

CS Options

Events: Core Strategy Options for Consideration - Chapter 11 Verwood and West Moors Housing and Centre Options

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO495	11	Object		This document was created in 2008 and does not apply current planning legislation with regard to Green Belt and Brown Field site developments. Comments made to this forum are being moderated. Why does it take a week to review and modify comments before they are made public? Is there a valid reason why commenters on this document are publicly named, however land owners who have put forward land for development may remain anonymous?			935
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22876	11	Object		Section 11 Object Most of this section has been derived from a flawed consultant's report East Dorset Housing Options Masterplan Report, Verwood by Broadway Malyan, 2010. Detailed comments on the many inaccuracies and omissions in that report are appended together with an analysis of those Key Issues Papers that are particularly relevant to Verwood. They do not stand alone as a report and should be read in conjunction with the documents to which they refer.			935
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO185	11.1	Object		No more houses in Verwood until there is enough employment and facilities to cope with the current population. More uses of brownbelt land, regeneration and building up not out. But we can't afford to do that, so we are going to go for the cheap option and pick on the greenbelt. Chip shop in Verwood land could take for example 3 shop units and 20 flats... JC's could take 2 units and 20 flats..... Land next to Hub compulsory purchase to build affordable homes.... etc etc			936
483204	Mr Mark Turnbull		CSO271	11.1	Object		Verwood has expanded rapidly in the last 40 years. We fear that further growth of up to 1500 people is unsustainable and will have significant adverse impacts on social communities,	Remove the south of manor road site from the plans and reduce the number of houses		936

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							infrastructure and the environment (particularly the site south of Manor Road). This is not about personal preference but about the continued prosperity of Verwood and significant development of this type will not be sustainable and will adversely impact on many peoples lives.	by at least 50% planned for the other developments.		
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO37 7	11.1	Object		No, there shouldn't be any new housing on the edge of Verwood. One of the main reasons for land to be designated as Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl. This counts as urban sprawl. I don't understand the logic that suggests improving the provision of open space is met by building on Green Belt!			936
483970	Mr Matthew Clark		CSO42 4	11.1	Object		Verwood has expanded very rapidly already and the infrastructure and services have not expanded at the same pace, so there are already insufficient services for the existing population without adding even more housing without addressing the pre-existing issues for the existing population.	stop considering the building of even more homes, particularly in places so close to sites of special scientific interest, in areas only accessible via un-adopted roads etc.		936
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO49 2	11.1	Object		* Whether there should be new housing on the edge of Verwood and, if so, where and how? - Why is the focus of this document immediately on the edge (Green Belt) and green field sites? No attempt is made to investigate sites that are suitable elsewhere within the town, which runs against current government policy. * How can we improve the provision of open space at Verwood to encourage residents away from heathlands and increase access to the countryside? - Stop building on open green sites and people will be able to enjoy them. * How can we maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of Verwood and West Moors town centres? - Increase available facilities within the town. Verwood has become a large housing estate due to current council policy. This document was created in 2008 and does not reflect current government planning legislation.			936
507525	Mr David Lander	Boyer Planning Ltd	CSO19 079	11.1	Object		Concern is raised as to the level of detail provided in relation to possible sites without the establishment of a housing target. Please see section 3.5 of the accompanying			936

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>statement.</p> <p>Chapter 11 Verwood and West Moors Housing and Centre Options</p> <p>3.5.1 As highlighted in paragraph 3.3.1 concern is raised as to the level of detail provided in relation to possible sites without the establishment of a housing target. At this stage it is considered that, if potential sites and green belt boundary changes are to be considered at all, all possible development locations should be considered to ensure that the housing target, when set, can be achieved.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>4.7 In suggesting potential locations for development around Verwood the Areas of Search were limited to the north west and south west of the town. A more systematic approach to assessing potential development options should be used to consider all locations around Verwood. It is submitted that land off Ringwood Road at Verwood, as identified on the attached plan, is an appropriate location for development and green belt release and should be considered further.</p> <p>3.5.2 In considering development options the strategy states that the Areas of Search around Verwood have been limited to the north-west and south-west of the existing settlement as 'these are the only substantial parcels of land adjacent to the existing built-up area that are not constrained by proximity to protected heathlands, floodplain or the boundary with Hampshire.' Whilst it is acknowledged that these are significant constraints on some areas surrounding the settlement, it is considered that opportunities do exist on other areas of the settlement outside of the areas of search which are not subject to these constraints.</p> <p>3.5.3 A more systematic approach is therefore considered to be required in the assessment of potential development options in the District.</p> <p>3.5.4 As a result of the assessment of the areas of search, four development options are suggested. Option VWM1 would create approximately 30 homes and is located on the north western edge of the town. Option VWM2 would create around 200 homes and is also located on the north western edge of the town, to the south of Option VWM1. 20 homes could be provided on the south western edge of the town as</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>part of Option VWM3. Option VWM would provide approximately 165 homes on the south western edge of the town, to the south east of Option VWM3.</p> <p>3.5.5 Depending on the chosen housing target for East Dorset, a combination of these sites is proposed to be allocated in the Core Strategy for development. These sites are generally smaller than would be considered a strategic allocation which is justified by the Council as they are required to 'provide information about whether comprehensive strategic planning scenarios are required for the area, involving transport, green spaces, provision of facilities and any necessary changes to Green Belt boundaries.' Whilst the forward-looking approach is supported to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place for developments, this should not prevent the consideration of all potential locations for development.</p> <p>3.5.6 The proposed options for development are all located to the north-west or south-west of Verwood as these were the only locations considered. Each of the proposed sites is linked with a potential location for SANGs which will help to reduce the pressure of development on the heaths. The current options will only serve the population of the western half of the settlement and therefore pressure will not be relieved on the areas of heath to the east of the settlement. Potential locations for development along with SANGs provision should therefore also be considered to the east of the settlement. Furthermore sites should not be dismissed as a result of an inability to provide a linked area of SANGs provision as the necessary policy framework is in place to enable financial contributions to help support other areas of SANGs provision.</p> <p>3.5.7 In this context we consider that land off Ringwood Road at Verwood (as shown on the attached plan) is a suitable candidate for inclusion in the urban area to accommodate a modest amount of additional housing and open space.</p> <p>3.5.8 In assessing the site as part of the East Dorset SHLAA the report concluded that the only policy designation affecting the site was that of the Green Belt. The proposed options set out in the Core Strategy have already established that the Council will support amendments to the Green Belt boundary</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>where appropriate and therefore the green belt status of the site does not represent a constraint in principle.</p> <p>3.5.9 The site was also considered as part of the Local Plan Inspector's Report, October 2000. Although the Inspector concluded that the site was not required as a result of the findings in relation to housing land supply, he made a number of positive conclusions. He felt that the site was 'very well contained by existing housing and woodland' and that 'the woodland edge would make an excellent, defensible boundary for the green belt.' Overall the Inspector concluded that he had no doubt that the site would warrant further consideration in the future and that he could 'understand the logic of taking this field out of the green belt' as:</p> <p>'The purpose of designating it as green belt is relatively limited, given its isolated nature, well divorced from the open countryside. Views out from the site to the surrounding countryside are non-existent. The woodland would make a very good new edge to the town here.'</p> <p>3.5.10 Importantly the site is located outside the 400 metres boundary of the heathlands and is in Flood Zone 1. Previous proposals for the site have demonstrated that satisfactory access can be provided onto Ringwood Road and that a mixed provision of housing and open space would have no significant impact on the landscape character of the area given the former use of the site and its containment by dense woodland to the north.</p> <p>3.5.11 Further strengths of the development of the site include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The offer of the woodland area for public access as a local amenity. • Access via the woodland within the site to the wider woodland and countryside beyond. • The traffic calming benefit associated with constructing a new access. • The accessibility of the site in terms of facilities and non-car modes of travel.. • The provision of affordable housing. • The site is not viable to farm and has no other realistic use. Its former playing field use ceased and was abandoned many years ago. Therefore the development would not constitute 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>any loss to existing facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services are already available up to the site so only limited upgrading would be required. • The site is suitable for a high quality lower density development, thereby adding to range and choice in the area. • The site is available for development and deliverable in terms of PPS3 para 54. <p>3.5.12 It is therefore submitted that this site is appropriate for development and has certain advantages compared to site at Coopers Lane South. Depending on the level of housing provision decided upon it could therefore comprise an addition or alternative to that site. In any event, further consideration should be given to all realistic development options around the entirety of the settlement.</p>			
478398	Mrs Diana Saville		CSO46	11.2	Object		<p>I strongly object to the proposals for 190 new homes in the Manor Road area of Verwood and another 230 new homes for north Verwood.</p> <p>This is just going to turn Verwood into a huge dormitory town. There are only a limited number of jobs here so most people will commute to work causing extra traffic on the A338 and A31. Also if there are any accidents or roadworks it will cause traffic chaos. An extra 400 houses could mean up to 800 more cars on the roads.</p> <p>In addition Verwood cannot adequately provide shopping, schools and health care facilities such as dentists and doctors therefore causing even more traffic on the roads. Greenbelt was designed for a reason – to give our towns a buffer against mass development.</p>			937
522240	Association Verwood Residents	Chairman Association Verwood Residents	CSO18086	11.2	Object		<p>The residents have completely lost confidence in the planning process that has allowed massive, rapid and seemingly uncontrolled expansion over the last 25 years, transforming what was once a pleasant rural Dorset village into the second largest, by population, towns in Dorset.</p> <p>It is accepted that the apathy demonstrated by the population over the years has contributed to the situation that now exists but enough is enough and the residents want their views to be heard. They want to contribute much more actively in the development of Verwood for the future to help correct the</p>			937

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>problems that exist and in preventing more mistakes being made.</p> <p>Even when the local Councils refuse planning for particular private development projects this is overturned by Government Planning Inspectors, in Bristol, and the people of Verwood are left with "out of character" developments, such as the flats blocks at Crane Drive and the retail/flat development on the old Fayrewood Public House site. Over the last 25 years the residents have seen housing development after housing development within the boundaries of the Town allowed to proceed without compatible improvement to the infrastructure.</p> <p>Most of the public green space within the Town's Boundaries has gone, never to return and the only appreciable areas that remain are the Recreation Ground and Bugdens Copse. Completion of Section 106 Agreements and the levying of development charges have not brought about the level of infrastructure improvement necessary to keep pace with the development of the additional housing already inflicted on the Town.</p> <p>As a result the residents of Verwood are left with a Town that is like no other in Dorset; it has become a "dormitory town" with residents having to travel many miles for employment and essential shopping facilities. Typically a return journey of 20 miles, minimum, is necessary to access a reasonable quality and quantity of shops and it is difficult to understand how this will not add to CO2 emissions and further increases in "Global Warming".</p> <p>The residents are concerned and angry with the plundering of Verwood that has already taken place by property developers in their drive to produce profits for their companies and shareholders alike. They have no empathy with the Town or its residents and as a result we have ended up with a Town that suffers acutely from the following shortcomings: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town has no logical or vibrant centre • There are inadequate retail outlets to avoid long journeys for essential shopping • There is one small supermarket that has inadequate parking at peak times and cannot keep the shelves stocked with goods quickly enough, due to the high demand, and does not 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>give sufficient variety of goods due to lack of space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not have an adequate leisure centre to meet the needs of such a large population • Despite being in local plans for at least 15 years we still do not have Manor Road improved to the County Highway Standard required for such an important "Distributor Road" • Similarly the Springfield Distributor Road has still not been constructed and at present is unlikely to happen for the next three to four years • There is only one adopted highway access to Emmanuel School when two are required on safety grounds for emergency vehicle access (a recent medical emergency at the school highlighted this issue) • Access to Manor Lane and St Michaels Road from Manor Road has still to be blocked off again a County Highway requirement • Many areas of the Town suffer from flooding due to the very high water table and the lack of adequate surface water drainage systems • The foul sewerage systems are at peak capacity and in the words of Wessex Water "Verwood is a disaster waiting to happen" • The Town is the only one of comparable size in Dorset that does not have a Senior School for its pupils • Doctor and Dentist facilities are at full stretch and there is very little NHS dentistry available in the Town • Highway access to and around Verwood is less than satisfactory: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Any traffic problems on the B3081 to Ringwood results in major traffic congestion o There are always peak time delays at the Three Legged Cross junction o There are always peak time delays at the Ashley Heath Roundabout o There is daily congestion as school children are "bussed" out to Ferndown and Wimborne • There are inadequate crossing facilities at various points on the B3081 road through Verwood <p>It is essential that these serious shortcomings are corrected before any further major development is allowed in Verwood.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Whilst we appreciate some issues are past redemption there is clearly much that can, and should be corrected, and the District Council's energies and finances should be funnelled in this direction.</p> <p>1. Introduction All figures and statistics within this section have been obtained from one of the references. When extrapolations have been made the basis for that is clarified in the text. Whilst many of the statistics are taken from reports applying to East Dorset there is nothing in the reports to indicate that they do not apply proportionately to Verwood. Indeed since the reports have been commissioned to decide on future housing strategy and this has determined that Verwood is one of five locations where future building is appropriate it can be argued that they are either relevant statistics or the reports are irrelevant. In most of the reports EDDC report a maximum margin of error District wide of 1.6% at the 95% confidence interval.</p> <p>We believe all statistical evidence used for the basis of the Core strategy needs further analysis and independent verification because of its importance in developing what happens to Verwood in the future. The following paragraphs demonstrate where the figures used for the Core Strategy may well be incorrect and or inappropriate.</p> <p>2. Population and Housing The East Dorset Housing Need and Demand Report June 2008 estimated that there are around 37,600 households in the District, of these around 85% are currently owner-occupiers with 8% living in the social rented sector and around 7% in the private rented sector.</p> <p>Out migrant households tend to be employed, whereas in migrant households have a higher proportion of retired households. Although the differences are not very large, the results would suggest that the in-migrants into Dorset are often wealthy households, retired or looking to retire.</p> <p>This is important on two fronts: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly retired populations are much more likely to want that sense of community that ironically this development plan will help to reduce. Consultation meetings run by the Council have shown very clearly that there is very strong support for 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>conserving the sense of Community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondly an ageing population places greater demands on infrastructure such as Doctors and Dentists. <p>3. Economic status in Verwood</p> <p>Working Unemployed Retired Other Total</p> <p>2611</p> <p>50.6% 38</p> <p>0.7% 2213</p> <p>42.9% 294</p> <p>5.7% 5156</p> <p>In 1991 nine out of ten employed people found their employment in Verwood, by 2008 there were 730 firms in Verwood, but 88% of them only employed 1 – 10 people. Since 65.5% (1710) of employed people in Verwood are classed as Wealthy Achievers it is evident that they must be finding employment outside of Verwood. In addition 90.7% of the population of Verwood are classed as comfortably off or better.</p> <p>It is estimated that at the time of the survey there was a current stock of affordable housing of around 325 which could be used to meet this need (including dwellings becoming available as households in the social rented sector move to different dwellings). Hence it was estimated that the net backlog of need for affordable housing is around 386 units (711- 325). Annualised over 5 years (as recommended in the Practice Guidance) this becomes 77 households (386/5). The total future need for affordable housing is therefore estimated to be 525 units per annum.</p> <p>Reports show that overall there is expected to be a greater demand for housing than the current stock of housing can meet. Overall, across all tenures there is an apparent shortfall of 375 dwellings per annum (excess demand over supply) of which 48% is for affordable housing. However the Audit Commission report criticises for consistently allowing over 900 dwellings to lie empty for more than one year and having a record of only getting three such dwellings back into use per annum.</p> <p>In total the plan shows an intention to develop 2570 houses over a fifteen year period, 35% of this could be provided by getting existing stock back into use leaving Green Field sites</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>unaffected. Since the references indicate that there is an anticipated annual need of 179 units and the plan would deliver 171 units, it is clear that the Council has no intention of addressing the Audit Commissions criticism of failing to bring long term empty stock back into use. This is a pity since as a strategy this has to be a much more sustainable and environmentally option.</p> <p>EDDC assume that any household with more than one spare bedroom is under-occupying their dwelling and nearly 50% of houses are in this category. An alternative strategy to new buildings could be to investigate incentive schemes to get existing stock more fully occupied.</p> <p>Since only a total of 65 households and an anticipated 43 households of inward migration have been identified as in need of housing in Verwood, the need for 415 units is questionable.</p> <p>Finally all of the data on housing need has been gathered prior to 2009 when the overall economic climate was very different. In view of the current economic climate it has to be worth reconsidering the demand for housing.</p> <p>A report run using the official Estate Agents and Land Registry Database shows that of the 100 properties marketed in the BH31 area in the quarter ending 9/1/11 only seven have been sold subject to contract with an additional nine under offer. Since this sample includes several new builds it calls into question the demand for such a high level of building in Verwood, and would be likely to result in even larger numbers of empty properties.</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that EDDC check officially with local Estate Agents the current state of the housing market before proceeding with this plan. In addition we have asked District Councillors to provide information on local waiting lists which are being used to justify the large percentage of affordable housing in the Core Strategy proposals. To date this has not been made available.</p> <p>4. Roads and Vehicles</p> <p>Car ownership data suggests that there is an average of 1.49 cars per household in the District. There are however large differences by tenure with owner-occupiers (with mortgage) having an average of 1.88 cars per household.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order															
							<p>In Verwood the Core Strategy as it stands will exacerbate the number of people living in the town but commuting to work, since all the employment opportunities exist outside Verwood. Of the existing 730 firms in Verwood 88% only employ between one and ten people. Assuming the proportion of economically active people remains broadly the same at 69% and that car ownership figures remain static, then the proposed 415 houses will place an additional 780 vehicles on the roads out of Verwood.</p> <p>Since the plan requires new housing to blend with the existing and surrounding housing it is inevitable that a high percentage will attract Executives who certainly will not be able to find suitable employment without commuting. The net effect will be to reduce further the sense of Community, directly in contravention of the Central Governments concept of the Big Community, and to further enhance the feeling of a Dormitory Town.</p> <p>Current car ownership in Verwood is stated to be: -</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>None</td> <td>One</td> <td>Two</td> <td>Three or more</td> <td>Total</td> </tr> <tr> <td>437</td> <td>8.4%</td> <td>2209</td> <td>42.9%</td> <td>1924</td> </tr> <tr> <td>37.3%</td> <td>582</td> <td>11.3%</td> <td>5152</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>There is an intention to close off to vehicular traffic Manor Lane St Michaels Lane at the Manor Road end. If the intended Springfield Close relief road is put in place then there will be increased vehicular traffic in Howe Lane above the potential increase due to the proposed housing development. Since the eastern end of Howe Lane is part of the bridle and cycle path network increasing vehicular traffic in this area will significantly adversely affect this valuable leisure provision.</p> <p>Currently Howe Lane and Margards Lane are almost impassable at school run time with vehicles parked on both sides of the road. It is just possible to get an ordinary car down the centre in these conditions, but an Emergency Vehicle would find it impossible. This situation would be made even worse with the introduction of probably over 1000 people in the additional 415 homes. Certainly any addition of</p>	None	One	Two	Three or more	Total	437	8.4%	2209	42.9%	1924	37.3%	582	11.3%	5152				
None	One	Two	Three or more	Total																					
437	8.4%	2209	42.9%	1924																					
37.3%	582	11.3%	5152																						

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>a Secondary School would make a bad situation intolerable. The Howe Lane development has only two choices of access, one off Howe Lane which almost certainly would have an impact on established and protected trees as well as potential adverse impact on the curtilage provisions of the Listed Building.</p> <p>As mentioned above there are also significant traffic congestion problems around school run times, making this access at best problematic. The other access option is via Summer Fields, this option requires purchasing a substantial proportion of the front gardens of two dwellings. There are already parking problems for houses in the area resulting in existing homeowners parking their vehicles on the street. In addition, established hedging on front gardens hinders sightlines making the turn in or out of the Close blind and therefore extremely hazardous. The twenty proposed properties would add an additional nearly 40 vehicles to this narrow access.</p> <p>Although not contained within the plan it is understood that there is an intention to put a relief road through Springfields linking Manor Road with the Eastern end of Howe Lane. This road would reduce further the ability of the land to allow natural run off of surface water in an area already prone to flooding. It will also add vehicular congestion to an area that is already dangerously congested for much of the day.</p> <p>Since most of the new occupants will have employment outside of Verwood they will be forced to commute out of the own via either the Ringwood Road or through Three Legged Cross. Both of these routes are already crowded in rush hour and neither permit widening of the road. The Ringwood Road in particular has recently had its speed limit reduced in order to try to reduce the number of fatal accidents.</p> <p>5. General</p> <p>The plan states that Verwood amongst other towns has been identified as an area suitable for development as it is a location where important facilities, services and employment are most accessible and readily improved. This is misleading as employment in Verwood is already inadequate for the existing population.</p> <p>With the exception of the Hub there are no entertainment</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							facilities such as Restaurants, a permanent cinema or theatre and Youth activities are generally agreed to be inadequate. Even the Hub is plainly failing to meet the entertainment desires of the population as it is loss making and yet there is significant outward migration of people in the evening. Finally the town is served by a retained fire station, in the current climate this is unlikely to change, the latest figures from show that the engine was unavailable due to manning constraints for over 10% of the time, the seventh worst station in Dorset.			
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO186	11.3	Object		Isolated why use this word, when you mean rural but can't use that because you want to build on our greenbelt.			938
483970	Mr Matthew Clark		CSO425	11.3	Object		I agree, Verwood has expanded quickly with residential housing already. A very large proportion of the existing population have to travel for employment and there are insufficient facilities for the newly expanded population without adding further to the problems. The building restrictions were put in place for very good reason, to protect the special heathland habitats etc. around the area.			938
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		CSO2550	11.3	Object		14000 odd residents with 88% car ownership and a high proportion of commuting journeys by car say that Verwood is not 'isolated.'	Remove ".....in a relatively isolated..."		938
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22877	11.3	Object		Para 11.3 Object to statement that previous plans identified Verwood as a place where large scale strategic growth should occur. The extent to which growth had been allowed prior to the Public Inquiry on the previous Local Plan was of great concern to the Inspector who took the view that Verwood is not a sustainable location (pl see comments on BM report under heading Sustainability of Verwood as a development location). It should also be put on record that Planning Officers have previously commented publicly that they have made mistakes with Verwood, that it is an unsustainable location, and that no more growth should or would be proposed. As a result of this	Amend second sentence to read The Town has expanded rapidly over recent years.		938

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							it was not considered a suitable location for inclusion in the submissions to the Regional Spatial Strategy. It remains an unsustainable location.			
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO27	11.4	Object		<p>I disagree that there are a wide range of facilities available in Verwood, particularly in view of the rate at which Verwood is growing. There is one main Supermarket, and residents are now making greater use of the new Tesco Express. The new Tesco appears popular, but traffic congestion and parking has worsened since it being built and will lead to a serious accident with people ignoring double yellow lines, and also being close to the children playground opposite.</p> <p>There is few restaurants. A curry house close to the BP garage as you exit town. A hairdresser, estate agent, electrical shop and a bakery are hardly sustainable for a growing hub.</p> <p>The Hub was set up to provide a focal point but continue to lose money and have little buy in from the local community. The population of Verwood is greater than Ringwood, yet there is no comparison of the facilities.</p> <p>The youth in Verwood have no place to attend. The Leisure Centre is in need of an overhaul, but again is not an area that can cater for a majority. Instead we see the usual problems on a Friday and Saturday night of youths hanging around in the car park, on the recreation ground and outside Tesco causing a nuisance and trouble.</p> <p>Please go into detail of the wide range of facilities available, as I must have missed out on this despite living here.</p> <p>It is a priority to cater for the current level of residents rather than look to build more with no facilities.</p>	A full review and public consultation needs to be undertaken to evaluate the facilities available and top define what new facilities should be looked at.		939
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO18 Z	11.4	Object		<p>The town does not have enough facilities for its current populations. No Swimming Pool, No medical centre, no adult learning, no college, not enough dentists, not enough doctors, no upper school, to decent bus service, 2 pubs (one knocked down for flats - not social housing though, permission again from outside the county)., not enough restaurants, appalling skatepark things for youngsters to do. No shoe shop, no clothes shops, no garden centre, just estate agents and hairdressers in abundance. See petitionbuzz/petitions/911 for</p>			939

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							comments about facilities from local residents, 200 signatures so far 03/11 - please make sure these comments are included in this point.			
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO378	11.4	Object		<p>It is clear that there are not enough facilities within Verwood to sustain the current population, never mind an increase in the population.</p> <p>In terms of some core services there is adequate provision in that there are two medical centres and a dentist. There is public transport, a library, post office, supermarket and a leisure centre. However in certain areas there are key gaps. There is nothing set up for the youth in terms of a meeting point. There is no focal point.</p> <p>If you consider Ringwood is actually smaller than Verwood there is no comparison in terms of the shops available. Public transport involves the last bus from Bournemouth to Ringwood leaving Bournemouth at about 6.15pm, and then from Verwood into Bournemouth at around the same time. How is this going to be improved? And if it is not, then where are the youngsters meant to go as they can't travel? Would it not be better to actually ask the current residents what they want and require. A flick through Verwood Facebook highlights significant things that current residents, both pro and against the housing plans would like to see in Verwood. Indeed even in this Strategy Document you refer to plans already highlighted that show a lack of provision for the youth yet this has not being addressed. Why?</p>	Ask local residents on their views for infrastructure and services. Take this to people in a position to provide infrastructure such as local bus companies and evaluate the routes and services. Invest in plans you made back in 2007.		939
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO493	11.4	Object		<p>The document states the wide range of facilities available. Where are these facilities, please list them.</p> <p>As one of the largest towns in East Dorset, it compares very poorly in relation to much smaller towns for facilities. Much smaller towns within East Dorset have the following facilities which are missing in Verwood:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hospital Allotments Proper Gymnasium with large Hall Youth Centre and suitable youth facilities Available places at a Doctors Available places at a Dentist 			939

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Regular Bus Services Train Stations Pedestrian crossings on roads approaching the Schools Secondary/Upper School			
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		CSO2551	11.4	Object		I object to the glib statement that Verwood has a 'wide range' of facilities. In the description of Wimborne town centre, for example, there is much more detail about the number and type of facilities such that the reader can gain a reasonable picture of the nature of the town. Such a brief statement about Verwood's facilities is camouflage for the fact that its facilities are sparse for a town of 14000 residents.	Be more specific about the number and nature of facilities and delete the adjective 'wide.'		939
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22880	11.4	Object		Para 11.4 Object as it stands Amend to reflect need to travel to upper school, Cranborne Middle School and most shopping.			939
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO28	11.5	Object		Recent changes to the traffic system around the centre of Verwood have caused more trouble than ever and it is only a matter of time before a serious accident occurs. the exit by Forest Green despite clearly saying only turn right is often flaunted and is not policed at all. This causes near misses on a regular basis. The car parking outside of Tesco is disgraceful. Cars are regularly parked on the double yellow lines or obstructing the exit. Few cars actually park in the adjacent car park, preferring instead to cram and stay on the pavement causing blocks in the traffic and a health risk. There is little change to the actual town centre or its vibrancy over the last few years. If this had dramatically improved then places such as the Hub would be generating a profit, which it is not. Morrisons does support the town centre in terms of a grocery shop, but has lost customers to the new Tesco. One Stop was never that busy.	Public Consultation and investigation needed to review traffic and services		940
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO189	11.5	Object		This is utterly not true, speak to the Butcher and the Post Office and the Spa. Has reduced passing trade to these shops. Also increased everyone in Verwood's carbon footprint by having to use a one-way system that is not			940

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							needed and never was. Pedestrian crossings, please try to get from one side of Verwood to the other in the rush hour. Children and the Elderly cannot cross Manor Road or Ringwood Road safely and the location of the crossings are not suitable and a lot more crossings are needed on both of these roads. Increasing Carbon footprint yet again as parents have to take kids to friends houses and take parents shopping.			
483462	Mr Neil Rackley		CSO365	11.5	Object		"As the population has grown new facilities have been provided", what exactly are these new facilities? the super market and sports facilities have not improved for years and are inadequate for the current population. There is ONE restaurant (Indian) - compare Verwood facilities with Ringwood ! "Town now has a wide range available". Oh Please what are you guys on? residents still need to travel to other nearby towns for some services (such as a meal that is not at the one Indian or a drink that is not in the Monmouth Ash AND secondary education/swimming lessons etc etc.			940
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO494	11.5	Object		The town centre is small, as Verwood commerce is distributed in a random fashion across the town, due to poor planning decisions, including this document. The town centre is far from a vibrant place, it is currently a place for the young people of the town to congregate due to lack of facilities within the town. It is very much a no go area for most people during darkness.			940
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		CSO2552	11.5	Object		The creation of the under-performing Hub and pedestrian area/shops and Heritage Centre at the top of Manor Road have certainly been beneficial in restoring some town-centre 'feel' to Verwood, albeit at the possible expense of business volumes at the older businesses in Manor Road. However, to describe it as 'more vibrant' is overdoing things a bit. 'Less dull' might be more appropriate. The last sentence is worded in a meaningless way.	Second & third sentences: 'Recent developments & pedestrian enhancements have improved the historic town centre. However the Morrisons supermarket and associated shops in Pennine Way are some way remote from this.'		940
479808	Mr Robert Anderson		CSO74	11.6	Object		The report makes no reference to the few main road into Verwood and what impact additional cars would have.	Report discusses car ownership, but does not discuss the existing contention		941

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								on the few existing roads into Verwood. More homes would mean more roads which would surely require additional or better roads in and out of Verwood.		
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO379	11.6	Support		I support aspects of this statement in that Verwood does have a poor public transport system. Maybe Verwood has a high number of car users as there is such a poor provision of alternatives. There is no mention of how this is improved, so do we suspect that an increase in housing will dramatically improve these facilities? I doubt that very much. In essence this document is increasing the carbon footprint and is setting out to increase congestion, stress the resident population and increase the Carbon footprint.	Review transport routes and timetable with local transport providers		941
483970	Mr Matthew Clark		CSO426	11.6	Object		Verwood has the second largest population of any settlement in East Dorset already and now you wish to increase that further, when we don't have a single clothes shop. I agree, that Verwood has a limited public transport infrastructure, which needs addressing for the pre-existing population prior to the considering any increase to the population.			941
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO350	11.7	Support		Green Belt land is designated as such for a reason. It MUST be retained and should not be re-designated simply to allow it to be developed.			943
483462	Mr Neil Rackley		CSO367	11.7	Support		The town has a limited public transport system, and has a very high rate of car ownership, do you think these fact might be connected? "the second largest in East Dorset. " and one taxi , no trains, one restaurant very few pubs, we have to have cars in Verwood ! You guys are suggesting that the developers will be asked to contribute to bus routes and cycle lanes! Where exactly do you think we are going to cycle to? Is your vision that your average Verwood citizen cycles into Ringwood to go out for a meal?			943

