. It is at least a 1 ½ mile walk to the nearest first school which is too far for young children to walk and the B3081 is too dangerous for children to cycle and there is no Bus Route.</p> <p>Older children would have to travel a lot further for Middle and Upper schools</p> <p>It is not consistent with National Policy because when public consultation was held in 2010 VTSW5 was not in those Plans and has only put in as an after thought at the end of 2011 when other areas were discounted. So first Public Knowledge of VTSW5 wasn't until Jan/Feb 2012.</p> <p>I wish to make an official complaint to the council on behalf of myself and my neighbours living at 219,221,223,225,229,231,233,235,237,239,241,243 Ringwood Road and 1, 11 Parkland Close.</p> <p>We wish to complain about the late inclusion of the land at the back of our homes into the council's core strategy proposal. The facts backing up our complaint are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In this current stage of consultation we are only being given legal consultation. We are being asked if it is legally sound. We have not been given our democratic right to the same public consultation that other areas have received and therefore have been discriminated against. 2. Numerous road shows have been held around the area over the past 2 years in order to allow the public to make comment on the proposed plans. In all of these exhibitions, the public were able to make comment on each area. VTSW5 was not included in any of these public exhibitions and the public were not offered the opportunity to add comments on the electronic comments "tablets" that were at these exhibitions. We have been discriminated against because VTSW5 was missing from those exhibitions and electronic comments systems. 3. Focus groups were held to discuss the plans and the areas but they were not given this particular plot of land to discuss. We have been discriminated against by missing this opportunity to have focus groups discuss this land, which clearly brings huge issues for Verwood residents in areas such as traffic congestion. School traffic congestion and parking congestion. 4. We have missed out on any survey of the land done by Dorset Wildlife or Natural England which has been carried out for the other areas. 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>5. The Neighbourhood report was only carried out in January 2012 so no one has had a chance to review that from Focus groups to other organisations that have been involved in the strategy proposals.</p> <p>6. The government guidelines to councils, wishing to make future plans for housing state that early engagement with residents affected by the areas proposed is necessary. We were not informed that this land was being put into the core strategy until someone we know, had heard about it from a third source that had been attending a council meeting. We couldn't believe that we had not been told and further more we were not informed of the council meeting in February to have public comments made.</p> <p>7. Although 2 or 3 people wished to speak at the meeting in February, we were only given 1 spot and the other 20+ places were given to people who wished to make comment on parts of the proposal that they had already had more than 18 months to make their thoughts known. How can this be seen as fair.</p> <p>8. If we had not heard about it from other sources, the first we would have known about it was when the response form came through our door in April 2012. At least 2 of our neighbours never received that form and on asking friends in other parts of the town a number did not receive them either.</p> <p>9. The Habitat Regulations assessment which was carried out was done at desk top level. The land is/was full of wildlife. With numerous protected species and no physical assessment carried out. This makes no sense to us.</p> <p>Please take our complaint seriously as we all feel very aggrieved by what we consider to be completely unfair treatment and discrimination. I look forward to hearing from you shortly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>					
656358	Mr & Mrs John Bainbridge		CSPS2835	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>I think the whole response form is difficult to understand, badly written with poor English spelling.</p> <p>Why all the big words.</p> <p>What does "Pre-Submission Core Strategy" mean?</p> <p>Lets have it in English/</p> <p>I disagree with most of the Councils under "no" anyway.</p> <p>The worst document/Questionnaire I have ever seen!</p> <p>How can I, I'm not a lawyer.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	
657353	Mrs Julie Higman		CSPS2781	Policy VTSW5	No	No			Yes		<p>Please find enclosed my completed Core Strategy Pre-submission Consultation Response Form. I do not live in Verwood myself, although I grew up in the area and my elderly parents continue to live in Verwood so I do still know the area well. I felt compelled to write to you to strongly object to the proposed plans under VTSW5.</p> <p>Firstly, I would like to voice my objections to the Representations Form you have asked local residents to complete. I work in business and get involved in the completion of a number of complex documents but</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>found this one to be totally baffling! You are asking the public to state whether this document is 'legally compliant' and 'sound' – I am sure you have your won Compliance Team who would not date send out a document that was anything other than 'legally compliant' and 'sound'. I have therefore answered these questions @No@ as I do not believe I am in a position to understand what you are asking here and would therefore not commit myself to a 'Yes@ answer. I have thereafter referred you to this letter in order that I can express my objections thoroughly to this proposal.</p> <p>As previously stated, my elderly parents live in a lovely bungalow and their back garden looks out onto the proposed development of VTSW5. The main reason they bought this property was due to the beautiful surroundings, and they can see an abundance of wildlife both in the field and coming into their garden, including pheasants, deer, badgers, many other unusual birds, rabbits and foxes. This has given them so much delight over the years and they are devastated that this will be taken away from them and replaced with houses and noise. There is also the impact of what this will do to the wildlife, driving them away from the area and destroying their natural habitat. I appreciate this is privately owned land but at the moment this is considered as green belt. It seems that green belt these days is an overused phrase and something that can be taken away at the whim of the Council when it suits them! There was a proposal a few years ago to expand the local cemetery into this field at whilst at the time this did not bring the approval of local residents, in retrospect this is preferable to a housing development – at least it would have been quite and still supported the wildlife.</p> <p>There is also the concern that this development will detract from the price and marketability of my parents' property. They have worked hard all their lives to provide for themselves and have a lovely home, yet there is no regard as to how this proposed development will adversely affect the people already living there.</p> <p>I attended the public exhibition in Verwood in April with my mother, although found the council employee there on the day to be very unsympathetic to the views of local residents and indicated that their views did not really have to be taken into consideration. We came away with the impression that this was a 'done deal'!</p> <p>The above details my personal and emotive reasons for objecting to this development and now I would like to address my other concerns around your proposals being 'sound'.</p> <p>Firstly, the location totally goes against your strategy which states 'offer residential development in close proximity to the existing facilities, within the town of Verwood'. VTSW5 goes totally against this, and when you look on the map this is the furthest location away from the schools, shops and facilities of the town. The</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>only facility nearby is the rubbish tip, the proposed Purple Haze development and Ebblake Industrial Estate – hardly child / family friendly facilities? I appreciate land may be scarce but this totally goes against your core strategy.</p> <p>You also state VTSW5 will provide ‘a sustainable form of development which can reduce the need to travel by car and which will be integrated into the existing urban fabric of the town, with good pedestrian and cycle links to the urban area, schools and facilities@. Again, completely untrue, as the shops and schools are NOT within walking distance but this development would actually join a very busy road providing the main transport route through Verwood. I would certainly not let children walk along that road to school and in all my time being in Verwood have never seen anyone walking their children to school from that end of Verwood – they will all use their cars. This will therefore only create more cars on which is already a very busy road.</p> <p>You state that ‘better bus services are being investigated with the bus providers’. It was only a while ago that bus routes were stopped from here and bearing in mind my comments above I do not believe for one second that these bus routes will be reinstated – this comment is just ‘lip service’!</p> <p>My other major concern is around road safety and I was astonished by your response that both the Highways Agency and the Dorset County Council support the proposals. The current turning from Ringwood Road into the service road which leads round to this piece of land is dangerous enough as it is with just a handful of cars using this. If this entrance were to be used for the proposed housing you would be looking at 100+ additional cars using this entrance daily. I guarantee there will be weekly accidents as this turning is on a slight bend so it is not easy to see oncoming traffic and you need to stop immediately you turn into the entrance to check for traffic either way. There is also the issue of significantly increased traffic creating additional noise for the residents along the service road.</p> <p>It would be unacceptable and extremely unsafe to use the current entrance as the main thoroughfare for these 50 houses and a separate entrance further up the Ringwood Road should be put in place if this development goes ahead.</p> <p>This whole proposal has left my parents and I very disillusioned about the council and planning authorities and is destroying Verwood which is no longer a village but a town.</p>					
657378	Mrs C Langley		CSPS3021	Policy VTSW5	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Say NO to yet MORE development in our Town! Are you aware of East Dorset County Council's core strategy plan to try and stuff even more homes into a small town? When will they say enough is enough! – Are you one of the large majority of residents who</p>				564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>have to queue to get in and out of the town morning and night?</p> <p>– Have you tried to find a space in the Potter's Wheel car park or the surgery car park on a weekday morning recently?</p> <p>– Have you tried to get a routine appointment at the doctors lately and been told the wait is approximately 2 weeks?</p> <p>– With 14,000 + residents do you think you/your loved ones will get a space in the cemetery when needed?</p> <p>If we do nothing East Dorset County Council will convince government that we residents do not mind them taking more of our green belt land and filling it with concrete. VTSW4 and VTSW5 are 2 sites presently in green belt that the plan wants to build 280 homes on. We all need to hold up our hands and be counted. The only way to do that is by completing the attached form and sending it to:</p> <p>Freepost BH575 Christchurch B.C., Civic Offices, Bridge Street, Christchurch. BH23 1BR</p> <p>Or email: Policy.planning@eastdorset.gov.uk or planning.policy@christchurch.gov.uk</p> <p>It will take 5, possibly 10 minutes of your time and you will be making a difference to the town that you call home. If not for yourself, please do it for your parents, children & grandchildren's sake.</p> <p>Some common misconceptions –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyone else will complain, I won't bother – what if everyone thinks like that • I am moving soon – consider the effect to house prices this & Purple Haze has • The council will do what it likes – if enough people complain they will have to listen, it is so easy to write a letter of an email. After recent local elections, they surely realise they need to take more notice of the ordinary citizen. • The response form is too complicated – Is it put you off completing it, don't let them manipulated you! Just write what you feel, you don't have to stick to the forms format as long as your name and address is on it. <p>Please write before the 25th June 2012</p> <p>Some of the things you might want to consider putting into your objection depending on your personal circumstances.</p> <p>Core Strategy Responses to VTSW5 development</p> <p>The document is not legally compliant and/or unsound because of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been no public consultation on VTSW5 we are only being given legal consultation asking us to state why the strategy is not legally compliant or sound. • Other plans in the strategy had public consultation in 2010. VTSW5 only added in 2011 so missing out on the chance for people to comment and make suggestion on it in 2010. ? • Development on the land would be a major loss of 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>wildlife habit for a huge number of creatures including bats, badgers, smooth snakes, adders to name a few</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sang is not big enough to be called a SANG – as stated by planning department ? • Proximity of the development to schools/doctors/supermarket/town's centre will go against the reduction of the towns carbon footprint as it will force families to have a second car. ? • The existing pathway on the B3081 could not be expanded to enable walkers, child and adult cyclists to share the path. • The proposed vehicle exit involves a 90 degree turn followed by a 360 degree turn to the town against the prevailing traffic within 20 yards of Parklands close exit. • Rush hour traffic between the A31 and Verwood would be slowed further by traffic turning into Verwood to reach amenities plus would add more cars to the queue to get to the A31. Into Verwood to reach amenities plus would add more cars to the queue to get to the A31. ? • The increase in traffic/pollution/carbon emissions that vehicles from additional housing will 2 trips per day, per child to school plus shopping, work etc. ? • Refuge and recycling trucks already have to back down the service road to reach the homes at the far end. When building site workers and lorries delivering building supplies are trying to use the road along with residents parking outside their homes, the services we pay out tax for will be impaired. ? • The interruption that traffic leaving the development will cause to the rush hour traffic flowing out of Verwood towards the A31 • Access to and from the B3081 onto the A31 is already at breaking point and Hampshire have cancelled plans to improve this junction. ? • The traffic congestion at the junction between Black Hill and Ringwood Road with school run traffic • The planned pedestrian and cycle exit enters Ringwood Road on a blind bend on the side of the road with no path. ? • There is no cycle path from the development to schools etc and the road is not wide enough to make one. • The possibility of making a path through the forest is unsound because of proximity to protected heathland. Its isolated location will stop parents allowing children to use it alone. Unless the path is tarmac it will be too wet/dry to use in the winter months. Plus in the winter time it will be in darkness unless electric lighting is put in. ? • The sight is a flood zone level 1 and water does sit on the land, this issue is known as there is a drain in the far corner of the development, only recently water was laying on the field ? • The forest commission are committed to returning managed forestry back to heath land. In time all the 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											forest surrounding one side of the land will be put back to heath land so building residences so close should be avoided, that's why the 400 metre rule is there. ? All ? refer to things I find UNSOUND and in need of further DISCUSSIONS WITH THE PUBLIC OF VERWOOD, WHO WILL BE ULTIMETLY AFFECTED.						
657785	Mr Mike Keene		CSPS2782	Policy VTSW5							<p>I believe that the document is not legally compliant and unsound because of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity of the development to schools / doctors / supermarket / town centre will go against the reduction of the town carbon footprint as it will force families to have a second car. • The existing pathway on the B3081 could not be expanded to enable walkers, children cycling and adult cyclists to share the path. • The proposed vehicle exit involves a 90degree turn followed by a 360 degree turn to the town against the prevailing traffic within 20 yards of Parklands close exit. • Rush hour traffic between the A31 and Verwood would be slowed further by traffic turning towards Verwood to reach amenities plus would add more cars to the queue to get onto the A31. • The increase in traffic/pollution/carbon emissions that the vehicles from these houses will cause making car trips to the above destinations, especially 2 trips per day to school and back for each household. • Refuse and recycling trucks already have to back down the service road to reach the homes at the far end. When building site worker and Lorries delivering building supplies are trying to use the road along with residents parking outside their homes, the services we paid our tax for will be impaired. • The interruption that traffic leaving the development will cause to the rush hour traffic flowing out of Verwood towards the A31. • Access to and from the B3081 onto the A31 is already at breaking point and Hampshire have cancelled plans to improve this junction. • The traffic congestion at the junction between Black Hill and Ringwood Road with school run traffic • The planned pedestrian and cycle exit enters Ringwood Road on a blind bend on the side of the road with no path. • There is no cycle path from the development to schools etc and the road is not wide enough to make one. • The possibility of making a path through the forest is unsound because of proximity to protected heathland. Its isolated location will stop parents allow children to use alone. Unless the path is tarmac it will be to wet/dirty to use in the winter months. Plus in the winter time it will be in darkness unless electric lighting is put in. • At least 50% of the homes are to be "affordable" to 					564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>allow families to half but or to rent from a housing association. These homes are not going to be preferential to the families if they have a factor in extra costs of cars etc for shopping and school journeys. In addition to these logistical issues I would like to bring to the councils attention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The huge amount of wildlife that is using this land including Bats, Badgers, slow worms, adders which are all protected not to mention a large amount of birds. Up until 18 months ago the land was left derelict and wildlife thrived. Once the land was offer up the owner has start to plough and rack the field regularly in order to deter wildlife and the ground nesting birds. Many of the lands neighbours have wonderful photos of the land waist high in grasses, showing deer etc. This could very easily be turned into a wildlife area or back into heath land. • The sight is a flood zone level 1 and water does sit on the land, this issue is known as there is a drain in the far corner of the development. (I have recent photos of the water logged land after the recent rain)The forestry commission are committed to returning the managed forest back into heathland. Presently building is not permitted within 400metres of heath land that is in the area. Once the forestry commission create a heath land this will in due course also need to be protected. I agree 					
660531	Mrs Lesley Swaffield		CSPS2871	Policy VTSW5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>1) In January 2012 I became aware that VSTW5 was being proposed. It was slipped into the Core Strategy overnight and not part of the 2010 Public Consultation, thus people unable to comment.</p> <p>2) In 2000 and 2001 I contacted E.D.D.C. planning department spoke to an officer as I was planning to buy a bungalow adjacent to VSTW5. I was told it was Green Belt and that nothing would be built on this piece of land.</p> <p>3) I also understand VSTW5 is within 400 mtrs of heathland which is protected.</p> <p>4) VTSW5 is home to a large amount of Wildlife. Badgers, Deer, Snakes, Bats, Pheasants, Foxes, Nightjars, Slowworms, Rabbit. Some of which are protected species.</p> <p>5) To my knowledge the proposed development has been turned down twice over the years. On the grounds there is no safe access to and from the site, so how can it be considered now.</p> <p>There is a dangerous bend very near to the site on the B3081. Traffic has increased on the B3081 since planning was last refused.</p> <p>50 more houses being built would mean at least 100+ cars entering and exiting every day.</p> <p>The section of Ringwood Road by the existing entrance from No 241 along is only a service road. The dust carts and recycling lorries already have to back down as there is no room for turning.</p> <p>Building lorries would not be able to turn without</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>swinging on to the other side of the B3081. Footway is non existent and to cross the B3081 is not easy due to more cars over the years as Verwood has grown. The nearest school is 1 ½ miles away so children would have to rely on parents using cars to get them to school so more traffic on the roads. There is no bus route in this area of Verwood. Thus with all these points this site is not suitable for a development and should remain an open space.</p>						
507525	Mr David Lander	Boyer Planning Ltd	CSPS3223	Policy VTSW5	Yes	Yes					<p>Policy VTSW5 allocates land at North Eastern Verwood for a new neighbourhood of approximately 50 homes. The Green Belt boundary will be amended to exclude the land identified for new housing. The policy highlights the following elements regarding the proposed allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The new neighbourhood will be set out according to the principles of the masterplan.” • “A design code will be agreed by the Council, setting out the required high standards.” • “Approximately half of the identified land is to be set out as informal open space along with children’s play.” • “A Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace strategy is to be implemented as part of the provision of the new housing as required by Policy ME3.” • “Vehicular access is to be provided from Ringwood Road.” • “Dedicated pedestrian and cycling links are to be provided throughout the housing area and link into the existing networks.” <p>4.2 Policy LN3 requires that the site provides 50% of the dwellings as affordable housing. Our concerns regarding this matter are set out above and therefore we do not repeat this in relation to the allocation itself.</p> <p>Principle of Allocation and of Green Belt Boundary Revision</p> <p>4.3 We consider that the proposed allocation of land to form the North Eastern Verwood New Neighbourhood and the associated amendment to the Green Belt boundary are fundamentally sound and justified by the Council’s evidence base. Given the nature of the settlements present in the District and the scale of development to be accommodated, it is considered that the allocation of such a site is appropriate in the Core Strategy. It is important to the delivery of housing, including affordable housing, and the achievement of the Local Authority’s vision for the area.</p> <p>4.4 We do however consider that the basis for the Green Belt boundary amendment needs to be more</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>the representation relates to a key policy in the Core Strategy. Our client is controls the land comprising the North Eastern Verwood New Neighbourhood and therefore has an important role to play in delivering this part of the strategy.</p>	564	<p>2253531_0_1.pdf 2253533_0_1.pdf 2253530_0_1.pdf 2253536_0_1.pdf 2253553_0_1.pdf 2253534_0_1.pdf 2253535_0_1.pdf</p>	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>fully explained to ensure the Plan is seen to be justified and sound in these terms. NPPF paragraph 83 states: “Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy”.</p> <p>4.5 Policy KS2 of the Pre-submission Core Strategy, sets out the most important purposes of the Green Belt in the area and then states: “Limited changes to the existing boundaries are proposed to enable some new housing and employment to meet local needs and to include areas in the Green Belt that are no longer capable of providing for these needs”</p> <p>4.6 We consider that the Core Strategy should include a brief statement of the rationale for amendments to the Green Belt boundary to demonstrate a proper justification. NPPF Paragraph 85 sets out the matters to be considered when defining Green Belt boundaries and is an appropriate basis for such a statement. We consider the North Eastern Verwood allocation against these criteria, where relevant, below: Consultation response to the Christchurch and East Dorset Pre-submission Core Strategy Consultation 10.221 – Land at Ringwood Road, Verwood</p> <p>7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development”: <p>4.7 Paragraph 11.29 of the submission draft Core Strategy states that Verwood is the second largest town within East Dorset, has a strong base of facilities, services and employment, and that there are plans for these to be expanded (including schools, convenience shopping and sport, recreation and open space). This statement demonstrates consistency with the strategy for sustainable development for Green Belt purposes as well as identifying a suitable location for a new neighbourhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open” <p>4.8 The North Eastern Verwood site is well contained and divorced from wider countryside. It does not therefore contribute to the openness of the wider Green Belt. The previous Local Plan Inspector commented that the site has a dense wooded backdrop giving it a clear edge to the town. The landscape assessment of the site carried out for the Council by Broadway Malyan (East Dorset New Neighbourhoods – Stage 1 Baseline Report) states that the site is well contained by Ringwood Forest to the east and housing on the western edge and concludes “There are no landscape</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>constraints to the principle of development”.</p> <p>4.9 These assessments confirm that a Green Belt boundary amendment in this location would safeguard two of the five purposes of Green Belt Policy namely “to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas” and “to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”.</p> <p>4.10 Within the South East Dorset Joint Study Area Report, “SED 04 Development Options” (which formed part of the evidence base for the Regional Spatial Strategy), land North East of Verwood is not defined as forming part of the “key gaps” or “key urban edges” which provide separation and separate physical identify to settlements within SE Dorset. Also, land north east of Verwood does not form part of areas defined within the SE Dorset Green Belt as contributing to the setting of historic towns.</p> <p>4.11 This evidence base confirms that a Green Belt boundary amendment in this location would not conflict with a further two of the five purposes of Green Belt Policy: “to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another” and “to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period” <p>4.12 It would not be appropriate to accommodate any significant further requirement for development at Verwood in the longer-term in this location as the limits of development are clearly defined by the adjoining Woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.” <p>4.13 The woodland to be retained will form a clear physical feature that is readily recognisable as the basis for a re-aligned Green Belt boundary. The Local Plan Inspector stated that the woodland to the north of the site would make a good defensible boundary for the Green Belt and edge to the town.</p> <p>Consultation Response to the Christchurch and East Dorset Pre-Submission Core Strategy Consultation 10.221 – Land at Ringwood Road, Verwood 8</p> <p>4.14 On the basis of the above consideration of key criteria for the definition of Green Belt boundaries in paragraph 85 of the NPPF, it is clear that there is a sound justification for the revision to the Green Belt boundary at this location as proposed in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Detailed considerations in relation to the proposed allocation</p> <p>4.15 As highlighted in paragraph 4.1, Policy VTSW5</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>identifies a series of key elements in relation to the proposed allocation. Our comments in relation to these and other matters relevant to demonstrating the deliverability of the allocation (and therefore the soundness of the Core Strategy) are set out below.</p> <p>4.16 Linden Homes have assembled a detailed evidence base to underpin the soundness of this proposal. The following documents accompany this submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological Scoping Report (Appendix One) • Access Appraisal (Appendix Two) • Landscape and Visual Appraisal (Appendix Three) • Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (Appendix Four) • Ground Appraisal Report (Appendix Five) • Engineering Appraisal (Appendix Six) • Development Principles / Masterplan (Appendix Seven) <p>Ecology / SANGs</p> <p>4.17 Tyler Grange have undertaken an ecological appraisal of the proposed site (see Appendix One). The appraisal has concluded that the site is predominantly arable land of negligible value though with some coniferous woodland, scrub and grassland of some local value. The site has been discharrowed annually by the current owners, the site's former use as a playing field having ceased and been abandoned many years ago. Adjacent to the north and east is Ringwood Forest, with that part to the east being designated as Ringwood Forest & Home Wood Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) on account of the notable bird, reptile, ant and plant species it supports.</p> <p>4.18 The potential for adverse effects to the Dorset Heathlands SPA is the most significant ecological issue in respect of future residential development of the Site. The Council, in consultation with Natural England, has identified that increased recreation pressure that would result from residential development would adversely affect the ground nesting birds for which the SPA is designated. In response to this issue, the Core Strategy Pre Submission contains a mechanism for mitigating such effects, which are common to all proposed residential sites within 5km of the SPA. The site is located outside the 400m buffer zone for the SPA.</p> <p>4.19 In respect of the Site, Policy VTSW5 states that, if developed, it should include a SANG, as required under ME2. However, the SANG illustrated under VTSW5 is insufficiently large to satisfy the design requirements set out in ME3, and for it to meet the requirements, would require additional land within Ringwood Forest, beyond the site boundary. With Forestry Commission</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>consent, such a solution is feasible, given the Forestry Commission, who own the land, is committed to heathland restoration in the forest. Alternatively, in accordance with Policy ME3, a contribution could be made towards the provision of off-site SANGs. As such it is considered that the strategy to mitigate the site could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial contributions to off-site SANG provision; <p>Consultation response to the Christchurch and East Dorset Pre-submission Core Strategy Consultation 10.221 – Land at Ringwood Road, Verwood 9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of a SANG on site and within adjacent land within Ringwood Forest; and/or • A combination of both. <p>4.20 The detail of the strategy to address effects would be agreed prior to the submission of a planning application.</p> <p>4.21 The design of the drainage strategy within the development, and precautions during construction, can avoid potential adverse effects to the sensitive wetland habitats within the Dorset Heathlands SAC and other nearby wetland statutory sites.</p> <p>4.22 The proposed development layout affects habitats that are predominantly of negligible value, though some are of Site or local value. With the open space shown, there is ample opportunity to enhance retained woodland and to create new habitats that are identified in the Local BAP to more than mitigate impacts, and deliver net biodiversity gain.</p> <p>4.23 The report concluded that “there is every reason to suspect that allocation and future development of the Site would accord with relevant planning policy that seeks to protect and enhance ecological resources.”</p> <p>Access</p> <p>4.24 Bellamy Roberts LLP have considered the access and transport issues arising from the scheme (see Appendix Two). Two potential access arrangements are considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access road serving the site directly from Ringwood Road • An alternative route via Parkland Close. <p>4.25 The report concludes that the two possible forms of accessing the site are both technically feasible and can be implemented without delay. From discussions with the Area Highway Officer at the time of preparing this report, he was considering both options. The proposed access arrangement would be the subject of further consultation in the preparation of the planning application for the development of the site.</p> <p>4.26 Pedestrian and cycle routes can be provided with the development scheme and a pedestrian footway can be provided along Ringwood Road, to link</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>up with the existing footway network. This would also link up Parkland Close to the existing network, to the benefit of those residents.</p> <p>4.27 The development of about 50 dwellings is likely to generate in the region of 35 traffic movements during the peak hour periods. Such low flows could be accommodated within the existing highway network and would not generate a severe impact and as such, would accord with the guidance of the NPPF (March 2012).</p> <p>Landscape and Visual Appraisal</p> <p>4.28 Tyler Grange has undertaken a Landscape and Visual Appraisal of the proposed allocation site (see Appendix Three). The report concludes that the site is visually contained on all sides either by dense coniferous plantations or by residential properties with enclosed wooden fencing. There are likely to be localised views into the site from the gardens and houses of adjacent properties, although such views will be partially obscured by fencing and a mix of mature tree and shrub planting. There are also localised views into the site from the edge of the forestry maintenance tracks and from a gateway along the south eastern edge of the site, just off Parkland Close. Within Consultation Response to the Christchurch and East Dorset Pre-Submission Core Strategy Consultation 10.221 – Land at Ringwood Road, Verwood 10</p> <p>the wider visual context which the site is perceived, there is the wooded backdrop of Pistle Hill which forms part of Ringwood Forest beyond the built form of Verwood.</p> <p>4.29 The report includes a series of recommendations which have been used to inform the development principles plan and will be used to inform more detailed proposals for the site.</p> <p>Services / Facilities</p> <p>4.30 The table below indicates the distance of the site from a variety of services and facilities in and around Verwood. The new X6 bus service runs from the bus stop located in close proximity to the proposed site access which provides connections to Verwood village centre as well as to Bournemouth, Ferndown and Poole. In addition to the strong bus links, the site is in close proximity to footpath links along Ringwood Road into the centre of Verwood. In addition Ebblake Industrial Estate is located on the opposite of Ringwood Road providing employment opportunities in close proximity to the site.</p> <p>Details Distance from Site</p> <p>Bus Stop</p> <p>Closest Bus Stop</p> <p>The new X6 bus service runs</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>an hourly service to Bournemouth, Ferndown and Poole. 0.1km Education Hillside Community School, Verwood Primary School 2km Verwood Church of England First School, Verwood Primary School 2.4km Trinity CE VA School, Verwood Primary School 2.6km Ferndown Upper School, Ferndown Secondary School 8.2km Queen Elizabeth's School, Wimborne Secondary School 13km Healthcare Cranborne Practice, Verwood GP Surgery 1km The Verwood Surgery, Verwood GP Surgery 2.4km Employment Ebblake Industrial Estate 0.3km Verwood Trading Estate 1.3km Archaeology 4.31 CgMS Consulting have undertaken a desk based to assessment to consider whether there are any archaeological impacts arising from the proposed development (see Appendix Four). The assessment has established that the site has low potential for remains of all archaeological periods Consultation response to the Christchurch and East Dorset Pre-submission Core Strategy Consultation 10.221 – Land at Ringwood Road, Verwood 11 and that the proposed development will have no archaeological impacts. Therefore, further archaeological investigation in support of the proposed development is considered to be unnecessary. Other Detailed Considerations 4.32 The site is located in Flood Zone 1 which is the lowest level of flood risk and is defined as having a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river or sea flooding in any year. The site is over 1 hectare in size and therefore a Flood Risk Assessment would be prepared and submitted as part of the planning application. 4.33 A Ground Appraisal Report has been produced by Geo-Environmental Services Limited regarding the proposed allocation site at North Eastern Verwood (see Appendix Five). The report found that based on the ground and groundwater conditions</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>encountered in the exploratory holes, it is considered that conventional foundations would be suitable for the proposed development. On the basis of the ground and groundwater conditions encountered, it is considered likely that shallow soakaways could be used to dispose of storm water.</p> <p>4.34 Relevant service providers have been contacted to ascertain whether sufficient capacity exists in their current services. The accompanying Final Engineering Appraisal (see Appendix Seven) confirms that there is sufficient capacity in existing water, gas, electricity and foul drainage, since the completion of the report Wessex Water have confirmed that the existing pumping station will have sufficient capacity to serve the proposed development.</p> <p>Development Principles</p> <p>4.35 Based on a review of the above evidence a development principles plan has been prepared by Pope Priestley, see Appendix Seven. Pope Priestley's analysis of the development principles is set out below.</p> <p>Initial observations and conclusions from a visual site analysis coupled with a review of the local authority Core Strategy Pre-Submission and other consultant reports including a Landscape and Visual Appraisal, have informed the design principles and concept for residential development of the site. These are illustrated on the Principles of Development Plan.</p> <p>The site has 2 key boundary characteristics; the first being the proximity of the built form and private gardens of the existing properties to the south and west; and secondly the more significant boundaries that border onto large areas of heath and forest to the north and east. Surrounding development comprises post war bungalows in a regular pattern, ribbon style development. These properties are largely detached but closely located together with generous front gardens and where fronting onto Ringwood road are set in a mature treescape. Rear gardens on the west boundary contain mature trees whilst the rear gardens of existing properties to the south and north are more open.</p> <p>The point of access off Parkland Close is determined by an existing gap in the building frontage serving as a private drive to 3 existing properties and leading to an existing field gate. It is logical to extend this access to serve the proposed development. Immediately entering the site the access would extend through an 'arrival space' retaining an open aspect through the site toward the retained informal open space. New buildings would frame this view to each side and this area also</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>includes a landscaped open space encompassing an existing tree to be retained. The internal road Consultation Response to the Christchurch and East Dorset Pre-Submission Core Strategy Consultation 10.221 – Land at Ringwood Road, Verwood 12</p> <p>structure would permeate through the site from the 'arrival space' using a hierarchy of 'street types' including shared surfaces, access courts and private drives.</p> <p>The proposed built form on the south and west edges is to respect the general scale of the adjacent existing properties, including a variation in height (1 to 1.5 storey) with clear gaps between properties and with private gardens placed against the boundary. The proposed development further from sensitive boundaries would increase to a maximum 2 storey form, arranged in a perimeter block style with active frontages and a clear definition between public and private realms. As development extends toward the north and east the grain would become more irregular, the road hierarchy more informal which in combination with appropriate landscaping would create an appropriate interface with the heath and forest as well as the retained informal open space. The irregular form of development would comprise properties with active frontages onto the open land offering natural surveillance over that area, including the proposed pedestrian link across the site at this point of intersection between the open space and the built form.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>4.36 Policy VTSW5 proposes a new neighbourhood of 50 dwellings to the north east of Verwood. We consider that the proposed allocation and the associated amendment to the Green Belt boundary are fundamentally sound and justified by the Council's evidence base. However, the basis for the Green Belt boundary amendment needs to be more fully explained to ensure the Plan is seen to be justified and sound in these terms.</p> <p>4.37 Further evidence is submitted which demonstrates the deliverability of the proposed allocation of land to form the North Eastern Verwood New Neighbourhood.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>5.1 This Statement has set out the representations by Linden Homes Strategic Land in respect of the Christchurch and East Dorset Pre-Submission Core Strategy consultation. The Statement has focused on those elements of the Core Strategy relevant to East Dorset and Verwood in particular.</p> <p>5.2 In summary our submissions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council should apply the approach of the Three 					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Dragons assessment in considering which greenfield strategic allocations should have their affordable housing target lowered from 50%. As such it is considered that sites in Verwood should have a target of 35-40% affordable housing to take account of its location in the Low Value East Dorset market value area and to make the Core Strategy effective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We consider that the proposed allocation of land to form the North Eastern Verwood New Neighbourhood and the associated amendment to the Green Belt boundary are fundamentally sound and justified by the Council's evidence base. However, the basis for the Green Belt boundary amendment needs to be more fully explained to ensure the Plan is seen to be justified and sound in these terms. Further evidence is submitted which demonstrates the deliverability of the proposed allocation of land to form the North Eastern Verwood New Neighbourhood. 					