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18188	11.7	Support		.Chapter 11.7, supported, a small extension on the Northern edge of Verwood will have minimal landscape impact and take the town to a new natural boundary for the Green Belt.			943
483425	Mr Adam Boock		CSO1313	11.9	Object		There is no mention that some of the proposed sites for development are on land that is currently designated as Green Belt. There is a reason that land has been designated as Green Belt and this Core Strategy seems to be attempting to avoid the issue by ignoring it! Rest assured that the residents of Verwood will not ignore it.	Please add "Any proposals or attempts to develop on designated Green Belt land will be rejected"		945
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18189	11.9	Support		Chapter 11.9, supported, the proposed development will enable the delivery of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace to reduce the pressure of existing and proposed residential development on environmentally sensitive areas. Part of the land ownership lies within a 400m SSSI protection zone.			945
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22881	11.9		General Comment	Para 11.9 Comment It should be noted that much of the recent development in Verwood (and other parts of East Dorset) has been responsible for the loss of our heathland and natural/semi-natural grassland and the open green spaces that are needed by residents for informal recreation.			945
478222	Mrs Yvonne Kemsley		CSO38	11.10	Object		The so called "fragile woodland" has already been slowly ripped out by a greedy landowner. Who will put an end to this destruction?			946
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO496	11.10	Object		Site VWM7 is around 300m from a SSSI site.			946
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO29	11.11	Support		I agree with the phrasing of the comment, but question whether the facilities are adequate or relevant to a population the size of Verwood. The main town centre at Ferret Green is made up of an electrical shop, 2 estate agents, a bakery and a solicitor. These are hardly the hive of activity to support a busy town. As mentioned previously Verwood has a greater population	Full review and public consultation		947

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							compared to Ringwood, yet there is no comparison to the facilities provided.			
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22882	11.11		General Comment	Para 11.11 Comment Verwood has suffered because of changes in policy on where the town centre should be. In the late 1970s the decision was taken for the town (then a village) to be centred around what is now Morrison's and affordable, market entry and social housing was built nearby. The changes planned for the historic centre at the time of the last Local Plan did not materialise because of legal problems.			947
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO193	11.12	Object		This statement is not correct			948
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO380	11.12	Object		Verwood has adequate services in terms of two doctor surgeries, however this does not constitute an overall adequate provision. Verwood is supported by three local Hospitals at Salisbury, Poole and Bournemouth, but is not supplied by a transport network to allow easy access. There are public Governors for this area from each Hospital, but no contact has being made to seek their views on health provision. No work is undertaken looking at referral pathways or looking at patient PROMS. Please provide your evidence to back up this statement, as without this, then you cannot make such bland statements.	Review and consultation with health service providers		948
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO351	11.12	Object		I assume that whoever wrote this paragraph has never tried to make an appointment at the Verwood Surgery on Station Road!			948
483462	Mr Neil Rackley		CSO368	11.12	Object		As stated above Verwood is the second largest town in East Dorset. Morrisons is NOT a "large supermarket" it is far too small for the population size. Who is writing and reviewing this document? "This area had been planned as a new town centre for the growing town" - if this is the best the town planner can do I suggest you recruit some new blood, the place is old and tired and in need of complete re-development	change large to small supermarket		948

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO497	11.12	Object		Verwood is well served for medical services in relation to doctors surgeries and dental practises and has a good, relatively new, day care centre. The nearest hospitals are at Salisbury to the north and Bournemouth to the south. Verwood is VERY POORLY served in relation to doctors surgeries and dental practices. The nearest hospitals are more than 12 hours away by public transport if you need to visit late in the day.	Verwood is VERY POORLY served in relation to doctors surgeries and dental practices. It has no access to hospital facilities for public transport users.		948
533905	Mr & Mrs A Kell		CSO19243	11.12		General Comment	Future housing would need further provision for medical needs, as we frequently have to wait three weeks for a doctors appointment			948
360749	Cllr. Mrs T. B. Coombs	Verwood Dewlands Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO19406	11.12		General Comment	Day Care centre only caters for people with a learning/physical disability no elderly care, Age Concern Day Centre run from Band Hut.			948
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22883	11.12		General Comment	Para 11.12 Comment Medical and dental services in Verwood are stretched. Not all hospital treatment is available at Bournemouth or Salisbury. Residents are forced to attend Poole for a number of specialist treatments			948
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		CSO22743	11.12		General Comment	11.12 Medical services - suggest both present GP Practices to operate from one building, with two practices to continue; A. reduced premises and administration and other costs, e.g. utilities, rates; etc. B. shared 'roof' but more clinical rooms C. opportunity for expansion of present medical care on site - in line with Coalition's proposals for NHS reforms at local level. - Dental practices: very few opportunities, at present for growth in NHS patients.			948
478222	Mrs Yvonne Kemsley		CSO39	11.13	Object		There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks.			949

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO199	11.13	Support		Although new, was built on a hill of debris from the road build, the ground there was flat. Suffering cracks already, this needs to be looked into to fund any improvements.			949
497479	Mr Barry Nicholl		CSO2366	11.13	Object		I do not feel that The Hub could be called "large" by any stretch of the imagination and, although I agree it is a great benefit and advantage to the town, the lack of use by the townspeople has put it's finances under great strain. The increases in fees for use of its facilities has meant many people and organisations will not use it because of the cost and I gather from other correspondents there are construction issues causing concerns. How long will the Council subsidise in the current economic climate ?	Speed up the plans for the Hub, Potterne Park and, (with Morrisons co-operation) the Leisure centre.		949
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO30	11.14	Support		Again I agree with the comment, but question as to what the Hub is actually providing. It is very set in what it does deliver, does not provide much variety, is poorly marketed to the local population and continues to run at a loss.	Public Consultation		950
483462	Mr Neil Rackley		CSO369	11.14	Object		"This is complemented by the Memorial Hall " this is untrue The Hub is under used and not financially viable and the Memorial Hall competes with the Hub for custom. The Hub site there with rooms empty as it cannot compete with the Memorial Halls low prices.	please amend to say the truth		950
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO200	11.15	Support					951
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO352	11.15	Object		I see nothing in the rest of the core strategy that any of the additional facilities identified in this paragraph will be provided. How can the number of homes and, therefore the population, keep increasing without this facilities being provided?			951
483970	Mr Matthew Clark		CSO427	11.15	Support		I agree with the statement that for a town the size of Verwood there are insufficient sports and leisure facilities, particularly for the children and teenagers. I also agree that people within the town would appreciate the opportunity of having allotments			951

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
521457	Mr and Mrs M Daymond		CSO17 859	11.15		General Comment	<p>NEW SPORT & FITNESS FACILITIES The facilities at Potterne Park have suffered because there is no on-site Management. Who wants to drive to pick up a key for tennis, drive to play tennis and drive back to return the key? Who wants to belong to a Tennis Club that has no pavilion or shelter? If these facilities are now going to be managed from the Hub, this scenario will be even worse. A sports hall attached to the Middle School means that it is only available to the public out of school hours. Currently the Leisure Centre is utilised by the public during the day. A new Fitness Suite at the Hub will exacerbate an already inadequate parking situation. Fitness equipment users want to pop in for a workout and then go. If parking is a problem because of big events at the Hub, then people will not be able to "pop in".</p> <p>SOLUTION If these facilities were established at Potterne Park and the Upper School built nearby, they could provide a facility for everyone rather than be duplicated when an Upper School is built.</p> <p>ALLOTMENTS Dense housing developments can only mean smaller gardens and result in a greater demand for allotments in the future. Part of the proposed Upper School site would be ideal for allotments for which there is currently a large demand and no land available. The Middle School could follow their example and be encouraged to have their own allotment alongside and maybe work together with the allotment holders.</p>			951
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 190	11.15	Support		Chapter 11.15, supported, there may be an area suitable for the provision of allotments as part of the overall scheme. In addition there will be land available for public open space and the provision of a cycle route around the proposed development site.			951
533905	Mr & Mrs A Kell		CSO19 244	11.15		General Comment	A swimming pool on the outskirts would be a useful addition to sports facilities, as many people have to travel to Ringwood, Ferndown or Wimborne. Why don't you consider asking Morrison Supermarket to build a swimming pool, if they get the permission to expand and will be the sole major			951

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							supplier of food to the town.			
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO31	11.16	Support		I totally agree, but am at a loss that if this is already identified, work is pushing ahead to provide further housing, when facilities you have already identified are lacking are put on a back burner.	Continue to work on existing facilities		952
483462	Mr Neil Rackley		CSO370	11.16	Object		"The study concluded that there were insufficient facilities for children and young people" so why are we not insisting on the developers paying for better facilities for children and young people before we allow more houses to be build which will obviously mean more children and young people?			952
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO17	11.17	Support		I support the building of a secondary school, and this should be made clear that one WILL be built should these developments go ahead. Also if a first school has to expand or be built, the land near Trinity or Howe Lane should be used for first school expansion not more houses. I suggest the first school at Hillside is to near heather and is protected. Where is the strategy for this - expansion of first school / build a new one - where?	Where it says a first school will have to be extended or one built, it should say the small sites at Trinity and Howe Lane should be avoided due to expansion of the first schools, inline with the increase in population.		953
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO201	11.17	Object		If options for new neighbourhoods are supported at Verwood it may be that a secondary school would have to be provided in the town. This is your comment, but previously you said if the building goes ahead in the other towns a school will be built. I think this is misleading. It should be made clear in the document what facilities proposed have funding or do not. There are no funds for an Upper School and no mention made where the money will come from for one.			953
483970	Mr Matthew Clark		CSO428	11.17	Object		I believe that a secondary school is required for the existing population, without considering the proposal to increase the housing further. However, I do not believe the proposed site on Howe Lane is ideal without serious thought about the access to the site. Church Road and Margards Lane are already extremely busy during the school run periods with the existing first and middle schools on that site. The addition of a senior school would seriously exacerbate the problem.	consider alternative sites for the school		953

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO498	11.17	Object		"If options for new neighbourhoods are supported at Verwood it may be that a secondary school would have to be provided in the town" This is blatantly incorrect - the council has confirmed that there shall be no development of an Upper School. Cllr Flowers has commented that there are no funds and that this statement in the consultation is untrue.	There is no funding and an upper school is not planned within the next 15 years for Verwood.		953
487796	Mr Liam Cunningham		CSO648	11.17	Object		I agree with the idea of building a secondary school in Verwood as I understand that there is a massive overflow of population trying to access the other schools in the area, and as Verwood is a large town, it seems quite sensible. However, I would say that the funds the council gets should be used to improve the schools we have, rather than build new ones.	instead of building a new first school, concentrate on expanding and improving the schools we already have.		953
497479	Mr Barry Nicholl		CSO2369	11.17	Object		There are no funds apparently available for a senior school and, in any event, it certainly should not be built near Emmanuel and Verwood First. If and when those schools are improved, provision should be made for a decent sized car park as, at present, when the children are leaving, there is nowhere near enough spaces and eventually there will be a serious accident.	No longer consider any new schools in Verwood and concentrate on improving those we have. If there are insufficient spaces for a growing population, we must prevent any further development in the area.		953
533905	Mr & Mrs A Kell		CSO19245	11.17		General Comment	A secondary school in the town is definitely overdue. However the current proposed siting, presents a huge traffic problem with only one limited access by made up roads.			953
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22884	11.17		General Comment	Para 11.17 Comment A possible need to extend one of the first Schools or build a fourth one is identified here but no provision is made for this in the land use proposals or in the identification of the infrastructure that would be required.			953
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO32	11.18	Support		The question then arises where you would situate the new secondary school or a new primary school. It also knocks on into problems associated with school transport and the fact that Verwood has an isolated position.			954
478222	Mrs		CSO40	11.18	Object		The schools are not equipped to cope with a further 800plus			954

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Yvonne Kemsley						new students - where will be the green pastures to stimulate their young minds			
533905	Mr & Mrs A Kell		CSO19246	11.18		General Comment	Transport must include provision for sufficient parking in the town centre. At present it is difficult to park for a doctor's appointment in the Jenner Close car park, as other people use it who are not there for facilities on site. This close has become very crowded. The cars are already being parked in Berkeley Close, the residential street opposite, as an overflow for the blocks of flats built around the police station.			954
479808	Mr Robert Anderson		CSO75	11.19	Object		Good roads? You need to discuss the impact of additional cars on the existing roads	The report ignores the impact of additional cars on the existing roads and makes no recommendations.		955
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO203	11.19	Object		We do not have good road links, there are 2 main roads out of Verwood and if there is an accident on one of them the emergency services have trouble getting in. Horses and bicyclists use these roads and hold their life in their hands.			955
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO381	11.19	Object		Verwood does not have a good road link at all. There are two roads leading in and out of Verwood, and if problems occur on either of these roads then congestion soon follows. This was demonstrated by the recent water works that lead to delays and congestion back into Verwood, bad weather with ice in previous winters that has led to the road being closed. The roads are often involved with serious road accidents and hence why Verwood has 2 safety cameras in situ and regular mobile speed units by Dorset Police. The main road to Ringwood has had a number of fatal accidents. There is also congestion at points through the year with access to Moors Valley, Car Boot sales etc. At which point is this classed as very good road links? Has the planners even visited the roads or sought views? The only valid point is recognition of a poor bus service, but again no plans to improve this, simply to put extra pressure on it.	Review transport links with all local stakeholders		955
483425	Mr		CSO35	11.19	Object		The B3081 is NOT a good road link. How many serious &			955

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Adam Boocock		3				fatal accidents have there been in the last decade?			
483970	Mr Matthew Clark		CSO429	11.19	Object		I agree that the current public transport provision is limited. Far too limited for the pre-existing populous before we consider extending the population further. I disagree that the town has good road links. The recent work on the water supply highlighted the restricted options available to residents and the limited alternatives to the Ringwood Road. Additional housing will only exacerbate the existing dependencies.	amend to state there are limited road links to the A31 and A338.		955
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO499	11.19	Object		The town has very poor, insufficient transport routes. The single carriageway to the A31 is usually congested, does not support safe cycling access and is often highlighted as one of the most dangerous pieces of road in Hampshire. The Alderholt junction is a death trap. Wilts and Dorset busses are currently removing bus routes to Verwood. The 10% of residents not using a car to escape from Verwood, soon will have no option.	The town has very poor, insufficient transport routes.		955
484502	Mr John Turner		CSO609	11.19	Object		Does not reflect the true nature of the link to A31(T) Suggested amendment does not address link to A338	Change " However, it does have a good road link to the A31(T) and A338. The 2001 Census showed that about 90% of commuters either drove or were passengers in a car." to "It does have road links to the A338 and A31(T). However as reported in the 2001 Census, about 90% of commuters either drove or were passengers in a car and the single carriageway link to the A31(T) - which provides the direct route to Bournemouth hospital - is routinely busy, often highly congested and too narrow to be used safely by cyclists."		955
488955	Mr.		CSO68	11.19	Support		Verwood South.			955

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Colin Adcock		0				<p>1.Affordable housing is badly needed in Verwood but with the housing of young families comes the necessity for better roads especially from home to school.</p> <p>2.Thus,it is imperative that Howe lane is made up completely with the cost met by the developers and the council. If this is not done, there is a grave risk of fatal accidents occurring to school children who will increase appreciably when travelling to and from St Michael's Rd. and Manor Rd.</p> <p>3.Howe Lane un-adopted portion between Summerfields and St. Michael's Rd. is indeed a death trap due to potholes the size of which would not be out of place on the Somme battlefield. It is therefore essential that the extremely poor state of the lane is improved to the council's adopted standard to avoid serious dangers to the resulting increased traffic both on foot and in vehicles.</p>			
497479	Mr Barry Nicholl		CSO2370	11.19	Object		<p>I agree there is certainly limited public transport with only an hourly bus service and, although there is only a small percentage of the population that need to use the buses, namely the elderly, the young and the less well off, they should not be ignored or forgotten.</p> <p>After 7pm, these people cannot even get back from Ringwood, let alone Bournemouth, but with empty buses during the day and high fares, no improvement is likely.</p>	If the young people cannot escape from Verwood during the evening, perhaps we should make some provision to give them something to do that they can afford, rather than hanging around the shops and park.		955
533905	Mr & Mrs A Kell		CSO19247	11.19		General Comment	<p>There is only one main feeder road into Verwood, which has to be shared with a regular amount of Veolia traffic (New much bigger contract was negotiated recently for lorries to empty their loads every 5 minutes) and is very heavily used already. The residential Manor Road is becoming busier and busier for traffic travelling south. Comparatively less traffic uses the Edmondsham Road to Cranborne or the B3081 Station Road out westwards past the Golf Course.</p>			955
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22885	11.19		General Comment	<p>Para 11.19 Comment This completely overlooks the problems that Verwood has with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to other areas on unsuitable roads, • the traffic safety issues within the town, • inadequate parking provision, and 			955

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the long commuting distances of many Verwood residents. 			
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO33	11.20	Object		<p>I agree with the main body of this comment. Verwood does have an incredibly limited bus service. It is also run in such a way that at times of rush hour, for example at 8am with people travelling to work, the buses provided are single decker with limited space. Yet at other times Double Deckers are put on, that at best I have seen a maximum of 10 people on during the course of the day.</p> <p>Verwood has two roads to go in and out. If there is a problem on any of those roads then chaos ensues.</p> <p>Recent examples include the bad weather and frost of last year, the recent roadworks leading out of Verwood that can cause a build up of traffic and add up to an hour onto the journey time.</p> <p>Maybe the use of the car is high because the local transport links are so very very poor.</p>	Full review on the use of public transport and numbers		956
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO408	11.21	Object		<p>Please define what is meant by "a large scale source of employment" when referring to the Ebblake Industrial Estate and what the total number of jobs are available here and within the rest of the town as a percentage of the overall working population.</p> <p>Where are any additional jobs to support the increase in population going to come from?</p> <p>The reality will be that most people will continue to need to commute (invariably by car) outside the town for work. Not very environmentally friendly.</p>			957
360112	Mr Kenneth BROOKS	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19191	11.22	Object		<p>The introduction to all 4 Sections on urban extensions quotes one sentence from National Planning Policy Statements PPS1 and PPS3. Both policy statements are comprehensive documents with the emphasis on quality rather than quantity, and the deliberate selection of just one sentence to suit the objective of delivering sufficient 'affordable homes' is totally unacceptable.</p>			959
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO206	11.23	Object		<p>Verwood has done it's bit and the developers have been allowed to build here for too long without including social housing. Therefore it is not the fault of the Verwood resident that there are not any social housing. With the population of</p>			960

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Verwood the facilities must catch up first before any new houses are built. There is no need to build houses on the greenbelt, there is private brownbelt land with planning permission to build flats near the Hub for example that should be compulsory purchased and offered as a alternative. 100% social housing should be built not more urban sprawl.			
483970	Mr Matthew Clark		CSO430	11.23	Object		I disagree that the need to provide affordable housing means that the green belt boundary has to be amended. That is taking the easy route without thinking harder about the issue. The greenbelt was put in place for a very good reason and should be respected.	Amend the statement to highlight that the objective should be to address the need for additional housing within the pre-existing greenbelt limitations and looking at other alternatives.		960
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO1042	11.23	Object		The Key Issue is stated as "Can sites for new neighbourhoods on the edge of the town be provided in a sustainable form so as to add to the vitality and viability of the town and if so, where and how?". Why do these new neighbourhoods have to be on the edge of the town? What has been done to look at brown field sites that could be redeveloped? "Can sites for new neighbourhoods on the edge of the town be provided in a sustainable form" really means can new neighbourhood be built in the countryside and on Green Belt land in a sustainable form. The answer is "No" - as soon as you accept that it is okay to build on Green Belt land then it becomes unsustainable!			960
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO500	11.23	Object		Why is the focus of this document on building on green field and green belt land? There is no discussion on brown field development opportunities. This is contrary to current government guidance. Currently around 5% of Verwood's housing stock is listed for sale. Obviously there is insufficient demand for these houses. How is adding to the stock of unsold developments a positive action?			960
522815	Mr Edward	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18191	11.23	Support		Chapter 11.23, supported, the proposed development will make provision for the required 40% affordable housing. It is			960

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Dyke						proposed to provide the affordable housing by way of a 'Community Land Trust' in collaboration with the Verwood Town Council and other community groups. It is believed that the development as proposed will create new neighbourhood on the edge of the town which will be provided in a sustainable form so as to add to the vitality and viability of the town.			
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18181	11.23	Support		3. Our clients support chapter 11 relating to the housing development proposed at Verwood. The development brief shows how up to 350 dwellings may be provided on the Northern edge of Verwood.			960
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22886	11.23		General Comment	Para 11.23 Comment There is an undoubted need for affordable homes in SE Dorset particularly intermediate housing. However, it is questionable if the available data on housing need are sufficiently robust given that those in need of social housing can put their names on any number of housing lists across the country. Further, analysis of the Fordham Housing Needs Survey (see ETAG response) indicates that in terms of meeting a local affordable housing need, the proposed growth would in fact exacerbate the current problem. This is unsustainable and unacceptable.			960
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		CSO22857	11.23	Support	General Comment	11.23 The Housing Debate: A. whilst it is agreed that in East Dorset, there is a considerable need for affordable housing i.e. social housing and part rent/part own, there is no mention in the Strategy for the equal need for 'affordable' homes for those who do not qualify for Housing Association support i.e. starter homes. B. Suggest that there should be a mandatory requirement on each housing development for there to be a minimum of supply, e.g. 15/20%, of 'starter' homes for those households whose combined earnings are below the minimum requirement to sustain a commercial mortgage. This could be a very effective tool to enable local people to stay local. C. Starter homes: could be terraced - smaller foot print, lower building cost than semi-detached and detached homes. D. Each housing development to have a mandatory			960

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							requirement of provision for allotments for not less than 20% of the homes on site, in addition to enclosed designed, safe play areas for young children as well as communal seating areas.			
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO34	11.24	Object		<p>The answer is short. No. Verwood cannot cater for the existing number of people. It has poor facilities, poor infrastructure, poor transport links. It cannot cope with a further increase in population. Recent developments look like they are built on a grass verge, and actually seek to devalue the town and the culture and community spirit Verwood does have. If town planners actually visited some of the external sources of information like the Verwood Facebook Page you would understand the way people feel about the wooden clad monstrosity, the Ghetto etc. These are quotes taken directly from people. To add to the vitality and viability of the town would need an investment in infrastructure, some of which you have already identified. An improvement in the road structure, and effort placed into the Hub to make it a profit making business catering for the community. Adding more housing, whilst reducing the green belt land will have a catastrophic effect on Verwood.</p>	Invest in amenities and infrastructure not new housing		961
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO207	11.24	Object		Where is the link for this, is this a fair consultation			961
483462	Mr Neil Rackley		CSO372	11.24	Object		<p>You have not taken a holistic view "This is because house prices are high compared to wages" so the problem is a ratio problem of which there are two parts 1, house prices could be lowered and/or 2 wages could be raised. Raising wages compliments your vision statement, lowering house prices will create the opposite effect. What we need is well paid jobs for Verwood residents, thus they could afford the housing and boost the local economy. Building cheap houses for low income people will not help the local economy as low income people by the very nature will</p>			961

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>not have much disposable income.</p> <p>If we look at VWM2 if we rebuilt a train line into Southampton, London etc. these 200 homes would be ideal for people to commute into well paid jobs. This would be a plus for Verwood and I would support it. If we build lots of homes and have no new local jobs it will mean either lots more cars commuting (flies in the face of your vision statements below) and/or lots of unemployed people in Verwood with all the social problem that it brings.</p> <p>Be bold and follow your vision as these are good aims :-)</p> <p>3.4 vision and strategic objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Provide a positive framework for economic growth; * Promote urban and rural regeneration; * Promote communities which are inclusive and safe; * Bring forward sufficient land for housing, industrial and commercial development, and for leisure; * Provide improved access to jobs and services; * Focus major development in existing centres; * Reduce the need to travel, and encourage more sustainable patterns of transport development; * Promote the efficient use of land through higher density development, mixed use development, and better use of previously developed land; * Enhance and protect biodiversity; * Address the causes of climate change. 			
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO10 43	11.24	Object		Please advise where these documents are published. Given this part of the consultation is web based it's not rocket science to have links to them!!			961
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO50 1	11.24	Object		Where are these documents published? This consultation is not being presented in a fair fashion - there is no/very little advertising by the council of this document and related documents remain unpublished.			961
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO10 44	11.25	Object		Please advise where these documents are published. Given this part of the consultation is web based it's not rocket science to have links to them!!			962
484187	Mr R		CSO50 2	11.25	Object		Where are these documents published?			962

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Tindall									
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18198	11.25	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.25, preferred option ME1 noted, ME2 – SANGs can be provided and delivered as part of the proposed development. ME3 noted as are the remaining ME's			962
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO208	11.28	Object		The government are currently assessing people in social housing and some should not be there, until these figures are highlighted and more homes become free, the demand for social housing may change. Therefore please incorporate these figures into the document.			965
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO382	11.28	Support		I am 100% in favour of this priority. However it is also the government policy to make accountability more local, and to provide a sustainable environment for new houses. There is no right to press ahead with housing and ignore the infrastructure, that this Council has a track record of doing.			965
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO1045	11.28	Object		What about the rights of existing residents..... and the natural flora and fauna in these proposed development sites?			965
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO503	11.28	Object		Define "decent". Define "affordable" This document proposes destroying a community where people would like to live.			965
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18199	11.28	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.28, 11.29 and 11.30 the proposed development on the Northern edge of Verwood will deliver on all these and take into account the issues raised.			965
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO210	11.29	Object		We don't need a mix of housing, this just creates more sprawl. Just social housing please for Verwood, we could possibly cope with 80 houses not 400 or now it's 20% of new builds your asking for 40 now - ?? We have enough market value houses.			966
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO1046	11.29	Object		"High quality housing that is well-designed and built to a high standard" How do the council police this? They seem to have been unable to stop the recent building of horrendous blocks			966

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>of flats in Verwood.</p> <p>"A mix of housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of tenure and price, to support a wide variety of households in all areas, both urban and rural." The houses sold at market value have to include a premium to allow the affordable houses to be built. If 40% of new homes have to be affordable then that pushes the premium up even higher, either making the market value homes unaffordable or increasing the overall market value, making it even more difficult for people to afford homes in the future.</p> <p>"Housing developments in suitable locations, which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure." Green belt land is not a suitable location!</p>			
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO504	11.29	Object		<p>* High quality housing that is well-designed and built to a high standard.</p> <p>The planners cannot define how decent or well designed a development should be - refer to the current developments of flats in Verwood for evidence of this.</p> <p>* A mix of housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of tenure and price, to support a wide variety of households in all areas, both urban and rural.</p> <p>What urban areas are being developed? There are none in this plan.</p> <p>* Housing developments in suitable locations, which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure.</p> <p>How are the areas suitable? - These are unsuitable locations - Green Belt land.</p> <p>Where are the range of community facilities? - No public transport.</p> <p>Where are the jobs being provided? - The council is not going to provide any jobs in this proposal/</p> <p>Where are the key services? - I can't see them, the hospital is 12 hours away by public transport if you need to get there in the evening.</p> <p>Where is the infrastructure? - Roads are poor quality, overloaded and dangerous.</p>			966

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 200	11.29	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.28, 11.29 and 11.30 the proposed development on the Northern edge of Verwood will deliver on all these and take into account the issues raised.			966
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		CSO22 849	11.29		General Comment	3rd bullet point: infrastructure i.e. water, sewerage, drainage, telephone, mobile phone coverage, etc., should be in place to a minimum standard before building commences on any one site or in any one designated Strategy area.			966
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO35	11.30	Object		I quote your report:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing developments in suitable locations, which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. How can you push ahead with plans for new houses when you have already identified needs relating to community facilities, services and infrastructure that you are aware of, and have being aware of for at least 2 years and yet have done absolutely nothing about.	Invest in infrastructure and services		967
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO21 1	11.30	Object		SEARCH MORE CAREFULLY THE BROWNBELT FOR 80 OR 40 AFFORDABLE HOUSES.			967
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO10 47	11.30	Object		Green belt land is not suitable land. It may be cheaper and easier for developers to build on but that doesn't make it suitable.			967
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO50 5	11.30	Object		Bring forward sufficient land of a suitable quality in appropriate locations to meet the expected needs for housing, taking into account issues such as accessibility and sustainable transport needs, the provision of essential infrastructure, including for sustainable waste management, and the need to avoid flood risk and other natural hazards. (PPS1) "Appropriate locations" - This has been very poorly researched. The consultation has not investigated one single brown field site for development in the consultation. The easy route is to look at a map and pick out fields as has been done here. "Sustainable Transport Needs" - "Flood Risk" - VWM4 is a site which has serious flooding			967

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							issues. A flood plain. How is this development sustainable if it is under water every winter? "Natural Hazards" - VWM4 is a site where the land contains a large volume of sand. Why do developers not build on sandy floodplains?			
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18201	11.30	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.28, 11.29 and 11.30 the proposed development on the Northern edge of Verwood will deliver on all these and take into account the issues raised.			967
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO36	11.31	Support		I support the comment but refer you back to previous comments made. Currently none of that has happened, so forgive me for being sceptical that it will actually take place.			968
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO409	11.33	Object		This statement is completely at odds with the proposal to build on Green Belt land.			970
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO506	11.33	Object		Demands for housing are currently in decline. Approximately 5% of the housing in Verwood is for sale. Much of this stockpile has been for sale for a period greater than 12 months. If people do not want to purchase housing in Verwood, how is adding another 400 properties to this sustainable.			970
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18202	11.33	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.33, supported, open space and SANGs will be delivered			970
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO410	11.34	Object		What is the evidence that that Verwood has problems with local recruitment and retention?			971
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO508	11.34	Object		Dorset's economy is affected in small part by housing and in a large part by private commerce. The shortage of local housing is an illusion peddled by the council. 5% of Verwood' s' housing is for sale, more is available for rent. There are no new jobs available in Verwood from this consultation, therefore there is no need to provide housing for			971

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							people who do not need it. People commute, providing housing in Verwood does not add to local commerce.			
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18203	11.34	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.34, 11.37, 11.39 supported, affordable homes will be delivered by the proposed 'Community Land Trust'			971
483462	Mr Neil Rackley		CSO374	11.35	Object		"Dorset's economy is affected by the housing market." again blanket statements without looking at the whole picture! Dorset's economy is affected by the jobs market. It is no coincidence that the areas with high employment and high wages have high house prices. If we create well paid jobs in Dorset that will affect the economy NOT the house prices. You can go upto the north and buy a house for £20K. is the economy booming in these areas because the houses are cheap? no because they have no jobs there. "The shortage of affordable homes can lead to recruitment and retention problems" - Low wages can also lead o recruitment and retention problems. Bring well paid IT jobs into Dorset and see how these problems get resolved - look at Hampshire			972
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO507	11.35	Object		An ageing population will require access to a hospital, a doctors, a dentist. Facilities that are not easily accessible within Verwood.			972
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO213	11.37	Support		Facilities must be in place before social housing is built. The youths of Verwood have nothing to do, their skatepark is miserable, youth club restricted opening, more youths coming in to social housing that have been thrown out of other estates or just generally bored is a recipe for disaster. Get the facilities in to support these youths.			974
483970	Mr Matthew Clark		CSO431	11.37	Support		I agree that any new housing should take into consideration the need for the infrastructure and facilities to support it. However, the infrastructure and facilities in Verwood are already inadequate for the pre-existing population and therefore Verwood is not the place to be building even more additional housing which will increase these problems even			974