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3739	Policy VTSW5							<p>Policy Allocation Dwellings/land area Comment WMC3 Cuthbury allotments and St Margaret's Close New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 260 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC4 Stone Lane 90 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 6 WMC5 Cranborne Road New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 600 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC6 South of Leigh Road New Neighbourhood and Sports Village, Wimborne 75 ha SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 CM1 Lockyer's School and Land North of Corfe Mullen New Neighbourhood 250 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP3 Holmwood House New Neighbourhood, Ferndown 110 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP4</p>		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	564	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Coppins new Neighbourhood, Ferndown 30 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP6</p> <p>Land East of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley 320 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP7</p> <p>West of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley 200 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW4</p> <p>North West Verwood New Neighbourhood 230 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP8</p> <p>Blunt's Farm Employment Allocation, Ferndown 30ha A mitigation strategy to be agreed to avoid harm to European sites and SSSI VTSW5</p> <p>North Eastern Verwood New Neighbourhood 50 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW6</p> <p>Woolsbridge Employment Allocation, Three Legged Cross 9.7ha A mitigation strategy to be agreed to SSSI</p> <p>The RSPB does not, in principle, object to the residential allocations above. However, the table does illustrate the heavy reliance on SANGs as a mitigation measure. The Councils will be aware of the relatively untested nature of SANGs as effective mitigation, albeit in the context of available measures, it is clear that SANGs offer perhaps the best opportunity of addressing potential adverse impacts on the European sites. SANGs are a principal component of the approach taken by the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework (IPF), and are used as a mitigation vehicle elsewhere in England, notably in the Thames Basin Heaths.</p> <p>Research continues on the effectiveness of SANGs, and it is imperative that this research informs SANGs development anticipated under the Core Strategy. Long-term management and monitoring is also critical (as is identified in policy CN1).</p> <p>Testing of the suitability of SANGs as a mitigation measure for the above policies is essential and has not yet been undertaken. We are concerned that some of the SANGs proposed may be ineffective, particularly SANGs associated with smaller allocations.</p> <p>With respect to employment allocations FWP8 (Blunt's Farm) and VTSW6 (Woolsbridge), we are not familiar with these locations. We do not object to these policies</p>					

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											subject to receiving clarification from Natural England of the issues pertinent to these sites, and the likely efficacy of mitigation strategies anticipated by these policies.					
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3566	Policy VTSW5	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Policy VTSW 5 is deficient in the delivery of sufficient green infrastructure. Whilst Policy ME 3 does not require sites of 50 dwellings or less to provide a Sustainable Natural Green Space (SANGS) on site, a financial contribution (in lieu) will not be effective in mitigating the use of nearby areas of protected heathland for passive recreation.</p> <p>Currently, the Core Strategy (CS) only contains provision for the possible delivery of one SANGS, to the north west of the settlement. This is in association with a settlement extension that we regard as unsound – see our separate representations in respect of Policy VTSW 4. Even if the CS is adopted with the inclusion of the north west Verwood site allocation, the SANGS that is associated with it is remote from the VTSW 5 site, and unlikely to be attractive to users. There are areas of open space, but designated as protected heathland, closer to the VTSW 5 site that will continue to be used for passive recreation.</p> <p>Policy VTSW 5 will therefore be ineffective as its potential contribution to the required housing needs of East Dorset will be to the detriment of internationally protected heathland.</p>	Delete Policy VTSW 5.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine the effectiveness and delivery of housing and open space at Verwood.	564	
649505	Miss Dawn Leader		CSPS304	Map 11.6	No	No	No	No			<p>The SANG shown on this map is not of sufficient size to be called a SANG and why should it be on the other side of the development to the existing housing. All the local residents should benefit.</p> <p>This land is also the only undeveloped piece left in this part of the town, it is opposite the cemetery and should be considered in the councils strategic view for cemeteries in the next 20 years. Once land is filled up with houses it cannot be turned back into cemetery. If the council plans to continue development in Verwood, more cemetery space will be needed, especially as we have a high than average senior population.</p>	The strategic review should earmark cemetery space for future use too.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		565	
650215	Mr I Hickman		CSPS308	Map 11.6	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>there are plenty of empty wasted spaces in Verwood that are not currently 'greenbelt', these by law need to be developed before hand!</p> <p>the proposed entrance/exit to this proposed 'estate' is by far the most thoughtless part of the plan</p> <p>there is protected wildlife living in this 'area of greenbelt'</p>	the entrance to land if it does go ahead needs to be direct from the main b3081 but not be sited anywhere near or in front of the residential houses 219 to 243 ringwood road and especially not pass along 219,221,223 ringwood road.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	i intend on living here for a very long time, i also have alot of concern that 50+ houses are to be built around my surrounding fences causing my house to be an island within a building site!	565	
650714	Mr Norman Bethell		CSPS374	Map 11.6							<p>The exit from the service road for addresses 219-243 Ringwood Road (stated on the plan as Parklands Close) is already dangerous. The proposal to build a further 50 houses will result in 50 to 100 more cars exiting onto the B3081, mostly between the hours of 7-9am, which will</p>				565	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											cause chaos on a road that is already very busy at that time. I can foresee many accidents happening due to frustration and bad tempers of drivers wanting to get to work or shops and the inevitable school runs.					
650714	Mr Norman Bethell		CSPS641	Map 11.6	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	I have not been kept informed during every stage of the legal process. There have been no debates between the public and Council Officials. If the proposed 50 or so houses are built they will generate 50-100 more cars which will have to gain access to the B3081 Ringwood Road, via the existing junction which is already dangerous. I can foresee that accidents will occur at this junction due to the frustration and impatience of drivers, who will have been kept waiting to join this road, which is very busy between 7am and 9am every weekday.		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination		565	
651093	Mrs Beryl Capacci		CSPS527	Map 11.6	No	No	No	No	No	No	I consider a proposal for building as in VTSW5 is too far from the present facilities and totally unsuitable for families needing to walk to school, doctors etc. Our house is on the market and one couple turned it down because it is too far to walk to school. There is no room for a cycle path on the B3081 either and any child trying to cycle to school on the road would put it's life at risk as there are just 9 seconds from the bend in the road to get out if the driver is observing the speed limit which many aren't. Therefore cars would be making many trips a day thus increasing the carbon footprints for this area. The field is a haven for wildlife and should therefore be allowed to remain fallow. This proposal went in at the 3rd stage so missed out on stages 1 and 2, giving residents little chance to object and is therefore not compliant. Mrs. B. Capacci		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		565	
652710	Mr Gary Balmer		CSPS476	Map 11.6	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	The size of the field put aside for SANG purposes is not big enough according to government guidelines	any development would have to be considerably smaller to incorporate a SANG of the correct size.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		565	
652994	Mrs Kathleen Leader		CSPS546	Map 11.6	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	This map shows pedestrian and cycle access from the site, straight out on a blind bend, that is completely crazy and very dangerous	a new entrance & exit must be found if this crazy development is to move forward	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		565	
656214	Mrs B Lawford		CSPS1546	Map 11.6	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Whoever drew up the plan/report did not even get the name of the area correct. If attention had been made it would have been known that the road concerned is not Parkland Close but a service road of Ringwood Road at the appropriate dwelling have Ringwood Rd as their address. Parkland Close runs 20yrs the further along. If the people responsible cannot get the location right what chance is there for the rest of the document. Parkland Close does not run parallel to B3081 - it is Ringwood Road- service road. The proposed exit involves a 90 degree turn followed by a 360 degree turn to the town against prevailing traffic. To the right of the		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		565	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>exit is a bend in the B3081 and with ever increasing traffic - rarely keeping to the 30mph limit - there is great difficulty already exiting on to the B3081. If further development was allowed a disaster would be waiting to happen on a daily basis there are oak trees on the grass verge.</p> <p>VTSW5 was not included in original strategy which had public consultation in 2010 therefore not giving us the opportunity to comment at the time.</p> <p>The sight ia s flood zone level 1 and water does sit on the land - this issue is known as there is a drain in the far corner of the development and water is lying on the field - at the forest end of the proposed site runs a stream which could be contaninated with further building.</p> <p>Proximity of site to schools/doctors/town centre/supermarket will go against reduction of carbon footprint and the schools/doctors are already full. Nothing is within walking distances. 'Apollo' is not a leisure centre, it is a unit on the Ebblake Est for musical repairs. The nearest leisure centre is near the supermarket.</p>					
656214	Mrs B Lawford		CSPS1548	Map 11.6	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	<p>Whoever drew up the plan/report did not even get the name of the area correct. If attention had been made it would have been known that the road concerned is not Parkland Close but a service road of Ringwood Road at the appropriate dwelling have Ringwood Rd as their address. Parkland Close runs 20yrs the further along. If the people responsible cannot get the location right what chance is there for the rest of the document.</p> <p>Parkland Close does not run parallel to B3081 - it is Ringwood Road- service road. The proposed exit involves a 90 degree turn followed by a 360 degree turn to the town against prevailing traffic. To the right of the exit is a bend in the B3081 and with ever increasing traffic - rarely keeping to the 30mph limit - there is great difficulty already exiting on to the B3081. If further development was allowed a disaster would be waiting to happen on a daily basis there are oak trees on the grass verge.</p> <p>VTSW5 was not included in original strategy which had public consultation in 2010 therefore not giving us the opportunity to comment at the time.</p> <p>The sight ia s flood zone level 1 and water does sit on the land - this issue is known as there is a drain in the far corner of the development and water is lying on the field - at the forest end of the proposed site runs a stream which could be contaninated with further building.</p> <p>Proximity of site to schools/doctors/town centre/supermarket will go against reduction of carbon footprint and the schools/doctors are already full. Nothing is within walking distances. 'Apollo' is not a leisure centre, it is a unit on the Ebblake Est for musical</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		565	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											repairs. The nearest leisure centre is near the supermarket.					
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3571	Map 11.6	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Policy VTSW 5 is deficient in the delivery of sufficient green infrastructure. Whilst Policy ME 3 does not require sites of 50 dwellings or less to provide a Sustainable Natural Green Space (SANGS) on site, a financial contribution (in lieu) will not be effective in mitigating the use of nearby areas of protected heathland for passive recreation.</p> <p>Currently, the Core Strategy (CS) only contains provision for the possible delivery of one SANGS, to the north west of the settlement. This is in association with a settlement extension that we regard as unsound – see our separate representations in respect of Policy VTSW 4. Even if the CS is adopted with the inclusion of the north west Verwood site allocation, the SANGS that is associated with it is remote from the VTSW 5 site, and unlikely to be attractive to users. There are areas of open space, but designated as protected heathland, closer to the VTSW 5 site that will continue to be used for passive recreation.</p> <p>Policy VTSW 5 will therefore be ineffective as its potential contribution to the required housing needs of East Dorset will be to the detriment of internationally protected heathland.</p>	Delete Policy VTSW 5.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine the effectiveness and delivery of housing and open space at Verwood.	565	
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3569	11.35	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Policy VTSW 5 is deficient in the delivery of sufficient green infrastructure. Whilst Policy ME 3 does not require sites of 50 dwellings or less to provide a Sustainable Natural Green Space (SANGS) on site, a financial contribution (in lieu) will not be effective in mitigating the use of nearby areas of protected heathland for passive recreation.</p> <p>Currently, the Core Strategy (CS) only contains provision for the possible delivery of one SANGS, to the north west of the settlement. This is in association with a settlement extension that we regard as unsound – see our separate representations in respect of Policy VTSW 4. Even if the CS is adopted with the inclusion of the north west Verwood site allocation, the SANGS that is associated with it is remote from the VTSW 5 site, and unlikely to be attractive to users. There are areas of open space, but designated as protected heathland, closer to the VTSW 5 site that will continue to be used for passive recreation.</p> <p>Policy VTSW 5 will therefore be ineffective as its potential contribution to the required housing needs of East Dorset will be to the detriment of internationally protected heathland.</p>	Delete Policy VTSW 5.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine the effectiveness and delivery of housing and open space at Verwood.	566	
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3570	11.36	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Policy VTSW 5 is deficient in the delivery of sufficient green infrastructure. Whilst Policy ME 3 does not require sites of 50 dwellings or less to provide a Sustainable Natural Green Space (SANGS) on site, a financial contribution (in lieu) will not be effective in mitigating the</p>	Delete Policy VTSW 5.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To critically examine the effectiveness and delivery of housing and open space at Verwood.	567	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>use of nearby areas of protected heathland for passive recreation.</p> <p>Currently, the Core Strategy (CS) only contains provision for the possible delivery of one SANGS, to the north west of the settlement. This is in association with a settlement extension that we regard as unsound – see our separate representations in respect of Policy VTSW 4. Even if the CS is adopted with the inclusion of the north west Verwood site allocation, the SANGS that is associated with it is remote from the VTSW 5 site, and unlikely to be attractive to users. There are areas of open space, but designated as protected heathland, closer to the VTSW 5 site that will continue to be used for passive recreation.</p> <p>Policy VTSW 5 will therefore be ineffective as its potential contribution to the required housing needs of East Dorset will be to the detriment of internationally protected heathland.</p>					
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1486	11.37	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Ecological survey information for this site is not available therefore it is not possible to fully assess the potential environmental impacts of development on this site. NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment.</p> <p>Dorset Wildlife Trust has significant concerns over the development of this site due to its close proximity to features of nature conservation importance including the Holt and West Moors Heath SSSI (internationally designated), Moors River SSSI and Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI (SU00/53). The latter lies immediately adjacent to the allocated site and is designated for its semi-natural wet woodland and unimproved damp neutral grassland (site package attached for information). Development here would cut the SNCI off from an open corridor to the heathland SSSI, reducing its ecological connectivity, which is not in line with NPPF (117). The Moors River SSSI is of high environmental sensitivity, currently in unfavourable status, and has a history of pollution which has resulted in poor water quality and impacts on biodiversity. This new development could further add to existing pressures from upstream, including from the adjacent industrial site.</p> <p>Within the policy, DWT supports the prerequisites for the development but considers these need strengthening to ensure no harm to the designated Dorset Heaths and Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI, which lying downstream, would be susceptible to any changes to water quality or quantity.</p> <p>This area lies within an area identified by RSPB as having potential for heathland re-creation and we consider that there is opportunity for landscape buffers to re-create priority habitats, informed by ecological survey work, in line with NPPF (118).</p>	<p>DWT hold an objection until information is provided for this site to assess whether the environmental strand of sustainability is satisfied and the allocation is deliverable.</p> <p>Within paragraph 11.37 we would like to see a change in wording to:</p> <p>Development of the site will need to take into account areas subject to flooding and also ensure that the nature conservation quality of the European designated Dorset Heaths, Moors River SSSI and Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI is are not harmed.</p> <p>Within Policy VTSW6 we would like a change in wording to:</p> <p>Provision of significant landscape and ecological buffers alongside the countryside edges of the site, which protect the designated sites, complimenting surrounding habitats and enhancing the ecological network.</p> <p>A wildlife strategy to be agreed with the Council that ensures no harm to the Moors River SSSI,</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county, are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership.</p>	568	2256008_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											We consider that all designated wildlife sites require significant ecological buffers.	European designated Dorset Heaths and Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI, will derive from the Estate. Particular regard to the water environment will be needed and in this respect the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to mitigate any potential impacts will be expected to form part of the strategy. We also request that Map 11.7 should show adjacent nature conservation designations and floodplain and groundwater protection zones to define the planning constraints. Also to indicate land suitable for provision of ecological and landscape buffers and protection of the water environment, as shown on maps associated with housing proposals elsewhere in the strategy.				
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3320	11.37	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>This site drains into the Moors River SSSI, a riverine system which supports an exceptional range of biodiversity including rare Odonata and the Otter. There have been serious pollution incidents in the past from employment estates which drain into the Moors River which have proved highly damaging to its biodiversity. We are therefore deeply concerned about the pollution threat from this proposal, both from acute accidental pollution and ongoing diffuse pollution via ongoing surface water pollution. Both sections of the allocation lies within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and partially within areas that are susceptible to surface flooding (which is likely to increase in the longer term due to climate change NPPF para 99), so the issue of surface water pollution when this flooding inevitably occurs is especially worrying. Without absolute certainty that no damage will result to the Moors River system, the policy fails to comply with NPPF para 120.</p> <p>The Environment Agency's GP3 (2011), Groundwater Protection, Policy and Practice explains the need for the precautionary approach and the very real problems that pollution can cause, sometimes taking decades to resolve. Of particular relevance is Part 2, the Technical Framework and the section on pollutants. (http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/library/publications/40741.aspx)</p>	<p>The allocation should be informed by full biological survey. All designated habitats and flood risk zones should be shown on proposals maps – in this case Map 11.7. Include reference to the adjacent SNCI and N2K heathlands in para 11.37 and add a prerequisite for the wildlife strategy to consider the SNCI and N2K heathland.. The policy should explicitly refer to the risk of light pollution and the need to comply with Lighting SPG. Add a prerequisite to direct all surface water from the new and existing estate through a pollution control balancing feature for which a detailed management plan must be agreed by the Council, Environment Agency and Natural</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	As part of the East Dorset Community Partnership, ETAG's remit on biological sciences and sustainability is wider than that of Natural England or Dorset Wildlife Trust. Membership includes highly qualified natural scientists and town & parish representatives.	568	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>In our response to the Options consultation, we advised, Of the several employment estates in the catchment of the Moors River, the Woolsbridge Estate is arguably one of the most threatening due to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • its extreme proximity to the river so that any contaminated surface water runoff can reach the river very quickly, lessening the opportunity for detection and containment; and • its susceptibility to flood (as witnessed by the constraints map and the transecting public footpath being flooded/waterlogged for 6 months of the year) allowing pollutants to be washed into the nearby river. Further Para 11.37 refers only to Moors River SSSI and thus fails to take into account the adjacent N2K heathland and the Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI, neither of which are marked on the proposals map. We advise that all SSSIs and SNCIs that are close to proposed development sites should be shown on proposals maps to demonstrate that these are planning constraints that need to be taken on board by developers. <p>There has been no biological survey of the actual allocations, the eastern of which at least would appear to be an undisturbed grassland habitat. The potential for damaging light pollution, to both heathland and aquatic ecosystems, is high. Please see ETAG's detailed supplementary advice to the Options consultation (Light Pollution – Issues for consideration in developing the Core Strategy submitted to EDDC, 5.6.11) which includes details of why light pollution is harmful and what particular developments (roads and buildings, as well as lighting) can have devastating effects.</p> <p>We consider that deliverability of this policy is in doubt. The proposal lacks flexibility to deliver objectives if part or all of the potential allocation fails. It should be noted that the bus service to the site has been terminated recently (May 2012) so sustainable travel to work plans are less likely to be achieved. The present site is significantly under occupied, calling into question the need for such an extensive extension.</p> <p>Notwithstanding our view that the site should not be taken forward for development, we support the prerequisites but recommend that they are strengthened to take better account of the Moors River SSSI and the nearby SNCI and N2K heathland</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species</p> <p>There is no evidence that the policy will meet the objective. High risk of damaging water borne pollution and light pollution affecting Moors River SSSI, SNCI and N2K heathland. Aquatic and terrestrial protected and priority species will be at risk.</p> <p>Negative score not neutral</p>	England.				

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>SA Objective 3 Minimise pollution Travel to work plans may limit GHG emissions but the high risk of polluting ecosystems remains. Scoring possibly negative</p> <p>SA Objective 4 Minimise factors contributing to climate change Travel to work plans may limit GHG emissions but bus service has been withdrawn. Service industries (such as boiler maintenance companies etc as on the present site) depend on using fleets of vehicles. Such additional vehicle movements can only be controlled by defining carefully the type of business use that is acceptable.</p> <p>SA Objective 5 Provide access to meet people's needs Travel to work plans may limit GHG emissions but the bus service has been withdrawn. A meaningful travel to work plan may not be achievable. Current plans for improving cycleways will contribute to meeting the objective.</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment More explicit guidance on mitigation is required than is covered by Policy HE3</p>					
524338	Mr Kenneth Brooks		CSPS249	Policy VTSW6							<p>Expansion of Woolsbridge Industrial estate presents two serious potential problems:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The area adjoins Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 areas close to the Moors River and the risk of flooding will be difficult to overcome. 2. With no public transport serving the site the increased employment would seriously impact on the traffic using Horton Road through Ashley Heath and Three Legged Cross. 				570	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1477	Policy VTSW6	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Ecological survey information for this site is not available therefore it is not possible to fully assess the potential environmental impacts of development on this site. NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment.</p> <p>Dorset Wildlife Trust has significant concerns over the development of this site due to its close proximity to features of nature conservation importance including the Holt and West Moors Heath SSSI (internationally designated), Moors River SSSI and Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI (SU00/53). The latter lies immediately adjacent to the allocated site and is designated for its semi-natural wet woodland and unimproved damp neutral grassland (site package attached for information). Development here would cut the SNCI off from an open corridor to the heathland SSSI, reducing its ecological connectivity, which is not in line with NPPF (117). The Moors River SSSI is of high environmental sensitivity, currently in unfavourable status, and has a history of pollution which has resulted in poor water quality and impacts on biodiversity. This new development could further add to existing pressures from upstream, including from the adjacent industrial</p>	<p>DWT hold an objection until information is provided for this site to assess whether the environmental strand of sustainability is satisfied and the allocation is deliverable.</p> <p>Within paragraph 11.37 we would like to see a change in wording to: Development of the site will need to take into account areas subject to flooding and also ensure that the nature conservation quality of the European designated Dorset Heaths, Moors River SSSI and Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI is are not harmed.</p> <p>Within Policy VTSW6 we would like a change in wording to: Provision of significant</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county, are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership.</p>	570	2256008_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>site.</p> <p>Within the policy, DWT supports the prerequisites for the development but considers these need strengthening to ensure no harm to the designated Dorset Heaths and Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI, which lying downstream, would be susceptible to any changes to water quality or quantity.</p> <p>This area lies within an area identified by RSPB as having potential for heathland re-creation and we consider that there is opportunity for landscape buffers to re-create priority habitats, informed by ecological survey work, in line with NPPF (118).</p> <p>We consider that all designated wildlife sites require significant ecological buffers.</p>	<p>landscape and ecological buffers alongside the countryside edges of the site, which protect the designated sites, complimenting surrounding habitats and enhancing the ecological network.</p> <p>A wildlife strategy to be agreed with the Council that ensures no harm to the Moors River SSSI, European designated Dorset Heaths and Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI, will derive from the Estate. Particular regard to the water environment will be needed and in this respect the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to mitigate any potential impacts will be expected to form part of the strategy.</p> <p>We also request that Map 11.7 should show adjacent nature conservation designations and floodplain and groundwater protection zones to define the planning constraints. Also to indicate land suitable for provision of ecological and landscape buffers and protection of the water environment, as shown on maps associated with housing proposals elsewhere in the strategy.</p>				
359547	Mrs V Bright	Verwood Town Council	CSPS1754	Policy VTSW6	Yes	Yes					The Town council support this policy. A bus route is a prerequisite to the development but we are concerned that the X36 bus route which served it has just been discontinued.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		570	
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS2082	Policy VTSW6	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>The policy is unsound and may also not be legally compliant in relation to requirements under the Habitats Directive/Regulations because:</p> <p>The policy wording on prerequisites fails to adequately identify mitigation in relation to avoiding harm to a heathland site bordering the proposed new employment land that is part of the Dorset Heaths SPA, SAC and Ramsar site and part of Holt and West Moors Heaths SSSI.</p> <p>Map 11.7 fails to identify land for the mitigation required to protect the water environment of the Moors River</p>	<p>Amend the prerequisites as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Provision of significant landscape buffers alongside the countryside edges of the site, including a buffer of adequate size and appropriate nature to safeguard the heathland site forming part of the 	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		570	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>System SSSI. Therefore it is not clear whether adequate mitigation can be delivered and the policy can meet the requirements of sustainable development on biodiversity set out in the NPPF. This contrasts for example with maps for new neighbourhoods where land such as for SANG and open space is identified. We consider that SUDS integrated into the development of the employment land, e.g. swales, can provide only part of the mitigation. They will not be sufficient alone to provide adequate flow attenuation to mitigate run-off from the increase in the area of hard surfaced land and to intercept sediment and poor quality urban run-off carried by these flows.</p> <p>The policy wording on prerequisites provides no mention of any requirement to safeguard the quality of an adjacent SNCI as part of the wildlife strategy or to maintain ecological network connections (the proposed employment land intrudes between designated areas of high biodiversity value) and is thus inadequate in relation to the NPPF on these matters (e.g. paragraph 117).</p>	<p>Dorset Heaths.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'A wildlife strategy ... that ensures that the landscape buffers are secured and managed as part of an ecological network connecting with adjacent land of high biodiversity value, and that no harm to the Moors River System SSSI and adjacent SNCI will derive from the Estate. Particular regard to the water environment...' <p>Revise Map 11.7 to show potential land that is suitable and will be available for surface water flow attenuation and water quality improvement. This land may include the existing flood attenuation impoundment but this impoundment as currently operated does not aim to provide water quality mitigation. Additional land may be required. The identified land should not conflict with protection of the designated sites or the function of the landscape buffers.</p>				
359437	Ms Gill Smith	Dorset County Council	CSPS2027	Policy VTSW6	Yes						<p>As the Lead Local Flood Authority, Dorset County Council has responsibility to develop a strategy to tackle local flood risks and to ensure that other plans and policies accord with it. A number of references in the Core Strategy need updating and new ones included to ensure that it reflects the County Council's responsibilities in respect of flood risk management.</p>	<p>Discussion of the Sustainable Drainage Systems needs to be under a separate bullet point. Amend fourth bullet point and create fifth bullet as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A wildlife strategy to be agreed with the Council that ensures that no harm to the Moors River SSSI will derive from the Estate. Particular regard to the water environment will be needed in this respect. The use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to mitigate any potential impacts will be expected to form part of the strategy. 	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		570	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3321	Policy VTSW6	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>This site drains into the Moors River SSSI, a riverine system which supports an exceptional range of biodiversity including rare Odonata and the Otter. There have been serious pollution incidents in the past from employment estates which drain into the Moors River which have proved highly damaging to its biodiversity. We are therefore deeply concerned about the pollution threat from this proposal, both from acute accidental pollution and ongoing diffuse pollution via ongoing surface water pollution. Both sections of the allocation lies within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and partially within areas that are susceptible to surface flooding (which is likely to increase in the longer term due to climate change NPPF para 99), so the issue of surface water pollution when this flooding inevitably occurs is especially worrying. Without absolute certainty that no damage will result to the Moors River system, the policy fails to comply with NPPF para 120.</p> <p>The Environment Agency's GP3 (2011), Groundwater Protection, Policy and Practice explains the need for the precautionary approach and the very real problems that pollution can cause, sometimes taking decades to resolve. Of particular relevance is Part 2, the Technical Framework and the section on pollutants. (http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/library/publications/40741.aspx)</p> <p>In our response to the Options consultation, we advised, Of the several employment estates in the catchment of the Moors River, the Woolsbridge Estate is arguably one of the most threatening due to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> its extreme proximity to the river so that any contaminated surface water runoff can reach the river very quickly, lessening the opportunity for detection and containment; and its susceptibility to flood (as witnessed by the constraints map and the transecting public footpath being flooded/waterlogged for 6 months of the year) allowing pollutants to be washed into the nearby river. <p>Further Para 11.37 refers only to Moors River SSSI and thus fails to take into account the adjacent N2K heathland and the Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI, neither of which are marked on the proposals map.</p> <p>We advise that all SSSIs and SNCIs that are close to proposed development sites should be shown on proposals maps to demonstrate that these are planning constraints that need to be taken on board by developers.</p> <p>There has been no biological survey of the actual allocations, the eastern of which at least would appear to be an undisturbed grassland habitat.</p> <p>The potential for damaging light pollution, to both heathland and aquatic ecosystems, is high.</p> <p>Please see ETAG's detailed supplementary advice to the Options consultation (Light Pollution – Issues for</p>	<p>The allocation should be informed by full biological survey.</p> <p>All designated habitats and flood risk zones should be shown on proposals maps – in this case Map 11.7.</p> <p>Include reference to the adjacent SNCI and N2K heathlands in para 11.37 and add a prerequisite for the wildlife strategy to consider the SNCI and N2K heathland..</p> <p>The policy should explicitly refer to the risk of light pollution and the need to comply with Lighting SPG. Add a prerequisite to direct all surface water from the new and existing estate through a pollution control balancing feature for which a detailed management plan must be agreed by the Council, Environment Agency and Natural England.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	As part of the East Dorset Community Partnership, ETAG's remit on biological sciences and sustainability is wider than that of Natural England or Dorset Wildlife Trust. Membership includes highly qualified natural scientists and town & parish representatives.	570	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>consideration in developing the Core Strategy submitted to EDDC, 5.6.11) which includes details of why light pollution is harmful and what particular developments (roads and buildings, as well as lighting) can have devastating effects.</p> <p>We consider that deliverability of this policy is in doubt. The proposal lacks flexibility to deliver objectives if part or all of the potential allocation fails. It should be noted that the bus service to the site has been terminated recently (May 2012) so sustainable travel to work plans are less likely to be achieved. The present site is significantly under occupied, calling into question the need for such an extensive extension.</p> <p>Notwithstanding our view that the site should not be taken forward for development, we support the prerequisites but recommend that they are strengthened to take better account of the Moors River SSSI and the nearby SNCI and N2K heathland</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species</p> <p>There is no evidence that the policy will meet the objective. High risk of damaging water borne pollution and light pollution affecting Moors River SSSI, SNCI and N2K heathland. Aquatic and terrestrial protected and priority species will be at risk.</p> <p>Negative score not neutral</p> <p>SA Objective 3 Minimise pollution Travel to work plans may limit GHG emissions but the high risk of polluting ecosystems remains. Scoring possibly negative</p> <p>SA Objective 4 Minimise factors contributing to climate change Travel to work plans may limit GHG emissions but bus service has been withdrawn. Service industries (such as boiler maintenance companies etc as on the present site) depend on using fleets of vehicles. Such additional vehicle movements can only be controlled by defining carefully the type of business use that is acceptable.</p> <p>SA Objective 5 Provide access to meet people's needs Travel to work plans may limit GHG emissions but the bus service has been withdrawn. A meaningful travel to work plan may not be achievable. Current plans for improving cycleways will contribute to meeting the objective.</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment More explicit guidance on mitigation is required than is covered by Policy HE3</p>					
656562	Mr Andrew Robinson	Symonds & Sampson	CSPS3210	Policy VTSW6	No				Yes		<p>The additional 9.7ha of employment land to be provided by the Core Strategy is welcomed because it adjoins the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, which has close links to the A31 and the highway network. It would also help to meet the needs for additional employment opportunities within the district.</p>	<p>By the inclusion of the land shown edged red on the attached plan, the deliverability and flexibility of the proposed policy VTSW6 is greatly improved.</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>It is important the Government Inspector fully understands the problems that Policy VTSW6 and its additional land designation will create as currently</p>	570	2272189_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>In our opinion however, the Policy VTWS6 is not effective because:</p> <p>a) Deliverability It is quite clear that the proposed policy site lies directly adjacent to the Holt & West Moors Heath SSSI Area of Nature Conservation and to the Moors River SSSI. Policy is clear in stating a package of mitigation measures to ensure that the development does not have an adverse impact on the Moors River SSSI will be required and it is equally clear that landscape buffers alongside the countryside edge of the site will also be required. Over and above this, thought will also have to be given to flood protection. 9.7ha of additional employment land will not, therefore, be delivered because areas will be lost from the site to meet these mitigation measures. Over and above this, the additional employment land will be entirely dependent upon Old Barn Farm Road to provide access and question marks must exist over the adequacy of the road and the adequacy of the access on to Ringwood Road. The land opposite Old Barn Road is undoubtedly in third party ownership and relevant control may not exist in relation to the land to the east and west of the access with the Ringwood Road. Highway problems may, therefore, render this policy undeliverable as requirements for an improved and appropriate access to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate in its increased size cannot be met.</p> <p>b) Flexible Both environmental and highway constraints make this policy inflexible, with Natural England, the Highway Authority and numerous third parties able to render this policy unworkable and unimplementable.</p> <p>c) Able to be monitored Whilst an annual monitoring report can be implemented with regard to the land included within Policy VTSW6, that annual monitoring report may, as boundaries are drawn, merely have to comment upon the issues which are preventing the development proceeding. That, in our view, is not an effective policy.</p> <p>d) For the avoidance of doubt, contact has been made with the owners of the "additional employment land" currently promoted by Policy BTSW6. Informally, it has been agreed that the inclusion of the land coloured red on the attached plan will improve the deliverability of the overall package of "additional employment land" adjacent to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and, therefore, cooperation between the relevant land owning parties will occur to ensure that the policy can be fully and properly implemented in the short term.</p>	<p>The land in question is within the ownership of one family. As the land in question has a long frontage to Ringwood Road, Three Legged Cross, a new or secondary access to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate could be created without need for dialogue or agreement with third parties. That can ensure that, whatever the limitations and failings of Old Barn Farm Road, Policy VTSW6 can be implemented and additional employment land delivered. It also means, by including the land shown edged red on the attached plan, mitigation measures and landscape buffers can be considered and implemented, whilst maintaining the developable area of the additional employment land, thereby providing greater employment in the area. Policy VTSW6 merely needs to be changed by including within the red line on the policy documentation the land which we have highlighted and by amending Policy VTSW6 by wording it "12.2ha of land at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is removed from the Green Belt and developed for new employment".</p>		<p>drawn. 9.2 As the policy stands and as the land allocation stands, the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate may not be able to: a) provide suitable access to and from the increased employment site, as the current site owners have little or no control over the land that fronts Ringwood Road, Three Legged Cross and may not, therefore, be able to offer appropriate splays, right hand turning lanes, etc. as the additional land is developed and the junction becomes busier; b) provide 9.7ha of additional employment land as parts of the area must, by the nature of policy VTSW6 be lost to: i) mitigation measures to meet an overall Wildlife Strategy ii) flood protection iii) landscape buffers. 9.3 The inclusion of the land shown edged red on the attached plan can overcome these difficulties by providing: a) either a completely new access to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, resulting in the closure of Old Barn Farm Road; or a second access/egress to and from the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, allowing for either a one way only system to be adopted, thereby overcoming certain of the difficulties created by the junction of Old Barn Farm Road with Ringwood Road, and by reducing pressure on that access. b) addition potential employment land, allowing land to be taken for mitigation measures, flood</p>		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
														protection and landscape buffers, whilst maintaining a deliverable area of employment land.		