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							further. Verwood has the second largest population of any settlement in East Dorset and yet does not have a single clothes shop. If you need a new pair of socks you have to get in your car (due to the limited public transport) and go to Ringwood. Until the facilities and infrastructure catch up with the rapid growth that has already occurred the town cannot consider even more housing.			
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO509	11.37	Object		This document does not support or fund any new facilities.			974
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18205	11.37	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.34, 11.37, 11.39 supported, affordable homes will be delivered by the proposed 'Community Land Trust'			974
523366	Mr Raymond Silverthorne		CSO18360	11.37	Support		Where community facilities are suggested in proposed developments, we would like to see positive references to include places of worship. This should also be added in sections 10.37 and 11.37 as part of a sustainable community strategy statement.			974
483970	Mr Matthew Clark		CSO432	11.39	Support		I agree with this statement, but the services the families require are not provided in Verwood and therefore the building of new homes here should not currently be considered.			976
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO510	11.39	Object		Services that are not provided in Verwood.			976
484502	Mr John Turner		CSO610	11.39	Object		Without a secondary school, Verwood is not attractive to families; expansion in housing must be matched in other areas. (My proposed amendment might also fit well in Section 2 principles)	Change to "Support initiatives which seek to ensure families are appropriately housed near to the services they require. To ensure development does not increase the burden imposed by school run and commuting car journeys, this means providing the full spectrum of primary and secondary		976

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								education facilities' and employment close to housing development areas, as well as ensuring medical and general infrastructure (water, sewerage, power) provision keeps pace with local population increases."		
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18207	11.39	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.34, 11.37, 11.39 supported, affordable homes will be delivered by the proposed 'Community Land Trust'			976
483970	Mr Matthew Clark		CSO433	11.41	Support		and as that view has now apparently changed, the need for peoples views to be sought and taken into accounts needs to be accepted and acted upon in a clear way.			978
484502	Mr John Turner		CSO611	11.41	Object		Need to explain whether there are plans for subsequent consultation.	Add: "Therefore, prior to deciding to develop in the Verwood area, a separate consultation programme will be undertaken to ensure views are understood."		978
499873	Mr Graham Holt		CSO4001	11.41	Object		The South West Regional Spatial Strategy recommended no further large scale development for Verwood and as a result these was no consultation at the Issues and Options stage. The ruling should be kept to.			978
360112	Mr Kenneth BROOKS	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19143	11.41		General Comment	As pointed out in para 11.41 "there were no proposals in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy for development at Verwood over and above the new homes envisaged within the SHLAA carried out in 2008 and 2009." I have no doubt that most residents were unaware of the existence of the SHLAA, let alone the predicted new development for Verwood. Clearly, recent Core Strategy Consultation exhibitions and meetings have alerted Verwood residents to strongly oppose any substantial new development around Verwood. The possibility of providing a secondary school in Verwood based on the needs of a larger residential population is unlikely to persuade current residents to support substantial			978

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							development around Verwood.			
478222	Mrs Yvonne Kemsley		CSO41	11.42	Object		Will the Council listen now to the objections they are facing over these proposed developments?	There is sufficient brown field land on which to build without encroaching on greenbelt.		979
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO214	11.43	Object		I think maybe more than 180 homes have been built since 2008/9... So why more?			980
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO383	11.43	Support		So in terms of recent developments in Verwood and a proposed introduction of 180 over a 15 year period. Why has this now changed? Would it not be better to rework the assessment and work with current and feasible figures?	Consider a new assessment document with realistic figures used.		980
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO511	11.43	Object		How many new homes and flats have been built since 2008? This will more than cover our allocation of 180.	Verwood has not met its objective as defined and requires no new housing developments within the next 15 year period. No gardens or grazing land will be grabbed as part of this consultation, as defined by the coalition government.		980
360112	Mr Kenneth BROOKS	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Plan Group	CSO19192	11.43	Object		<p>Para 11.43 accepts that a new and, hopefully, realistic SHLAA is required. Clearly, this new Assessment needs to be directly linked to the primary Key Issue statement assuring us: "it is of prime importance to protect and enhance the character of this area."</p> <p>Since this Core Strategy Consultation period started, two volumes of the East Dorset Housing Options Master Plan Report, November 2010 have been placed on Ferndown Library, providing more detailed information on the search areas covered in Sections 8 to 11 in the Core Strategy document. These Masterplan documents appear to have been produced by Broadway Urbanism Design on behalf of East Dorset District Council. On the one hand presumptions on the number of homes each site can provide appears to have been calculated simply on the basis of the area divided by the former density target of 30dph. On the other hand the</p>			980

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							amount of detail suggests Landowners/Developers have already discussed their outline planning proposals with the Council. Otherwise, how could the dph figures be highlighted on each site option together with the percentage of each site which will be covered by buildings? Clearly, some explanation and consultation is required.			
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO19050	11.45		General Comment	In terms of the relative isolation of the town from the rest of the SE Dorset conurbation and other market towns, further development in Verwood at first glance appears unsustainable. Additional car based trips are likely to be generated to access to jobs and services in the urban areas some distance from the town. However current figures show that Verwood is already relatively self contained with approximately one third of residents living and working within Verwood. Development of the right scale and nature in conjunction with sustainable transport improvements could therefore help increase self containment by supporting existing facilities. A new upper school at the current school campus in Verwood would have the benefit of reducing the need for pupils to travel from Verwood to upper schools elsewhere in the district. The whole town is within recommended walking or cycling distance from the schools so use of these modes rather than the car should be high. However this is also likely to bring about a greater need for delivery of the Springfield Distributor Road to improve access to the school sites via all modes of travel.			982
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO512	11.46	Object		* The environmental impact. No assessment of brown field sites were investigated before proposing to bulldoze the green belt. * The impact on the purposes of the Green Belt. The impact? It is being bulldozed to allow land owners and developers to purchase nice homes in sunny locations with their profits. * Infrastructure capacity, including access Access has not been considered as part of this consultation - fields were pulled of an OS map by the planners, without visiting sites.			983

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>* The opportunity to support and improve services and facilities. There are no new facilities being funded through this document.</p> <p>* The effect on local communities. The local community has not been considered. The local community want green belt land to be just that - green belt land.</p>			
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO37	11.47	Object		<p>I question the work undertaken by the Consultants and their lack of care. Looking at the proposed plans, I wonder if you realise that it includes land that is privately owned? I see no part of the plans that talks about an enforced sale of land. Or is this just an oversight?</p>			984
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO215	11.47	Object		<p>Other private land should be looked at even though the landowner may not be keen, especially to prevent building on the greenbelt.</p>			984
484502	Mr John Turner		CSO612	11.47	Object		<p>Owners of Green Belt land should not be encouraged by local (or national) government to sell for development until ALL brown-field sites have been used up.</p>	<p>"This has involved an assessment of areas promoted by landowners for development as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The fact that the land has been promoted means that if options are taken forward they are likely to be deliverable. However Green Belt land will not be used until ALL brown-field sites have been used and at all times development must be balanced with the need to create sustainable communities. Not all of the locations being promoted will meet sustainability objectives."</p>		984
484187	Mr		CSO51	11.49	Object		<p>No investigation of brown field sites or fields within the current</p>			986

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	R Tindall		3				town have taken place as part of this strategy.			
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO216	11.50	Object		Where is the link for this, is this a fair consultation?			987
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO514	11.50	Object		Another document that is not currently available publicly as part of this consultation.			987
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO217	11.53	Object		The search area should not have been looking for a green field in the greenbelt but smaller pockets of land in the brown.			990
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18214	11.53	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			990
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18215	11.54	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			991
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18216	11.55	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			992

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 217	11.56	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			993
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 218	11.57	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			995
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 219	11.58	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			996
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 220	11.59	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			997
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO22 0	11.60	Object		From what you have said here, the line has been changed due to Trinity and there is no natural boundary, apart from a large row of houses!! Which therefore means that if you start building here you can keep going until you hit a narrow parcel of greenbelt before Cranborne, are you trying to create a			998

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Borough of Verwood??			
483970	Mr Matthew Clark		CSO434	11.60	Object		What this paragraph appears to say is that Trinity School should not have actually been built on this site, but as it was and we got away with it we are now going to take the chance again and push it even further. Apparently the fact that the site's designation of "great landscape value" is only a local designation, this can be ignored, especially as it is within walking distance of local facilities.	This paragraph should be amended to state that even though Trinity School was built in an area of great landscape value, as locally designated, it does not mean that additional housing can be built in the existing greenbelt, which was put there for good reason to protect the open countryside into which this area opens, despite the fact that this area is within walking distance of the local facilities. The fact that the town centre is within walking distance of areas designated as of "great landscape value" and which open on to open countryside is part of what gives Verwood it's identity and should be protected and maintained.		998
499873	Mr Graham Holt		CSO3992	11.60	Object		11.60 states that this is an "Area of Great Landscape Value" already compromised by the development of Trinity School. The school was designed as a low development on low ground. The proposed field is at roof level to the school and development will destroy the "Valued" landscape. This is not "infill" or "contained development". Try viewing this area and VWM2 from Stephen's Castle.			998
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18221	11.60	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and			998

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 222	11.61	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			999
497467	MR OLIVER RODWAY		CSO23 53	11.62	Object		This area already has a naturally formed boundary in the shape of a line of oak tress that run adjacent to the current development and the small children's play area. The proposed development would engulf this natural boundary and extend the edge of the town to the railway line. The railway line isn't in itself a 'natural' boundary as it is purely a man made construction following the shortest and flattest routes between two places. It isn't even logical boundary, in that it does not continue to exist elsewhere since the Albion way Development to the SW overreaches it.	Our children wouldn't thank us for building more houses on a this parcel of beautiful Dorset Countryside.		1000
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 223	11.62	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			1000
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 224	11.63	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			1001
522815	Mr	Chesterton	CSO18	11.64	Support	General	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised			1002

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Edward Dyke	Humberts	225			Comment	development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 226	11.65	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			1003
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 227	11.66	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			1004
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 228	11.67	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			1006
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 229	11.68	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and			1007

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 230	11.69	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			1008
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 231	11.70	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			1009
497467	MR OLIVER RODWAY		CSO23 54	11.71	Object		There is an overarching need for a review of infrastructure, (Shops, transport, education, healthcare, young people activities, restaurants) before the problems are added to by increasing the number of residents in the town. More houses will just compound the issues that already exist. I would suggest that a strategy on the above items should come before one on additional housing.			1010
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 232	11.71	Support	General Comment	Chapter 11.51 to 11.71 supported and extended. The revised development brief plan shows the optimum area for development on the Northern fringe of Verwood. It is deemed essential to extend the proposed development boundary to the north of the Edmondsham Road in order to be able to provide all the required environmental, public open space and circular cycle rout for the benefit of the new development and the existing inhabitants of Verwood.			1010
483462	Mr Neil Rackley		CSO37 6	11.72		General Comment	As highlighted in previous comments I can both object and support this development depending on factors, such as if you also provide transport (eg train) links and local jobs. If			1012

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>you simply build 200 houses and do nothing to improve the infrastructure it will make Verwood worse.</p> <p>I more strongly object to the appalling language in your leaflet suggesting that this "could provide valuable green infrastructure that would benefit residents"</p> <p>Please use plain English to explain how our current view over beautiful Dorset countryside with horses grazing by the park, being replace by 200 houses and roads is going to provide "valuable green infrastructure" and benefit us?</p> <p>In fact can you translate "valuable green infrastructure" into plain language us simple country folk understand please?</p> <p>If you do not create the jobs and we have affordable homes with low income/unemployed people in. I assume the council tax will rise to cover the extra costs? Increased Policing as well maybe? etc. etc.</p> <p>Can you please publish what figures you are using to plan this expansion. For example how many new school places will be required? more cars on the road? jobs needed in the area? Facilities such as doctors/ NHS dentists etc</p> <p>You must have statistical models that you use for town planning.</p>			
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO515	11.72	Object		Verwood is growing at such an unsustainable rate, that the consultation divides us in to North and South.			1012
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO222	11.74	Object		The search area should have included all of Verwood' s brownbelt looking for small parcels of private and council owned land the build on, not looking for a ripe green field, this is all very simplistic and the initial search should have put forward brown sites first, I will be writing to the Secretary of State to highlight this before making a decision on building on greenbelt land. With photos of land available and potential regeneration / rebuilding.			1014
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO223	11.75	Object		Please mention in this paragraph the protected oak trees. Please mention the River which borders some of the developments in an SSI site.			1015
484187	Mr R		CSO516	11.75	Object		The land contains a significant number of trees which hold current TPO's.			1015

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Tindall									
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO224	11.76	Object		There are no safe crossings here for residents to get to the facilities.			1016
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO517	11.76	Object		Please define what facilities are available to be near in Verwood.			1016
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO518	11.78	Object		The searches performed do not cover any brown field sites, which as per the planning regulations, should be investigated before the destruction of green belt land.			1018
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO225	11.82	Object		I understand this land is Greenbelt, if I am correct please mention it in this paragraph.			1023
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO519	11.82	Object		These areas are constrained by the fact that planning regulations define that brown field sites should be investigated prior to the development of green field sites. This has not occurred within this document.			1023
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO520	11.87	Object		All trees within the area should be considered. Many trees in this area are mature and of a significant age.			1029
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO521	11.88	Object		VWM3 is within 400m of area 5, which is an SSSI. VWM4 is within 400m of area 5, which is an SSSI. As proposed, these developments are not allowed by European laws regarding development within 400m of an SSSI.	VWM3 is within 400m of area 5, which is an SSSI. VWM4 is within 400m of area 5, which is an SSSI. As proposed, these developments are not allowed by european law - development within 400m of an SSSI.		1030
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17587	11.88	Object		Paragraph 11.88 Environmental and Conservation designations, page 233 Fisheries Recreation and Biodiversity This paragraph needs to specify that the River Crane that flows to the south of the Western and Eastern Sub Area is a			1030

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							SSSI. Provision must be made for a wetland buffer			
483204	Mr Mark Turnbull		CSO270	11.91	Object		This is an small area of Green Belt on the outskirts of Verwood. The proposed developments south of Manor Road will have an adverse impact on not only the immediate area but also the whole of Verwood. This is not a sustainable development for an already strained infrastructure; aspects such as Schools, amenities, shops, parks, roads etc...will be impacted and this will lead Verwood to having an unsustainable residential population and eventually running the area down. The area is also of significant interest and beauty which of course will be damaged beyond repair.	Remove this site from the plans		1033
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO522	11.91	Object		Area 1 - This site has very restricted access and is located within 400m of an SSSI. Area 2 - This site is within 400m of an SSSI. It also has issues with sinkage and flooding.			1033
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO226	11.93	Support		All of what you say should be built here on the Howe Lane site not houses. When these facilities are in place Verwood can grow, more houses can be built using regeneration and planning, no more sprawl. See CPRE site on urban sprawl for facts and figures.			1036
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO561	11.93	Object		On the map distributed to locals there are details of where the upper school will be, this is not here in the consultation document. There is a purple line around the upper school which means it is within 400 metres of Heathland.			1036
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO523	11.93	Object		* Possible new secondary school at Verwood. Potential site already identified and purchased by Dorset County Council next to existing Emmanuel School Plans for a school are not in place - there will be no new school funding. This is a quote from Cllr Flower. * Sports, recreation and open space (between 2.04ha and 4.08ha) How do you add more land to Verwood - The green belt that is currently enjoyed by the community is being built upon in these proposals? * Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (between 4.36ha and 17.43ha)			1036

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Why not continue to use the currently available greenspaces? Why develop them if we need the greenspace?			
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO524	11.96	Object		"Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces will need to be provided in perpetuity to mitigate the impact of people on nearby heathlands, with provision to be phased in advance of the occupation of dwellings on the site." SANGS are areas which are set aside as new greenspace following destruction and development of the previously set aside SANGS. A SANG is just future development land.			1039
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO227	11.97	Object		Government guidelines is now 20% I understand. I would rather we just had the 80 social houses, which is what this is all about, than ruin our greenbelt. Again, build on brownbelt please.			1040
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO525	11.97	Object		This is not in keeping with the current local community. The local area is 100% detached properties.			1040
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO526	11.98	Object		The green belt boundary should remain in force, development within east dorset should occur on brown field sites. Destroying the green belt for future generations is something that cannot be reversed. Green belt land is green belt land for a reason.			1041
483970	Mr Matthew Clark		CSO435	11.99	Object		The greenbelt designation was put in place for a good reason and should not simply be ignored when it is inconvenient because you wish to build new housing. That is why the greenbelt was put there in the first place, to protect the countryside from urban sprawl. It may be inconvenient, but it was put there for exactly this reason and should not be ridden over. I agree that there is a need for affordable housing in East Dorset, I do not agree that the greenbelt area around an town which has already grown so much is the right place to put the additional developments. I do not believe the greenbelt needs to be revised to find the necessary space in East Dorset for this housing.	The greenbelt designation must not be amended or revised and must be respected when identifying potential sites for development of affordable housing		1042
484187	Mr		CSO52	11.99	Object		All references to the upper school should be removed from			1042

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	R Tindall		7				the document. The upper school development is not funded and will not occur within the life of this document.			
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO22 8	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
361055	Mr David OAKLEY		CSO10 18	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
490570	Mrs Patricia RYAN		CSO10 32	Option VWM 1		No Opinion	As a resident of Verwood I feel that it already does not have the facilities to support a town of this size, so an increase in housing seems like madness. The main Ringwood road is already very hard to access at the best of times, without more cars being added.			1045
490846	Karen COOMBS		CSO10 58	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
490854	D MUTTON		CSO10 66	Option VWM 1		No Opinion	I only support the home development south of Howe Lane and south of Manor Road if Howe Lane and St Michael Road are adopted and improved to provide additional access to the additional homes etc (school). Margards Lane/Church Hill already have more than enough traffic congestion at times. From SNAP: The support of those areas of Verwood marked as 'supported' is dependent on an improved road access - especially in respect of Howe Lane, which needs to be adopted. Margards Lane/Church Hill are already over-loaded with traffic at certain times of the day. This could be relieved by re-opening the northern arm of Church Hill onto Manor Road - with 'left turn only' at this point			1045
495558	Linda Raybould		CSO14 96	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
495562	Mr MJ Banting		CSO15 16	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
495625	Mr Michael McMath		CSO15 43	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>While I support the building of a new upper school in Verwood which I think has been needed for years my main concern is that if 415 new houses are to be built in Verwood where are all the children who will be living in these houses be going to school? I would assume that 415 houses would mean about 700 or more children, the current 1st and middle schools do not have the capacity to take in this number of new pupils so they would have to be bussed to schools outside Verwood.</p> <p>My other concerns are the extra traffic that would be generated by another 700 cars. There are times when pedestrians can wait 5 minutes or more to cross Manor Lane to the Monmouth Ash car park for access to Morrisons, this will just get worse. Where are all these residents going to work? I assume they will be commuting in and out of Verwood every day thus adding to the already busy roads.</p>			1045
496188	Mr RE Vogel		CSO16 45	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
496338	Mr John Clough		CSO16 47	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>Recent roadworks on the B3081 have demonstrated how fragile the routes in and out of Verwood are. More housing will make the situation worse. Recent disastrous developments including the Fairwood site clearly demonstrate the insensitivity of planning within Verwood. I can see no need for supporting further development when it is clear the needs of existing residents are being disregarded and our environment damaged without thought or consideration for the future. I continue to travel to Ringwood and Ferndown for town amenities until such time as these are available in Verwood. I strongly object to further development.</p>			1045
496462	Mr and Mrs Guy Jameson		CSO16 76	Option VWM 1	Support		<p>Before developing hundreds of homes the local infrastructure in Verwood requires enhancements. If a senior school is required in Verwood then a suitable site needs to be found. Land that is protected by green belt status must be respected and adhered to.</p>			1045
496479	Charlotte Dixon		CSO17 17	Option VWM 1	Support					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
496526	Mr Dennis Barrow		CSO1733	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
496564	JH Lockwood		CSO1756	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
496707	Mr David Richards		CSO1844	Option VWM 1	Object		First why use consultants from outside the district when you have planning officers in forward planning who know the District well. Case in point for this area of land, a major watercourse discharges and runs right through the middle of the site and takes into account of the wildlife that lives within the wood at the top of the site you say sites have been considered in relation to landscape quality, wildlife and transport. Developing this area of land is very much an intrusion into the countryside and takes no notice of the considered points in your document. The access would come out far to close to an existing roundabout for all the reasons I do not consider the consultants have chosen in accordance with their strategy.	Use area of land from Copse in Eastworth Road to the edge of play area and back to dismantled railway line.		1045
360714	Carol Morgan		CSO2030	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO2343	Option VWM 1	Object		ARC would object to this proposal. Its proximity to the heathland nature reserve would ensure additional public use to this increasingly vulnerable site. The provision of a SANG could not reduce this.			1045
361111	Mr Raymond Brown		CSO2080	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
361170	Mr TR HARVEY		CSO2851	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
484088	Mr David Price		CSO2530	Option VWM 1	Object		If correct guidelines and environmental studies for wildlife etc are conducted along with consultation on all aspects of development then they could proceed with developments but scale in relation to services and infrastructure for these	A period of FULL public consultation should be entered into and the council should provide a clearer information		1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							developments is completely out of balance. The relatively short open period for consultation on a document that has clearly been developed over quite sometime is a concern in order to formulate a serious plan of objections. The descriptions of local infrastructure and improvements has been met with much derision along with the continued failure to upgrade the supportive infrastructure required. This is not surprising with the consultants being in Weybridge and clearly have only visited the area briefly. Additionally I note that the environmental impact has been glibbed over as the Bat, Badger, Deer, Slow worm and newt populations have raised considerably. Living on Eastworth itself I cannot see how the council proposes to make the road safe to use as they are narrow and protected by houses, nor is there room for the required pedestrian walkways.	pack to local councils and remove the fear that everyone has that this is a done deal and residents will not be listened to,.		
491311	Mr Kevin GILLING		CSO27 11	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
495971	T A Reith		CSO22 46	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
496958	Mrs J Beech		CSO19 37	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
497026	Doreen Smith		CSO19 97	Option VWM 1	Object		This amount of building will create extra traffic in Ferndown and Parley which already has a lot of road build up in the busy morning and evening travel. Also taking a lot of natural land for our wild life.			1045
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		CSO21 09	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
497184	Mr Hilling		CSO22 17	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
497223	AJ Marvin		CSO22 31	Option VWM 1	Object		My prime objections to Verwood developments are 1 Loss of green belt. What is wrong with the Boundary Lane			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							area? 2 Over 20 years Verwood has expanded out of all proportion, to a level infrastructure is barely able to support. 3 Car parking in the village centre i.e. Pottery, surgery and limited roadside parking is totally inadequate at present (certainly am) shops have been approved with no parking or at least very limited-how will it cope with 400 new families In favour An upper school will reduce traffic in and out of town save money and environmentally friendly-needs access road improvement from Margards / Church Hill.			
497343	Sharon Sutcliffe		CSO22 80	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
497467	MR OLIVER RODWAY		CSO23 55	Option VWM 1	Object		Greenbelt			1045
497773	R Johnstone		CSO24 83	Option VWM 1	Object		Regarding Verwood proposals, I think the town needs more infrastructure before expansion. There is no cinema, swimming pool and a lack of small shops in the centre. Morrison's is not the "be all and end all". The traffic at present (connected with VWM7 proposal) is already clogging our roads twice a day. New facilities (housing and schooling) will increase the street parking problems for residents as there is no sensible drop off points in the schools campus. New roads invariably draw in more traffic. More needs to be done to encourage children to walk to school and for cars to be left in the garage. I have witnessed ladies who arrive early for the pick up to "reserve" their street parking and when I challenged one lady for parking on the pavement, found she lived in Haywards Cres.			1045
498044	Carolyne BANKS		CSO26 80	Option VWM 1	Support		Use the newer out-of-town developments to extend housing - after all that's what they were created for i.e.: Verwood, Corfe Mullen, Sturminster Marshall. Don't cram more development into existing residential areas in town.			1045
498047	CD Bradford		CSO26 57	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
498051	Mrs Mary Connor		CSO2650	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		CSO2738	Option VWM 1	Support		Although I live in Ferndown, I work and travel a lot in the local area so feel I can voice my opinion on developments around the area.			1045
498078	G Sims		CSO2720	Option VWM 1	Support		Gives the young a chance of buying affordable homes and a secondary school which is needed.			1045
498084	Mr P HARTLEY		CSO2761	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
498122	Williams		CSO2774	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
498125	Mr and Mrs P DASHWOOD		CSO2798	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
498133	Mrs Dowling		CSO2789	Option VWM 1	Object		The opinions of Verwoodians seem to count for nothing, the unsightly, unwanted, unneeded building at Blackhill being a good example.			1045
498160	Mrs Gwendoline Martin		CSO2852	Option VWM 1	Object		No housing development without infrastructure-road in Verwood cannot carry any further traffic Station Road is a death trap we are only waiting for a accident to happen Shop deliveries should be controlled-and not allowed to happen at rush hour. When a satisfactory road scheme is planned-housing could be considered. Developer must be made to pay-towards the above.			1045
360037	Mr Dave BARNES		CSO4052	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361041	Mr & Mrs G K HAMPTON		CSO40 24	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
361106	Mr and Mrs Robin and Janet WALL		CSO36 78	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO32 78	Option VWM 1	Support		Verwood already has a population of about 14,000 and doesn't yet benefit from the infrastructure or vibrancy which it's residents deserve. Nevertheless, I support a limited amount of development in the town in the hope that it will contribute to improving Verwood's infrastructure, it's vibrancy as a town and its green spaces. I also support limited development to provide desperately needed affordable homes as part of a mixed community.			1045
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		CSO25 69	Option VWM 1	Object		Para 11.17 states that there may be a need to expand primary schools or build a new one. It is there much better to reserve this parcel of land for such a use. The expansion of Trinity School could incorporate pick-up/drop-off areas thereby relieving local roads of the current congestion.	Include an option to use this parcel of land for expansion of Trinity School.		1045
498169	Mrs D WEAVER		CSO29 02	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
498184	Mrs Angela BARKER		CSO29 29	Option VWM 1	Object		Not every area needs affordable housing - if a lot of people are retired and/or own their own homes, does it matter?			1045
498268	Mr and Mrs R Cullen		CSO30 11	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
498271	Mandy CHEESEM AN		CSO30 60	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
498335	Mr and Mrs		CSO32	Option	Support					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lester		19	VWM 1						
498385	Ms Sarah Cosgrove		CSO31 24	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is already over populated. There are not enough facilities to accommodate these small or huge developments. The roads in and out of Verwood would not withstand an extra 400+ cars. We have no secondary school and the current primary schools would not cope with such an influx of people. You cannot have a development of this size without additional services and facilities which you have failed to plan for.	No amendments to be made. It is a ridiculous suggestion to develop this many houses in such a small area.		1045
498386	Mr & Mrs DL & MD Thompson		CSO31 29	Option VWM 1	Support		The scheme meets government demands for future housing using land which will not cause problems to existing residents - good planning to incorporate ancillary components of the scheme - i.e. balance cost for housing, transport needs and schooling. Overall a well thought out scheme which hopefully will reduce the need for high density schemes to be built within the town's current planning belt. NB If The Hub had been as well thought out at planning we would not have been facing the current problems.			1045
498518	Mr & Mrs Grieg and Ruth Brown		CSO32 50	Option VWM 1	Object		The proposed land is good arable land and should remain of an agricultural usage only. Poor quality land should be used for redevelopment. The proposed land is designated Green Belt. There are no TPO's on many of the trees in the fields. The roads in and out of the proposed development and Verwood cannot cope with another 300+ vehicles per day. Verwood's infrastructure (education, sports facilities, shops, roads) are already overloaded, especially with regards to secondary education. Devaluation of local properties including affecting some home environments. Verwood already has a glut of affordable housing; new built flats and houses plus existing bungalows suitable for the elderly. The roads in and out of the proposed development (and Verwood) cannot cope with another 300+ vehicles per day. Verwood's infra-structure (education, sports facilities, shops, roads) are already overloaded (esp with regards to secondary			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							education). Devaluation of local properties including affecting some home environments. Verwood already has a glut of affordable housing, new built flats and houses plus existing bungalows suitable for the elderly.			
498527	Mr John Edgar		CSO3289	Option VWM 1	Object		The sellers of the proposed land and the Council have no consideration of the impact of the proposals on Verwood's infrastructure, existing retail and manufacturing employment facilities or even transport route. The town does not need any more "housing association" style estates with all the problems such areas often bring to areas. Further more, why is Verwood the only East Dorset town to be targeted for such unreasonable numbers of extra profiles (1200 - 1500) a further growth of 10%+, especially as the existing infrastructure hardly copes with today's population. Verwood was given to understand that the town had now received its "quota" of new builds. Most or all of the proposed "sell off" area are farmland or green belt which this area is fast losing to the exasperation of all residents.	Amend the proposals by reducing the new homes plans by no less than 75% and share the proposed houses between other less affected towns such as Ferndown, Wimborne, Blandford etc, all of which have far less populations.		1045
498711	Mr Tam Chant		CSO3394	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
498996	M E CLARKE		CSO3458	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
499044	Mrs Carolyn MASKELL		CSO3485	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
499231	Mrs A Lathbury		CSO3535	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
499236	J PIPE		CSO3550	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
499245	Mr and Mrs		CSO35	Option		No				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	N BUTLER		83	VWM 1		Opinion				
499261	Mrs Norma JACKSON		CSO36 18	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
499271	Mrs P Giles		CSO36 08	Option VWM 1	Object		No new building should take place in Verwood without consideration being given to improving public transport for existing residents. There is no transport after approx 18.30 to enable people to enjoy existing facilities like The Hub and Club 31. A large proportion of the elderly do not have their own cars, taxis are expensive and therefore these venues are not well frequented and are running at a loss. Verwood should be made more 'user friendly'.			1045
499290	Mrs Lisa TURNBULL		CSO36 50	Option VWM 1	Support		SNAP: No Opinion.			1045
499291	R S Welch		CSO36 38	Option VWM 1	Object		The extension of housing at VWM1 and VWM2 will constitute an enormous traffic problem due to the existing poor roads, and is a considerable intrusion into green belt land which is wholly unnecessary.			1045
360685	Mr M.P HOSE		CSO46 40	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
496396	Mrs Jill Freer		CSO37 51	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood has undergone massive building projects since 1993. I feel that we can't take any more. Hideous flats have been built in a most unsuitable site in Crane Drive; and a worse looking building is going up where the Fayrewood Pub stood. How on earth was permission granted for these buildings? The schools are full, Drs are full, NHS Dentist is full - and the road to Ringwood is dangerous and very busy at times. We just CANNOT take another 400+ houses - which equals 1,000 people at least - and cars and vans etc.			1045
498495	Mr		CSO37	Option	Support					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	John Williams		25	VWM 1						
499384	Mr A I ROSE		CSO37 22	Option VWM 1	Support		Verwood seems to be a dormitory with no town centre (scattered development). All the talk when I moved to the area in 1978 was 'Wessex City'. What happened? Is this the first stage of completing the arc around the Poole/Bournemouth conurbation? If this is so, develop southwards, west of the Moors River, flood plains permitting and there is the planners utopia for the 22nd century.			1045
499481	Mr John MARTIN		CSO37 90	Option VWM 1	Object		I would be against building west of Trinity School. 30 homes is not going to go anywhere near supplying much needed homes. My main concern would be that it will set a precedent for gradual infilling of the area above the school and behind Coopers Lane.			1045
499533	Mr & Mrs A & C Clein		CSO38 12	Option VWM 1	Object		I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised. The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.			
499537	C Ayling		CSO38 14	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the 			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
499551	Rachel TYLER		CSO38 24	Option VWM 1	Support		<p>The main focus of my support is for a new upper school in Verwood. Even without the increase in housing there is a desperate need for this, along with the added community facilities this will bring. For children from outlying villages, they have a longer journey than Verwood children to QE currently. A new upper school would also shorten their travel distances considerably, i.e.: Cranborne / Sixpenny Handley etc.</p> <p>As a parent of 2 children aged 8 and 3, I just hope it comes in time for them. I have real concerns about the travel involved for my girls to Wimborne, especially as they currently walk to school.</p>			1045
499559	Mrs S E Ayling		CSO38 25	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by 			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.			
499592	Mr & Mrs David & Mary Hockaday		CSO38 43	Option VWM 1	Object		As residents of Verwood, we are dismayed to see that there is a proposal to build 450 new houses on Green Belt land. Apart from violating the principal of encroachment of the Green Belt the infrastructure of Verwood has never kept pace with the number of new houses in the town. For this reason we wish to register our objection to this proposal.			1045
499635	Mr Lee Thornhill		CSO38 58	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land 			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.			
499649	Ms Janet Bentick		CSO3862	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? 			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>• Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision.</p> <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499735	Mr & Mrs Mary & Bernard Fox		CSO38 92	Option VWM 1	Object		I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision.</p> <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499748	Ms Soozi Cooper		CSO38 99	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats,</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499759	Mrs Freda White		CSO3911	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.			
499763	S.E. Portnell		CSO3919	Option VWM 1	Object		I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised. The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land 			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.			
499771	Mr & Mrs Helen and Clive Bonner		CSO3921	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? 			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>• Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision.</p> <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499774	Mr S Weatherill-Podbury		CSO39 24	Option VWM 1	Object		I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision.</p> <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499777	Mr J.E. Podbury		CSO39 26	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats,</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499779	Mr & Mrs J Wilson		CSO3929	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.			
499780	Ms Patricia Wykes		CSO39 32	Option VWM 1	Object		I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised. The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land 			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.			
499781	Mrs R Collins		CSO3936	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? 			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>• Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision.</p> <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499782	Mrs A.G. Cox		CSO39 39	Option VWM 1	Object		I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision.</p> <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499785	R.B. Humphries		CSO39 41	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats,</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499791	Mr & Mrs Ralph and Vivienne Odell		CSO3944	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.			
499873	Mr Graham Holt		CSO39 93	Option VWM 1	Object		11.60 states that this is an "Area of Great Landscape Value" already compromised by the development of Trinity School. The school was designed as a low development on low ground. The proposed field is at roof level to the school and development will destroy the "Valued" landscape. This is not "infill" or "contained development". Try viewing this area and VWM2 from Stephen's Castle.			1045
500060	Mr Stuart PIDDOCK		CSO40 80	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
500222	S Hartley		CSO44 39	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
500350	Mr P H BARTLETT		CSO42 25	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
500361	Mr and Miss N and A Middleton and Turner		CSO42 66	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
500394	Mrs Sandra HOWES		CSO42 87	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
500418	Mr and Mrs		CSO42	Option	Object		Verwood already has too many houses because there is an			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	S H YATES		96	VWM 1			inadequate infrastructure, especially roads. Howe Lane in particular needs to be improved to provide alternative access to the existing schools. A new school on this site, even with Howe Lane improvements, would create gridlock with only 2 means of access.			
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		CSO43 15	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
500558	A Baker		CSO43 66	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
500697	Mr Thomas SMITH		CSO44 86	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
500706	R & J Jeans		CSO45 35	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
500720	Mrs VALLIER		CSO45 39	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
500748	Mrs Lauren MATTHEW S		CSO45 92	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
500802	J Hayward		CSO47 16	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
500807	Mr and Mrs K E EYRES		CSO46 58	Option VWM 1	Object		Paragraph 11.9 of the Core Strategy options document for Verwood and West Moors states that Verwood has a GOOD ROAD LINK to the A31(T) and the A338. This road, part of the B3081, is TOTALLY INADEQUATE for the volume of traffic it carries in both directions. An unacceptable number of FATAL ACCIDENTS between Verwood and Ringwood have occurred in recent years. This road should be UPGRADED TO DUAL CARRIAGEWAY before any further development is allowed in Verwood. Furthermore, most of the other routes through the town which			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>link to the B3081 - Manor Road, Lake Road, Woodlinken Drive, Burnbake Road, Newtown Road, Newtown Lane - to name but a few, are in a TERRIBLE STATE OF REPAIR, mainly due to adjacent development accessing the underground services, followed by POOR QUALITY, and often TEMPORARY repairs to the road surface. Again these issues need to be addressed before further development is permitted.</p> <p>A new Secondary school is a definite requirement for a Town of Verwood's size, but it must have ADEQUATE VEHICULAR ACCESS. Surely the land to the West of Trinity School, close to the Southern and Western relief roads, would be a better option than the Emmanuel Campus. This would give some relief to the long suffering residents of St. Michaels Road, Howe Lane and Margards Lane.</p>			
500836	Mrs Sylvia Hines		CSO47 31	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
500903	Mr and Mrs S and R Harris		CSO47 85	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
500999	Mrs JD Burton		CSO48 02	Option VWM 1	Support		Regarding Verwood. We need more doctors, shops, buses, to cope with extra property			1045
501012	Louise ARNOLD		CSO48 78	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		CSO48 74	Option VWM 1	Object		Station Road Verwood and Eastworth Road are presently overloaded with vehicle traffic. Heavy vehicles traffic has increased by 400% in the past ten years and it is now essential that heavy vehicle numbers passing through the centre of Verwood be reduced, diverting to other routes. It is also very necessary to improve Station Road footpath before a serious accident occurs.			1045
501069	Mr and Mrs R		CSO49 10	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood does not have enough existing facilities for us who already live here.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Rich						1 - Doctors 2 - Dentists 3 - Local shops. We moved here years ago to get away from continuous road noise and heavy traffic and to have a nice green environment which will be spoilt by your plans.			
501090	Mr and Mrs Gee		CSO49 34	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
501106	Mr John Victor Rogers		CSO49 47	Option VWM 1	Support		Verwood needs more housing to ensure that we have a secondary school and an increase in population will help to secure the future of the "Hub". And Morrisons will have to enlarge which will benefit us all and the land in this area is only suitable for housing not "crops".			1045
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		CSO50 16	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
501118	Mr Ron Cook		CSO50 18	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
501135	Charlie Wassell		CSO50 36	Option VWM 1	Support		Only homeless people should be able to object to the building of new homes. Residents should consider how to improve facilities. Developers should contribute to improving facilities.			1045
501235	Mr and Mrs J Churchward		CSO51 23	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is big enough, the infrastructure just can't take any more homes and people. Our supermarket struggles to cope, the doctors are full and maybe before planning is granted trips should be made in and out of Verwood during the rush hour. Both roads out are like the M25 a constant stream of traffic, and then when an accident occurs and they do it grinds to a halt all the roads are gridlocked. Imagine the extra cars adding to this situation. This is greenbelt land , keeping Verwood the size it is, adding houses and the necessary road system will ruin this rural town.			1045
501261	Mr and Mrs Jeffries		CSO51 43	Option VWM 1	Object					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501351	Mr and Mrs R D'Cruze		CSO5246	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
501485	Mrs J JACKSON		CSO5295	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
501488	Chris LAMB		CSO5329	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
501502	Mr Michael WAREHAM		CSO5375	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
501512	Donald Gray		CSO5390	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
501515	Mrs A Ryan		CSO5404	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
501520	Mrs Z MERRIFIELD		CSO5447	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
501523	Rita Gilbert		CSO5484	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
501525	G Pearson		CSO5430	Option VWM 1	Object		For over 20 years the council planners have rode roughshod over residents wishes, totally ignoring the fact everyone wanted no more housing development in the town. The councils obsession with high density and so called 'affordable housing' was neither wanted or desired by the majority of residents. The monstrosity being built on the former Fairwood Pub site is just one example of council attitude.			1045
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		CSO5527	Option VWM 1	Support		Please do not accept any community centre / halls or leisure centre as a corporate inducement from developers of housing developments. In my experience they hardly ever work and			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							cost a great deal in subsidy for councils each and every year. i.e.. Verwood Hub; Lenham, Kent; Ditton, Nr Maidstone, Kent. My ref: 10 years as a Parish Councillor in Ditton, Kent.			
501560	Mr Christopher CLARKE		CSO5585	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
359908	Mr F.D.A REVILL		CSO6258	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
359927	Mrs Ann BISSEX		CSO6366	Option VWM 1	Object		The green belt should not be encroached on any further. No building should be allowed on flood plains. Much more serious effort needs to be put into reducing necessity of relying on car travel.			1045
501364	Mr M Devetta		CSO5864	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
501583	Mrs Jean Russell		CSO5642	Option VWM 1	Object		This has been considered before, e.g. when the new houses were built in Howe Lane and beyond St. Michael's Cottage, what happened to that money? Also the developers statement 'will contribute to transport improvements' will they? I rather doubt it considering their previous track record. The holes in Howe Lane and St. Michael's Road bear testimony to this. Try driving along these roads! An accident waiting to happen. No one in this area wants this dreadful plan implemented. It seems to have escaped your notice, that we shall all end up under water. There should not be any more houses / flats in this particular area, there are far too many dreadful flats and developments in gardens and how could all those dreadful developments on the edge of the town ever gained approval? They are a disgrace. Verwood used to be a pleasant place to live when we moved here 39 years ago. Look at it now! Are you proud of the 'improvements'?!! No one else is. I realise that housing is needed. To go ahead with this plan will be a disaster and how did you decide to fall in with the plans / request to sell off this land, just because the owners could sell it at a very good			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							profit? It is possible that they will not be living in the water? I think not. The present infrastructure will not sustain such a large project as this and the drains in Manor Road are at full capacity now. Even more water will accumulate as the leaves fall.			
501616	R J Joyce		CSO5991	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
501626	Mrs J A Russell		CSO5761	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
501694	Mr R BRYAN		CSO5796	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
501699	B THOMAS		CSO5823	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
501720	Dr and Mrs D HARLOW		CSO5920	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
501761	Mr D Curtis		CSO6019	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
501867	Mrs I M Marks		CSO6304	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
501873	Mr and Mrs Harold A and D Joan Lilley		CSO6254	Option VWM 1	Object		All proposals of this nature have a number of basic needs. One of the most important is infrastructure. Subject to finance being available Canford Bottom Roundabout is to be drastically amended for the Olympic Games. The reference to "Improvements to Canford Bottom therefore appear to have been superseded. Since I cannot find any intention to improve the road network all these proposals will only add to our present problems and			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							cannot be supported.			
501876	J Long		CSO6212	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
501881	B W Deverill		CSO6286	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		CSO6273	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502022	Mr HWR Stevens		CSO6392	Option VWM 1	Object		Dorset's villages and small towns should be preserved as such. So called "developers" are only concerned with profits. There'll always be an England? Not when it has been built over and occupied by strangers.			1045
502029	Mr J MacArthur		CSO6435	Option VWM 1	Support	General Comment	Quality of materials and road layout is a key requirement to any new house building. More 2 bed homes to give small families a chance at being housed. Houses and roads can be attractive (Look at Poundbury, Nr Dorchester). Enough parking is a must - no 1.25 spaces per plot, plus a couple of visitors bays, will not suffice. Plenty of 'part rent - part buy' should be included to give all young people a chance to have a home. Try to get away from open plan frontages. Terraces of even small boundary fenced homes look better and give a feel of being established houses.			1045
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		CSO6451	Option VWM 1	Object		The whole area is congested, there is no real provision for new TRANSPORT OR services for new homes i.e. doctors, local shops or community ctrs. There are already MANY EMPTY industrial units. Building more industrial is only viable if a tax loss for developers. Verwood has lost its soul now, and does not need any more ad-hock development. Wimborne will follow if the development of this (at present) lovely Town is carried out in the same way as Verwood has been.			1045
502059	Mr R		CSO6505	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Seddon									
502061	J and M Jeater and Tilley		CSO6483	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
361113	Mr Alan Meade		CSO7197	Option VWM 1	Support		.I like the rate of affordable housing to private homes. We all know that there is a shortage. Jobs will be created, money brought in, good for all in East Dorset, Christchurch			1045
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		CSO6780	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		CSO6974	Option VWM 1	Object	General Comment	The area cannot sustain this quantity of new homes which would also require jobs for the vast majority. This proposal of 2,570 homes would also add another 5,000 cars to an already congested junction at West Parley. This area is already over stretched private and industrial vehicles. Jobs are already at a premium with companies moving out of the area or even closing. Warehouses are lying empty and shops are being converted into living accommodation. The young local people are not able to find homes due to the vast majority going to people moving into the area. This vast development will destroy this rural area. Just look at Bournemouth if you require any proof.			1045
501940	Mr M J Godfrey		CSO7187	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502076	Kay Stead		CSO6560	Option VWM 1	Object		A new secondary school is VITAL for the Verwood area. Verwood has quadrupled in size since we came here 8 years ago. There are enough new homes - many haven't sold. There are not enough facilities in the town to sustain any more residents. The leisure centre is dire, however, the Hub is a triumph.			1045
502077	Douglas Poole		CSO6519	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is already an overcrowded and congested area. Further developments will contribute to make this town a ghetto like place - what for?			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502078	Mr R Marlow		CSO6539	Option VWM 1	Object		Why waste more tax payers money!!! Too much now!!! These proposals are ridiculous, as any further work prospects in this are "zero". So why more homes and cars when the road/transport structure is obsolete for modern days need, let alone provision for the future 20/30 years. Just building more houses will not solve the long standing problems in Dorset i.e. jobs and road structures.			1045
502092	Mr and Mrs A Watkinson		CSO6551	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
502099	Carolyn Lourens		CSO6595	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502114	Mr P Foster		CSO6642	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		CSO6686	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502138	Mrs E Mason		CSO6700	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502253	Mrs Lesley Jane Franklin		CSO6752	Option VWM 1	Support		I support all options for Verwood, Wimborne and Colehill because I feel there is a great need for more affordable housing in these areas, especially for young families and vulnerable elderly people in rural areas.			1045
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		CSO6802	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502317	Cllr Peter Lucas		CSO6833	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
502326	Mr and Mrs		CSO68	Option	Object		With more homes will need more employment, a vicious			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	T Bennett		82	VWM 1			circle. Our roads are too busy now. We surely have enough community areas and centres.			
502329	Mrs Rosemary Rooke		CSO6889	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
502345	Mr and Mrs Ray and Irene Coulson		CSO6950	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
502347	Sarah Cobb		CSO7091	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502381	Mr Cyril Josey		CSO7065	Option VWM 1	Support		Why is it necessary to include affordable homes (low value) in with others (of higher value), thus lowering the value of other properties in the area. Put low value homes of high density in low value areas. People are not going to accept paying high prices for property when other houses nearby are run by housing associations or the council renting to tenants. 50% affordable housing in any area is too much. Local infrastructure, road improvement, services etc must be provided in all cases.			1045
502387	Mr George Kilpatrick		CSO7052	Option VWM 1	Object		I would like to see the justification for increased housing in East Dorset eg, demographics, immigration, increased work opportunities etc. I would also like to understand how transport strategy (and infrastructure) is coordinated with this in such a way to make expansion sustainable.			1045
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		CSO7164	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
502468	Robert Lambert		CSO7386	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502568	sarah		CSO72	Option		No				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	morgan		80	VWM 1		Opinion				
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		CSO73 08	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502570	Mr Samways		CSO73 36	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502579	Mr & Mrs R L Thorne		CSO73 65	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502595	Mr Colin House		CSO74 58	Option VWM 1	Support		All these developments will cause an impact on the local heathland and the proposals in all areas will cause road chaos on the A31, Ferndown, Parley and Wimborne. A new road structure is required before any development takes place.			1045
502610	John Jackson		CSO74 91	Option VWM 1	Object		The population of Verwood is already larger than that of Ringwood without the civic amenities and the people of Verwood deserve better, a proper leisure centre including a swimming pool and adequate shopping facilities. However good the service from the existing retail businesses; is a tiny post office, one petrol station; a handful of shops, and a small dated supermarket really adequate?			1045
359598	Mr A KETCHLEY		CSO80 02	Option VWM 1	Support		Unfortunately whatever is finally decided on the following well known saying will occur: 'You can please some of the people all the time, You can please all of the people some of the time, But you cannot please all of the people all of the time!' I wish you well in whatever is decided. Some will see it as inevitable due to the area's population increases, whereas others will see it as a necessary evil, and some will accept it without question			1045
359873	Mrs M HUGHES		CSO86 24	Option VWM 1	Support					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359977	Miss M.G. EARP		CSO8058	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		CSO8208	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
361123	Mr Iain STEVENSON		CSO8229	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		CSO7459	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502673	Mrs A Powell		CSO7568	Option VWM 1	Object		The infrastructure in this area needs to be sorted out before anymore building goes ahead. There are times you cannot move on the roads. The area is being ruined with all this building works that are already going on.			1045
502701	Mrs M Williams		CSO7595	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
502708	Ms Julia Owen		CSO7647	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502745	Mrs J.M Kenny		CSO7686	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		CSO7915	Option VWM 1	Object		There should not be any more large scale house building in the East Dorset area as the roads cannot cope with any more traffic			1045