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSPS3740	Policy VTSW6							Policy Allocation Dwellings/land area Comment WMC3 Cuthbury allotments and St Margaret's Close New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 260 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC4 Stone Lane 90 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 6 WMC5 Cranborne Road New Neighbourhood, Wimborne 600 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 WMC6 South of Leigh Road New Neighbourhood and Sports Village, Wimborne 75 ha SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 CM1 Lockyer's School and Land North of Corfe Mullen New Neighbourhood 250 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP3 Holmwood House New Neighbourhood, Ferndown 110 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP4 Coppins new Neighbourhood, Ferndown 30 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP6 Land East of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley 320 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP7 West of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley 200 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW4 North West Verwood New Neighbourhood 230 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 FWP8		Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	we would like to confirm that we wish to reserve the right to appear at the Examination into the Core Strategy, on the grounds the Core Strategy raises significant issues relating to the protection of internationally important wildlife sites (as highlighted in the HRA) and that there remains uncertainty over the delivery of appropriate and effective mitigation measures.	570	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Blunt's Farm Employment Allocation, Ferndown 30ha A mitigation strategy to be agreed to avoid harm to European sites and SSSI VTSW5 North Eastern Verwood New Neighbourhood 50 SANG to be provided in accordance with policy ME3 VTSW6 Woolsbridge Employment Allocation, Three Legged Cross 9.7ha A mitigation strategy to be agreed to SSSI The RSPB does not, in principle, object to the residential allocations above. However, the table does illustrate the heavy reliance on SANGs as a mitigation measure. The Councils will be aware of the relatively untested nature of SANGs as effective mitigation, albeit in the context of available measures, it is clear that SANGs offer perhaps the best opportunity of addressing potential adverse impacts on the European sites. SANGs are a principal component of the approach taken by the Dorset Heathlands Interim Planning Framework (IPF), and are used as a mitigation vehicle elsewhere in England, notably in the Thames Basin Heaths. Research continues on the effectiveness of SANGs, and it is imperative that this research informs SANGs development anticipated under the Core Strategy. Long-term management and monitoring is also critical (as is identified in policy CN1). Testing of the suitability of SANGs as a mitigation measure for the above policies is essential and has not yet been undertaken. We are concerned that some of the SANGs proposed may be ineffective, particularly SANGs associated with smaller allocations. With respect to employment allocations FWP8 (Blunt's Farm) and VTSW6 (Woolsbridge), we are not familiar with these locations. We do not object to these policies subject to receiving clarification from Natural England of the issues pertinent to these sites, and the likely efficacy of mitigation strategies anticipated by these policies.</p>					
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1488	Map 11.7	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>Ecological survey information for this site is not available therefore it is not possible to fully assess the potential environmental impacts of development on this site. NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment. Dorset Wildlife Trust has significant concerns over the development of this site due to its close proximity to features of nature conservation importance including the Holt and West Moors Heath SSSI (internationally designated), Moors River SSSI and Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI (SU00/53). The latter lies immediately adjacent to the allocated site and is designated for its</p>	<p>DWT hold an objection until information is provided for this site to assess whether the environmental strand of sustainability is satisfied and the allocation is deliverable. Within paragraph 11.37 we would like to see a change in wording to: Development of the site will need to take into account areas subject to flooding</p>	<p>Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination</p>	<p>Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county, are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset</p>	571	2256008_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>semi-natural wet woodland and unimproved damp neutral grassland (site package attached for information). Development here would cut the SNCI off from an open corridor to the heathland SSSI, reducing its ecological connectivity, which is not in line with NPPF (117). The Moors River SSSI is of high environmental sensitivity, currently in unfavourable status, and has a history of pollution which has resulted in poor water quality and impacts on biodiversity. This new development could further add to existing pressures from upstream, including from the adjacent industrial site.</p> <p>Within the policy, DWT supports the prerequisites for the development but considers these need strengthening to ensure no harm to the designated Dorset Heaths and Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI, which lying downstream, would be susceptible to any changes to water quality or quantity.</p> <p>This area lies within an area identified by RSPB as having potential for heathland re-creation and we consider that there is opportunity for landscape buffers to re-create priority habitats, informed by ecological survey work, in line with NPPF (118).</p> <p>We consider that all designated wildlife sites require significant ecological buffers.</p>	<p>and also ensure that the nature conservation quality of the European designated Dorset Heaths, Moors River SSSI and Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI is are not harmed.</p> <p>Within Policy VTSW6 we would like a change in wording to: Provision of significant landscape and ecological buffers alongside the countryside edges of the site, which protect the designated sites, complimenting surrounding habitats and enhancing the ecological network.</p> <p>A wildlife strategy to be agreed with the Council that ensures no harm to the Moors River SSSI, European designated Dorset Heaths and Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI, will derive from the Estate. Particular regard to the water environment will be needed and in this respect the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to mitigate any potential impacts will be expected to form part of the strategy.</p> <p>We also request that Map 11.7 should show adjacent nature conservation designations and floodplain and groundwater protection zones to define the planning constraints. Also to indicate land suitable for provision of ecological and landscape buffers and protection of the water environment, as shown on maps associated with housing proposals elsewhere in the strategy.</p>		Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership.		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3322	Map 11.7		No	No	No	No	No	<p>This site drains into the Moors River SSSI, a riverine system which supports an exceptional range of biodiversity including rare Odonata and the Otter. There have been serious pollution incidents in the past from</p>	<p>The allocation should be informed by full biological survey. All designated habitats and</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	As part of the East Dorset Community Partnership, ETAG's remit on biological sciences and sustainability	571	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>employment estates which drain into the Moors River which have proved highly damaging to its biodiversity. We are therefore deeply concerned about the pollution threat from this proposal, both from acute accidental pollution and ongoing diffuse pollution via ongoing surface water pollution. Both sections of the allocation lies within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and partially within areas that are susceptible to surface flooding (which is likely to increase in the longer term due to climate change NPPF para 99), so the issue of surface water pollution when this flooding inevitably occurs is especially worrying. Without absolute certainty that no damage will result to the Moors River system, the policy fails to comply with NPPF para 120.</p> <p>The Environment Agency's GP3 (2011), Groundwater Protection, Policy and Practice explains the need for the precautionary approach and the very real problems that pollution can cause, sometimes taking decades to resolve. Of particular relevance is Part 2, the Technical Framework and the section on pollutants. (http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/library/publications/40741.aspx)</p> <p>In our response to the Options consultation, we advised, Of the several employment estates in the catchment of the Moors River, the Woolsbridge Estate is arguably one of the most threatening due to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • its extreme proximity to the river so that any contaminated surface water runoff can reach the river very quickly, lessening the opportunity for detection and containment; and • its susceptibility to flood (as witnessed by the constraints map and the transecting public footpath being flooded/waterlogged for 6 months of the year) allowing pollutants to be washed into the nearby river. <p>Further Para 11.37 refers only to Moors River SSSI and thus fails to take into account the adjacent N2K heathland and the Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI, neither of which are marked on the proposals map. We advise that all SSSIs and SNCIs that are close to proposed development sites should be shown on proposals maps to demonstrate that these are planning constraints that need to be taken on board by developers.</p> <p>There has been no biological survey of the actual allocations, the eastern of which at least would appear to be an undisturbed grassland habitat. The potential for damaging light pollution, to both heathland and aquatic ecosystems, is high. Please see ETAG's detailed supplementary advice to the Options consultation (Light Pollution – Issues for consideration in developing the Core Strategy submitted to EDDC, 5.6.11) which includes details of why light pollution is harmful and what particular developments (roads and buildings, as well as lighting) can have</p>	<p>flood risk zones should be shown on proposals maps – in this case Map 11.7. Include reference to the adjacent SNCI and N2K heathlands in para 11.37 and add a prerequisite for the wildlife strategy to consider the SNCI and N2K heathland.. The policy should explicitly refer to the risk of light pollution and the need to comply with Lighting SPG. Add a prerequisite to direct all surface water from the new and existing estate through a pollution control balancing feature for which a detailed management plan must be agreed by the Council, Environment Agency and Natural England.</p>		<p>is wider than that of Natural England or Dorset Wildlife Trust. Membership includes highly qualified natural scientists and town & parish representatives.</p>		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>devastating effects.</p> <p>We consider that deliverability of this policy is in doubt. The proposal lacks flexibility to deliver objectives if part or all of the potential allocation fails. It should be noted that the bus service to the site has been terminated recently (May 2012) so sustainable travel to work plans are less likely to be achieved. The present site is significantly under occupied, calling into question the need for such an extensive extension.</p> <p>Notwithstanding our view that the site should not be taken forward for development, we support the prerequisites but recommend that they are strengthened to take better account of the Moors River SSSI and the nearby SNCI and N2K heathland</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species</p> <p>There is no evidence that the policy will meet the objective. High risk of damaging water borne pollution and light pollution affecting Moors River SSSI, SNCI and N2K heathland. Aquatic and terrestrial protected and priority species will be at risk.</p> <p>Negative score not neutral</p> <p>SA Objective 3 Minimise pollution</p> <p>Travel to work plans may limit GHG emissions but the high risk of polluting ecosystems remains.</p> <p>Scoring possibly negative</p> <p>SA Objective 4 Minimise factors contributing to climate change</p> <p>Travel to work plans may limit GHG emissions but bus service has been withdrawn. Service industries (such as boiler maintenance companies etc as on the present site) depend on using fleets of vehicles. Such additional vehicle movements can only be controlled by defining carefully the type of business use that is acceptable.</p> <p>SA Objective 5 Provide access to meet people's needs</p> <p>Travel to work plans may limit GHG emissions but the bus service has been withdrawn. A meaningful travel to work plan may not be achievable. Current plans for improving cycleways will contribute to meeting the objective.</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment</p> <p>More explicit guidance on mitigation is required than is covered by Policy HE3</p>					
656562	Mr Andrew Robinson	Symonds & Sampson	CSPS3211	Map 11.7	No				Yes		<p>The additional 9.7ha of employment land to be provided by the Core Strategy is welcomed because it adjoins the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, which has close links to the A31 and the highway network. It would also help to meet the needs for additional employment opportunities within the district.</p> <p>In our opinion however, the Policy VTWS6 is not effective because:</p> <p>a) Deliverability</p> <p>It is quite clear that the proposed policy site lies directly</p>	<p>By the inclusion of the land shown edged red on the attached plan, the deliverability and flexibility of the proposed policy VTSW6 is greatly improved. The land in question is within the ownership of one family.</p> <p>As the land in question has</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>It is important the Government Inspector fully understands the problems that Policy VTSW6 and its additional land designation will create as currently drawn.</p> <p>9.2 As the policy stands and as the land allocation stands, the Woolsbridge</p>	571	2272189_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>adjacent to the Holt & West Moors Heath SSSI Area of Nature Conservation and to the Moors River SSSI. Policy is clear in stating a package of mitigation measures to ensure that the development does not have an adverse impact on the Moors River SSSI will be required and it is equally clear that landscape buffers alongside the countryside edge of the site will also be required. Over and above this, thought will also have to be given to flood protection.</p> <p>9.7ha of additional employment land will not, therefore, be delivered because areas will be lost from the site to meet these mitigation measures.</p> <p>Over and above this, the additional employment land will be entirely dependent upon Old Barn Farm Road to provide access and question marks must exist over the adequacy of the road and the adequacy of the access on to Ringwood Road. The land opposite Old Barn Road is undoubtedly in third party ownership and relevant control may not exist in relation to the land to the east and west of the access with the Ringwood Road. Highway problems may, therefore, render this policy undeliverable as requirements for an improved and appropriate access to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate in its increased size cannot be met.</p> <p>b) Flexible Both environmental and highway constraints make this policy inflexible, with Natural England, the Highway Authority and numerous third parties able to render this policy unworkable and unimplementable.</p> <p>c) Able to be monitored Whilst an annual monitoring report can be implemented with regard to the land included within Policy VTSW6, that annual monitoring report may, as boundaries are drawn, merely have to comment upon the issues which are preventing the development proceeding. That, in our view, is not an effective policy.</p> <p>d) For the avoidance of doubt, contact has been made with the owners of the "additional employment land" currently promoted by Policy BTSW6. Informally, it has been agreed that the inclusion of the land coloured red on the attached plan will improve the deliverability of the overall package of "additional employment land" adjacent to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and, therefore, cooperation between the relevant land owning parties will occur to ensure that the policy can be fully and properly implemented in the short term.</p>	<p>a long frontage to Ringwood Road, Three Legged Cross, a new or secondary access to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate could be created without need for dialogue or agreement with third parties. That can ensure that, whatever the limitations and failings of Old Barn Farm Road, Policy VTSW6 can be implemented and additional employment land delivered. It also means, by including the land shown edged red on the attached plan, mitigation measures and landscape buffers can be considered and implemented, whilst maintaining the developable area of the additional employment land, thereby providing greater employment in the area. Policy VTSW6 merely needs to be changed by including within the red line on the policy documentation the land which we have highlighted and by amending Policy VTSW6 by wording it "12.2ha of land at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is removed from the Green Belt and developed for new employment".</p>		<p>Industrial Estate may not be able to:</p> <p>a) provide suitable access to and from the increased employment site, as the current site owners have little or no control over the land that fronts Ringwood Road, Three Legged Cross and may not, therefore, be able to offer appropriate splays, right hand turning lanes, etc. as the additional land is developed and the junction becomes busier;</p> <p>b) provide 9.7ha of additional employment land as parts of the area must, by the nature of policy VTSW6 be lost to:</p> <p>i) mitigation measures to meet an overall Wildlife Strategy</p> <p>ii) flood protection</p> <p>iii) landscape buffers.</p> <p>9.3 The inclusion of the land shown edged red on the attached plan can overcome these difficulties by providing:</p> <p>a) either a completely new access to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, resulting in the closure of Old Barn Farm Road; or a second access/egress to and from the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, allowing for either a one way only system to be adopted, thereby overcoming certain of the difficulties created by the junction of Old Barn Farm Road with Ringwood Road, and by reducing pressure on that access.</p> <p>b) addition potential employment land, allowing land to be taken for mitigation measures, flood protection and landscape buffers, whilst maintaining a deliverable area of employment land.</p>		

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1490	11.41		No				No	To achieve sustainable development we consider that, as the nature conservation interests within and adjacent to the site have a strong bearing on appropriate redevelopment, this should be acknowledged in the text. A large part of the St Leonard's Hospital site is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and development could impact on the Moors River SSSI and European designated sites.	Changes We would like to see added wording in paragraph 11.41:Further opportunities to make good use of the land are therefore likely to be investigated by the landowner. Environmental constraints will have a strong bearing on redevelopment . Development of the site will need to ensure that the nature conservation quality of the European designated Dorset Heaths, Moors River SSSI and St Leonards Hospital SNCI are not harmed.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county, are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership.	575	2256011_0_1.pdf
524338	Mr Kenneth Brooks		CSPS250	Policy VTSW7							Longstanding, but still active, planning permission to create a Care Village has not been implemented, clearly due to the cost of the land being too high to attract developers. In 2007, Barretts were making plans to promote the site as a Retirement Village but subsequently they fell through because of high costs. If we really need the number of affordable homes projected in the this Core Strategy then the Government should be lobbied at a high level to put their own policies in action and render this site, which is effectively owned by the Government, attractive to residential developers rather than being offered for non-specific employment purposes as proposed in the Core Strategy Options Document 2010.				576	
648124	Mrs Lesley Eve		CSPS137	Policy VTSW7	Yes	No			Yes		The land should be used solely for 100% low cost housing. There is a great need for young couples to get on the housing ladder. Without low cost housing this is impossible - not 25%, 40%, 50%, but 100%! I dont know why you are using this jargon. Is it so you can throw away all our opinions / suggestions? I just want low cost housing for our young people - those who work hard and deserve a home!		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	Because I want my views to be heard. When I was 20 and got married we could afford a house - in 1962 things were fairer. My grand children can't afford one.	576	
485066	Mr David Branchley		CSPS405	Policy VTSW7	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	It is clear from the statement made by EDDC in policy VTSW7, that developers needed to turn this site into a care village are not prepared to finance the site, because it is too expensive for them. Therefore, EDDC are suggesting that the developers should be allowed to build something else here instead. Houses I would guess! This clearly shows that the developers are in charge of this policy and not EDDC! Dorset County Council has stated in the response to the Core Strategy, that the area of West Moors needs yet another care facility for the elderly (although this is disputed within the Village). The St Leonards site lies	EDDC should insist on the original plan for St Leonards, a care village to prevent the needless erosion of green sites in the area.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Because local residence should be allowed to put their point forward in a democratic Country.	576	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>approximately 300 meters away from the edge of West Moors Village and it already has planning permission for a care village. So why does EDDC believe West Moors needs yet another care facility at Blackfield Farm? The developer probably wants to build houses on this site, as there is a better return in that, than in a care village. This is because there is more cost in developing a brown field site than a virgin green site. Therefore, it appears that EDDC will change this site for the benefit of developers and will also allow development of what should have been built here (a care facility) at Blackfield Farm instead, again because it is cheaper for the developers!</p> <p>The purpose of a plan is to make draw together coherent policies in order to benefit the area. Both policy VTSW 7 and VTSW 8 benefit developers first and foremost.</p>					
652710	Mr Gary Balmer		CSPS477	Policy VTSW7	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	It has proved uninteresting to developers because they cannot make enough money from developing it as a care village. This would seem like the ideal location for a large new neighbourhood of residential housing, close to amenities and a main route.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		576	