502921	Mr and Mrs L Forinton		CSO7791	Option VWM 1	Object		We moved to Verwood a year ago. When considering whether to buy the bungalow we contacted East Dorset District Council (EDDC) future policy planning department.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>We were told that under the existing policy (incorporating the Regional Spatial Strategy) the council had decided that Verwood had reached its capacity after many years of rapid growth and they would only allow infill housing development in future i.e. no large scale housing development would take place. We realise that the Regional Spatial Strategy has been scrapped however nothing in Verwood has changed therefore we were astonished that the council has done a u-turn and are now considering building up to 415 new houses in the town.</p> <p>We assume these sites have only been included in the core strategy options because landowners have said they would be prepared to sell their land for housing development. We trust therefore that after due consideration the council will conclude that these sites are unsuitable for housing development for the very valid reasons that lead to the previous policy outlined to us in 2009.</p> <p>Our reasons for objecting to further large scale development in Verwood are as follows:</p> <p>Green Belt (South East Dorset). As a general comment building on green belt land should be a last resort, all other options should be considered first. In particular, the site (VWM2) West of Eastworth Road is green belt land and is of particular importance as it is rich arable land (only poor quality land should be used for residential development) and for this reason should remain agricultural land; and has been designated an area of outstanding natural beauty. This part of the green belt is an asset to the town and should be preserved as such, once gone it can never be got back – gone forever. In addition it is understood that there may be rare species of plant and animal inhabitants in this area that need to be protected and preserved which would make the site unsuitable for development. No doubt the council as part of its responsibility will be commissioning a full environmental survey of the site to establish this and I would be pleased to receive a copy once available. Also there are tree preservation orders on many of the trees in these fields, the roots of these trees will be interfered with to get services to these properties.</p> <p>Employment. There are no plans in the core strategy to</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>increase employment opportunities in Verwood; employment presently is very limited indeed, meaning that most people have to travel miles to their place of work. It makes obvious sense to build houses where there are jobs and good public transport. This is particularly important due to the high number of affordable houses being proposed so that low income families would have access to jobs locally with an economical means of getting to work. This is essential in the present climate to ensure people have easy and affordable access to jobs otherwise the council may be creating a problem whereby people end up on benefit through no fault of their own; the ramifications of which do not bear thinking about. On top of this are the obvious environmental benefits of people not travelling long distances to work i.e. pollution, carbon footprint etc.</p> <p>The conclusion being that the housing development should be built in places like Ferndown, West Parley and Three Legged Cross where proposals have been put forward for additional land for employment. Also as the council have a wider environmental responsibility they should not be creating a core strategy which encourages more cars on the roads with the resultant increase in pollution, carbon footprint, congestion etc.</p> <p>Amenities. Verwood population has doubled since 1991 to 15,000 however the amenities have not kept pace with the expansion, in fact facilities, shops etc have actually reduced in recent years. Doctors, NHS dentists, opticians are all hard pressed to cope with present demand as are schools. Those shops we do have are woefully inadequate or consist of Estate Agents, Hairdressers galore. The bottom line is we do not have enough amenities / facilities to cope at present and as these are largely private enterprises we cannot just magic more out of thin air, it has to be viable to attract businesses and clearly from recent experience we are not a viable proposition. The same can be said about doctors, NHS dentists and schools during this period of austerity when public money will be in very short supply severely limiting the possibility of expansion. Contrary to the council's consultants report Verwood does not have a vibrant town centre; you just have to look at Ringwood a town with a similar population to</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>see what we mean.</p> <p>Additionally, facilities for leisure, children and young people are also woefully inadequate and again seem unlikely to improve for years to come during this period of austerity. There isn't enough for the youth of Verwood to do now but with the prospect of 415 houses, possibly 830 more young people, they are going to cause problems roaming the streets. There are no buses after early evening to take them into Bournemouth or Poole they wont have anything to do. The conclusion is that Verwood cannot cope with anymore large scale housing development.</p> <p>Infrastructure and Transport. It's the same old story I'm afraid the population doubles but infrastructure, roads and public transport fail to keep up with the expansion. Its as if the council approve large scale residential housing development, see it built, and then turn their back and walk away from doing anything significant to improve the infrastructure. We were staggered to see the number of unmade roads serving housing development when we moved here, take Springfield Road as an example. We also understand that Verwood has suffered in the past with so called 'bolt on solutions' which don't work. The fear is that EDDC, based on past record, will build the houses and then leave the residents of the outpost which is Verwood to deal with the consequences. This cannot be allowed to happen. The result is that we have two main routes out of Verwood, Station Road and Edmondsham Road which are no more than country lanes which cannot take the extra cars 415 houses would produce. Public transport (buses) doesn't help much as it too is woefully inadequate, too few houses during the daytime and no buses after early evening at all. We also understand that Wessex Water are in the process of producing a report on foul and surface water sewage and drainage which will make interesting reading; again we would appreciate a copy when it is produced.</p> <p>Affordable Housing. We are very concerned about the high percentage of affordable housing per site being proposed; 40-50% is far too high a figure. Not only would it have an adverse effect on the new estate it would also adversely affect the social harmony of Verwood itself. People would be moved into the area for social housing reasons – low income</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>families, there are very few jobs in Verwood they can't afford to travel to work and so end up on benefit. It is an unfortunate fact, learnt in other parts of the country that having such a high proportion of affordable housing (social housing and shared ownership) brings with it many problems. The council should review this aspect in the light of experiences elsewhere, a more sensible figure would be 5-10%.</p> <p>WVM2 Land west of Eastworth Road (200 homes). More specifically we object to housing development on this site for the following reasons:-</p> <p>1) Shouldn't build on Green Belt land – for all the reasons given in our earlier comments Green Belt (South East Dorset).</p> <p>2) There could be up to 400 more cars as a result of this development, on local roads. Station Road and Edmondsham Road are no more than country lanes unable to cope with the increased traffic. As proposed vehicular access along Eastworth Road is preposterous, it is a very narrow lane inadequate for the purpose. In addition, exit and entry onto Station Road and Edmondsham Road from Eastworth Road by this volume of traffic would be inherently dangerous as would exit and entry from the other entrance onto Edmondsham Road. This is a very significant safety aspect.</p> <p>3) Eastworth Road forms a natural boundary to the town, the new housing estate would by its nature be remote and detached.</p> <p>In conclusion, we feel that EDDC as custodians of the built environment have a responsibility to the environment and the people of Verwood to ensure any development is in-keeping with the town and preserves and protects residents way of life and maintains Verwood as a nice place to live. We would also like to quote two extracts from the EDDC Core Strategy Consultation Document relating to Verwood.</p> <p>a) "The specific outcomes that the planning system should deliver are housing developments in suitable locations which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure".</p> <p>b) "The area of great landscape value area should largely be retained comprises open and gently undulating countryside which forms a key strategic structural landscape element".</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							It is with these in mind that we end by saying that the housing proposals for Verwood in the Core Strategy Consultation Document and in particular site VWM2 land west of Eastworth Road will not fulfil the specific outcome that the planning system should deliver as set out in a) nor that set out in b) for the reasons we have given above.			
502935	Mr Roger Parker		CSO7819	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503044	Mr and Mrs R Setchfield		CSO7926	Option VWM 1	Object		We strongly feel, before any further development in Verwood the infrastructure needs to be vastly improved.			1045
503056	Mr and Mrs Semmens		CSO7945	Option VWM 1	Object		Beautiful countryside!			1045
503062	Mr and Mrs D C Hubbard		CSO7950	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
503085	Mr P.A. Scott		CSO7976	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503156	Richard and Jackie Blunderfield		CSO8043	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
503162	Mr Marcus J Huggins		CSO8023	Option VWM 1	Support		The road from the A31 into Verwood is not good enough to support extra traffic - rough estimate - 1000 more cars using this road (3081) more people and cars would create extra dangers. There have been many deaths on this road in the past. Improve the roads before considering any big developments!			1045
503171	Sally Cooke		CSO8089	Option VWM 1	Support		Build homes so people have somewhere to live BUT what about Verwood's infrastructure? Where are our facilities? Secondary school must be a priority.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503183	B Chissell		CSO81 64	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503193	Julie Richardson		CSO81 26	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503197	Mr M Smith		CSO81 39	Option VWM 1	Object		Why build more houses, when there are a lack of facilities, i.e. shops, nothing for the younger generation to do or use. In my opinion, Verwood is just one big housing estate - all you are encouraging is for gang warfare in the future because the kids have nothing to do. Verwood used to be a village - what do you call it now!!!			1045
503203	Mr and Mrs M Squire		CSO81 54	Option VWM 1	Object		Having lived in Verwood for over 30 years we have seen continuous development with poor thought to road systems and town centre shops. Verwood is already a large town in comparison other town populations in Ringwood, Wimborne, Fordingbridge etc, yet has no town centre facilities. Residents are forced to travel at least 7 miles to find a range of shops. Verwood is no longer a village so why pretend that it is? (This is the excuse given for no town centre shops). In fact Verwood offered a wider range of shops 30 years ago when it was a small village than it does now. Please do not allow any further building in Verwood before we have town facilities and fore-thought re - roads to any new properties, especially a school. Margards Lane cannot cope with more traffic.			1045
503218	Mr Chris Beaven		CSO81 71	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood already lacks the facilities to support the current number of houses. This is further development for builder profit and little benefit for the community. Health facilities are already fully stretched, poor public transport and road network to support expansion. Limited shopping facilities exist and the sports centre lacks sufficient facilities.			1045
503230	P Andrews		CSO81 85	Option VWM 1	Support		I would be shocked if plans were passed to increase housing yet again in Verwood. Provision has not been made to cope with existing traffic and shopping problems. This is a town existing in a village environment. It's time to deal with present problems before creating more.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503233	F Parkes		CSO8252	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503250	Mrs Helen Poole		CSO8274	Option VWM 1	Object		Too many new homes in Verwood, not enough resources for those of us who already live here. Stop filling up our green space! There are far to many new buildings going up in Verwood - We cant cope with more cars on the road, and we do not have enough shops or facilities for more residents - please stop !			1045
503303	Mr Anthony Roberts		CSO8313	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		CSO8340	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
359889	Mr and Mrs P CLARK		CSO8493	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
359920	S PARKER		CSO9547	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		CSO9603	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
360288	Mr & Mrs E T SPENCER	E T Spencer (Heating)	CSO9629	Option VWM 1	Object		The area is growing far too fast with inadequate facilities. We need to keep Green Belt land.			1045
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E HACK		CSO8513	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
503024	Valerie Measey		CSO8895	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503347	Ms Hardwick		CSO8369	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
503355	Mr Robert Griffiths		CSO8397	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503358	H C Hoare		CSO8426	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503444	R Hobbs		CSO8572	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
503463	Mrs Rita Lockyer		CSO8590	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
503477	Mr Edward Fiddler		CSO8621	Option VWM 1	Support		<p>Housing Development in Dorset</p> <p>I am receipt of your publication re the above and other items. During the 1960's certain councils allocated land for development, divided it into plots of about 1/4 acre and sold these plots to individuals. The owners of these plots produced building plans which were submitted for approval. Once approved the owners hired tradesmen to carry out the building work.</p> <p>Most of the owners were relatively new to the housing market. They had limited resources but they were ready to muck in to help with construction. Banks were willing to then to provide stage payments to help cash flow.</p> <p>The end result of all this was a series of beautiful estates with every house different. For some reason this arrangement ceased and I have never found out why.</p> <p>Could I ask you if this facility could be repeated? Such a plan would produce lovely estates and encourage people to act on their own initiative.</p>			1045
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		CSO8673	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503554	Mr		CSO87	Option		No				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	D Verguson		74	VWM 1		Opinion				
503598	Mr John Turner		CSO8777	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503603	Mrs DJ Morley		CSO8803	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503621	A G Haines		CSO8851	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503624	Mr RT Jackson		CSO8848	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503635	Mr J Gough		CSO8901	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		CSO8943	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503640	N J and S A White		CSO9101	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503644	Mr J Riley		CSO8974	Option VWM 1	Object		Re. Housing / xxx Options Reasons for objections is that as proven on many occasions in our area of Verwood no thought has been given on the visual effect / blending in of new with old and existing properties i.e.. flats on main road behind The Hub and the redevelopment of Fayrewood Pub on Blackhill. Also the impact of traffic congestion is always underestimated especially if there is a traffic incident on a main route. More thought needs to be put into providing more facilities for the people/children of our area.			1045
503666	A H J		CSO90	Option	Support		Re. your statement concerning the District car ownership			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Paul		02	VWM 1			level, I trust, that despite financial restrictions, that road surfaces are maintained at a high level on the grounds of safety, noise and vehicular damage.			
503687	Mr Nick Smith		CSO9076	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		CSO9128	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503695	Mr and Mrs N White		CSO9090	Option VWM 1	Support		If Verwood is to continue to expand, facilities other than a new school are needed. Other towns of a comparable size in Dorset have better/larger more diverse sports and leisure facilities, medical centres, large supermarket, better public transport. Verwood is just becoming one large housing estate with little else. Planning permission should also be considered for new restaurant businesses other than pubs, to enhance the area for residents - Ferndown/Wimborne both have an abundance of these.			1045
503705	B B Morgan		CSO9106	Option VWM 1	Object		Strongly object. Green fields will be destroyed and MORE HEAVY TRAFFIC on Station Road. Where has the Green Belt disappeared to?			1045
503706	Mr David Portnell		CSO9116	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood has very few amenities and this proposed development will just make things worse.			1045
503709	Mr and Mrs A Fairclough		CSO9129	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
503759	Mr D.J. Middleton		CSO9249	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503787	Mrs P A		CSO9273	Option VWM 1	Support		I am totally against the development of large housing estates as they are not popular with the public. Also the cost of			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Dent						providing infrastructure will be phenomenal and impact on existing communities detrimental. Far better to use small existing areas of land rubber stamped as Green belt land but of no benefit to the community. These parcels are mainly within residential areas and give immediate access to facilities without overloading them. With a small number of houses built, people can get to know their neighbours better. I, of course, am part owner of such a piece of land.			
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		CSO10 014	Option VWM 1	Support		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I want to know the projected time scale for these options to start to become active. 2. It is most important that there is adequate employment to accommodate the houses to be built. 3. More attention must be made to supply of affordable housing. 4. The green belt must be respected where possible. 5. The estates around Wimborne must be consulted fully. 			1045
360029	Mr David LANIGAN		CSO10 286	Option VWM 1	Support		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy Document, Managing Growth and Development up to the year 2027. I agree with the preamble stating that we need to meet local housing needs, with the emphasis on growing the main settlements where we have good access to facilities that people require. Some development of smaller communities should continue however, especially the provision of low cost housing. The community as a whole needs the services of teachers, nurses, firemen, postmen, and policemen who are poorly paid because they commit to a vocation rather than a high salary job. We also need the services of skilled people such as builders, electricians, plumbers, gas fitters, and motor mechanics, the essentially blue collar professionals. They must not be priced out of the market in terms of being able to buy a starter home, in the community that they serve. Having bought my first home in 1963, a two bedroom bungalow for £2,200 I am aware that locally such a property is currently one hundred times as much. This makes things difficult for young couples with the ratio of house prices to wages being the highest in the country. Many struggle with getting mortgages that now require typically a 25% deposit on</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>an already expensive property.</p> <p>I moved to West Moors 15 years ago and appreciate the planning decisions that have taken place affecting this village. We now have a new build shopping centre on Station Road, complete with flats, good pavements, lighting, pelican crossing and trees. I am pleased to have seen built several small, three storey, blocks of retirement and two bed flats close to the village centre. I support the gradual expansion of the</p> <p>Village, current population around 7,500 as we have good schools, a large Memorial hall, Churches with halls, two public houses, doctors, dentists and good bus services to both Poole and Bournemouth. We have footpath access to open land such as Holt Heath, as well as being able to use the old railway line route through the village to Ringwood, - the Castleman Trail. Recently St Marys Church has had built a new Church Hall which will serve the community and thanks to the National Lottery grant we now have an excellent Bowling Club. I support the continued slow expansion of the village as currently we have many facilities for people of all ages to enjoy.</p> <p>My current house was built in the mid 70s, and has trebled in value since my wife and I moved here 15 years ago. In the 1970s West Moors doubled in size and acquired new schools and since then other infrastructure improvements. In recent years the Library was refurbished. The facilities for retirees in West Moors, with access to Ferndown and Verwood, are very good, and coupled with excellent hospitals at Poole, Bournemouth and Wimborne, and I have felt no need to move from East Dorset area in the conceivable future.</p> <p>I therefore support the proposals for additional housing as outlined in the Core Strategy Consultation, as well as the proposals for business sites for employment. I also support provisions for new schools particularly a new Secondary School at Verwood, and recreation areas to cater for the population increase. I understand that net immigration into Dorset is running at two thousand people a year so clearly we need to plan for housing, jobs, education, recreation, road improvements especially at busy junctions, and off road car parking in town centres and on new housing estates.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							There are many reasons why East Dorset and Christchurch, are attractive places for people to live, work and retire to. Long term planning that caters for the needs of a steady population increase is sensible and is to be welcomed.			
360095	Mr & Mrs John & Barbara POLKINGHORN		CSO9826	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
361105	Mr John GOOCH	Also member of Colehill Parish Council	CSO9914	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
497752	Kelly		CSO10298	Option VWM 1	Object		First build the infrastructure to support any extra housing. Then consider the environment surrounding the proposed developments. It is highly likely that badger and bat colonies are within and/or adjacent to the sites, although I doubt any housing developer will find them before work begins. Where, in Verwood, is the Town centre?			1045
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		CSO9315	Option VWM 1	Object		My objections to the housing are simply the fact that as a Verwood resident, there is already enough houses - far too many for the present infrastructure. Verwood is a joke. It is just a massive, massive, pile of houses in the middle of the forest. Why is it referred to as a 'town'? It has no centre!! New Milton, Christchurch, Ringwood, Ferndown.... they all have healthy centres with lots of amenities. Not enough shops, supermarkets, petrol stations etc. No more houses till this mess is sorted. Soulless.			1045
503861	Mr E Hawkins		CSO9346	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503878	Mr Peter Smith		CSO9402	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
503879	Mr		CSO94	Option		No				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	S Smithson		27	VWM 1		Opinion				
503943	Mr & Mrs Rumball		CSO9456	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
504093	Mr & Mrs Vivian		CSO9483	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
504101	Mrs Mary Trewiss-Bell		CSO9510	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
504193	Mrs Shauna Green		CSO9523	Option VWM 1	Object		We have far too many homes in Verwood for the facilities we have. The Ringwood Road is so busy now its hard to get out of The Chase now and far too much traffic.			1045
504203	Kate Pursglove		CSO9534	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood does not have sufficient facilities and infrastructure for its present population (shops, sports facilities, high school etc). It has a growing youth population with nothing for them to do/occupy them. The roads in and out of Verwood are too small to support the current population with frequent accidents, long delays for the slightest disturbance in the traffic and no safe alternative way to get in and out (no dedicated cycle tracks, poor bus service)			1045
504207	L S Dean		CSO9550	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
504216	Mr Mark Rich		CSO9576	Option VWM 1	Object		The facilities which already exist in Verwood are not enough for the community already living here. Doctors, Dentists, Variety of local shops. We moved here to enjoy a peaceful and green environment from a place where there was heavy traffic and continual road noise. I do not want the proposals to go ahead as it will spoil our peace and quiet and your plans are not in keeping with the area.			1045
504232	Rachel and Paul		CSO9604	Option VWM 1	Object		The reason we enjoy living in Verwood is due to it's size and community feel. I do not want to live in another Ferndown.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Higgins						The roads and shops will not support more residents.			
504241	Mr and Mrs Ansell		CSO96 16	Option VWM 1	Object		Will generate more traffic in Station Road area. Will also generate more traffic, and in Howe Lane, people there cannot get in and out of their own properties there now!! Comments from Verwood Housing leaflet Will generate at least 2 to 3 hundred extra cars per day passing along Station Road which is already difficult to negotiate now.			1045
504243	G Haskell		CSO96 21	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
504285	Mr P Miller		CSO96 55	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
504288	Tracey Doherty		CSO96 38	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
504297	C Johnson		CSO96 65	Option VWM 1	Support		Verwood does not need more homes but if you have to build then 30 it is!!			1045
504300	Paul Cocker		CSO96 71	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
504307	Lucy Cocker		CSO96 76	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
504311	Mr Victor Steeden		CSO96 81	Option VWM 1	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood is already heavily overstretched and incapable of giving a good service eg poor clearance of debris, road repairs etc and further housing will do nothing but to add to the already paucity of 'service'!			1045
504314	Ms Selina Roper		CSO97 16	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
504318	R V and P Reeks		CSO96 87	Option VWM 1	Object		Parking outside schools horrendous. Cycle tacks in the town needed to encourage use of bicycles. Traffic congestion on town centre frequently caused by loading and unloading at			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							retail stores. Pavements already too narrow for push chairs/buggies.			
504344	B Blake-Coleman		CSO9695	Option VWM 1	Object		Lack of facilities for increased population - no NHS dentists, limited medical care, only one supermarket etc. Facilities and amenities need to match increased demand.			1045
504349	A Hall		CSO9700	Option VWM 1	Object		Council have made a complete mess of Verwood - once a good place to live. Where are needed facilities, no infrastructure. A so - called town with one shop, village road, unable to cope. We have enough house - leave the Green Belt alone. This is Wessex City by the back door. As a life long Verwoodian it saddens me to experience the mess the Council have erected.			1045
504468	Mrs M Last		CSO9756	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
504477	Mr Martin Turner		CSO9763	Option VWM 1	Object		I believe there is enough housing in the Verwood area, small developments are ok up to say 20 homes. It is the amenities that need improvement say an upper school for example. The infrastructure i.e. roads are already crammed at rush hour times. The development around Albion Way has produced a lot more traffic that end of town another large development would cause untold misery. We are an old Verwood family and have seen many changes but this is one too far.			1045
504517	Mrs T Otton		CSO9770	Option VWM 1	Object		Would the Planning Committee remember that Verwood is a country town. The recent developments, The Hub, Co-op stores and flats just off Crane Drive, look suitable for a sub station in outer space - poorly designed and out of keeping.			1045
504530	Christine Phipps		CSO9775	Option VWM 1	Object		The town is over populated now, how will it cope with more families moving here?			1045
504541	Mrs S Newham		CSO9780	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
504641	Elizabeth		CSO97	Option		General	I was born in Verwood in 1920. We do not want any further			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Gresty		99	VWM 1		Comment	development - Verwood has been ruined enough - it was once a beautiful little village - you have ruined and wrecked it - the people and residents and awful buildings are not to be admired at all - we need opportunity for the young people. The new people have done nothing to give to give them that.			
505273	Mrs Lorraine Hubbard		CSO9853	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
505288	Mrs S Cramer		CSO9888	Option VWM 1	Support	General Comment	As a married mother of 3 children, 2 girls and 1 boy, living in a 2 bed Council flat (first floor), I welcome more housing to the Wimborne area for young families needing affordable housing / rented housing.			1045
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		CSO9960	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
505369	J Young		CSO9987	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		CSO10063	Option VWM 1	Object	General Comment	Building more houses has NOTHING to do with meeting the needs of (existing) local residents. We do not need or want more houses in our area. Planning to build more houses is driven by the 'need' to meet externally imposed quotas based on false assumptions on the desirability of further population and economic growth. Instead of wasting resources on building more housing which is ecologically unsustainable, we should be using them to make a transition to a low energy sustainable future for our children. Please listen to local residents and reject further development.			1045
505561	Mr. D. Calvert		CSO10105	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
505590	M Spalding		CSO10143	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		CSO10 179	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
505742	L. J. Ashplant		CSO10 205	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
505802	Mr RGH Chapman		CSO10 256	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
360146	Mrs Marilyn A WARBURTON		CSO11 160	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood just does not have the infrastructure shops public transport etc to support more housing - we need bus shuttle road crossing branches we don't have enough doctors / dentists old people's homes better footpaths and roads.			1045
498775	Mrs P L Buckler		CSO10 759	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		CSO10 330	Option VWM 1	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			1045
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		CSO10 359	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
506754	Mr Derek E Marsh		CSO10 394	Option VWM 1	Object		I have signalled objection to all Verwood development since the town already has significant new build expansion. It is in danger of losing its "village" community ways. Important to planners? – maybe not. The definition of and integration of "affordable homes" is another danger to this. Finally, any development that is made really needs to have: roads and sight-lines etc in place before house building begins; access to schools and shops provided in plenty of time for new residents; low density development would be more in keeping with this town if any! Am I a nimby or am I trying to protect a rare and valuable asset of English life? I have lived through 2 phases of Basingstoke development,			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							and though at poorly run "infill" in Benbridge - a town much like Verwood!			
506934	Mrs R Hall		CSO10 399	Option VWM 1	Object		I strongly object to any further building, housing or otherwise, in Verwood as the infrastructure cannot even cope at the moment! The doctors are so busy any appointment within 2 – 3 days is virtually impossible. The bus service is atrocious, nothing after 6pm and during the day it's only hourly. There are no decent shops and not a great deal of evening entertainment for adults without hordes of children running around. Traffic some days is really at a standstill at school times. I have to go to Muscliffe for a dentist as I can't get in here!			1045
506975	Mrs V Kesler		CSO10 403	Option VWM 1		No Opinion	Verwood RA form-object Verwood RA form- Verwood does not need any more/further developments and in particular NO MORE SCHOOLS. Margards Lane is already a nightmare with the awful school traffic.			1045
506984	Mr T Newnham		CSO10 409	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood needs improvements for existing residents. More dedicated play space for young adults, new provision for youth clubs. There is a 'need' for improved services for food shopping and fuel for cars. Up to a potential of 1000 new residents with and estimate 300+ cars would congest and degrade the road system. Also medical provision and education would be put under strain and degrade present services to existing residents.			1045
506989	Mrs Barbara Harris		CSO10 414	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood needs a bigger super-market and another filling petrol station prior to more housing. Morrisons wants, and needs to be enlarged prior to any more houses being built. Verwood is a large village as it is.			1045
507026	Mr David Craig		CSO10 439	Option VWM 1	Support	General Comment	I would like to see priority given to projects which have a higher concentration of social housing inclusion, and also include a higher green/renewable energy provision. Particular concentration on family areas, playgrounds and social/community facilities should be considered.			1045
507032	Mr		CSO10	Option		No				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	David Oliver		465	VWM 1		Opinion				
507033	A R Twaits		CSO10 491	Option VWM 1	Support	General Comment	Despite improvements to public transport, cycling and walking, the reality is that the vast majority of journeys will continue to be made by car. Local roads are already congested and the extent of development proposed is not acceptable without significant increases in the capacity of these roads for cars. In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.			1045
507132	Ms L Joyce		CSO10 534	Option VWM 1	Object		Support VWM 2, 4 and 8. Otherwise I would be very reluctant to support any new developments and would urge the council to reconsider current options with a view to inclusion of : Extensive food store New leisure centre that developers could contribute to. These two things alone would alleviate traffic pressures, pressures on QE and Ringwood plus wider area.			1045
507136	Mrs S A Segal		CSO10 540	Option VWM 1	Object		I have lived in Verwood for 26 years. When my husband and I first arrived here there were more small and varied shops and also four banks. I do not think that we could happily and safely sustain the amount of new residents that is being planned for.			1045
507141	Smallman		CSO10 547	Option VWM 1	Object		All you ever want to build in Verwood is more houses. Where are you going to promote and build commercial/ business areas to create local facilities/ employment. Building a school next to 2 existing schools will create massive road jams. This should be built next to Trinity school where the road system is better.			1045
507144	Paul Brewer		CSO10 551	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507152	Mrs A E J Dolan		CSO10 558	Option VWM 1	Object		There are no work opportunities in Verwood therefore roads through Verwood will be further clogged fighting to get to cities south and north for work. We have not the infrastructure for this vast amount of housing.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							I object most strongly to the whole concept.			
507160	Mrs H Walker		CSO10 563	Option VWM 1	Object		I think that Verwood's infrastructure will not be able to cope with any further development. Even if a new upper school is built the amount of cars would be unacceptable as Verwood is so spread out not many children would walk to the school.			1045
507170	Miss A K Jukes		CSO10 587	Option VWM 1	Object		When I moved to Verwood in 2000 I was informed and read for myself that Verwood would not expand any further. As houses have been sold and subsequently demolished, there have been many infill homes built to replace them. I am under the impression that sites VWM 1,2 and 3 are sites of old munitions dumps therefore unsuitable. Anywhere on flood plain e.g. VWM 4 and 7 are without question, unwise. More facilities required e.g. swimming pool and more shops – not hairdressers or supermarkets!			1045
507178	Mr Paul Banning		CSO10 595	Option VWM 1	Object		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is disingenuous to show the proposals without showing existing planned development – please publish these plans. • In the past 20 years Verwood has experienced exponential expansion of residential property and now need a period of time to mature and create an identity and community. • These proposals will lead to the increase of motor vehicles (c.500) and daily vehicles journeys measured in excess of 1000. This increases atmospheric and noise pollution and leads to a reduction in quality of life for existing residents. Because Verwood is a dormitory town it already experiences high levels of road usage as it is essential to use a car for most activity. • EDDC will fail in its promises (especially 1+3) if these plans proceed. • The parking on the public highway at Trinity school is already a danger to pupils and local residents (no access for emergency services) and this will greatly exacerbate the problem. <p>Further comments submitted in a letter dated 12.1.11: In our view it would be inappropriate to expand the town of Verwood, as it has already experienced almost exponential population growth since the beginning of the nineties and now needs time to mature and establish a sense of identity. For a</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>town the size and population of Verwood the facilities and shopping areas are only adequate, and they need more time to develop before making a significant increase in new houses. For this reason, and the more detailed points that we make below, we are against the proposals.</p> <p>The main concern is the proposed use of greenbelt for further encroachment of suburban sprawl into the countryside. A main attraction of Verwood is that it still retains a rural feel, especially at its northern edges and its boundary with Ringwood Forest. We believe this should be maintained, and not jeopardised for the future by a further sprawl of relatively high density housing. You do not publicise the capacity for additional houses within the existing non-greenbelt boundaries of Verwood, and this is a serious omission to the integrity and transparency of the planning process. This should be addressed in the next round of the planning process.</p> <p>There is also a lot of detail on the proposals to build houses, but very little on facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>An example of this, are the proposals for VWM 1 and 2, totalling 230 homes many of which will have young children. My understanding is that the existing Trinity School is already full, and so First School capacity would need to be increased, or provided elsewhere in Verwood. An increase in capacity at Trinity School would lead to an increase in volume in traffic at the start and end of the school day. The parking and delivery of children is already chaotic, often making the roads impassable if emergency vehicles need access to the houses accessed through Edmondsham Road and Coopers Lane. This in itself reflects poorly on the organisational abilities of the school and local authorities to provide a suitable solution. The attitude appears to be move the problem outside of the school premises (for reasons associated with litigation) onto the surrounding roads, without concern for general public and pupil safety. The proposals for mitigation of traffic volumes (walking trains etc) fell away very quickly. It would be interesting to understand how Trinity now compares with best practice in this regard.</p> <p>As an example of town planning, this is a microcosm of poor implementation and follow through that must be a concern for</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>any changes proposed by a planning function at local authority level. My household experience of EDDC planning since moving to Verwood is very poor. In my previous 30+ of home ownership I have experienced reasonable responses in my interactions with the local authority. With EDDC I have had to make a letter of complaint, also escalated another issue to the LGO. This does not give any confidence that EDDC can manage the changes proposed in the Town Plan to a successful conclusion.</p> <p>We are concerned that the Consultation document makes no attempt to set out a financial plan for the strategy. I have to say that in my years of working in large business the idea of strategic planning without an indication of the financial implications would have been anathema. In the 8 years that we have lived in Verwood we have experienced above inflation levels of Council Tax increases without any obvious changes in services. Having compared the Council Tax payable in Verwood with a number of houses in the same band in Dorset and Devon, I have been surprised that Verwood is more expensive than most. This is particularly surprising since the value of our house in Verwood is usually substantially less than the houses in these other areas.</p> <p>So the Plan makes no commitment to the existing Council Tax payers that any proposals will be at least financially neutral to them. Indeed the majority of the proposals will not bring benefit to the existing Tax payers, but the contrary. While Verwood retains a rural feel, it is essentially a commuter town. Most people whose to live here but work elsewhere – as shown in the planning documentation. We see little scope to change this, so any increase in housing brings with it increased traffic noise and atmospheric pollution. An increase of more than 400 houses will, we estimate, bring 1 – 2000 additional car journeys per day, mostly during peak hours for work commuting and school runs by runs by parents. This will again further tip the balance from Verwood retaining a rural character, to just becoming a noisy, crowded suburban sprawl.</p> <p>So, in summary our views are that the plan should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preserve the greenbelt wherever possible. 2. Retain as much rural character in Verwood as possible. 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							3. Address existing noise pollution and not exacerbate this. 4. Focus on meeting the needs of existing Council Tax payers, as prime stakeholders in the community. 5. Promote organic growth in the provision of both housing and facilities.			
507183	Mr G Roberts		CSO10 590	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507207	Paula Edwards		CSO10 599	Option VWM 1		No Opinion	I live in Verwood and I wanted to make comment about the proposed developments. As we are one of the fastest growing towns in Europe I would like to add that its great having all this housing but we do need more facilities to accommodate the needs of each and every family, i.e. a super leisure centre with swimming and great sporting facilities for young people to adults is needed. More improved bus facilities for quicker access to neighbouring towns, and cheaper fare so that people will be encouraged to use the bus rather than the car (the Spanish bus was so cheap and so well used it was great).			1045
507213	Ieuan and Janice Davies		CSO10 605	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
507219	Mrs Louise Spencer		CSO10 611	Option VWM 1	Object		I object to anymore new homes in Verwood as at the moment all the facilities are overstretched, schools are full and doctors are full. Not enough shops and HSBC bank closed. Buses are only every hour only one petrol station, 3 pubs all for very different tastes. No leisure facilities for teenagers. The parking at Emmanuel middle and Verwood first schools is absolutely dreadful and the roads couldn't cope with more traffic if more places were available. A new secondary school would need a very big car park and new road. Some roads in Verwood are in a dreadful unmade state e.g. Manor Lane, St Michaels Road and Howe Lane (in places).			1045
507220	R Sharples		CSO10 616	Option VWM 1	Support		The land between Verwood and Three Legged Cross appears appropriate for new housing as it almost represents infill between the two settlements, whereas any significant			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							building to the other (West, North, East) sides of the town encroaches too much on the countryside. VWM housing leaflet- No Opinion			
507235	Mrs Margaret Chalk		CSO10 637	Option VWM 1	Object		Don't spoil Verwood any more. The new road was bad enough and the new shops aren't at all inspiring, not enough thought was given to the choice as far different ones were needed as there are not any really decent shops in Verwood. There are three hairdressers also estate agents all within a stones throw of each other. We only really have small village facilities considering the large number of houses that there already are in Verwood.			1045
507253	Joyce Smith		CSO10 642	Option VWM 1	Object		Please no more! Verwood will end up being a place that no one wants to live.			1045
507264	L F J Garratt		CSO10 648	Option VWM 1	Object		The area is overcrowded at present. The majority of the residents (voters) do not want change. Listen to the majority voice.			1045
507269	Michael and Alexandra King		CSO10 658	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507272	A E Cook		CSO10 664	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507274	Miss M Kettless		CSO10 669	Option VWM 1	Object		3 buildings which have ruined Verwood. 1) the flats which look over the Hub, and another 44 which nobody wants, there should have been a green area. 2) the flats with the stupid wavy roofs. 3) the Co-op which is being built onto of the traffic lights this is so dangerous vans park on the bend it is going be an accident plus 3 flights flats people around this building are so angry. We would like to see these buildings pulled down, no-one new there was an application for the Co-op until it was passed, and people say we did not need another food shop as we already have 3 and why was it passed in Bristol, did anyone bother to come down and look where the building was and to see how dangerous it is going to be, and now 44 flats looking over the Hub, the police, and the fire station said no to it, the people of Verwood don't want any			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							more housing, what builders have done to Verwood have ruined it with their designs.			
507275	A Saxby		CSO10 670	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
507279	Anne Tubbs		CSO10 675	Option VWM 1	Support		It would be very good to have affordable homes for our young ones.			1045
507286	Mr N P Butler		CSO10 699	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood needs more infrastructure before more homes are contemplated i.e. facilities such as a leisure centre, supermarket etc. incentives for more businesses to set up here to stop it continuing to be simply a dormitory town. I am not surprised that Dorset has the highest level of car ownership in the country. A large percentage of it can be seen leaving Verwood between 7am and 8.30am every morning!			1045
507326	Mr and Mrs M Salter		CSO10 713	Option VWM 1	Object		There should be no further 'major' housing developments in Verwood. Verwood is becoming over crowded, the roads are very busy, doctors' surgeries and the schools are overcrowded. Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support more people! It does however need a secondary school, swimming pool / leisure centre and decent shops. Access in and out of Verwood is very poor given the amount of people who already live here!			1045
507330	Mr Malcolm Lay		CSO10 714	Option VWM 1	Object		Transport and infrastructure has to be a priority in Verwood prior to any new homes. To even be thinking about building more homes is irresponsible of the council, unrealistic and will result in the local area being ruined. The council also need to attract new companies, entrepreneurs to the area to stimulate jobs as unemployment will increase substantially otherwise. Comments from Verwood Housing leaflet Until Verwood has a proper infrastructure no new homes should be built. We require urgently a proper, updated, expanded supermarket together with petrol station, new doctor, dentist, a proper bus service and a large leisure centre. Also the roads cannot handle the current level of			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							traffic.			
507335	Mr J Bridges		CSO10 732	Option VWM 1	Object		How do you expect to get residents support when you send out this information on the 12th November informing one that the information was on display until the 11th November?			1045
507336	Mr John Page		CSO10 764	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
507345	Mr B Hodgkins - Wright		CSO10 746	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
507353	Mr and Mrs M Morgan		CSO10 788	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		CSO10 855	Option VWM 1	Object		We strongly object to any housing development in Verwood, there are not enough facilities to cater for this amount of proposed development and we are particularly concerned about the effect it will have on the first schools that are already at full capacity and the middle school which could become over subscribed! It would also have a fundamental effect on our children not having enough spaces at QE School in Wimborne. Verwood is a nice green and safe place to live; we do not need anymore development!			1045
507361	Mr Kenneth Archer		CSO10 809	Option VWM 1	Object		Existing infrastructure needs a great deal of improvement i.e. shops, doctors, dentist, transport, before any new properties are built - urgent need for a senior school but build it next to Trinity School. Morrisons needs updating and competition need another. Petrol station, dentist - doctors wait for appointments (waited 9 days) indicates an urgent need. In fact we need a decent shopping centre and road system this amount of new housing would bring Verwood to a standstill. SNAP: A big issue concerns the A31 motorway which would need to be developed into dual carriageway to join up with the A35 motorway. As already stated on all the other survey's Verwood is so lacking in essential facilities to build new			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							housing before sorting out this problem would turn Verwood into one very large housing estate and little else ,especially the figure of 40% being ear-marked as so-called social housing the town would see a massive exodus of it's existing residents who have grown to love being part of Verwood's community.			
507362	Mrs J F Preece		CSO10 808	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		CSO10 891	Option VWM 1	Object	General Comment	The area alongside the A31 between St Leonards Hospital and Tricketts Cross is an area where many houses could be built. Currently this area is an eye-sore and gives a bad impression to visitors as they cross into Dorset from Hampshire. Why are nearly all your proposals on greenbelt land? There are many areas in East Dorset on non greenbelt land which could be built on. Your proposal (FWP 4 and 5) will put more pressure on Parley Common as well as introduce more traffic on an already busy road system.			1045
507366	Dennis A Pattensen		CSO10 820	Option VWM 1	Object		Larger Morrison supermarket to be extended to meet the demands of the current population together with the addition of a petrol outlet.			1045
507372	Andrew Innis		CSO10 836	Option VWM 1	Object		EDDC uses Verwood to fund other areas - the infrastructure needs to be improved before any more houses are built.			1045
507378	Ms Anni Dencher		CSO10 856	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507386	D Hobbs		CSO10 877	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507388	Mr David Huggins		CSO10 915	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
507395	Geoffrey		CSO10	Option	Object		No more houses until bigger supermarket and better roads			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	and Valerie Coates		893	VWM 1			out of town - another school, and doctor's surgeries can't cope already with numbers.			
507402	Mrs V Crout		CSO10 914	Option VWM 1	Object		Building should not take place on Green Belt land. Church Hill already suffers from too much school traffic. Manor Road is always extremely busy. With more housing it will become even worse.			1045
507409	John Crout		CSO10 934	Option VWM 1	Object		My concern is that you planners have allowed piece meal development with very little regard to the infrastructure, and the roads in particular. I would suggest that Church Hill and Manor Road already exceed their design capacity.			1045
507418	Mrs J Alexander		CSO10 948	Option VWM 1	Object		Strongly object to building on Green Belt land! Verwood would not be able to accommodate further building of new homes given it's present infrastructure, it would destroy the area!			1045
507425	E M Connick		CSO10 955	Option VWM 1	Object		Having been familiar with 3 Cross and Verwood since the early 60's when my sister and family lived in 3Cross, later my parents in Verwood and now 2 brothers living in the area, I would like to object to this huge development. Verwood was a relatively small village in the 60's that has grown and grown with little improvement to the infrastructure. The Green Belt has been nibbled away and the narrow roads are quite dangerous for the youngsters and the elderly. We ourselves have lived here since 1993 and we feel this development would be a step to far. We lack so much including facilities like a swimming pool.			1045
507435	J Barnacle and S Bennington-Fewsey		CSO10 965	Option VWM 1	Object		We would oppose any further developments in Verwood with the infrastructure that is in place at present, and the alarming amount of affordable housing being proposed, coupled with the erosion of what's left of open fields and land in Verwood.			1045
507451	F Williamson		CSO10 985	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507461	Mr G J Babb		CSO11 002	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507487	Mr W A Linter		CSO11 037	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
507499	Mr M Ward		CSO11 051	Option VWM 1		No Opinion	These developments do not affect me directly. But. The infrastructure cannot cope. Supermarket not large enough. Doctors have long waiting times for consultation. Chemists cannot cope. Suggest supermarket is rebuilt immediately incorporating leisure centre. Centre to be transferred to land at 'the hub' which is not economically viable.			1045
507524	Mr C G Richardson		CSO11 085	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
507555	Mr and Mrs C Lamond		CSO11 112	Option VWM 1	Object		No more 'new' housing in Verwood please until the existing houses been built / up for sale show signs of being sold and lived in (i.e. not investment properties)			1045
359890	Mrs G.M. PROWSE		CSO11 342	Option VWM 1	Object		VWM 1 - This area and part of VWM 2 is the only grade 2 land in the parish. WWM 1 is well suited for much needed allotments.			1045
361037	Mr P STRATFOR D		CSO11 320	Option VWM 1	Object		I expect that my objection to everything is not very practical. However, I have lived in the area for most of the last fifty years. In that time there has been a constant cycle of the council saying we need more housing, followed by we need more industrial areas to provide extra jobs for all the new homes. Then in turn the council says we require extra jobs for the new homes, then in turn the council says we require extra homes for the new workers. This process is never ending. During this time I've witnessed the creation and expansion of the industrial estates at Ferndown, Uddens, Ebblake and Wimborne. A whole new housing estate at Tricketts Cross, Glenmoor Rd Ferndown, and the expansion of West Moors, Colehill, and Verwood turned from sleepy village into a town. In this time I am not aware of any developed area being returned to its natural state from a developed one. Please let me know if you think differently. I hope you agree that my objection to development is rational and that the never ending cycle of expansion is stopped.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary Hendy		CSO11 740	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
507580	Mr and Mrs P & J Gardner		CSO11 143	Option VWM 1	Object		Green Belt land being grabbed - unforgivable!!! No infrastructure sufficient to support these proposals. Verwood is being decimated and has now become too busy i.e. always bedlam in Morrison's supermarket as it is no longer big enough. P.S. Please stop the constant parking outside Tesco Express (Ringwood Road) it is an accident waiting to happen.			1045
507595	Mr D Johnson		CSO11 180	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		CSO11 223	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
507668	Mr Gavin Lee		CSO11 233	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507693	Mrs P Carter		CSO11 275	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507699	Mr Robert Rawles		CSO11 248	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood lacks a vibrant town centre but are close to having the population equivalent to Ringwood.			1045
507708	Mr Powell		CSO11 273	Option VWM 1	Object		We object to all the development if there are no plans to improve the infrastructure - 415 houses = potentially 830 more cars. No leisure facilities, no decent bus services, no cinema, swimming pool, bistros.			1045
507716	G R Cridlan		CSO11 293	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507721	Mr		CSO11	Option	Object	General	Existing facilities in Verwood are inadequate for the existing			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	M O'Kelly		298	VWM 1		Comment	population. To increase the population by circa 2,000 will only acxxxxx what is currently a poor situation. You really need to show how you will improve bus routes, roads, centre of town etc etc.			
507723	Oliver Stonehouse		CSO11 299	Option VWM 1	Object		I strongly object to further large developments in Verwood. Verwood is being overdeveloped, without adequate infrastructure of local amenities and services being available. Roads cannot cope with the extra industrial traffic. The town has been spoilt, with ugly buildings and long traffic delays due to poor roadworks. Children have been put at risk of road accidents. Verwood town centre and residential areas are an eyesore with masses of uncollected rubbish. Council cannot cope. Building planning is not thorough enough. Consideration must also be given to the damage caused to wildlife and woodlands, something the Dorset is famous for.			1045
507733	Mrs Susan Phillips		CSO11 312	Option VWM 1	Object		Close to SSSI land. Green Belt.			1045
507737	Mrs S Philpot		CSO11 318	Option VWM 1	Object	General Comment	I believe that crime and vandalism will rise in Verwood if more houses/people come to the area as the community feeling will be lost. A larger school will also mean that housing near the school will be subject to rubbish, vandalism and graffiti, too many extra cars when there is already a problem at present. Getting in and out of driveways at present is a precision manoeuvre so as not to run anyone over! There is not a problem with the children travelling out of Verwood to upper schools, QE has just spent a lot of money to accommodate the intake of children and this will be irrelevant if you take away the children from a very good school.			1045
507744	D Timpron		CSO11 327	Option VWM 1		No Opinion	The large new developments proposed will seriously reduce the (apparently) rural aspect of the town by being visible when approaching Verwood. The VWM1 development would also be visible on approach but at least it is a relatively small development.			1045
507752	Mr Glen		CSO11 337	Option VWM 1	Support		Bring it on more jobs.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Bailey									
507755	Maureen Niblock		CSO11 350	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to accommodate another fifteen hundred people. There is nothing there - particularly for teenagers or adults. The Council ignored the wishes of the inhabitants and built The Hub instead of the swimming pool, which most people wanted, and which would have been great for young and old alike. At present there is little vandalism. This will change with a large influx of teenagers from big towns and cities. Traffic problems will increase. Doctors and dentists will be overwhelmed making it even more difficult than ever to get an appointment.			1045
507760	Mr and Mrs R Gardner		CSO11 366	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507768	John Niblock		CSO11 368	Option VWM 1	Object		We moved here because, like many other people who moved here, we wanted to live somewhere quiet in the countryside. Since we arrived ten years ago there has been almost non-stop building. There are insufficient amenities in Verwood to serve the present community let alone another fifteen hundred people and eight hundred extra vehicles. The road between Verwood and the A31 is already dangerous and with extra traffic will get worse.			1045
507771	Mrs P M Coventry		CSO11 373	Option VWM 1	Object	General Comment	Lack of shops. 70 people waiting for allotments, objection to taking land designated green belt. Why not in-fill between Verwood, 3X, Ashley Heath and West Moors and allow a smaller Castle Point, to serve these areas, thus saving trips to Bournemouth or Salisbury. You assured me some time ago that there was to be no more estates built in Verwood, only in-fill, i.e.. knock down and put 3 - 4 up.			1045
507780	V R Strickland		CSO11 391	Option VWM 1	Object		I am sorry but I think you have already spoilt our lovely Verwood. PLEASE, PLEASE leave us alone.			1045
507782	Jennifer Baxendale		CSO11 396	Option VWM 1	Support					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507786	Ms Helen Scriven		CSO11 399	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood already requires improvement to facilities: larger supermarket, better leisure centre including swimming pool, senior school. If we get more houses we will require a fourth primary school and road access improvements and much much more. We also need our precious greenbelt to be protected as we are proud of our rare species and country style life for our children.			1045
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		CSO11 453	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
507795	A M Baxendale		CSO11 411	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
507800	Mrs K M Platt		CSO11 477	Option VWM 1	Object		Too much development in Verwood already.			1045
507805	Mrs N J Wareham		CSO11 421	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
507808	Mrs J V Atyeo		CSO11 426	Option VWM 1	Object		We need more shops, as people are coming to retire in Verwood they may not be able to travel out of the town to shop. Also the school should have been here years ago.			1045
507812	Mr D Masters		CSO11 430	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507817	Mr R Gulliver		CSO11 442	Option VWM 1	Object	General Comment	The new housing does not improve anything in Verwood. We do not need more homes!! We need a Secondary school to build a future for our children. We should not be held to ransom, that if we allow the housing, we will get a Secondary School, because we all fear that you will just walk away and leave us with nothing. Why use Green Belt land, when the council has brown land that it can use. i.e.. land behind the Police Station for Social Housing. The Nursery's, Pre-schools, Schools, Doctors, Dentist etc can			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							not cope. 400 homes will create another 800+ cars and 1.245 to 1,660 people. NO! NO! NO more!			
507833	Mrs Johnson		CSO11 459	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507839	Margaret Williams		CSO11 474	Option VWM 1	Object		When my husband and I came to Verwood nearly 12 years ago, it was a delight to walk into the village centre along Ringwood Road. Not any more. The amount of traffic has increased dramatically in proportion to the growth of what was then a small town. The growth of Verwood has been noted as the fastest growing town in the country. I suggest it is big enough.			1045
507869	B O'Kelly		CSO11 495	Option VWM 1	Object		Current facilities are moderate - to add up to 2,000 additional occupants is foolish and unacceptable. It is time our elected representatives began to represent us.			1045
507891	Mr R W Johnson		CSO11 503	Option VWM 1		No Opinion	Further Bus services or more frequent existing routes (36, 36a, 37) or Yellow Buses to extend to Verwood from West Moors? Depending on these being practicable of course.			1045
507899	R J Potts		CSO11 511	Option VWM 1	Object		There should be no more houses built without adequate infrastructure, in particular more shops and a second supermarket in the centre of the town.			1045
507909	G Waterton		CSO11 520	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507915	R Waterton		CSO11 526	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507931	Mr and Mrs R S W Spicer		CSO11 537	Option VWM 1	Object		We are new to Verwood but feel that Verwood is very much over houses with very little infrastructure. Verwood was and still should be a village.			1045
507941	Mr and Mrs Avril and George Jeavons		CSO11 543	Option VWM 1	Object					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507946	Mr and Mrs K Carter		CSO11 546	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
507957	Mr and Mrs L R Vining		CSO11 553	Option VWM 1	Object		415 x 2 cars per household plus 1 petrol station and only single carriage roads = gridlock! We don't have enough doctor's surgeries or infrastructure to cope!! with this there is almost zero public transport!			1045
507965	Mr Jack Harvey		CSO11 562	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>We consider Verwood housing has already outgrown the size of the town. There would be insufficient services to support what would be at best another 400 families.</p> <p>There are still many unmade-up roads in Verwood awaiting the promises of 20 years ago. These roads have got progressively worse with all the new building work - Manor Lane in particular as the builders got away with not repairing the damage done during the build of the Spring Close area and new houses on what was an open field.</p> <p>Traffic that should use Margard's Lane persists in using Manor Lane as a short cut and with a new secondary school this would increase.</p> <p>We understand that the Health and Safety rules say that there should be at least two made-up roads to the school to provide IN/OUT access in the event of an emergency - Margards lane or Springfield Road /Close to Howe Lane as was on the ORIGINAL PLAN.</p>			1045
507968	Philip Chivers		CSO11 566	Option VWM 1	Support		<p>Email</p> <p>I would like to comment on the new proposed housing developments in Verwood. Although new houses are inevitable, I believe that there are a number of issues which need to be addressed.</p> <p>The infrastructure in and around Verwood is just not in place yet and the town needs time to develop and get things in place before so many houses are built.</p> <p>Schools - there are insufficient places in schools which means either an additional school or extensions will need to be built. Who will pay for this?</p> <p>Medical - The Dr's surgery is already stretched to the limit and will never be able to cope with such an influx. who will</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>pay for new services?</p> <p>Road systems - I believe that the roads will simply not be able to cope and am particularly interested in access for the vwm2 area? I note from the document that you talk about bike lanes, these aren't required as f you live in Verwood you need a car to get anywhere else!</p> <p>Water - The water pressure is already a problem due to the number of new flats built in Verwood. What will another 400 homes mean?</p> <p>Employment - during the recent meeting at the Hub we heard about how half the population of Verwood leave the area to work so lack of jobs wouldn't be an issue - Half leave because there are no jobs in Verwood. Working for a national company I understand about recruitment and profiles of various people. With 50% of people in social housing, I know for a fact that on average they won't travel more than 5 miles and won't be working from home and creating new business. If we therefore intend to move people here from other "council estates/waiting lists" this will simply create a poorer life for all. I grew up in social housing so know better than most the result of this policy! We will certainly need more police and other social resources. Who will pay? Will the residents in social housing be paying full council tax? If not who will make up their shortfall. As it is our council tax is already ridiculously high!</p> <p>So what is the best way forward? Provided access and roads have been considered I think the developments should be smaller in particular VWM2 which is a really large development. Why not build 1/4 of the proposed homes spread across all zones and phase the overall growth over 15 years to allow time?</p> <p>No doubt this is a done deal and council members have hidden interests in this but I think you should be really consider the size and impact of what you are proposing.</p>			
507980	Sylvia Allen		CSO11593	Option VWM 1	Support		Any extra traffic at Parley Cross and Longham would be unbearable without major road improvements. Re more homes at Parley Cross.			1045
508383	Ms		CSO11	Option	Object					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Emma Hayter		708	VWM 1						
508413	Mrs S Best		CSO11 768	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
508529	Jackie Chivers		CSO11 861	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
508532	L C E Leman		CSO11 868	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
508535	D G Sandy		CSO11 879	Option VWM 1	Object		There is not enough facilities at present for Verwood other than food shopping i.e. Morrisons you have to travel several miles to the next nearest town for any other goods, Verwood has become a hotch potch of housing developments, with no effort for other facilities and infrastructure. We don't want any more houses.			1045
508545	Dorothy Goodenough & Alan Craddock		CSO11 893	Option VWM 1	Object		There is insufficient infrastructure/facilities etc shops, swimming pool to sustain an increase in the population of Verwood. Until Verwood has better facilities and a more frequent bus service (currently one hour service) increased housing puts a greater strain on our community.			1045
508554	Mr P Mitton		CSO11 902	Option VWM 1	Object		No more houses! We need more facilities - especially a swimming pool.			1045
508560	Mrs Coral Collins		CSO11 910	Option VWM 1	Object		The roads and facilities in Verwood cannot cope with any extra houses, it will spoil what is a very nice place to live.			1045
508577	Mr and Mrs R J Ribbons		CSO11 921	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure, eg buses, shops, leisure facilities, parking etc to support yet more housing.			1045
508580	Mrs Kirkcaldy		CSO11 931	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508588	Michelle Hocking		CSO11 947	Option VWM 1	Object		There are already too many empty properties in Verwood. Some remain half built for months and become an eyesore. The planning office don't appear to have any control over the building. The height of the properties is excessive in a small town totally out of proportion.			1045
508596	Whyberd		CSO11 956	Option VWM 1	Object		The area does not have enough facilities to support all the extra people that the new homes would bring.			1045
508609	Patricia Thorley		CSO11 983	Option VWM 1	Object		I Have lived in Verwood since 1976 and strongly object to any further development. The once rural location has been over-developed - and many other properties have been lost or inappropriate houses have been built in gardens. I would question the need for more housing - it seems to satisfy a buy - to -let market only - our roads are over-burdened with traffic. I believe enough is enough - we need to protect rather than destroy our environment.			1045
508611	Mrs Rosamond Heaven		CSO11 988	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
508628	Martyn Heaven		CSO12 005	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
508635	Mrs I A Jordan		CSO12 011	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
508642	P Williams		CSO12 021	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
508650	Mrs M Peters		CSO12 028	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
508656	Mr and Mrs J Fry		CSO12 041	Option VWM 1	Object		Although we are all for improving Verwood and its facilities, we feel that the above future plans will only cause problems within the town. If land is registered as Green Belt then it should not be built on for a reason. We don't have enough facilities for the residents of Verwood as it is, what it would be			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							like with another 415 houses would be a complete nightmare! No No No!!!			
508664	Mrs Sharon Hak		CSO12 057	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
508671	Barry and Carole Bull		CSO12 072	Option VWM 1	Object		The plans for yet more housing is lunacy. Roads in and out of Verwood are few and already totally inadequate at the busy times of day for the amount of traffic, particularly the Ringwood Road. Where are the new inhabitants of these 415 houses going to work? Not in Verwood! So even more cars to clog up the road to Ringwood for hours each day. Any sane person can see that Verwood is already overdeveloped for the infrastructure it can sustain. It's about time we stopped these lunatic planners from using Verwood, only just in Dorset, as the repository for all their county housing requirements, so that they can avoid the difficult issues which challenge them in development of towns and villages in the rest of the County. Now's the time to say enough is enough - they have already wrecked Verwood enough already with overdevelopment and equally lunatic road systems			1045
359931	R E PETERS		CSO12 854	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
477753	Mr Stephen Saville		CSO12 626	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
508690	E and R Wood		CSO12 094	Option VWM 1	Object		No more homes! Sell what is built first then think of the amenities etc - Council and builders are the only people who will benefit.			1045
508696	Kate and David Fuller		CSO12 100	Option VWM 1	Object		Apart for the lack of infrastructure and facilities, indiscriminate (and ghastly) new buildings and ridiculous alterations to traffic flow have already resulted in the decline of Verwood. Our car parks have become 'Park and Ride' facilities for people living long distances away and using their free bus passes.			1045
508709	Mr and Mrs		CSO12	Option	Object					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Bennett		105	VWM 1						
508711	Tina Alexander		CSO12 116	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood has already developed too quickly. Facilities have not been reflected. The recent new homes are out of character and shoe horned in. There is overflow of flats already, let these be taken up before considering further new development.			1045
508715	David Drayton		CSO12 125	Option VWM 1	Object		Not enough infrastructure to support more families living in Verwood.			1045
508718	Sienna Drayton		CSO12 132	Option VWM 1	Object		Not enough infrastructure.			1045
508735	Mr Peter Barham		CSO12 142	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
508738	Mankin		CSO12 148	Option VWM 1	Object		We have enough traffic problems as it is.			1045
508826	Mr R.G. Smith		CSO12 158	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is already over developed, from a pleasant country village into now a sprawling dormitory town without a heart or character. As a villages laced with lanes and sandy tracks, consecutive councils have eroded its natural beauty until we now have vast tracts of housing. Refuse these developers plans and call a halt to these cancerous estates, remember this, once granted, the damage to the countryside is irreversible.			1045
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		CSO12 192	Option VWM 1	Object		The Council is always after land for housing or business development. Whatever is granted is never enough and a few years later they want more. This process has been going on for over 50 years and it is time it came to a stop. Enough is enough as it is ruining the area.			1045
508842	M G Carlyon		CSO12 193	Option VWM 1	Object		The facilities have not kept pace with present housing situation so approx 400 new homes will only make matters worse. Verwood lacks the infrastructure to support more houses. Traffic is bad at present, more houses will increase this.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Comparisons:</p> <p>RINGWOOD - 2 supermarkets, Upper school, Boots, Iceland, Smiths and High Street of shops.</p> <p>WIMBORNE - 2 supermarkets, Upper school, and square of shops with more leading shops in roads leading off The Square.</p> <p>FERNDOWN - 3 supermarkets, Upper school, Boots and numerous shops.</p> <p>VERWOOD - 1 small supermarket, no Upper school, and some very small shops. A Post Office which was here when Verwood was a village. Some people use Three Legged Cross or Cranborne P.O. because of the long queues.</p> <p>This shows that Verwood has a long way to go to catch up with any of the other towns. More houses will make the situation worse.</p>			
508848	M Lardner		CSO12 206	Option VWM 1	Object		General comment - I would like the results published so all can see them - i.e. not in local papers which are not always delivered.			1045
508852	Mrs L.A. Chesshire		CSO12 254	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
508853	Charlotte Rout		CSO12 218	Option VWM 1	Object		Not enough infrastructure.			1045
508857	Mrs and Miss EJ and P D Goode and Smith		CSO12 231	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>There is an insufficient infrastructure of roads and services for a large increase of housing in Verwood. The B3081 (leading to M27 and M3), already under pressure, would see a significant increase of traffic. The Edmondsham road is a country lane completely unsuitable for a large increase of traffic.</p> <p>Large tracts of unspoilt countryside would be built on and nearby wildlife would be threatened.</p> <p>NW7 and 3 already struggle with traffic problems in school term times. Such an increase of residents would inevitably lead to a demand for more shops, services and leisure facilities - and where would they be built?! Verwood really is big enough NOW!</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508859	Matilda Rout		CSO12 233	Option VWM 1	Object		Not enough infrastructure			1045
508863	Mrs L A Seward		CSO12 248	Option VWM 1	Object		VWM 1 - use of this land for green space - allotments would be a big advantage for the town - especially as the land in Howe Lane is to be used for a school. These developments VWM 1 and VWM 2 are very near SSSI sites. The road from Edmondsham is not sufficient to deal with the increased traffic.			1045
508865	Miss B A Page		CSO12 251	Option VWM 1	Object		A secondary school needs to be around Potterne Park area (if at all: even one of 500 pupils will have a wage bill of £1 million p.a.) (I was a clerk to the Governors of a large secondary school). The Howe Lane one would be impossible for people to drive to - and parents won't use a bus if at all possible. NB. Ferndown Upper is under-subscribed. I am pleased that the area around Doe's Lane (Dewlands Farm and into Horton) has been left undeveloped: it would be the death knell of the nature reserves on Dewlands Common if it were developed, and a problem to fulfil the EU directive on river valley protection (The Crane flows across the end of Doe's Lane.)			1045
508867	Mrs J Martin		CSO12 261	Option VWM 1	Object		I moved to Verwood in 1985 - we have no more amenities now than we did then! The road system is to serve a rural village and cannot cope with the volume of traffic and you want to make the situation worse??? You apparently have orders from 'upstairs' to provide 415 more houses - and you will - so why send these forms - I guess you have to show that you did!			1045
508874	Mr Orkney		CSO12 276	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
508886	Mrs G V Grover		CSO12 286	Option VWM 1		General Comment	We want more facilities for the houses already here. (will anybody listen)			1045
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		CSO12 320	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508890	Mr L Rackham		CSO12 290	Option VWM 1	Object		Would it not be best to just leave well alone.			1045
508898	K Banning		CSO12 299	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
508907	Heather Teasdale		CSO12 311	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
508923	Mrs L Earl		CSO12 341	Option VWM 1		No Opinion	<p>My opinion would only be valid if the proposal was either put into place or dropped. For the Proposal.</p> <p>We know the local government have to abide by government's ruling for more sustainable housing therefore it is inevitable that building will eventually come. More population should create a livelier environment adding to events we already have in place, such as farmers markets, carnivals, rustic fayres, shows at the Hub (which must be badly attended as they are always short of cash), and Memorial Hall, Heritage centre etc. Obviously more rates would help local government which should help create extra amenities for local people.</p> <p>We already have a lack of shops. West Moors which has a smaller population has far far more shops . We also have 1 petrol station which denies us the benefit of competition. 400 more homes would probably increase the population by over 1000 making the area more desirable for business. Extra money from rates could help create more places of leisure or expand those we have for our teenagers who hang around with nothing to do, perhaps a skatepark or club. I would like to see any extra cash put to use making a hard surface cycle lane on one side of the Verwood to Ringwood road. Going south there is a path already for most of the right hand side, but not suitable for cycling.</p> <p>Against the proposal Large areas of council type housing. Nice family houses are always acceptable with interspaced council run at say 5% - 10% this would stop the rough teenage element that most people fear. Roads are not good enough to take the extra</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>traffic that an increase of about 800 - 1000 extra cars would cause. Schools would have to be enlarged as well as the proposed new school. Well in advance of the housing, and has the Council got enough funding for this. Will the extra population cause problems for our car parking, which is often full, making it necessary to enlarge it, making us have to pay for it in the future?</p> <p>If the plans go forward may I suggest that the roads are made up by the developers. Verwood already has far too many roads that are a hazard if one has to drive down them, it is totally unfair to tradesmen, doctors, ambulances, postmen, etc. who through no fault of their own risk flat tyres and broken suspensions.</p>			
508938	Mr Michael Smith		CSO12 365	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
508956	Mr T Webb		CSO12 377	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
508973	Mr Kevin Reynolds		CSO12 395	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
508975	A W J Seaward		CSO12 396	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
508985	Mr N Meyrick		CSO12 408	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
509040	J W Hislop		CSO12 442	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
509043	Mrs P Craven		CSO12 464	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is getting too overcrowded. Lack of facilities is a big factor. So many people - more cars and reduced to only one petrol station!			1045
509053	Mrs		CSO12	Option	Object		More population will make Doctor's surgery appointments			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	B Macfarlane		453	VWM 1			even longer - already over one week.			
509062	Clare Symons		CSO12 466	Option VWM 1	Object		1. Verwood has more than its fair share of modern housing estates. 2. Development southwards is least favourable. Need to retain green space between Verwood and Three Legged Cross. 3. Transport improvements? Few people in Verwood, buses too slow for commuters. Latter mainly drive via Ringwood or West Moors, much congestion. Would developer fund dual carriageway or new road?			1045
509065	Mrs B Burge		CSO12 501	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
509072	Juliet Garratt		CSO12 476	Option VWM 1	Object		There are too many houses now for the current infrastructure. If more are built it will only lead to increased problems with roads, services i.e. doctors, lack of garages and shops. Surely it would be more appropriate to build on less congested sites. Perhaps the site of the old hospital at St Leonards which must already be marked as a 'brown site'. If East Dorset District Council persist with this plan the area will be irrevocably destroyed by over development. Despite Verwood being called a 'town' because of the increase in population it is in real terms a village. A town has facilities and shops which we do not. I like the area as it is, that is why I moved here and any attempt to turn the area into a suburban sprawl is resented by yours truly. Verwood will see the movement from a caring population to a transient population. The residents will only live here because of access to work, they will not be the life force of the village. In other words they will not care because Verwood will be like a lot of other villages that have been swallowed and become dormitory towns of other larger conurbations. I have seen it happen, don't let it happen here.			1045
509099	Mrs L S Timberlake		CSO12 507	Option VWM 1	Object		These plans will instigate the demise of Verwood socially and economically. Current infrastructure is inadequate -			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Roads/Doctors/Dentists/shops Begg belief that we were refused permission to relocate the access to the front of our house, but there are now plans to completely reshape and redevelop the whole area.			
509116	E I Sams		CSO12 532	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
509128	Susan J Cheese		CSO12 540	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
509251	Frances Hudson		CSO12 594	Option VWM 1	Object		Leave Verwood alone, it's grown too much already - the infrastructure and the facilities cannot cope as it is. Verwood is a beautiful place to live - don't spoil it with more houses, more cars and more kids on the streets with nothing to do. This is just a recipe for disaster.			1045
509293	Caroline Laraman		CSO12 610	Option VWM 1	Object		I understand the need to develop and support a growing town, which is the case in the current climate. But my concern is that the Government can afford to build a secondary school, secondly maintain the school for the forthcoming years. Also the schools especially primary and pre-school are currently oversubscribed, so what will be done to resolve this with more families? Also what other facilities are available, eg. swimming pool etc.			1045
509421	Mr J Dowling		CSO12 647	Option VWM 1	Object		Unless Ferndown and Wimborne schools are over subscribed, I think the building of a secondary school in Verwood is not a good idea, as it only breeds local gang culture into our youths. It is far better for young people to mix with people from other areas, as it lessens the us and them culture.			1045
509861	Mrs V Aitken		CSO12 875	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
509899	Mr Peter Harfleet		CSO12 887	Option VWM 1	Support		With all the additional housing there must be an improvement in the bus services and local facilities, especially the only large supermarket in the area 'Morrisons', which cannot maintain its services for its customers at present, let alone			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							with more residents. It should be encouraged and helped to expand its present site.			
509922	Mr and Mrs V Feltham		CSO12 912	Option VWM 1	Support		Very serious consideration should be given to the following: 1. Verwood has no proper infrastructure - Doctors surgeries are already at bursting point and there are no available places on NHS Dentists waiting lists. 2. There's nowhere in Verwood (other than the charity shops) to purchase clothes, shoes, bedding and other household essentials. 3. Would it not be better to build the school at VWM 4 where sporting facilities and open spaces are already available at nearby Potterne Park? This in turn would relieve traffic congestion which would arise at VWM 7 if the school was sited there. 4. To erect the number of homes outlined in the document would mean a tremendous increase in traffic. Verwood is already a commuter town with people already having to travel to work, and with no proper facilities for shopping have to go to Ringwood, Bournemouth and Poole. To increase the volume of traffic would seriously affect safety and the environment.			1045
361121	Mrs Elizabeth JONES		CSO14 017	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
361161	Mr Douglas FORWARD		CSO13 605	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