654320	Mrs Meghann Downing	Highways Agency	CSPS759	Policy VTSW7	Yes	Yes					<p>Whilst we acknowledge the desire to allow development at this site, its location with access directly onto the A31 trunk road means that any proposals for development here would need to present a robust case that the operation and safety of the A31 would be maintained. We would strongly recommend early engagement with the Highways Agency for any developer wishing to make a proposal for this site.</p>		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		576	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1493	Policy VTSW7		No	No	No	No	No	<p>Dorset Wildlife Trust considers that, as this site is under investigation by the landowner for opportunities to make good use of the land (stated in para 11.41), policy guidance is required to judge whether proposals are acceptable.</p> <p>A large proportion of the land at St Leonards Hospital is identified as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (St Leonards Hospital SNCI SU10/024) (site package attached for information) and includes an extensive mixture of habitat types, most notably rare U1 Festuca ovina-Agrostis capillaris-Rumex acetosella grassland. Other habitats include dry dwarf shrub heathland with acid grassland mosaics, marshy grassland, birch dominated woodland, pine plantation and areas of seemingly semi-natural woodland. The site supports 23 Dorset Notable Species within the acid grassland and heath areas.</p> <p>DWT has previously provided considerable input into planning applications for this site and has concerns that a change in use of the land could lead to significant impacts on the SNCI, especially as the most important habitats lie close to or within the currently developed area. These grassland areas are not habitats which can</p>	<p>DWT consider that this policy should be extended to give guidance on acceptable development and include pre-requisites for development.</p> <p>Development of this site has considerable implications for biodiversity which we believe need to be addressed including:</p> <p>Green Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection and enhancement of the priority habitats and species of the SNCI • Protection of European designated sites through the provision of SANG as required by Policy ME3 • Avoidance of harm to populations of SPA bird species 	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>Dorset Wildlife Trust is a voluntary nature conservation organisation which has specialist knowledge of the wildlife of Dorset and can offer local expertise. We manage the Sites of Nature Conservation Interest scheme for the county, are members of the East Dorset Environment Action Theme Group, the Dorset Biodiversity Officers Group and Dorset Biodiversity Partnership.</p>	576	2256011_0_1.pdf

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>be easily translocated or re-created. Previous negotiations led to a planning obligation attached to the care village proposal for nature conservation mitigation, to include translocation of some areas of the SNCI grassland, management of the SNCI areas within the care village and management of the wider SNCI surrounding the site through scrub and tree removal and heathland restoration. DWT would expect any future proposal to secure future conservation and management of the SNCI to the same or enhanced standards as in the Section 106 agreement for the care village. NPPF (109) promotes the minimisation of impacts on biodiversity, providing net gains where possible, including by establishing coherent ecological networks. NPPF (117) also promotes the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations. This site lies within a corridor of potential heathland restoration with scope to link heathland and grassland sites to the south and north. To keep an option for such a corridor to be improved in future, some open habitat would need to be retained on the St Leonards site.</p> <p>Of particular concern on this site would be a change to housing provision, which we understand is now under consideration. Natural England have identified that this policy is not legally compliant as it fails to address the need to provide a SANG (Policy ME3) if the development is of a scale and type which without mitigation cannot be shown not to have an adverse effect on the Dorset Heaths SPA, SAC and Ramsar site situated in the wider area. We support this view and agree with Natural England that there is a need to address any harm to populations of SPA bird species. Additionally, housing provision would lead to loss of, and pressure onto, the SNCI habitats as described above. As drainage from this site is to the Moors River SSSI, housing or employment use here could also have consequences for the Moors River SSSI, where there is already concern with respect to water quality. DWT therefore considers this policy unsound as it does not provide any requirements/considerations for development, or the type of development which may be permissible, which we feel is essential to protect biodiversity and the natural environment .</p> <p>Moreover, we are concerned to see the SNCI included within the area defined as major developed site without clarification of the identified developable area as was shown on the map in the Core Strategy Options (PC7 p330-1) as 'identified site'.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive improvements to the ecological network including links between the SNCI and Moors river SSSI Drainage A Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme which addresses any adverse potential impacts on the Moors River. <p>We also consider that guidance in line other policies would be helpful including layout and design, light pollution, transport and access, and phasing.</p>				
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS2085	Policy VTSW7	No	No	No		No	No	The policy is not legally compliant as it fails to address the need to provide a SANG if the development is of a scale and type which without mitigation cannot be shown not to have an adverse effect on the Dorset	The policy should be expanded to identify the prerequisites that will enable development to	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	The policy raises complex matters on demonstrating compliance with legislative considerations under the	576	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Heaths SPA, SAC and Ramsar site situated in the wider area. The policy may also not be legally compliant if it fails to address any harm to populations of SPA bird species in the general area of the development site whether or not these species are recorded in the designated SPA boundary.</p> <p>This policy is also unsound as it fails to identify other biodiversity prerequisites that are significant in delivering development of the site in accordance with the requirements of sustainable development. On these matters the policy is not compliant with the NPPF (e.g. paras 9 and 117). There are two elements to this point:</p> <p>i.</p> <p>The development site drains to the Moors River System SSSI. The development could raise adverse impacts on the designated features of this SSSI due to elevated flow caused by run-off from the increase in the area of hard surfaced land and inputs of sediment and poor quality urban run-off carried by these flows. Also it is also unclear how foul water drainage would be addressed. Discharge to the SSSI could raise adverse impacts on the designated features.</p> <p>ii.</p> <p>A large part of the development site is an SNCI that supports priority habitats (heathland and species rich grassland) and priority species (e.g. reptiles). Much of the SNCI should be retained in situ to protect the priority habitat and species interests. But appropriate management secured through development could provide positive improvements in the quality of the biodiversity. Also there may be opportunities to provide positive improvements through relocation and compensatory habitat re-creation measures giving a better long term spatial configuration of these biodiversity interests with ecological connection to those in the adjacent forestry.</p>	<p>meet legislative requirements under the Habitats Directive/Regulations and the NPPF on sustainable development including that in relation to biodiversity. The policy may be set out in a similar way to those on new neighbourhoods but should address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The provision of SANG. - Avoidance of harm to populations of SPA bird species whether or not within the designated Dorset Heathlands SPA. - The provision of SUDS and other measures to mitigate any potential adverse impacts on the water environment of the Moors River System SSSI - Protection of priority habitats and species held by the SNCI, positive improvements to the quantity and quality of these features and the delivery of ecological network connection with those in adjacent forestry land. 		<p>Habitats Directive/Regulations for SPA birds and demonstrating compatibility between mitigation by provision of SANG and the protection of SAC/SPA habitat and species features not included in the designated sites and within the context of SANG provision. Our wish for participation in oral examination will depend on whether or not the policy is amended in accordance with the above suggestions.</p>		
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3326	Policy VTSW7		No	No	No		No	<p>We recommend that the proposal should acknowledge in the text the significant biodiversity constraints. These include substantial SNCI areas within the site (encompassing important neutral grassland with Green Winged Orchids and heathland) and the adjoining Moors River SSSI system, valley bogs and more N2K heathland. The extensive potential for heathland restoration and habitat linkages from this site have been mapped by the RSPB. More detailed mapping and biological survey together with FRA is required and should be taken into account in considering potential ecological links and buffering to ensure net biodiversity gain and contribute to coherent and resilient ecological networks (NPPF para 109). We consider that normal residential development would be extremely damaging. The policy has not identified criteria such as Layout and Design, Green Infrastructure, Transport and Access, Phasing or, most critically for this site, Drainage.</p>	<p>Add new para to follow 11.43 The allocation should be informed by biological survey. The SNCI will be protected and buffered from the development and a Management Plan for the SNCI will be agreed with Dorset Wildlife Trust and arrangements put in place for its long term application. Include design criteria including a specific commitment that the Moors River SSSI will be protected from pollution.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		576	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species Despite claim that residential housing cannot take place here it is understood that proposals for 180 houses are being considered. . There is high risk to the SNCI. This area of important neutral grassland (together with Corfe Mullen Meadows and Alderney) was described by the leading authority on Dorset orchids (Martin Jenkinson) as being the finest site in the country for GreenWinged Orchids. Autumn Ladies Tresses is equally abundant on this site later in the year. Any loss of SNCI should be compensated to provide net biodiversity gain. SA Objective 3 Minimise pollution There is high risk of damaging light pollution to heathland and aquatic ecosystems. Habitats Regulations Assessment More explicit guidance on mitigation of light pollution is required than is covered by Policy HE3 The implications of new road access to the site have not been addressed.</p>						
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3327	Map 11.8	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>We recommend that the proposal should acknowledge in the text the significant biodiversity constraints. These include substantial SNCI areas within the site (encompassing important neutral grassland with Green Winged Orchids and heathland) and the adjoining Moors River SSSI system, valley bogs and more N2K heathland. The extensive potential for heathland restoration and habitat linkages from this site have been mapped by the RSPB. More detailed mapping and biological survey together with FRA is required and should be taken into account in considering potential ecological links and buffering to ensure net biodiversity gain and contribute to coherent and resilient ecological networks (NPPF para 109). We consider that normal residential development would be extremely damaging. The policy has not identified criteria such as Layout and Design, Green Infrastructure, Transport and Access, Phasing or, most critically for this site, Drainage. Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species Despite claim that residential housing cannot take place here it is understood that proposals for 180 houses are being considered. . There is high risk to the SNCI. This area of important neutral grassland (together with Corfe Mullen Meadows and Alderney) was described by the leading authority on Dorset orchids (Martin Jenkinson) as being the finest site in the country for GreenWinged Orchids. Autumn Ladies Tresses is equally abundant on this site later in the year. Any loss of SNCI should be compensated to provide net biodiversity gain. SA Objective 3 Minimise pollution There is high risk of damaging light pollution to</p>	<p>Add new para to follow11.43 The allocation should be informed by biological survey. The SNCI will be protected and buffered from the development and a Management Plan for the SNCI will be agreed with Dorset Wildlife Trust and arrangements put in place for its long term application. Include design criteria including a specific commitment that the Moors River SSSI will be protected from pollution.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination			577	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											heathland and aquatic ecosystems. Habitats Regulations Assessment More explicit guidance on mitigation of light pollution is required than is covered by Policy HE3 The implications of new road access to the site have not been addressed.					
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3325	11.43	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>We recommend that the proposal should acknowledge in the text the significant biodiversity constraints. These include substantial SNCI areas within the site (encompassing important neutral grassland with Green Winged Orchids and heathland) and the adjoining Moors River SSSI system, valley bogs and more N2K heathland. The extensive potential for heathland restoration and habitat linkages from this site have been mapped by the RSPB. More detailed mapping and biological survey together with FRA is required and should be taken into account in considering potential ecological links and buffering to ensure net biodiversity gain and contribute to coherent and resilient ecological networks (NPPF para 109). We consider that normal residential development would be extremely damaging. The policy has not identified criteria such as Layout and Design, Green Infrastructure, Transport and Access, Phasing or, most critically for this site, Drainage.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species Despite claim that residential housing cannot take place here it is understood that proposals for 180 houses are being considered. . There is high risk to the SNCI. This area of important neutral grassland (together with Corfe Mullen Meadows and Alderney) was described by the leading authority on Dorset orchids (Martin Jenkinson) as being the finest site in the country for GreenWinged Orchids. Autumn Ladies Tresses is equally abundant on this site later in the year. Any loss of SNCI should be compensated to provide net biodiversity gain.</p> <p>SA Objective 3 Minimise pollution There is high risk of damaging light pollution to heathland and aquatic ecosystems. Habitats Regulations Assessment More explicit guidance on mitigation of light pollution is required than is covered by Policy HE3 The implications of new road access to the site have not been addressed.</p>	Add new para to follow 11.43 The allocation should be informed by biological survey. The SNCI will be protected and buffered from the development and a Management Plan for the SNCI will be agreed with Dorset Wildlife Trust and arrangements put in place for its long term application. Include design criteria including a specific commitment that the Moors River SSSI will be protected from pollution.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		579	
654659	Mrs Julie Anne Rosier		CSPS761	11.44	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>The description of the land fails to address that ownership of the land is divided between two parties - Mr Budd and Persimmon Homes. Therefore, any proposals should deal with each plot of land on a separate basis and not as one combined piece of land. Blackfield is owned by Mr Budd but the Castleman Trail is owned by Persimmon Homes as far as I am aware. To combined the plots of land is unjust and the cause of the outcry from the village.</p>	<p>1. Identify the ownership of each piece of land and separate.</p> <p>2. Justify why the Castleman Trail is not under council ownership and designated as Green Belt and why you would allow development.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		581	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Secondly, why was the Castleman Trail land sold? Should the council not have compulsorily purchased this as you recommend the "Castleman Trail" in your places to visit when in Dorset - Tourist Information.	3 .Address the fuel depot and pipeline hazard. 4. Address MOD ownership. 5. Access to and from any proposed development in the future. 6. Lack of amenities within village to support any future inhabitants - only two GP practices and no NHS dental care. 7. The mention of two first schools within the village description is not advantageous to a care home for the elderly and hence the confusion continues with the core strategy - new homes are needed in the area but the land is not suitable for housing due to the SSSI and West Moors does not need another care home putting more strain on the resources of the village and so, we come back to the question "Why is Blackfield Farm and the Castleman Trail being considered as "urban" when quite clearly there is a conflict in the council's own proposals. Could it be that West Moors just does not have the coping mechanism for any more expansion. If housing cannot be considered due to the SSSI and a care home would not be advantageous to the village due the above, then on those grounds does Blackfield Farm become an attractive proposal at all.				
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSPS2185	11.44	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	It is considered that the policy, map and supporting text referred to is generally sound. However, the paragraph 11.44 refers to PPG2, which has now been superceded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Therefore it is not consistent with current national policy.	Reference to PPG2 needs to be removed and reference instead made to the NPPF.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		581	
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSPS2179	11.44	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	It is considered that the policy, map and supporting text referred to is generally sound. However, the paragraph 11.44 refers to PPG2, which has now been superceded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	Reference to PPG2 needs to be removed and reference instead made to the NPPF.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		581	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											Therefore it is not consistent with current national policy.					
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Goadsby Ltd	CSPS3563	11.44	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	<p>Paragraph 11.44 introduces a policy that allows for development (at West Moors) to take place on land that is situated within 400 metres of protected heathland, albeit not for general needs housing. The principle of this approach can be applied elsewhere.</p> <p>Land to the south east of Noon Hill Road, Verwood, is owned by Seward Properties. The site can also be accessed from a track that extends eastward from Southernhay Road. It is shown edged red on the attached plan, included as Appendix 1 to these representations.</p> <p>Although the site falls within 400 metres of protected dry heathland, it is submitted that it has potential to provide a range of community facilities to support the growth of the settlement of Verwood, as proposed by the Core Strategy. In particular, some feedback from the Verwood Focus Group meeting that took place on the 15th June 2012 identified the need for additional community and medical facilities in the town. There was also a concern that with the ageing population profile, more care home facilities may be needed.</p> <p>In this respect the site is well placed to accommodate a range of uses such as a doctor's practice, dental surgery, pharmacy and care home. These facilities are generally lacking in the eastern part of the settlement of Verwood. However, as the site extends to in excess of 2 hectares it is comfortably big enough to accommodate all of these uses, which are acceptable in terms of the relationship to the heath land. A new centre for the community can be established in a location that has a good catchment and excellent access via Ringwood Road.</p> <p>The size of the site means that it is also capable of accommodating allotments, for which we believe there is a need in the settlement.</p>	Omit land at Noon Hill Road from the green belt. Designate the site as being suitable for a range of community uses, including doctor's surgery, dental practice, pharmacy, care home and allotments.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		581	2260383_0_1.pdf
645041	Dr Bernie Edwards		CSPS42	Policy VTSW8	Yes	No		Yes	Yes		<p>Whilst the vision to enhance the vitality and viability of West Moors is to be welcomed (VTSW9) the above policy specifically advocating the building of yet another care home in the village, is not and directly contradicts the vision rendering the community unbalanced demographically and potentially stagnant.</p>	For the policy and vision to be sound there needs to be a deliberate and systematic effort to attract families into West moors through affordable housing. There needs to be a complete ban on any further care home/older persons developments, otherwise the demographics will become especially top-heavy.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	To be able to convey the strength of feeling that many local residents have about West Moors being used as the default area for older people. As a resident proud of the village I consider it important to have the opportunity to be able to put a coherent case forward directly to the Inspector.	582	
359552	Ms J Weedon	West Moors Parish Council	CSPS446	Policy VTSW8							In November 2010 when the Parish Council were consulted about the previous Core Strategy document and a response was sent outlining that the Parish Council did not support the option to include Blackfield				582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>Farm in the urban area (KS4), but that the Parish Council supported the option to include Blackfield Farm in the green belt (KS6). In the current consultation document and supporting documentation there is no reference to West Moors Parish Council's response from November 2010.</p> <p>It is disappointing that the view of the parish council has been ignored and not even mentioned in any documentation relating to the current Core Strategy. The Parish Council represent the views of the residents of West Moors and would therefore like to know why their previous comments have been disregarded with no explanation ever recieved.</p> <p>In response to the current consultation (Core Strategy Pre-Submission Consultation 2nd April-25th June), West Moors Parish Council wish to reiterate the views that Blackfield Farm and the portion of the Castleman Trailway (the entire area indicated by a bold red line on page 144 of the core strategy consultation document) be included in the Green Belt and not the urban area. We are aware that a probable use for this land could be a care home of some description but this is not exclusively so and other possible uses exist. However, concerns should this site be developed include increased traffic issues from the site to Station Road and it is felt that the current road infrastructure surrounding the site is not suitable or sustainable.</p>					
498251	Mr & Mrs Potter		CSPS434	Policy VTSW8							<p>I attach for your information our views as to the future of the above areas of land and why it should not be developed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Blackfield Farm is within 400m of heathland and as such should not be available either for housing or an elderly care home due to an embargo on such development, supported by Natural England. These areas are also adjacent to Sites of Special Scientific Interest and therefore any development would have a detrimental effect on the existing wildlife. 2. Road access from both of these sites is via Blackfield Lane which is extremely narrow and has an existing pinch point making it unsafe for any further increase in traffic. In addition to this point, access to Station Road from The Avenue is already extremely difficult due to both the heavy volume of traffic and sightlines. It was noted in the planning report for 2002 there was a substantial traffic flow along Station Road. This has now increased considerably. 3. Medical facilities within the village are already overstretched (our own personal experience obtaining a timely Doctor's appointment) and would not appear to be able to support further increases to demand. 4. Adjacent to Blackfield Farm there is what we believe to be 275,000 volt overhead transmission line. These overhead power lines produce electric and magnetic fields which many believe could have adverse effects on 				582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											people (cancer causing for example - see HM Government Department of Health report 16/10/2009 paragraphs 37-43, next steps p.25 www.dh.gov.uk). 5. The existing sewerage facilities already in situ for the current housing on "Blackfield Farm" would not be capable of handling any extra effluent. The main sewer connection from the pumping station in Harrison Way was laid through our property to connect into Fir Close approximately sixteen years ago, running between two large Scots Pine trees which have preservation orders on them. To increase the sewer size so many years further on would terminally affect these trees by disturbance of their now very extensive root system.					