482795	Mr and Mrs N F Steel		CSO13 874	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
500746	Mrs J Lothian		CSO13 794	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
509952	Tracey Legge		CSO12 949	Option VWM 1	Object					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
510420	Mr Peter Stevens		CSO13 158	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		CSO13 247	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
510532	W.W. Chant		CSO13 290	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
510623	Mr Douglas Priest		CSO13 393	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
510798	Mr F Sullivan		CSO13 536	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
510844	Mr Michael Guilmany-Cush		CSO13 580	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R. Mayes		CSO13 628	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
510974	Mr Jim Cullumbine		CSO13 656	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
510993	R.A. Cherrett		CSO13 691	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
511001	Mr Paul Few		CSO13 685	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
511015	Mr Christopher		CSO13 744	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	White									
511020	Mrs E Derbyshire		CSO13 716	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
511030	K Derbyshire		CSO13 734	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
511044	Mr B L Buckman		CSO13 746	Option VWM 1	Support		It's ok to build all these new homes so long as we can have a swimming pool built. Years ago this idea was rejected because of the lack of population in Verwood. Also we need a good shopping centre much like West Moors. Also a B and Q or Homebase save having to travel to Bournemouth to help the DIY man in Verwood. We also need another petrol station (I hear Morrisons may have this soon).			1045
511056	K H Saunders		CSO13 772	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
511058	Mr W Taylor		CSO13 771	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
511069	Mr John Cheese		CSO13 796	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
511076	Mr Ian Burden		CSO13 827	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
511095	Mrs Warburton		CSO13 820	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
360097	Mr John DOWLING		CSO14 500	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
511117	Mr and Mrs G		CSO13 838	Option VWM 1	Object		Our particular objections to the proposed new homes are as follows:-			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	McConnell						<p>1) Medical services - We already have difficulty in getting reasonably prompt appointments to see a doctor. An extra 1,000 (?) inhabitants would make matters much worse.</p> <p>2) Telephones - We live next door to the BT exchange. Within the last year or so, increased overheating of equipment has required the installation of noisy, forced ventilation. Another 400+ phones has the potential for creating really objectionable ventilation noise.</p>			
511128	Eileen Housden		CSO13 856	Option VWM 1	Support		The new secondary school should be built before the houses are developed. This has been proposed since I moved into the 'village' in 1979 when the population was a fraction of what it is today. Verwood is now just a dormitory town totally lacking in character and identity. The planning is appalling and hopefully no more blocks of flats will be allowed - the blocks of flats near The Hub are monstrous.			1045
511135	S D and N Richards		CSO13 865	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>In relation to the proposed development of schemes VWM1 and VWM2 and the attached plan from Mrs S Burrows we would like to raise the following concern:</p> <p>At present we run a holiday letting business with three cottages from Eastworth Farm that are marketed as being in a rural area with country views and walks. Obviously if the above schemes become a reality, it would ruin our business because there would be no rural aspect and the volume of traffic passing about 3m from the front doors would be horrendous.</p> <p>This aside from our personal aspect, which we enjoy living at Eastworth Farm with the views and reasonably quiet road yet have the facility of a town nearby.</p> <p>From our point of view, we feel the following point is relevant to the proposed development:</p> <p>Should development take place along Eastworth Road with any of the above schemes, the conservation boundary be taken around the boundary of Eastworth Farm. Therefore, our land would be included in the 'brown field' area giving us the possibility of including our land in the development proposal and the opportunity to lift the section 106 agreement, thereby changing the cottages to residential units.</p> <p>We have had discussions with Mrs Burrows regarding the</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							proposals and have agreed that our land can be included in their scheme should the inevitable take place and the development goes ahead.			
511137	Sarah Barrow		CSO13 866	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
511175	Webber		CSO13 887	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
511181	Pauline Barrow		CSO13 896	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
511189	Miss Pamela A Stannard		CSO13 903	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>My comments and reasons for objection</p> <p>General comments.</p> <p>Verwood has grown by 500% in the last 20 years. During this time very little has been done to improve the infrastructure to support all this development. Much of the character of this former village (now town) has already been destroyed. We have a duty to protect what remains. The greenbelt, areas of special scientific interest and areas of 'special character' (in the proposed South Verwood Development area) have so far survived. The proposed development on this very special part of South Verwood would be on greenbelt land and runs close to the River Crane (a triple SSI). This must not be allowed. The residents of Verwood and EDDC have in my opinion a duty to protect this very special area and our heritage.</p> <p>Transport issues.</p> <p>Increase in traffic. The current infrastructure/roads in Verwood are already inadequate. The West Moors bypass originally planned to ease traffic problems in Verwood following previous developments was scrapped in favour of new homes. No doubt this would give more revenue to EDDC than any bypass!!!! What I want to know is when are you going to give something back to Verwood???? How do you propose to deal with the increase in traffic and the problems this will cause if these developments go ahead?</p> <p>Potential increased risk of flooding and drainage problems. How would any new development be drained?? I understand the river Crane is a triple SSI so I assume water will not be drained there? I also understand that according to Councillor</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Flower the drains in Manor Road are 'not fit for purpose' and already 'full to capacity'. I therefore assume water cannot be drained there either? People have shown me photos of flooded fields in the Verwood South area that would serve the Manor Road development. I know the water levels are high in parts of St Michaels Road and peoples gardens are already waterlogged during winter months. Surely further development of land in this area can only make things worse. You only have to look at what happened to the listed cottage in Burnbake Road following land development in that area, The cottage and grounds were so damaged the cottage had to be pulled down!! Do you want this to happen to St Michaels Cottage (also Listed) as well??? Increase in development means increase in surface water. Are you prepared to take the risk and increase flooding in the Verwood South area? Are you prepared to be accountable for your actions and responsible for any damage you cause to privately owned property????</p> <p>Encroachment on greenbelt.</p> <p>I have lived in St Michaels Road for 22 years. I understand that land beyond Howe Lane is and always has been greenbelt. This area must be protected for our future heritage. You only have to walk down the farm and beyond to realise how peaceful and special this area is. St Michaels Road and part of Manor Road are also areas of 'special character'. This is confirmed in the Council Plan (2004). What will happen to wild life that depends on areas like this? This area will be destroyed if this development goes ahead.</p> <p>In the 22 years I have resided in St Michaels Close I have seen much change. This change has not been for the better. I feel privileged to live where I do and have direct access to the delights of walking up St Michaels Road and beyond the farm on a summers evening or a Sunday afternoon. I am able get away from the hustle and bustle in the Manor Road area. I witness bats in my garden on a late summer evening despite living toward the developed end of the road. Much wild life depends on this area for its survival. I have seen evidence of badgers in my back garden and have witnessed many rare birds visiting my garden. For example, woodpeckers, chaffinch, green finch, jackdaws to name but a few.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Ten years ago Verwood was described as the most rapidly developed town in Europe. We have had enough now. If this council is so concerned with providing affordable housing why did it sell land adjacent to the hub to a developer who I understand will not be providing affordable housing? There is plenty of brown belt land around Verwood that could be used. I understand that during a recent Dorset study, the majority of survey respondents said they were against housing construction on the countryside, yet the report's conclusion was in favour of development?! I would ask EDDC what evidence they have that suggests there is a 'need' for housing in this area? If the evidence for housing need is bogus, as has been suggested to me, and if the wishes of the local community are being ignored, surely there is no justification for building on otherwise protected land in the open countryside?			
511200	Audrey Barrow		CSO13 904	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
511211	Mr Peter Hodges		CSO13 914	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
511236	G Thomas and J R Thomas		CSO13 930	Option VWM 1	Object		Church Hill is already blocked with traffic at school times. Enough is enough!			1045
511246	Mr and Mrs Daniels		CSO13 940	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
511252	Ms Mary Harris		CSO13 947	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
511294	Mr Alan Dorey		CSO13 978	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and		CSO14 065	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Diana Froud									
511430	A.D. May		CSO14 196	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
511489	Mr H G Holden		CSO14 179	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
511571	Colin Alborough		CSO14 234	Option VWM 1	Support		We are in desperate need of more affordable housing in the East Dorset area. There is also a shortage of employment opportunities in the area. The provision of more houses should help to push house prices down to give young people a change of getting on the property ladder.			1045
511618	Mrs V Blunden		CSO14 300	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
511621	Ms Mary A Combe		CSO14 280	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
511711	Coombes		CSO14 440	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
511997	Mr Tom Saville		CSO14 805	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is big enough; it doesn't need or can cope with any further development. More traffic as a result of more houses will be a disaster for the town; Verwood should not be turned into a dormitory Town.			1045
360809	Mr Brian Skyrme		CSO15 412	Option VWM 1	Object		New secondary school in Howe Lane is the wrong location – support new school on land west of Trinity school. This to be built and opened before housing the middle house building period is finished. Also all roads and parking facilities to be completed at the opening date of the school. House building on the scale suggest in ridiculous without the infrastructure to support it. By this I mean, transport, shops, leisure, doctor surgeries, etc. etc.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
476264	Mr David Reddaway		CSO15 680	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
498376	Mrs Helen Holman		CSO15 295	Option VWM 1	Object		We object to the development proposals on the grounds that the proportion of "affordable" housing is too high and on the lack of appropriate plan to improve services within Verwood – including the provision of an appropriately sized supermarket, competition for petrol station, leisure centre. Definition of 'affordable' housing not given in documents.			1045
500817	Mr L Lothian		CSO15 366	Option VWM 1	Object		1) Re use or develop existing empty houses. 2) Each house has 2 – 3 cars not 1 car. There is too much traffic and congestion in west moors. We do not need a bypass either. 3) There are no jobs here, build the houses were there is work i.e. Bournemouth or Poole, not our green land.			1045
511374	Mr Shane Smith		CSO15 185	Option VWM 1	Support		We have been concerned regarding the volume of traffic along Howe Lane already, and the addition of any additional housing would in our opinion cause too much strain on these old roads. As it is a fire engine could not pass during school runs. The two main roads leading out to the A31 already too busy during peak times and the addition of this number of houses would be a problem we think. Also we are worried about ruin our view – which is why we bought our house in the old area of Verwood as it was quite rural feeling.			1045
511383	Mrs Jean Archer		CSO15 251	Option VWM 1	Object		Existing infrastructure needs greatly improving before any new building could be considered – need senior school but build it next to trinity. Morrisons needs updating and competition, need another petrol station and dentist, doctor can't cope now (waited 9 days for appointment). In fact we need a decent shopping centre and road system. You can't have it all ways. With the amount of houses it's no longer a village more like a town with few amenities. SNAP:A big issue concerns the A31 motorway which would need to be developed into dual carriageway to join up with the A35 motorway. As already stated on all the other survey's Verwood is so lacking in essential facilities to build new			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							housing before sorting out this problem would turn Verwood into one very large housing estate and little else ,especially the figure of 40% being ear-marked as so-called social housing the town would see a massive exodus of it's existing residents who have grown to love being part of Verwood's community.			
511449	Mr K F Armstrong		CSO15 258	Option VWM 1	Support		Option VWM 7 must have new road access developed first along Howe Lane and into Manor Road. Margards Lane is not suitable for construction traffic and is already grid-locked twice per day.			1045
511453	Mr & Mrs Weeks		CSO15 269	Option VWM 1	Object		We object to any further housing in Verwood as there is not sufficient infrastructure to support it. We appreciate that a senior school is needed but are extremely concerned re the access to it and parking. The traffic in Margards Lane is now sometimes grid-locked and a further school would make this an even worse situation. We are amazed that a further school could be built in this vicinity. Safety is also an issue here as is access to emergency vehicles.			1045
511508	Mr & Mrs J E Maiden		CSO15 286	Option VWM 1	Object		Virtually no infrastructure has been provided to Verwood in the last 20 years despite the explosion in population and development. Already the road system towards Bournemouth is at breaking point if ever maintenance is required. I believe Verwood has twice the population of Wimborne but only a small fraction of the facilities, I don't want to move again!			1045
511549	Ms Debby Andrews		CSO15 318	Option VWM 1	Object		There are barely any facilities for current residents and they certainly will not stretch to 400 more homes. Provide infrastructure first and then maybe I wouldn't object.			1045
511564	Ms Emma Prince		CSO15 335	Option VWM 1	Support		I support these proposals providing that any developers are required to provide allotments sites to the north and south of Verwood to meet the current huge level of demand. And also the facilities in Verwood (leisure etc) need to be improved to cope with additional demand.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511620	Mr Neil Hudson		CSO15 341	Option VWM 1	Support		You simply cannot go ahead with major expansion of Verwood (already grown from 3000 – 13000 approximate residents in 25 years) without addressing the infrastructure of Verwood itself. The roads are a classic example most residents commute out of Verwood to work. Most of this is either towards Ringwood or towards West Moors. There is already traffic build up at junction points. The access to Emmanuel school is currently down Church Hill and Margards Lane. I have recently written to the county council over the current vehicle situation affecting residents of Margards Lane, Haywards Lane, Howe Lane, Keswick Road, Lancaster Drive with drivers on the school run (in an 8 min spell I counted 250 car movements). The noise pollution is currently unbearable. When it rains we are close to gridlock (with the implications of emergency vehicle access) Margards Lane was never designed as the main school access. Any further expansion will make matters worse; you need a school access relief road built now!			1045
511827	Mr J Kennard		CSO15 353	Option VWM 1	Object		I'm sure there are many good reasons why affordable housing could be increased in Verwood; however access and increased traffic issues have been touched on by the community. Public transport is poor for people living in Verwood: Serious investment is needed to improve transport infrastructure between Verwood and neighbouring towns and cities without constantly increasing the size of the town.			1045
511836	Mr J Middleton		CSO15 360	Option VWM 1	Object		Build all amenities first (i.e. more useful shops, sporting facilities, better bus services, more doctors etc. etc. etc.) more exit roads out of village??			1045
511850	Mr & Mrs R C Williamson		CSO15 373	Option VWM 1	Object		I believe the town of Verwood is unprepared for such expansion. Also building on agricultural or woodland is short-sighted, as in long term the country will need land to grow our food. The council should use brown sites as there seems to be quite a few.			1045
511855	Mr Alan Thorn		CSO15 392	Option VWM 1	Object		It would be crazy to build 400 new homes without major investment in the infrastructure, with only one road in and out of Verwood and not enough doctors and dentists and only one major supermarket for 15,000 people.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							If the government took responsibility for building affordable housing you would only need to build 180 new homes not the current 400 proposed. This would work out cheaper in the long run as you would not have to make major investment in the infrastructure.			
511868	J Weedon		CSO15 439	Option VWM 1	Object		Any increase in housing in Verwood has an impact on the traffic through West Moors. No consideration has been given to this. Improved infrastructure is needed before housing developments.			1045
511878	Mr Paul Seymour		CSO15 499	Option VWM 1	Support		I support limited development around the Trinity school area as the road system has been 'improved' in that area. I believe a small development would have no further detriment to the area. I do not support any further large scale development in Verwood or infilling of green field in Howe Lane as the area is already 'busy' with existing houses and traffic for the schools.			1045
511980	Mr Stuart Folley		CSO15 505	Option VWM 1	Object		The school is required to meet the requirements of existing population. Additional homes will put increasing strain on an already highly populated town.			1045
512072	Mr W B Chung		CSO14 824	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
512125	Mrs Julie Long		CSO14 879	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
512145	Mr & Mrs J Dutton		CSO14 923	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
512175	Mr Noel Baugh		CSO14 961	Option VWM 1	Support		The larger concern is one of a village infrastructure (Verwood) through shops and facilities (lack of) supporting a population of 17000 already. Look at Ringwood. Its no greater population but has a better 'high street'. A larger Morrisons will not alter this per se..			1045
512281	Graham		CSO15	Option		No				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Roberts		007	VWM 1		Opinion				
512326	Mr Ian Willis		CSO15064	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
512431	Mr & Mrs Lee		CSO15152	Option VWM 1	Object		No further development of Verwood should take place until improvements have been made to facilities available to existing residents. Transport links, health facilities, shopping and work places are sadly lacking and its short sighted of council to propose putting pressure on these. Keep Verwood as a small town where it is currently a pleasant place to live. Leave us alone.			1045
512557	Ms Karen French		CSO15178	Option VWM 1		No Opinion	It is a 'catch 22' situation in that in order to have a new secondary school we need new housing. The main concern is the lack of facilities for an increased population. Although Verwood is a town it has the feel and facilities of a village.			1045
513509	Mr Roy Brodie		CSO15404	Option VWM 1	Object		As residents of Verwood for the past 16 years we would like to comment on the proposed Core Strategy. We are concerned that during our time here the population of our town has doubled but the infrastructure has stayed the same. Its true we have had a new community centre built and Ferret Green has been made a pleasant area but very little has been done to improve our roads. There are only two roads to connect us with the A31. These are extremely busy during the early hours and evening rush. Often cars entering Ringwood Road from side roads have a long wait. Huge delivery lorries block the traffic at Tesco and Baileys. The prospect of another four hundred plus cars frightens us. Surely we have had our fair share of new houses built in recent years, indeed it was once rumoured that Verwood was the fastest growing town in Europe. Many young families who moved in during that time no have children able to drive. Lets sit back now and improve what we have then think about building more houses.			1045
513581	Nicola Beesley		CSO15401	Option VWM 1	Object		In 1987 the population of Verwood was less than 10000 and the figure available for 2009 was 14820, representing an			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>increase of 51%. However the Verwood Town Council has stated, 'that the population is expected to rise to a peak of 15000 and then hopefully stay at that level.' Obviously the figure of 15000 was determined as a result of the Council undertaking full and proper assessments of the facilities that exist in the town to support the citizens and with the due cognizance of the East Dorset District Council Structure Plan. However much the District and Town Councils deserve praise for achieving their own objective, it should be argued that there is currently an inadequacy of proper facilities to serve the needs of the existing population and they must now apply policies to ensure that the needs of the Town inhabitants are properly addressed before additional dwelling places are built.</p> <p>The population of Verwood is already larger than that of Ringwood without the civic amenities and the people of Verwood deserve better, a proper leisure centre including a swimming pool and adequate shopping facilities. However good the service from the existing retail businesses: is a tiny post office, one petrol station; a handful of shops, and a small dated supermarket really adequate?</p> <p>Traffic in Howe Lane is atrocious particularly during rush hours with additional hazards of the school parking - emergency vehicles cannot get through now at key school times. To build adjacent to St Michaels too will mean the unmade section of Howe Lane will become a proper metalled road with the consequences of speeding increased traffic levels.</p> <p>The area between St Michaels Road and Manor Road is currently designated Green Belt land by the existing East Dorset Structure and Local Plans. Environmentally these developments are a potential disaster with the loss of much needed green space for relaxation and the habitat for local flora and fauna in addition to increased traffic and pollution volumes such development will undoubtedly bring!</p> <p>Heavy traffic flow on Manor Road currently causes congestion and safety hazards at busy times without the extra volumes which can be expected from another 165 homes - potentially 330 cars BEFORE the offspring enter the market for vehicles.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Under each succeeding structure plan East Dorset District Council has consistently, met and exceeded the housing targets set for it, while protecting the Green Belt and the environment of the District.</p> <p>Approval of these proposals can only lead to the destruction of the Green Belt and the local environment and future development MUST only be allowed to proceed on brown field sites within the jurisdiction of East District Council.</p> <p>The Town Council should continue with the objective of maintaining the population at its own pre-determined level and reject these proposals, restricting any development to that which improves the amenities and lifestyle of that population.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Nicola Beesley</p>			
513617	Valerie J Brown		CSO15 417	Option VWM 1	Support		<p>In moderation.</p> <p>I support moderate increase in housing but the following issues must be addressed first.</p> <p>1) access to Verwood via Ringwood Rd- a dangerous rd too narrow for the present traffic in rush hour.</p> <p>2) Access to all the sites should protect present residents</p> <p>3) General services to Verwood suitably increases</p> <p>4) Money for new school (and services) definitely available</p> <p>5) Woodland areas eg St Michaels/Howe Lane corner protected.</p> <p>^ St Michaels Rd left xxxxxx and unlit.</p> <p>No xxxx street xxxxxx lot of traffic on this narrow side road.</p> <p>No access from Summerfields - quite wrong, xxxxxxxx current properties.</p> <p>(This wording unreadable due to water spill prior to receiving the form)</p>			1045
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A Kirby		CSO15 453	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I live in the beautiful countryside of Verwood and would like it to stay that way. This is why my wife and I decided to move here some 11 years ago.</p> <p>We object to the proposed building of more houses around Verwood and Three Legged Cross.</p> <p>These areas already have an over population of houses without the required facilities. We need better road networks,</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							larger supermarket, another petrol station, more dentists, doctors and all the NHS services are under pressure. We do not have sufficient facilities to support these additional homes. We must have better infrastructure to sustain further development FIRST including secondary school, shops and swimming pool. Also Verwood and West Moors Housing leaflet			
513651	Mrs W Pearsall		CSO15 435	Option VWM 1	Support		1 Increase bus frequency and to Wimborne. More buses on Saturdays and Sundays. 1 per hour is not sufficient. 2 Increase transport to all hospitals, Bournemouth, Poole, St Leonards, Wimborne, Salisbury and Southampton. 3 Verwood needs direct links to all railway stations and airports. 4 Verwood needs allotments. Council land (including County Council) needs to be immediately available at an economic rate. Suggest land parallel to Potterne Way alongside river. land being auctioned on Potterne Way. Part of land VWM 4 in flooding area away from river. 5 VWM4 Access via Manor Rd and St Michaels Lane. Already congested and impeded vision around new gas station. Suggest small roundabout junction these 2 roads. Would slow traffic on this dangerous road and be safer for school children.			1045
513671	Mr and Mrs G Green		CSO15 458	Option VWM 1	Support		Unless we get infrastructure in place first Verwood cannot sustain more homes in such high numbers. Our facilities at present are used by other villages too and what we have here is not nearly enough. Doctors, dentists, shop, a garage, leisure facilities are really inadequate now and would not be able to support more homes. More traffic will be generated, so roads more congested and public transport is high on unavailable at times now.			1045
513719	Mr and Mrs E Roberts		CSO15 494	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is sadly not the place we moved to 31 years ago. We feel we already have enough new building. If all these houses are built, where are the people going to work? Will they commute out of the town and make the B3081 even busier than it is now.? Another reason, has adequate thought gone into health, i.e. doctors surgeries which are already			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							overcrowded, also hospital accommodation. Also where are these extra people going to shop?			
513880	Mr Derek Martin		CSO15 507	Option VWM 1	Object		No development without infrastructure including road improvement. Station road can not carry any further increase in traffic. Developers must pay for this first before any building.			1045
513883	Mr West		CSO15 512	Option VWM 1	Object		The town could not support the extra people (at least 1245) if you say 3 people per house - probably a lot more. Doctors surgeries, schools, car parks could not cope. The centre of the town does not have or could not have shops of enough interest to stop people just driving on their way to larger towns.			1045
513891	Mr RA Parsons		CSO15 532	Option VWM 1	Object		Leave Verwood as it is. Give us more sensible shops and better roads and the allotments promised 20 years ago. We cannot keep up with the housing we already have. No more.			1045
513900	Mr P Wall		CSO15 591	Option VWM 1	Object		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed eg. road improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			1045
513915	Mrs PA Parsons		CSO15 567	Option VWM 1	Object		I object to any more houses in Verwood. We have very little in shops less now than 20 years ago. Roads need a lot of attention. No concessions for allotments-if green spaces found for housing why could you not find green space for allotments. Disgrace to you East Dorset Council.			1045
360838	Cllr. Mrs Carol Holmes	Parish Councillor West Moors Parish Council	CSO16 654	Option VWM 1	Object		1) How would you ensure new homes were for local people? 2) Verwood needs competitive retail outlets like Waitrose etc to offer consumer choice and competition with Morrisons. It is not right to have just one supermarket for a town the size of Verwood. It would cut back on traffic movement too. 3) All the proposed housing developments would put further strain on Station Road, West Moors. 4) Give serious thought to using St Leonards' Hospital site for major retail eg B and Q to cut down travel to Castle Point.		Not changed to processed until clarification of status of response	1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
									nt received. L King	
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		CSO16 363	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
361196	Mr J.M BULLIVANT		CSO16 281	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
491252	Margaret Wareham		CSO16 588	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
511639	Paul Hockey		CSO16 093	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
513974	Mr A Moore		CSO15 821	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
513988	Mr & Mrs S.G Smith		CSO15 650	Option VWM 1		No Opinion	It is absolutely essential for new road to be forthcoming if new school proceeds. In House Lane, let alone the further housing planned.			1045
514049	Mrs E Hellier		CSO15 750	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
514091	Mr RJ Potts		CSO15 826	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
514092	Ms Natasha Saville		CSO15 795	Option VWM 1	Object		I think that there should be no more building in Verwood without more infrastructure, shops. Doctors Etc. Verwood is big enough; the green belt should be saved for future generations.			1045
514099	Mr and Mrs T C		CSO15 857	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Blakeley									
514100	Mrs Eileen Gibbs		CSO15 829	Option VWM 1	Object		The infrastructure in Verwood is not sufficient to accommodate all the extra cards and people.			1045
514111	Penelope Webiery		CSO15 899	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
514121	Mr David Dencher		CSO15 900	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
514136	Mrs J Crumb		CSO15 959	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
514225	Mr Simon Dixon	Secretary West Moors Traders Association	CSO16 005	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon Chaffey		CSO16 004	Option VWM 1	Object		Our feeling is this is yet another token gesture by the Council. This is clearly obvious by the planning permission that seems to be given for the most grotesque buildings in Verwood. The corner of Ringwood Road and Black Hill Road as a typical example. Also all those other awful flats in the middle of Verwood. If you are going to build then think before giving planning permission. Also speed up the development of Morrisons to keep in line with the increased population to Verwood.			1045
514274	Mr Showell		CSO16 073	Option VWM 1	Support		Instead of new housing there should be a new strategy of providing more public open space. The lessons of the Edwardians/Victorians should be learnt. New public parks like Poole Park, Queens Park and Kings Park save an area from urban crowding. Perhaps all the land proposed for housing could be reallocated to public parks.			1045
514282	Ian Bignell		CSO16	Option	Object		If Verwood gets more houses, it will need more facilities.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	and Sally Hinchliffe		037	VWM 1			There are lots of houses on the market at the moment, most of which aren't selling, so this proves we don't need any more houses. I agree with secondary school, as long as the middle school system is maintained.			
514287	Mr Brian Walker		CSO16 047	Option VWM 1	Object		Over the last few years Verwood's population has increased above 16,000 due to building expansion, I feel that Verwood has already contributed our duty to the housing problem. Any more house building would put even greater pressure on our limited infrastructure, transport services, roads, parking etc. Also within this proposal for more than 40% of affordable houses, where are these people expected to find employment in the Verwood area? No Green Belt land should be allowed to be built upon. B3081 main road out of Verwood is already over congested in the rush hours.			1045
514344	Ms Emily Saville		CSO16 117	Option VWM 1	Object		Don't ruin our green belt. Too many houses in Verwood already – not enough facilities to support this!			1045
514355	Mr T Gee		CSO16 125	Option VWM 1	Object		Living on Station Road we have noticed the massive increase in traffic over the years. An increase of a further 400 homes would probably bring another 800 cars to an already congested town. most people who live in Verwood work elsewhere hence the high number of people travelling at commuting times. There are no employment opportunities in Verwood and no one can guarantee that firms or businesses would open up in Verwood. This is a dormitory town with a high percentage of OAP's. Building on Green Belt land in a semi rural area would directly adversely affect the quality of life of existing residents and the council must do all it can to prevent further building on Green Belt land.			1045
514367	Mr R S Coates		CSO16 129	Option VWM 1	Support		We need started homes (housing assessment). We need a plan for traffic management.			1045
514379	Mrs Denise		CSO16 138	Option VWM 1	Object		There are already many properties for sale in Verwood and the need to build others is questionable. An increase of 400			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Bannister						homes in this area potentially means 800 more cars. Access to and from Verwood is likely to become more problematical. There are very few jobs in Verwood and to increase housing further is likely to mean that more people will be travelling out of and back to Verwood each day. Whilst building a secondary school does have some merits, access to the existing schools is already difficult and at a time of serious financial constraints it would make sense economically to develop existing secondary school sites and thus minimise the effects upon the local community. Congestion within Verwood does not need to increase and in terms of environmental concerns, any further destruction of the Green Belt land around this area must be strongly and forcefully opposed. There are plenty of brownfield sites within local communities that could be enhanced by developments before encroaching on green field sites. Finally facilities such as shopping and community facilities would not support more housing.			
514392	Alison Frost		CSO16 149	Option VWM 1		No Opinion	Please can you leave land to provide allotments for the residents of Verwood? They are a vital part of health and well being for residents with little or no garden and are much needed in the town.			1045
514429	Joan and Ann Humphries		CSO16 154	Option VWM 1	Object		The proposed areas not compatible for whole of the area. Infrastructure non-negotiable. Traffic conditions not generally good at this present time. Amount of homes suggested - quite ridiculous. xxx 200 here and there - what about the people to fill - need into 1000's. Build on brown sites and not green open spaces.			1045
514455	Mrs Christine Groves		CSO16 161	Option VWM 1	Object		There are enough homes and people in Verwood and enough traffic on our roads.			1045
514467	Mrs Lesley Cripps		CSO16 205	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
514482	C E T Gilbert		CSO16 239	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514499	Mrs S H Chung		CSO16 225	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		CSO16 318	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
514703	Mr S Harvey		CSO16 369	Option VWM 1	Object		The village has enough housing stock already and is too densely populated with a need for a better public transport network that operates beyond the hours of 6pm! We need to build a secondary school and more shops offering local goods and not just estate agents!			1045
514752	Claire Richardson & Jamie Shirley		CSO16 394	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
514812	Mr C Sawyer		CSO16 430	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		CSO16 486	Option VWM 1	Support		Seeking the opinion of the general public on planning issues is all very commendable - but setting aside all political persuasion my feeling is that this is no more than a Public Relations exercise because in the end the final decisions are always to the advantage of the developers whoever they may be because of money, greed and looks good on paper. My general view is that density levels for new homes should be kept down; East Dorset has become so over developed that its now just one big urban sprawl. Infact it has lost so much of all the natural character and charm that it used to enjoy it is hard to know where the so called green belt begins and ends.			1045
514913	Mr and Mrs M Clark		CSO16 466	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
514939	D		CSO16	Option	Object		The more land you concrete over the more you have to			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Porter		510	VWM 1			because you just increase demand. Infill best option.			
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		CSO16 539	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
360167	Mrs Pippa WHEATLEY		CSO17 447	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>As Options comments are requested on separate sheets, I will make points which are general to the four Verwood Options (VWM1 to VWM4) first, and then make comments relating to this particular site.</p> <p>Comments general to the 4 Verwood Housing Options Opportunistic This does not appear to be a 'strategy'. It appears to be a Phew! Someone's offering us land for housing. Let's try and make the facts fit. Complete reversal of intentions in RSS Under RSS there was no intention to roll back Green Belt and subject Verwood to yet more large areas of housing. There was indeed the sentiment that Verwood had far more than its share over the past few decades. In your Vision para 3.10 you tell us that PPS 12 advises that the Vision should be in general conformity with the RSS and closely relate to any Sustainable Community Strategy for the area. As far as Verwood is concerned there has been a complete turn around on both these issues</p> <p>Sustainability All sites have rich biodiversity. Sites generally appear to be unimproved grassland, probably not ploughed for many decades, good hedgerows and mature trees. These are increasingly being recognised for their role in carbon capture. Verwood is noted for high car ownership and high usage to get to work which is largely out of Verwood. No increased employment sites are put forward for Verwood so any newcomers will inevitably add to the traffic going out and returning home to Verwood on a daily basis. Increased traffic will be generated by the needs of these developments for supplies to local shops, home deliveries and people having to shop for many items in outlying towns. The road system in and around Verwood is incapable of</p>	Delete Option VWM 1		1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>coping with increased traffic and there is no plan to improve the main access route B3081 or to make it safer. The roads will be continually jammed up with traffic queues, burning up oil and puffing out carbon.</p> <p>Climate change means likelihood of more impact from flooding. All these sites are going to affect the Moors river system where there is already concern.</p> <p>Green Belt</p> <p>I have commented on Option KS2. The Green Belt is being treated far too casually. Three of the four Verwood sites require movement of the Green Belt. I do not think sufficient attention is being given to national guidance. Have the following in PPG2 been properly considered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposes of the Green Belt, in particular to check unrestricted sprawl and to safeguard our countryside • Sustainability – to consider consequences for sustainability including effects of car travel if channelling development toward areas of Green Belt • Permanence – the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence <p>In 06 Green Belt Key Issue paper para 2.14 you tell us the Core Strategy will only propose alteration to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate recognised local needs in sustainable locations. Most Verwood people I have talked to do not agree we need these houses and it is difficult to argue these are sustainable locations.</p> <p>I notice the Masterplan document in its appraisal on Green Belt seems to find very little justification for moving it. The only thing that is mentioned is maintaining key gaps and key edges.</p> <p>Overdevelopment</p> <p>Verwood has too much housing. Your figures show Verwood has five times more houses than in the early 1960s, resulting in a population of around 15,000. It was known as the fastest growing town in Europe. The facilities are only still that of a village. It is not viable as a fully functioning town while there is the daily exodus of the majority of the workforce.</p> <p>It is a distortion to mention in para 11.3 that 300 houses were unable to be built without saying 'However, a large number of houses and flats have been, and are still being, built on</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Bakers Farm land which was to have been reserved for Community facilities / supermarket in a previous plan. Also part of the land at Ebblake Industrial Estate has been used for houses when it was previously reserved for employment.'</p> <p>Further comments relating to WWM 1</p> <p>Landscape and Nature Conservation</p> <p>This site is the most concerning of the four Verwood sites proposed. As well as being Green Belt it is in the AGVL. It is on higher ground with a beautiful open landscape stretching to Ringwood Forest in the distance.</p> <p>It has great wildlife and conservation value in its own right as well as being only just outside the 400m boundary of Stephens Castle, a particularly important and fragile heathland reserve of international importance.</p> <p>Misinformation</p> <p>It is wrong to infer this area has been compromised by Trinity School (para 11.60) although someone sitting at a desk may have thought this. The school nestles down in lower land and was specially built in low 'chicken hut' style to blend in with the countryside. There is a wildlife pond being cared for which is a valuable contribution to nature conservation.</p> <p>Eastworth Farm</p> <p>This attractive old farm has been sensitively restored and the farm buildings provide holiday lets. There must have been huge expense to achieve this imaginative 'rural diversification' and they must have thought themselves protected by the Green Belt. Not only do you show the proposed housing going right up to the farm, but one choice of access sweeps right round it effectively putting it into an island surrounded by roads or development.</p> <p>Questionable practice?</p> <p>Planning Application 3/10/0075 was submitted last year for houses to be built on a small piece of wet ground straddling the stream, close to the roundabout, and which was not shown as Green Belt. I believe this was partly done to test the opposition to building in this area and there was opposition, including Verwood Town Council. I would like to know why a mystery message was sent from a council source saying this was WITHDRAWN just days before the EDDC Planning meeting. Consequently the spokesperson for the opposition</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							and other interested people did not attend only to find later this information was false. Also I wonder if the developer who has now purchased this land was informed that there were plans afoot to try and move the Green Belt boundary that is shown right alongside this land. Access The access to Edmondsham road will be dangerous with either choice of access.			