651247	Mrs Linda Johnston		CSPS408	Policy VTSW8	No	No				Yes	I live in West Moors and I am writing to support the change of use of the land [both sections] to Green belt. This land should not be for building use and the uncertainty over its future should be sorted out now. It is an area of special scientific interest and the route of the Castleman trailway. The people of West Moors will fight development here and feel that it is one of the few assets which made us choose to live here. This is a Site of Special Scientific Interest, there should be no development within 400m.	It should not be legal to change designation. I would consider a change of the land in question to Green Belt. The Castleman Trailway is routed here for the West Moors community.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		582	
651704	Mr Richard Calver		CSPS422	Policy VTSW8	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	The land having been deemed unsuitable for housing for environmental reasons is now deemed suitable for a different category of dwelling (care home).the proposal smacks of build at any costs and is a poor fit with the surrounding housing and the access requirement for such a busy type of establishment. It is unclear if any development will satisfy all the environmental concerns regarding threats to this heathland area with special protection. Arguments to support care home location in areas where the population has a high population of elderly persons are weak as location is more about provision over a larger geographical area and should always consider the local impact as a priority. To locate this type of facility away from the main center of any area or in area where there is poor access and local congestion would suggest that local issues have not been fully considered.	If a different access route to this site could be proposed then development could be considered subject to satisfying all environmental concerns. If not logic would say a change to green belt should be proposed. In any event the parcel of land which the trailway passes through should be changed to green belt status.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		582	
652635	Mr Peter Elkins		CSPS441	Policy VTSW8	No	No		Yes	Yes	No	I am not a lawyer and, therefore, unable to comment on the legality of the document.	The land at Blackfield Farm is unsuitable for development, particularly with regards to the access arrangements. The Avenue is a quiet residential road, which already suffers from congestion, because of parking near to the middle school. The junction with Station Road is difficult and	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
												potentially dangerous. Leading on from The Avenue, towards the site, is Blackfield Lane, which has a narrow chicane, making access for large vehicles difficult. This is a small housing estate unsuited to the traffic that would result of the site being developed. The site should be zoned as Green Belt.				
652686	Mr Barry Robinson		CSPS461	Policy VTSW8	Yes	No		Yes			No evidence is given to justify a need for additional care home spaces. It would be wrong to allow any development within 400m of heathland. Even a care home would put additional strain on existing roads, especially when considering school traffic and the dangers when pulling out from the Avenue into Station Road.	In accordance with a recommendation from West Moors Parish Council, the land should now be designated as green belt.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		582	
652797	Mr A Thomas		CSPS505	Policy VTSW8							The area should not receive planning permission, we oppose this as it should be Green Belt land. One reason being that the cuckoo bird is red listed RSPB and it frequents this part of West Moors and can clearly be heard early mornings this time of year. Any type of building on this land would scare off this bird we would think and would impact on other wildlife in the area as it very close to the designated SSSI. We would hope that planning is not given even to a care home.				582	
653913	Mr Keith Fullman		CSPS603	Policy VTSW8	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	I support the motion carried at a recent Parish Council meeting that the total area included in the plan should be designated as green belt. I have concern that the concept of a care home is flawed in that it does not take full account of the issues of access, via the Avenue or the potential problems with street parking. These concerns relate to the construction of any buildings and the subsequent use of the facility. There is also the question of whether West Moors actually needs a Care Home which I believe it does not. While the possible use of the actual Blackfield Farm site has been indicated there is no mention of the possible development of the land adjacent to the Castleman Trailway. If anything the development of this parcel of land gives me more concern: It would seem that access to this site is even more of a problem than for the Blackfield Farm site. Access via Arnold Close is obviously unworkable, given the width of the road. Likewise access via Braeside Road would not be practical given the road width. If alternatively the access is from the Avenue, via the Blackfileld Farm site then the issues already given become even more accute. A more important concern than that of access, for all of us, is the loss of habitat that would result from such	The change that I believe are necessary to make the document sound is that contained within the West Moor's Parish Council's proposal that the whole Blackfield Farm site, as outlined in the map provided, should be designated green belt land.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											development. While we have a wonderful facility in West Moors Plantation the land on either side of the Castleman Trailway represents an unparalleled area of meadow. While the land on the right of the Trailway, coming from Arnold Close, has a wide range of meadow flowers and grasses. The area to the left, which is undisturbed by walkers, is a home to an incredible range of flora and fauna. While it can be argued that West Moors does not need another care home the question as to whether West Moors needs to retain the wild spaces provide by the Blackfield Farm site must be an emphatic yes. Another area of concern, which I have only heard of through rumour, is that the Castleman Trailway may be re routed via the Avenue. This would be unfortunate as the present route provides access for a significant number of residents of West Moors.					
485066	Mr David Brenchley		CSPS848	Policy VTSW8	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>The area proposed for inclusion in the urban area is within 400 meters of the West Moors Heath a SSSI. The only possible allowable development on this site is a care home. West Moors has a proliferation of care and residential homes already. The village infrastructure cannot cope with any more of these developments. Specifically, the medical services are all but overwhelmed now. EDDC acknowledge that there is an issue with local infrastructure, yet want to make this area urban!</p> <p>The village has clearly stated, via representations to the Parish Council, who's voice EDDC have ignored to date, that this reclassification is a step too far. EDDC have been anything but open and honest in this matter. Both EDDC and DCC have made clear statements of intent and requirement over the years, such as road junction layout, visibility splays and a village bypass. Yet none of these requirements for West Moors has ever been delivered by either EDDC or DCC!</p> <p>In short this area should be placed into the Green belt because: The area is too close to a SSI. The roads within the village are not suited to more traffic, which a development on this site would bring. The roads directly around the site are too busy, too narrow and generally unsuitable for such a development. A care home on this site would not be in keeping with the local area. It would pose a danger for the residents due to the proximity of the MOD fuel site (less than 100m away). Increased traffic will pose a significant risk to the children living in the area. It will prevent local residents for enjoying their peaceful enjoyment of their properties. A development would adversely affect the natural environment and habitat of the area.</p>	West Moors should not have any more care homes or residential building allowed unless the village infrastructure is of sufficient quality and capacity to provide a level of care relevant to a 1st world country. Blackfield Farm should be reclassified as Green belt land and protected from development, in order to safe guard both the SSSI and the Castleman Trailway.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	I wish to address the inspector in order that the true deceit and undemocratic nature of EDDC can be exposed. Furthermore, the issues affecting this village because of EDDC lack of a coherent strategy are complex and need full oral discussion.	582	
654804	Mr		CSPS820	Policy	Yes	No		Yes	Yes		Enabling Blackfield Farm to remain designnated as	Taking the position that	No, I do not		582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
	Craig Brown			VTSW8							<p>urban area and therefore viable for future development (potential care home) is unsound because.....</p> <p>1. Access roads to the land are unsuitable for the inevitable increase in traffic during or after development. The main access road, The 'Avenue' is in continual use for St Mary's School during the week and especially busy at school drop of and collection times. Increased vehicle access to any development during these periods will overload the access road and significantly raise the risk of accident</p> <p>2. Blackfield Lane, Harrison Way and the surrounding cul-de-sac has clearly been designed as a family home and residential area. To maintain the urban status of the the remaining land to enable further development would dramatically alter the nature of the area and increase traffic noise (potentially all hours of the day and night) in a place where young families have chosen to live in a quiet environment.</p> <p>3. Blackfield Lane has a traffic calming pinch point which purposely reduces traffic to single file. It would be necessary to seek to widen this in light of the increased traffic loading should development be sought. However it would be impossible to do so due to the location of adjacent private propoerties and therefore totally inappropriate to do so.</p> <p>4. As a care home facility appears to be the only potential development option for the land, further care home provison in the village is unnecessary and will skew the age demographic too far to the upper age range thus spoiling the current viable and economic demographic balance for the vibrant village commerce centre.</p>	<p>Blackfield Farm should not maintain its urban status, because it is not suitable for further development, a more sound position would be to re-Designate the land as greenbelt. This will then enable</p> <p>1. the surrounding SSSI area to fully flourish</p> <p>2. for the Castleman Trail to remain in its current highly popular and usable state.</p> <p>3. for West Moors to maintain a better demographic balance</p> <p>4. for Blackfiled Lane to maintain it's quiet family residentail atmosphere</p> <p>5. the Avenue to maintain it's safe traffic levels appropriate in a school area</p> <p>5. More suitable development land to be sought</p>	wish to participate at the oral examination			
654833	Miss Janine Plaistow		CSPS859	Policy VTSW8	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>The process has not been transparent. The vote of the Parish Council opposing the change in the designation of the land and 60 negative responses to the Core Strategy during the consultation did not appear to be acknowledged by EDDC. Based upon the lack of transparency of the process, it leads me to believe the proposed strategy is based upon honouring promises being made to the owners of the land before the land was designated to be within 400m of the SSSI.</p> <p>I have no confidence that any planning permission process will be anymore transparent and is unlikely to enable the residents individually or through the auspices of the Parish Council to have our views on any planned development to be truely heard or considered.</p> <p>I dispute the idea that a "precedent" exists for the land to be developed. The fact that planning permission for houses was once given, does not mean that it should and can be developed now. The law has changed to protect areas of SSSI for good reason and therefore the land has been rightly protected from development by legislation. A good analogy is that we used to be able to drive over 70 mph on the motorway but since the law</p>	<p>The land should be changed from White to Green Belt.</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<p>Yes because this is complex issue with a number of reasons why this process can be put into question and a number of reasons why protection of this land is justified.</p>	582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											has changed it is now illegal. That does not mean that one can drive down the motorway at over 70mph now. A number of residents in the area, who have purchased their houses in the last 3 years, have been misinformed regarding proposals for the land. They have been informed by the EDDC that there was no planned development. From published documentation, it can be seen that discussions regarding the development of the area has been going on for a number of years. I believe this residents have been misled and deceived as to the proposed change of use of the land.						
656265	Mr & Mrs D Ivey		CSPS1102	Policy VTSW8							<p>I am writing to you with reference to the proposed development of the site at Blackfield Farm and Castleman Trailway, West Moors, Ferndown. I feel extremely strongly on this matter and am now registering my serious objections as a local resident. This proposal is viewed by myself and many local residents to be as far from 'in keeping' with the local character and proportionate development as it is possible to get! Indeed, both I and others feel that this is a dreadful proposal that would ruin the immediate area and set a precedent for other high density residences to begin appearing in the area.</p> <p>We moved to our address in February 2004 and feel very strongly about the character of the West Moors area. Effectively importing scores of people into a newly developed site on the outskirts of the village will inevitably have a resounding impact on the immediate area - development of that density is simply not suitable for the site, the local residents or the character of the area. The volume of vehicular traffic generated would cause far more noise and disruption and inevitably lead to a series of additional vehicles parked on otherwise very quiet roads that see virtually no roadside parking. I understand that the exact numbers of flats/ houses / care home residents proposed for these sites are still to be finalised, but the resulting increase in population will lead to road parking congestion, noise, a potential increase in car crime and a regular disruption to the bus routes.</p> <p>This new proposed development has galvanised many of my neighbours into action. Indeed the feeling amongst EVERYONE who I have spoken to on the subject seems to be that they are absolutely opposed to this. I am not the only one who objects vehemently to this.</p> <p>I see the need for new housing throughout the UK as a whole, not just this area, but it seems completely unsuitable to situate a development of this type in Blackfield Farm and Castleman Trailway sidings. I understand that pressure on 'brown field' land usage is paramount at present, but feel that if sites like this are developed in this manner we will all be the poorer for it in the future as our heritage is gradually eroded with the</p>					582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>loss of undeveloped land that is more cherished and of greater value to following generations.</p> <p>I am a REGULAR user of the Trailway between West Moors and Ringwood - using it daily for several months of every year to enable me to cycle to work and back. I have serious concerns about 'rights of way' which this proposal be approved.</p> <p>I think it is a great loss to see green space lost to development in this manner. Should the existing site see development literally bordering the SSSI situated just to the north and west it would set a new precedent for the area and the flood gates would inevitably open to more developments and a total catastrophic loss of identity and threats to the local environment and ecology? This would be a dreadful waste and add to the nationally felt pressure on green sites.</p> <p>I would urge the Planning Department to reject the proposed development of this site and others like it within this area. I would ideally like to see the maintenance of this site as an undeveloped 'buffer' between the local housing and the pre-existing and important SSSI.</p> <p>I see this area as of 'Special Character' and I am staggered that the council could even consider to concede planning permission to a project of this nature. If blocks of flats, a housing development or a massive care home are built on this site they will degrade the character so apparently appreciated by the vast majority of local residents.</p> <p>The proposed development will not RESPECT the local features and characteristics and as such I urge the Planning department to reject this site development proposal.</p>					
656785	Mrs Pamela Brown		CSPS1550	Policy VTSW8		No		No	No		<p>The current infrastructure of the village does not support the current number of occupants eg Dr's appointments - now one week wait. Parking and traffic on Avenue. Access to Avenue and Blackfield Lane already dangerous at busy times, how can it accommodate more traffic including access for emergency services? Presumably major concern for a care home.</p>	<p>Improved access to Blackfield Lane. Improved parking facilities for school pick up and drop off to avoid double parking on the Avenue.</p> <p>Improved access to village medical facilities which has already deteriorated significantly in past 5 years.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		582	
359461	Mrs Nicola Brunt	Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSPS1496	Policy VTSW8		No		No		No	<p>Ecological survey information for this site is not available therefore it is not possible to fully assess the potential environmental impacts of development on this site. NPPF (165) states that planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment. If priority habitat or species are present on this site it could be inappropriate to develop it and instead include at least part in the greenbelt</p>	<p>Provide ecological data to justify inclusion of this area in the urban area.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		582	
498956	Major & Mrs B Andrews		CSPS1871	Policy VTSW8	No	No		Yes			<p>Congestion on a school road. parking would be major problem for parents. Road not suitable for heavy goods</p>	<p>Possible access via Moorlands Road.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral		582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											vehicles, shift staff and ambulances. Restrictions would be required for parking on the Avenue.	See VTSW7. Incorporate care village at St Leonards with a care home. This makes sense and provides easy access. Congestion on West Moors (The Avenue) would be a major problem.	examination			
612430	Mr Nick Squirrel	Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSPS1949	Policy VTSW8	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	<p>Policies; CN 1, CN 2, CN 3, WMC 3, WMC 4, WMC 5, WMC 6, FWP 3, FWP 4, FWP 6, FWP 7, FWP 8, VTSW 2, VTSW3, VTSW 4, VTSW 8 etc are all proposing development and or mitigation in the form of SANGs on greenfield locations. In order to avoid a conflict with policy ME1 at a later stage in the planning process Natural England advise the authorities to bring to the attention of those with an interest in these locations the need to carry out a basic biodiversity survey eg Phase 1 habitat survey including assessment of the likely presence or evidence of other features likely to restrict or delay development eg badger setts, priority species such as reptiles, water voles etc in time for consideration at the EIP. In many cases this will simply be a statement as the proposer has already engaged an ecological advisor.</p> <p>These policies appear to have been brought forward in an absence of adequate information and assessment on the biodiversity features held by the policy land. There is reason to suspect that on some there may be a significant biodiversity interest owing to close proximity with designated sites and or other biodiversity sites. The NPPF requires that planning policies should be based on up-to date information on the natural environment (paragraph 165). These policies are not shown to be compliant with this requirement. Thus, irrespective of the above matters concerning other nearby designated sites, it is not possible to identify whether the policies are compliant with policy considerations in the NPPF on sustainable development for the sites alone, especially the aspect on sustainable development set out in paragraph 9 of moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains (for example on priory habitats and species).</p>	The policies may need to include specific paragraphs about features of biodiversity importance which are to be secured or enhanced.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Natural England has provided extensive advice to a number of the parties concerned with these policies and may be able to offer advice and reassurance to the Inspector about the reliance he may have on the effectiveness of the policy and any modification proposed.	582	
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSPS2186	Policy VTSW8	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	It is considered that the policy, map and supporting text referred to is generally sound. However, the paragraph 11.44 refers to PPG2, which has now been superceded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Therefore it is not consistent with current national policy.	Reference to PPG2 needs to be removed and reference instead made to the NPPF.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		582	
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSPS2183	Policy VTSW8	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	It is considered that the policy, map and supporting text referred to is generally sound. However, the paragraph 11.44 refers to PPG2, which has now been superceded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Therefore it is not consistent with current national policy.	Reference to PPG2 needs to be removed and reference instead made to the NPPF.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
496129	Mr and Mrs Edward Lewington		CSPS2801	Policy VTSW8							<p>Policy VTWS8 – Blackfield Farm Green Belt Boundaries & Castleman Trailway.</p> <p>We are writing to you with regards to the potential development of the above sites to express our concerns.</p> <p>Firstly, the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Response Form in the back of the East Dorset News, Spring Extra 2012 Edition, is not straightforward for us to understand what questions 4 & 5 actually mean.</p> <p>Castleman Trailway</p> <p>Why even consider doing anything with this site. It is used by numerous people for various activities and it should remain so. This site, in our opinion, should be given a green belt status.</p> <p>Why it was ever sold to a developer in the first place beggars belief.</p> <p>Blackfields Farm</p> <p>Why on earth we need another care home in West Moors is an enigma. In truth another care home would not benefit the village at all. It would be for anyone in the country or Europe coming into the village, therefore of little or no use to the village</p> <p>Also, it would put pressure on resources, especially the doctor's surgeries. Its bad enough now trying to get an appointment in less than a week, let along the traffic using Station Road. In the years that we have lived in West Moors, the traffic has been getting worse without adding to it.</p> <p>Why build on this site anyway. Cannot EDDC buy this land and make it green belt?</p> <p>West Moors is a lovely friendly village and should remain so.</p> <p>Finally, we read in the Stour & Avon Magazine dated 01.06.12 that Slop bog has been granted Charitable Status. Why not do the same for Blackfields Farm!</p> <p>Once again we would like to reiterate that we are in totally opposed to any sort of buildings on Blackfields Farm and to confirm that Castleman Trailway be given green belt status.</p>					582	
498251	Mr & Mrs Potter		CSPS2783	Policy VTSW8							<p>I attach for your information our views as to the future of the above areas of land and why it should not be developed.</p> <p>1. Blackfield Farm is within 400m of heathland and as such should not be available either for housing or an elderly care home due to an embargo on such development, supported by Natural England. These areas are also adjacent to Sites of special scientific interest and therefore any development would have a detrimental effect on the existing wildlife.</p> <p>2. Road access from both of these sites is via Blackfield Lane which is extremely narrow and has an existing pinch point making it unsafe for any further increase in traffic. In addition to this point, access to Station Road</p>					582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>from The Avenue is already extremely difficult due to both the heavy volume of traffic and sightlines. It was noted in the planning report for 2002 there was a substantial traffic flow along Station Road. This has now increased considerably.</p> <p>3. Medical facilities within the village are already overstretched (our own personal experience obtaining a timely Doctor's appointment) and would not appear to be able to support further increases to demand.</p> <p>4. Adjacent to Blackfield Farm there is what we believe to be 275,000 volt overhead transmission line. These overhead power lines produce electric and magnetic fields which many believe could have adverse effects on people (cancer causing for example – see HM Government Department of Health report 16/10/2009 paragraphs 37-43, next steps p.25 www.dh.gov.uk).</p> <p>5. The existing sewerage facilities already in situ for the current housing on "Blackfield Farm" would not be capable of handling any extra effluent. The main sewer connection from the pumping station in Harrison Way was laid through our property to connect into Fir Close approximately sixteen years ago, running between two large Scots Pine trees which have preservation orders on them. To increase the sewer size so many years further on would terminally affect these trees by disturbance of their now very extensive root system.</p>					
656494	Mr Steve Griffin		CSPS2936	Policy VTSW8	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Policy VTWS8 suggests the Blackfield Farm site could be developed for an alternative use, such as a care home. However, the vehicular access to this site would need to be made through residential streets. A care home is a commercial operation requiring traffic 7 days a week and out of normal day time hours too. A care home requires commercial vehicle deliveries to provide food and other goods to support the operation. To introduce a heavy burden of traffic into residential streets with no main highway access would be unreasonable, particularly when there are children living in these areas. It introduced a pattern of traffic that is completely different to the normal residential traffic serving residents living in the streets adjacent to the Blackfield Farm site.</p> <p>A care home operates 24 hours a day, and as such introduces lighting and sounds to what is a quiet area. Had this been a residential development, the lighting and sounds produced by the site would be compatible with surrounding homes. People go to sleep around 11pm and start again the following day. A care home however needs to be operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. There are changing staff shifts to support the business, all using the residential streets at unusual times of the day. The nature of a care home also suggests the need for medical staff visitors and ambulances coming and going to support the needs of the elderly and infirm. This all introduces an added</p>	<p>I would suggest that the site is to be recommended for inclusion as part of the green belt. Despite the pressure to build on the green belt, this location does not have good direct highway access to facilitate the development and operation of a care home without significant impact and compensation to local residents living adjacent to the Blackfield Farm sites.</p>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											burden of traffic on the residential streets that would provide access to the sites. Therefore, these reasons alone, the suggestion that this site could support an alternative development such as a care home could not be considered sound.						
657359	Mr P Copelin		CSPS2867	Policy VTSW8							<p>I am writing to you regarding the proposed reclassification of land at Blackfield Farm from White Field to Urban.</p> <p>I would like to make you aware that I object to this change in classification. I would like this site to be included in the Green Belt if at all possible, but failing this, it should remain as White Field land.</p> <p>The reason behind the proposed change, I believe, is so the land can be developed into a class C2 care facility, and subsequently wish to object based on the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The site is within 400m of an internationally important SSSI (West Moors Heath) and the development of this site will damage the Eco structure of this area of conservation. Rare animals are understood in inhabit this land. – The village of West Moors does not need yet another care facility and it certainty could not cope with the demands such a development would place upon the local facilities. There are numerous car home facilities already in Ferndown and surrounding areas, and planning permission already granted for more e.g. Badgers Walk, Ferndown. – A care facility on this site would only add to the already far higher than the national average number of elderly residents in West Moors. – There are a number of brown field sites both locally and within the County of Dorset which can be developed for care facilities without the need to use our countryside. – The roads in West Moors are already overburdened and cannot sustain yet more traffic, which the development of this site would certainly bring to the village. The Avenue which leads to Blackfield lane is already heavily congested at school pick up and drop off times and when church services take place. At these time cars park on both sides of the road, and on double yellow lines/zigzags meaning it can become impassable by the local bus, and in the event of an emergency a vehicle such as a fire engine would be delayed. – The proposed site is unsuitable for a care development due to its location, and the entrance to Blackfield Lane narrows to a single car width, and unsuitable for increased large vehicles such as delivery lorries, ambulances, etc. – The military fuels depot is only 500m away from this site and would be a significant risk to the proposed elderly residents who would not be able to evacuate the area without significant emergency resources in the event of an incident at the military site where evacuation 					582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename	
											<p>of the local area was required.</p> <p>I wish to be notified of any of the following, if they have any or potential impact on VTWW8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy has been submitted for independent examination. • Publication of the recommendations of any person appointed to carry out an independent examination • Adoption of the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy 						
657360	Mrs C Copelin		CSPS2863	Policy VTSW8							<p>I am writing to you regarding the proposed reclassification of land at Blackfield Farm from White Field to Urban.</p> <p>I would like to make you aware that I object to this change in classification. I would like this site to be included in the Green Belt if at all possible, but failing this, it should remain as White Field land.</p> <p>The reason behind the proposed change, I believe, is so the land can be developed into a class C2 care facility, and subsequently wish to object based on the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The site is within 400m of an internationally important SSSI (West Moors Heath) and the development of this site will damage the Eco structure of this area of conservation. Rare animals are understood in inhabit this land. – The village of West Moors does not need yet another care facility and it certainty could not cope with the demands such a development would place upon the local facilities. There are numerous car home facilities already in Ferndown and surrounding areas, and planning permission already granted for more e.g. Badgers Walk, Ferndown. – A care facility on this site would only add to the already far higher than the national average number of elderly residents in West Moors. – There are a number of brown field sites both locally and within the County of Dorset which can be developed for care facilities without the need to use our countryside. – The roads in West Moors are already overburdened and cannot sustain yet more traffic, which the development of this site would certainly bring to the village. The Avenue which leads to Blackfield lane is already heavily congested at school pick up and drop off times and when church services take place. At these time cars park on both sides of the road, and on double yellow lines/zigzags meaning it can become impassable by the local bus, and in the event of an emergency a vehicle such as a fire engine would be delayed. – The proposed site is unsuitable for a care development due to its location, and the entrance to Blackfield Lane narrows to a single car width, and unsuitable for increased large vehicles such as delivery lorries, ambulances, etc. – The military fuels depot is only 500m away from this 					582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											<p>site and would be a significant risk to the proposed elderly residents who would not be able to evacuate the area without significant emergency resources in the event of an incident at the military site where evacuation of the local area was required.</p> <p>I wish to be notified of any of the following, if they have any or potential impact on VTWW8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy has been submitted for independent examination. • Publication of the recommendations of any person appointed to carry out an independent examination • Adoption of the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy 					
657362	Mr J Bestley and Mrs J Light		CSPS2857	Policy VTSW8							<p>As you advise, in West Moors, land at Blackfield Farm is being considered, as is a Vision for the village centre. Below are some issues that we could not list on the form.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The access roads to the proposed development would cause extra traffic and congestion where there already is a danger at the St. Marys School, Church and West Moors Library. 2) The Vision opens the gate for much more building on surrounding areas in the near future. 3) There are enough care homes already in West Moors – a new one would not help local residents but draw in people from other parts of the country, as there is no restriction on who can live in a residential care home. 4) One of the road access points will undoubtedly interfere with the pleasure of the Castleman trail facilities. 5) Obviously one has to plan for the future and we agree this has to be done but why on this site as the owners, Persimmons, bought this land purely as a commercial venture and will build anything they can to make money. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In our view it would be more appropriate for this, or any, proposed development be sited at or near to St. Leonards Hospital where road access is better and it does not interfere with so many local residents. It also already has in place all the necessary utilities for a large development. The above has been listed very briefly but there are many other issues that could have a significant bearing on this subject. 				582	
657760	Mr B.R Miles		CSPS2802	Policy VTSW8							<p>I wish to object to this Development on the following grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The application is too inexact 64 to 300 beds could be the basis not for a Nursing Home but later use for Mental Care in the Community or for Asylum Seekers etc. <p>If I submitted an application to build a house of 1 – 5 bedrooms the application would soon be back with me for clarification.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Given the fact that West Moors has a single through road and is surrounded with Flood Plains and areas of special interest it does not lend it's self to any 				582	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											development however sympathetic or desirable The village cannot cope with the possible increase in traffic and pressure placed on its resources i.e. Doctors Dentists and Social Services. 3. If all that is required in this area is a Nursing Home then why have they not taken up the St Leonard's Hospital site there are no problems with access No MOD property or other problems. Referring to my objections in Item 1 regarding future use the flexibility aspect worries me also you cannot pickup a paper of listen to the news without hearing of the poor performance of private Nursing Homes either because they are being bought and sold as a commodity without regard to the residents or of poor nursing or abuse of people in their care.					
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3329	Policy VTSW8		No				No	The site has not been the subject of biological survey. Development will need to take account of the fact that it has been mapped by the RSPB as having heathland restoration potential. Being contiguous with N2K heathland in the West Moors Petroleum Depot, it could make a useful contribution to delivering coherent ecological networks (NPPF para 109). The larger area has remained undisturbed for many years. There is known biodiversity interest in the publicly accessible area alongside the Castleman Trailway. Gas and water mains would preclude that area from development. Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species Scoring should be negative not neutral/unknown. The land is adjacent to N2K heathland and presents opportunities for heathland restoration and expansion. The extent of that opportunity should be informed by survey.				582	
651021	Mr John Bartley		CSPS404	Map 11.9	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Whilst I consider that the Trailway section should be left undisturbed as part of the Castleman trailway I consider the land behind Blackfield Lane to be suitable for a purpose built Medical Centre. Forget all this talk of a CareHome, which probably is not required, instead consider that the existing village medical facilities are already inadequate and within the next 15 years will become very overstretched. The Blackfield Lane site is probably the only site left in the village urban area which is large enough for this sort of complex and would also provide sufficient parking spaces. The Parking would also be useful to those using the trailway. Such a scheme would, I believe, receive the backing of the majority of West Moors residents and would not contravene the existing policy regarding building close to heathland.		No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		583	
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSPS2187	Map 11.9	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	It is considered that the policy, map and supporting text referred to is generally sound. However, the paragraph 11.44 refers to PPG2, which has now been superceded	Reference to PPG2 needs to be removed and reference instead made to	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		583	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Therefore it is not consistent with current national policy.	the NPPF.				
497218	Mr Andy Shepley	GL Hearn	CSPS2184	Map 11.9	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	It is considered that the policy, map and supporting text referred to is generally sound. However, the paragraph 11.44 refers to PPG2, which has now been superceded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Therefore it is not consistent with current national policy.	Reference to PPG2 needs to be removed and reference instead made to the NPPF.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		583	
360302	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	Environment TAG (East Dorset)	CSPS3331	Map 11.9		No				No	The site has not been the subject of biological survey. Development will need to take account of the fact that it has been mapped by the RSPB as having heathland restoration potential. Being contiguous with N2K heathland in the West Moors Petroleum Depot, it could make a useful contribution to delivering coherent ecological networks (NPPF para 109). The larger area has remained undisturbed for many years. There is known biodiversity interest in the publicly accessible area alongside the Castleman Trailway. Gas and water mains would preclude that area from development. Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective 1 Protect, enhance and expand habitats and protected species Scoring should be negative not neutral/unknown. The land is adjacent to N2K heathland and presents opportunities for heathland restoration and expansion. The extent of that opportunity should be informed by survey.				583	
643623	Mrs Nita Mulford		CSPS18	Policy VTSW9	Yes	Yes							No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		586	
498956	Major & Mrs B Andrews		CSPS1876	Policy VTSW9	No	No		Yes			Congestion on a school road. parking would be major problem for parents. Road not suitable for heavy goods vehicles, shift staff and ambulances. Restrictions would be required for parking on the Avenue.	Possible access via Moorlands Road. See VTSW7. Incorporate care village at St Leonards with a care home. This makes sense and provides easy access. Congestion on West Moors (The Avenue) would be a major problem.	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination		586	
657362	Mr J Bestley and Mrs J Light		CSPS2859	Policy VTSW9							As you advise, in West Moors, land at Blackfield Farm is being considered, as is a Vision for the village centre. Below are some issues that we could not list on the form. 1) The access roads to the proposed development would cause extra traffic and congestion where there already is a danger at the St. Marys School, Church and West Moors Library. 2) The Vision opens the gate for much more building on surrounding areas in the near future. 3) There are enough care homes already in West Moors – a new one would not help local residents but draw in people from other parts of the country, as there is no				586	

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	ID	Number	Question 1 - Legally compliant	Question 2 - Sound	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Question 3 - Justified	Question 3 - Effective	Question 3 - Consistent with national policy	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Order	Filename
											restriction on who can live in a residential care home. 4) One of the road access points will undoubtedly interfere with the pleasure of the Castleman trail facilities. 5) Obviously one has to plan for the future and we agree this has to be done but why on this site as the owners, Persimmons, bought this land purely as a commercial venture and will build anything they can to make money. • In our view it would be more appropriate for this, or any, proposed development be sited at or near to St. Leonards Hospital where road access is better and it does not interfere with so many local residents. It also already has in place all the necessary utilities for a large development. The above has been listed very briefly but there are many other issues that could have a significant bearing on this subject.					