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		CSO16 890	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
508562	K Clayson		CSO16 946	Option VWM 1	Object		More houses will create more congestion on the roads.			1045
511936	Mrs G Anstey		CSO16 959	Option VWM 1	Object		I am in agreement with a new secondary school as Verwood needs one badly. I am NOT in agreement with more homes being built in Verwood. The roads are crowded enough as it is one of these days a terrible accident is going to occur. There is NO INFRASTRUCTURE here, and for children and young families a dead loss. I came here more than 20 years ago when Verwood was a village and it has been spoilt by over-building, ugly flats and stupid bureaucracy! All the open spaces are going, the fields with houses and our wildlife. WHEN IS IT GOING TO END???			1045
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		CSO16 573	Option VWM 1	Object		The area is already over-developed and congested - further development on the scales proposed would lead to deterioration of the environment and a reduction in the quality of life. I am particularly dismayed by continued threats to the Green Belt, especially as this Government pledged to protect it. I do not believe that such massive development is necessary or beneficial to the vast majority of inhabitants. Pressure on our area should be reduced by Government tackling such issues as population growth through immigration control and regeneration of brownfield sites in Midlands and North. There is a need for limited affordable and social housing locally, but not more executive homes. It is wrong to build new homes			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							while second homes and investment properties continue to exist.			
515033	Mr T Crump		CSO16 611	Option VWM 1	Object		These proposals are typical of the failures contrived by Council and Consultants to address short term solutions to Government edict. Fundamental to any significant further development is the need for joined up thinking for transportation. All of these proposals further the burden on traffic flow through and around conurbation centres. These major roads are the responsibility of the government highways department. They should foot the bill for their improvements prior to further development. Some of these proposals virtually adjoin 100 instance flood lines. This is totally unacceptable. Any proposal to move allotments, away from the housing that uses them, increases road usage and has a negative impact on the community.			1045
515086	Mrs Elaine Pugh		CSO16 609	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is lacking facilities to accommodate more homes and pressure on services is too much. Services must deteriorate. The main roads are already overwhelmed and can only get worse with yet more traffic. Most of the land is what is green belt and should stay green belt. Verwood has doubled in the last 10 years (approx) enough is enough!			1045
515114	M J Porter		CSO16 635	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
515148	Mr E G Howarth		CSO16 642	Option VWM 1	Object		Until it is clear how the infrastructure to support additional housing is to be provided it is not possible to support any of these proposals. Will the type of housing result in increased anti-social behaviour?			1045
515255	Mr and Mrs C Beck		CSO16 648	Option VWM 1		No Opinion	No problem with extra homes being built if facilities are increased – i.e. 1) Medical facilities – another surgery, more doctors, (we already have to wait for appointments!) nurses, dentists,			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>opticians, chiropodists</p> <p>2) Transport improvements</p> <p>3) Extra police</p> <p>4) Extra shops, larger post office and library</p> <p>5) Leisure facilities – especially swimming pool</p> <p>6) Elderly retirement homes</p>			
515287	Mr L Jackson		CSO16 685	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
515354	Mr Walker		CSO16 694	Option VWM 1	Object		I object very strongly to any further development in Verwood, especially of the size that has been proposed. Green belt land in this overcrowded island of ours is precious and should not be encroached upon by yet more homes. Verwood has more than played its part over the past 20 years in providing extra housing. I do not think the infrastructure will take the strain.			1045
515367	Mr & Mrs J Pottinger		CSO16 809	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
515786	Mrs A M Bright		CSO16 817	Option VWM 1	Support		<p>As a recent inhabitant of Verwood I am happy to support plans which will enable others to move to a town I have grown to love. It would be selfish to try to keep the town just for those of us already here.</p> <p>However I do not support the large development as I see the influx of over 2000 people creating a number of problems. Large developments seldom encourage community spirit and many house buyers are reluctant to purchase on an estate with large proportion of social housing. We do not need more empty properties. I am also concerned that without improvement to our infrastructure (more schools, shops, etc) Verwood may become ever more of a dormitory town.</p>			1045
516343	Mrs J Stebbings		CSO16 952	Option VWM 1		General Comment	<p>My concern is that a full infrastructure needs to be in place to cope with the extra pressure on amenities, in particular doctors/dentists surgery</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>Employment opportunities</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Facilities for young people Taking into consideration population growth in the whole areas in the scheme extra pressure on hospitals-already under strain.			
517572	Mr D Alexander		CSO16997	Option VWM 1	Object		We object to large scale development as the town infrastructure is inadequate now.			1045
517717	Mr Frederick Thorne		CSO17089	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>General Comments Verwood has grown by 500% in the last 20 years. During this time very little has been done to improve the infrastructure to support all this development. Much of the character of this former village (now town) has already been destroyed. We have a duty to protect what remains. The green belt, areas of special scientific interest and areas of 'special character' (in the proposed South Verwood Development area) have so far survived. The proposed development in this very special part of South Verwood would be on greenbelt land and run close to the river Crane (a triple SSSI). This must not be allowed. The residents of Verwood and EDDC have in my opinion a duty to protect this area and our heritage.</p> <p>Transport Issues Increase in traffic. The current infrastructure/roads in Verwood are already inadequate. The West Moors bypass originally planned to ease traffic problems in Verwood following previous developments was scrapped in favour of new homes. No doubt this would give more revenue to EDDC than any bypass!!!! What I want to know is when are you going to give something back to Verwood???? How do you propose to deal with the increase in traffic and the problems this will cause if these developments do go ahead? Potential increased risk of flooding and drainage problems. How would any new developments be drained?? I understand the river Crane is a triple SSI so I assume water will not be drained there? I also understand that according to Councillor Flower the drains in Manor Road are 'not fit for purpose' and already 'full to capacity'. I therefore assume water can not be drained there either? People have shown me photos of flooded fields in the Verwood South Area that would serve the</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Manor Road development. I know the water levels are high in parts of St Michaels Road and peoples gardens are already waterlogged during winter months. Surely further development of land in this area can only make things worse. You only have to look at what happened to the listed cottage in Burnbake Road following land development in the area. The cottage and grounds were so damaged the cottage had to be pulled down!! Do you want this to happen to St Michaels Cottage (also listed) as well??? Increase in development means increase in surface water. Are you prepared to take the risk and increase flooding in the Verwood South Area? Are you prepared to be accountable for your actions and responsible for any damage you cause to privately owned property????</p> <p>Encroachment on Green Belt I have lived in St Michaels Road for 56 years. I understand that land beyond Howe Lane is and always has been Green Belt. This area must be protected for our future heritage. St Michaels Road and part of Manor Road are areas of 'special character'. This is confirmed in the Council Plan (2004). What will happen to wild life that depends on areas like this? This area will be destroyed if this development goes ahead. In the 56 years I have resided in St Michaels Road I have seen much change. This change has not been for the better. I feel privileged to have lived where I do. I witness and watch wildlife that depends on this area for its survival. I have badgers that frequent my back garden and I spend hours there watching the nuthatch and long tailed tits feeding in the bushes. We have woodpeckers, chaffinch, green finch and robins are always present. Then there are the butterflies in the summer and the hedgehogs hibernating in the winter. This area is so special.</p> <p>I am now 86 years old now so your proposed development, if approved may not be witnessed by me. I do however feel the need to strongly verbalise my concern about what in my opinion would be total destruction of this peaceful, quiet and very special part of Verwood. The area is a haven for wildlife. What will happen to them?</p> <p>Ten years ago Verwood was described as the most rapidly developed town in Europe. We have had enough now. If this</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							council is so concerned with providing affordable housing why did it sell land adjacent to the hub to a developer who I understand will not be providing affordable housing? There is plenty of brown belt land around Verwood that could be used. I understand that during a recent Dorset study, the majority of survey respondents said they were against housing construction in the countryside, yet the report's conclusion was in favour of development?! I would ask EDDC what evidence they have that suggests there is a 'need' for housing in this area? If the evidence for housing need is bogus, as has been suggested to me, and if the wishes of the local community are being ignored, surely there is no justification for building on otherwise protected land in the open countryside?			
517741	Mr and Mrs Reid		CSO17 126	Option VWM 1	Object		That there should not be any new housing developments on green belt land. It is a well known fact that fuzzle fields has planning permission for a housing estate in the near future, this will create pressure on our road systems. Bearing all of the above the road infrastructure will not be able to cope. As it stands today Station Road footpath is inadequate and crossing the roundabout is a matter of taking your life in your hands. So let's not ruin a lovely village!			1045
517818	LT. CDR R Bennett RNR RETD.		CSO17 219	Option VWM 1	Support		The ratio of affordable homes is a major concern 400 extra dwellings will put further overload onto public services including sewage and drain systems. This number of dwellings will introduce at least an extra 1000 people + around 600 cars to the area. All this when we have virtually lost our fire service and police station Edmondsham Road still has no lighting, no footpath and no drains, how's that for progress.			1045
517935	J H Stacey		CSO17 261	Option VWM 1	Object		Before any development can take place on the indicated lands the section of road from the roundabout to the railway bridge must be improved to the same standard as Champtoceaux Avenue, and the bridge either removed or new brick safety parapets built. In its present condition the bridge is unsafe. I am not happy about proposal VWM1 since			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>it will adversely affect the outlook of the dwellings at Eastworth Farm, and therefore cannot support it.</p> <p>Comment: before any further housing is added to the Verwood area at all, major attention must be given to all the services - i.e. it must be ensures that the main utilities, namely electricity, gas, water and telephone have sufficient capacity to serve the extra number of dwellings. The roadways which will serve the new residential areas will have to be upgraded for the increase in traffic. The sewage and storm water systems will also have to be upgraded to cope with the extra volume that will be created by the new dwellings. It is well-known that the system can only just handle the current volume now, and tends to be blocked from time to time by thoughtless and/or uncaring householders and businesses discharging inappropriate materials into the system.</p> <p>Unless the above infrastructure improvements are implemented I cannot support any of the above options, notwithstanding support given in the first two paragraphs. I have lived in Verwood since 1982 as a householder and thus a ratepayer/council-tax payer, and therefore trust that the views expressed in this document will be respected. I should also add that my wife is in agreement with the above views.</p>			
517946	Mr and Mrs Jon Parsons		CSO17263	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>We are writing to express the strongest objection possible to any proposed building under Option reference VWM 1 and VWM 2.</p> <p>We have for the last 6 years lived along the Edmondsham Road that takes traffic from Verwood to Fordingbridge. We have in that time been absolutely staggered at the amount of traffic this road takes.</p> <p>Traffic of all types from cars, lorries, white vans, buses and heavy trucks. We have on numerous occasions had to take evasive action leading to damage to our cars. There are regular accidents and cars in hedges. Two last weeks alone. None of our family can ride bicycles or walk into Verwood because the road is terrifying. Currently, we are spending Christmas isolated and inconvenienced because the road has been closed to repair a collapsed culvert caused by this</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>excessive traffic. The Old Hump backed Railway bridge is quite lethal and was being repaired again two weeks ago. The proposed locations for new houses will add further traffic and congestion to this road.</p> <p>There is nowhere near enough parking at the local school and in the mornings and afternoons the area near the school is extremely dangerous.</p> <p>We ourselves had to battle with EDDC for 3 years over planning permission to link two buildings on our land that could only be seen by ourselves and nobody else. The reason - our property was on green belt land. How therefore can it be justified that 230 new properties can simply be built on Green Belt Land where they interfere with so many local people.</p> <p>The Edmondsham Road cannot possibly take more traffic created by extra properties. It is just not right that new properties can be enforced on green belt land. The local infrastructure - schools, shops, and facilities will not cope with more people created by this and it creates a dangerous precedent for further building on the Green Belt as and when the authorities see fit.</p> <p>We did not move to the countryside to have modern housing estates thrust on us and built close to our land, and I do not believe that it is right that people should be allowed to build any more in this particular area.</p> <p>We strongly object to the proposal.</p>			
518035	Mr Peter Pugh		CSO17 282	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>In my opinion Verwood is lacking the facilities to accommodate more homes and the pressure on services is too much the service must deteriorate!!</p> <p>The main roads are being overwhelmed now without more cars being added.</p> <p>Most of the land is low lying or subject to flooding which is why it should stay greenbelt.</p> <p>This town/village has doubled in the last ten years (approx) enough is enough!</p>			1045
518058	Mr and Mrs Glendinning		CSO17 290	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>This is just to express a letter of concern and objection to the proposed options for the Verwood area. As you can see from my address this concern is justified.</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>My main issues are the lack of facilities to support such over concentrated proposals, there is already a two week waiting list to get an appointment with the only doctor's surgery nearby to Eastworth Road. I doubt if local schools could cope with such an influx and as for local shops and amenities this is just a joke.</p> <p>If you want a hairdo or buy a house or TV - fine! Try to buy anything to wear, no chance, not even a pair of knickers. Even the two small supermarkets run out of essentials, especially at weekends.</p> <p>What are younger people going to do here? As far as I am aware there isn't even a table-tennis table they could use. This would mean parents having to transport them everywhere by car by putting more traffic and pollution on the roads.</p> <p>On the subject of environmental issues, what about the desecration of such a lovely part of the Green Belt land, not to mention all the indigenous wildlife it supports. As for building on arable land this is surely unacceptable, when we are trying to decrease the amount of imported food into this country.</p> <p>The other worrying fact is what is 'affordable' housing? Whilst I agree with the admirable sentiment that we should help local people who are working and providing a service and contributing to the economy of the town, how is this going to be controlled monitored and decided?</p> <p>Please register our concerns and objections.</p>			
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 499	Option VWM 1		General Comment	<p>We consider the biodiversity interests of this site need to be established to inform this option, including trees and bats for which we believe there are records on site. The potential area of landscape indicated on the map is small thus the provision of green infrastructure seems to be dependent on utilising land to the north. This option lies adjacent to a tributary of the River Crane and will require Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and adequate buffering to protect the quality and biodiversity of the watercourse. There is also concern over the potential for this development to cause light pollution to the open countryside areas beyond, which could have significant impacts on local wildlife</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359477	Ms Natasha Mackenzie	Clerk Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council	CSO17 708	Option VWM 1	Object	General Comment	<p>In reality, however, the 2001 Census advised a working population of 5000 in Verwood, of which 1/3rd worked locally and 2/3rd commuted out. The working population is estimated to have increased to 6.500 today. There is a significant disconnect in looking to alleviate an already over stretched road network identifying further housing provision in the town, but nearest additional employment opportunity in St Leonards and Ferndown. Until a new secondary school is built in Verwood any new housing will also mean even more journeys to Ferndown and Wimborne.</p> <p>The proposed additional housing and employment areas will therefore only increase the traffic problems at Ringwood and thus on the roads in our Parish, especially on the B3081, A338 and Linwood Road if the A31 is blocked. The junction at Bakers Hanging will also become even more saturated. The Parish Council agree that these developments should only go ahead if road improvements at Bakers Hanging and the junction of the A338 and A31 are carried out.</p>			1045
359547	Mrs V BRIGHT	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17 944	Option VWM 1	Support	General Comment	<p>We realise that there has been a rapid growth of population locally in recent years but that with it we have seen a reduced number of young adults in the 20-40 age group compared to the number of older working residents, retired elderly and children. There was also little forethought put in place by EDDC to improve infrastructure and amenities when the new developments were built over the last 10 years, resulting in a rapid expansion of footfall, traffic and pollution and bolt-on solutions to try and remedy problems that ensued later. The rise in house prices has outstripped wage levels, due to high demand coupled with the development of 3-4 bedroomed houses, which local people, on local salaries, could not afford. In fact, there are virtually no starter homes, and only a small amount of 2 bedroomed houses have been built over the last decade. If this trend is allowed to continue the District Council is faced with the difficult task of providing a range of houses to include affordable homes, both to retain the workforce and to reduce the existing long waiting lists. It is important that any affordable homes built should be for local people, and not made available for people living outside East Dorset.</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>The proposed sites immediately adjoining the existing urban area are not prime agricultural land and in planning terms can be construed as suitable for development. Whilst we understand and could support the proposals, we must stress that any development would require improvements in the infrastructure which should be in place before any houses are built, or at least alongside with the construction and before occupation. Therefore, when the statutory core strategy is prepared we feel it is important that timescales are included within the document which sets out not only the timings of the programme of works, but should include details and timings of the infrastructure proposed, which should complement the works programme.</p> <p>If we are to support the individual sites, both on housing need and the provision of open space not currently available, we would require more infrastructure and environmental improvements. All sites need to be surveyed for archaeological deposits and all require new access roads. Tree lines should be respected and two sites to the south of Verwood are close to the flood plain or watercourse. We would like EDDC to confirm that, due to the ecology and rich biodiversity of both sites, that at least a one year cyclical survey is conducted by EDDC to cover the 4 seasons, these surveys to be conducted under the statutory requirements of Natural England, the Environment Agency, and other relevant bodies, both UK and EU, the results of these surveys to be made available for inspection.</p>			
359552	Ms J WEEDON	Clerk West Moors Parish Council	CSO17 906	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>The Parish Council has expressed deep concern with regard to any further developments located in Verwood due to the impact that future developments would have on traffic through West Moors.</p> <p>West Moors is fully aware of the impact over the previous 20 years that the growth of Verwood has had on West Moors and would like to stress that they feel that investment in infrastructure is required before further developments in Verwood are considered.</p>			1045
359891	Mrs Susanne		CSO18 351	Option VWM 1	Support					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Parkin									
359894	Mr D.S Medlycott		CSO17 533	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>Parking problems - Public car park surgery Station Road</p> <p>When planning permission was granted for the Hub it was stated the overflow car park was the public car park adjacent to Verwood Surgery. Likewise the same was said again when planning permission was granted for The Herons when only 1 space per flat was allowed. Again when approval was granted for the proposed 29 flats (rear of the Police Station) with only 1 parking space per flat allocated it was stated that any additional vehicle overflow could use the above public car park.</p> <p>These planning applications were all dealt with individually without any thought to the combined collective consequences of the pressures it would place on the above car park. At the present moment there are constantly days when patients of the Verwood Surgery (including disabled) are unable to find a parking space and in addition staff at the surgery have also been unable to find a space in the staff car park</p> <p>The Practice Manager at the Surgery will confirm this as they have received many complaints from patients.</p> <p>The problem will be acute during the building of the 29 flats and will be exacerbated if the proposed 230 homes at the land west of Trinity School and land west of Eastworth Road went ahead.</p> <p>The reality is that the majority of people will not walk into town from these sites and in fact the elderly or disabled will be unable to do so.</p> <p>The idea that people will be discouraged from using their cars if no parking provision is made whilst laudable is totally unrealistic.</p> <p>Recently the paved footway area outside the surgery has had to be re-laid and bollards have been erected to prevent vehicles driving up to the surgery door and also to prevent parking on the paved footway by those vehicles unable to find a parking space.</p> <p>In addition to all the problems outlined above people do park their vehicles there all day and catch the bus to Bournemouth or Poole using their free bus passes.</p>	<p>I suggest</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Adequate parking provision is provided at new developments for both residents and visitors as often minimum requirements are insufficient. 2) Use of the Hub car park during daylight hours for additional public parking. 3) Notice in the Public Car Park to be erected saying "parking limited to two hours 7am - 7pm. Alternative parking available at Potters Wheel Car Park". No parking charges to be applied. <p>Transport</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) An east-west bypass be included in the Core Strategy (this was on the agenda 20 years ago when traffic flow was significantly lower) 2) The town centre to be pedestrianized vehicular traffic only for access, parking and deliveries. 3) Consideration of one way system for through traffic. 4) Alternative bypass routes using existing road infrastructure. On the 14th November 2010 during the remembrance service at Ferret Green all through traffic was diverted away from the town centre for some 30 minutes. This shows that other than building a new east-west 		1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Traffic B3081 Dorset County Council Traffic Counts undertaken in 1989, 1997, 2004 and 2007 show that there has been a hugely significant increase in traffic flow of 101% on 12 hour flow and 97% on 24 hour flow 7 day average. (Traffic is substantially lower on Sunday and therefore weekday figures will be in excess of the percentages stated above). Year Increase 12 hours 24 hours Increase 1989 3938 4670 1997 5368 6309 2004 40% 5505 6529 40% 2007 101% 7915 9181 97% 2007 8567 9895 5 day average Up to 2004 there was a 40% increase in traffic flow which at that time Mr Paul Willis (DCC Group Policy Planning Manager) considered to be highly significant. As shown above that percentage increase has now risen from 40% to 97% and 101% in the space of three years from 2004 to 2007. I would regard this as hugely significant. There are no figures available for 2010 but I would suggest that since 2007 there has been a further substantial increase in traffic flow, one of the factors being the use of Sat Nav's which has increased both HGV and cars using the B3081 through Verwood to get to places further afield. This increase in traffic has a detrimental effect on the town centre by way of Noise, Pollution, Vibration, Road Safety and Environmental Concerns. Traffic will increase further in the coming years and could even double by 2027 particularly if there is further housing development in Verwood and this increased traffic flow will have serious consequences for the town centre. In looking forward to 2027 and a Town Centre 'Fit for the Future' with an increasing elderly population it is essential that other options are considered. Housing I consider there is a need for more affordable housing for the Verwood Area, with a mix of 2/3 bed semi detached and terraced houses with adequate provision for off road parking and/or garages. However, unless the infrastructure is put in place in the first</p>	<p>bypass traffic could be diverted using Home Farm Road/Manor Road/Burnbake Road/Blackhill Road or Vicarage Road/Home Farm Road. 5) Traffic calming measures or reduced carriageway or speed humps should be avoided due to emergence services in Station Road (eg Police, Fire Ambulances re Verwood Surgery) and the environmental impact on the town centre. The slower the traffic the greater the pollution and congestion. It is also well documented that speed humps damage vehicles (types, wheel joints etc thus creating road safety concerns), adversely affect disabled drivers/passengers and created vibration damage to the immediate surrounding area. 6) A large retail store such as Wilkinson's should be encouraged to come to Verwood and also a traditional restaurant for midday and evening meals.</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							instance and the problems I have outlined earlier relating to the Town Centre and parking are resolved I cannot support the present proposals.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 751	Option VWM 1	Support		As in the case of the other potential urban extensions, the Agency supports the development of the evidence base to inform any strategic growth retained in the Verwood and West Moors area, notably the use of SEDMMTS. Given the very high level of car dependency evident at Verwood and the direct link between the town and the A31 east of Ashley, the area of search south of Verwood (Options VWM3 and VWM4) is likely to be of greater concern to the Agency compared to areas north of the town (Options VWM1 and VWM2).			1045
478398	Mrs Diana Saville		CSO17 686	Option VWM 1	Object		I strongly object to building houses on green belt. The green belt is there for a reason, to protect the countryside. Verwood does not have the infrastructure to cope with more development. In particular the roads cannot cope with more traffic. Most people work and do shopping outside Verwood. More houses would just create a bigger dormitory town.			1045
515763	Mr V S Harris		CSO17 789	Option VWM 1	Object		The growth of Verwood is beyond sensible limits and there is a strong need for all facilities to catch up with the current population. The development of green belt is totally unacceptable, brown field sites abound in the area and any new development must be restricted to these whatever the additional costs.	Scrub it!!		1045
518073	Mrs S Williams		CSO17 302	Option VWM 1	Object		Several of the areas are on green belt. It is against the planning guidance to build on green belt and so I think these options should be declined. The land affected is beautiful and the building will totally spoil these areas. It will also create a precedence that will be used in the future. This affects VWM1, VWM2, and VWM4 I think. The building is too near protected heathland and woodland. VWM1 and VWM2 are too near Ringwood Forest. VWM3 and VWM4 are too near Heathy How which is a beautiful wood and I think has an SSI order on it. Even if areas for sport are provided as part of the developments you will not be able to stop people using the heathland/woodland areas and people's pets will damage/kill the wildlife. This building would			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>be against the national guidelines on building near protected areas.</p> <p>There are currently not enough facilities to support the present population of Verwood. We do not have things that people living in much smaller settlements take for granted, eg allotments. In the 10 year plan produced shortly after we moved to Verwood in 1989 there was a leisure centre with a swimming pool and that has still not been built - in fact it's not even in the plans now. You are now talking about building on the land put aside for this - VWM3. For this reason I'm against VWM3, but also I think you need to sort the facilities out for the current population and not add to the problems by building more houses - so I'm against all the other options on this basis.</p> <p>Like many people we moved to Verwood as it was a village, with plans to increase to a small town. Further large scale building work is going to harm that feel and make it into a large conurbation. This will detract from the quality of life in Verwood. Over the last 20 years there has been a massive amount of building work here and lots of new houses. Verwood has done its bit to provide extra houses for East Dorset and I think its someone else's turn now. The people need some time to settle and grow into a community without the disruption of having further large-scale additions to the population.</p>			
518079	Mr Harold Foster		CSO17 304	Option VWM 1		General Comment	<p>My comments and concerns for the future housing, job opportunities, shopping and entertainment in Verwood are mainly concerned with suggested options VWM 1 and VWM 2.</p> <p>I fully support the urgent need for more affordable housing in our town; I have lived in Verwood since 1968 and so have witnessed many changes and many of them I believe for the good of the community. My concerns for VWM 1 include the increase in traffic and congestion this suggestion will create. It is only a matter of time before someone is hurt in the bottleneck caused by parents delivering or collecting siblings from Trinity First. Those of us who live close to Trinity School can not be expected to put up with even more of these unacceptably high road calming measures.</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
518095	Mrs M R Owen		CSO17 308	Option VWM 1	Object		I am objecting to the listed developments because of my concerns over land and mains drainage. Also there is no information on access to the proposed new school and also the proposed closure of Verwood police station as reported in the daily echo. There are not enough facilities for health care i.e. doctors, dentists for existing population as things are now never mind another 400+ houses.			1045
518105	John Maskell		CSO17 313	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I have read the Core Strategy Options document issued for voluntary consultations and object to the construction of a further 415 homes in Verwood as described in VWM 1 - 4 inclusive.</p> <p>Verwood has suffered from massive and uncontrolled expansion for many years and we are left with a 'messy' town with no single centre and a series of other problems relating to infrastructure, highways, shopping facilities, flooding, drainage systems and lack of acceptable recreational facilities.</p> <p>Most residents have to use cars just for the basic essentials such as food, employment, recreational facilities with round trips being at least 10 and in most cases more like 20 or more miles. The Verwood 'carbon footprint' is enormous and these proposals will only make it worse.</p> <p>We really do need substantial improvements to correct the existing problems that exist in Verwood today before we should even think about more housing. For example we need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Improve the highways including the B3081 through the town, Manor Road from Vicarage Road junction to Newtown Road junction, construct the Springfield Distributor Road and provide adequate crossing facilities in sufficient quantities on these roads to allow safe crossing locations. -The Sewage systems are running at full capacity and need substantial improvements. -We need more adequate leisure centre facilities. - We need more retail outlets to reduce the need to car travel. -As the second largest town in Dorset we do not have a senior school (the proposal to build one and the site adjacent to Emanuel School is not feasible). -We need time to consolidate before more homes are built. 			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>I understand that previous plans/strategies stated that Verwood could stand more housing developments when the West Moors bypass was constructed. Since this major road improvement scheme has now been abandoned perhaps it would be a good idea to abandon additional homes.</p> <p>A major concern is the erosion of further green belt land on the outskirts of the town and the resultant loss of amenity, wildlife and natural habitat.</p> <p>We have reduced the green areas within the existing town boundaries to a couple of reasonable size areas in the Recreation Ground and Bugdens Copse and now you want to re-align the protected green belt areas so we can build more homes and lose more green space. This is totally unacceptable; the green belt has been protected all these years to prevent urban crawl which is what you are now proposing to do. OK if the District Council does implement these proposals and we lose the areas of green belt what is to stop the next landowner from offering his land for development, are we to expect houses all over what is now Verwood Manor Farm. Before long Verwood will join Three Legged Cross, which will join West Moors, Which will join Ferndown and so on until we in Verwood become part of the Bournemouth/Poole Urban Conurbation.</p> <p>All of the proposed future development is very close to the protected Dorset heathland and to the established Sites of Special Scientific Interest, including the River Crane Valley. I strongly urge the District Council not to proceed with the proposals under VWM 1 - 4.</p> <p>To conclude I think it is time for Verwood to be left to consolidate as we are managing improvements as we can and as money becomes available.</p> <p>Improvements provided they are the right improvements, generated by the Morrison's expansion are welcome and should be encouraged.</p> <p>The other towns in East Dorset may think too much investment has been made in Verwood but Ferndown, Wimborne, Christchurch and the like have not expanded at the same rate as Verwood and have not been left in such a mess either.</p> <p>I have been a resident in Verwood since 1986 and have seen</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							most of the rapid expansion and along with a large number of others have sat back and done nothing about it. The Verwood apathy is no more, please listen to what we have to say. I appreciate some of it will be highly emotive, probably vitriolic and some downright rude but amongst all of it there will be a great deal of sense and constructive comments. Please Listen!			
518195	Mr M Willcocks		CSO17 319	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I wish to make the following comments regarding the proposals set out for Verwood:</p> <p>1. Verwood has already experienced a period of very rapid housing growth and development in recent years. I understand that Verwood now has a population of around 14,000 people and like myself, many residents believe that the town developed on a piecemeal basis such that we now suffer from many problems through lack of careful planning and development in recent times. My wife and I moved to Verwood in 2002 by which time the majority of rapid housing growth had already taken place. However, since 2002, housing expansion has still continued at a pace with two significant flat developments on Home Farm Road, a new Care Home on Station Road, a new block of flats at the junction of Station Road/Black Hill, a pocket of new houses close to the Cemetery, and recently there has been planning approval for 26 Flats behind the Police Station.</p> <p>2. TRANSPORTATION</p> <p>Links to Verwood are already up to capacity especially the main roads to Ringwood (B3081) and Three Legged Cross/West Moors (B3072). Verwood is very much a commuter town and a lot of the population works outside Verwood in places like Southampton, Bournemouth and Poole. So the main roads to and from Verwood already carry a high volume of traffic on a daily basis. There is a particular 'bottleneck' along the Ringwood Road at the 'Tesco Express' where parking of cars along the main road has led to a situation where cars cannot travel in opposite directions at the same time, thereby causing tailbacks on both sides of the road. The B3081 already suffers from the heavy lorry use to and from Bluehaze landfill site, as well as the significant car traffic to the Somerley domestic waste site. Because of these</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>waste sites, the number of heavy lorries travelling through the centre into Verwood (coming from the West Moors and Cranborne directions) has also increased in recent times adding to the heavy road usage.</p> <p>3. SCHOOL/HEALTHCARE/EMERGENCY SERVICES The already rapid population expansion has led to our Verwood infant/junior schools being at risk of running at beyond their current capacity. I understand there is very little, if any, spare capacity to cope with significant population growth.</p> <p>I am aware that the emergency services, especially the ambulance service are already struggling to deal with the level of emergency calls they already have to deal with. We already have a considerable number of residents who are elderly and this adds pressure to the problem.</p> <p>Then of course there is the question as to whether the current medical practices could handle a greater number of patients. The Medical Practice that I belong to already seems to be extremely busy.</p> <p>4. SHOPS Complaints about the lack of shops in Verwood has been an issue for several years now, and further population growth will only serve to exacerbate this ongoing problem.</p> <p>5. In summary, it is highly questionable whether Verwood is able to absorb the high level of new housing proposed, firstly because after such a rapid expansion in recent years, it now needs time to mature as a town. Secondly, there are strong questions about whether the transport links, schools, emergency and medical services could cope with such expansion. And finally, I believe a strategy based upon such a high proportion of affordable housing in a town where plentiful employment opportunities are not available or even within a short travel distance will ultimately fail the constituents of Verwood.</p> <p>I should be grateful if you could give consideration to these comments.</p>			
518281	Adrian Palmer	Clerk to Governors Emmanuel	CSO17 345	Option VWM 1		General Comment	I have been asked to send you the following extract from the minutes of our Full Governing Body Meeting on Tuesday 11th January 2011.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Middle School					"JW (Head teacher) explained the potential implications for EMS should additional housing be approved. Already the school hall is too small for our purposes. Also we do not have any spare classrooms, so any additional pupils would mean additional buildings for new classrooms."			
518303	Mr P R Owen		CSO17 353	Option VWM 1	Object		Nothing in the plan about access to the school. Also concerns about land surface water drainage with ref to Howe Lane site (V3) also main drainage. With reference to Burnbake Road. Some years ago when a development behind Elmtree Cottage caused surface water to engulf the site and the cottage had to be demolished. As I am sure you can remember this would be a problem for VWM 3 and 4 sites.			1045
518433	Chris Holmes		CSO17 362	Option VWM 1	Object		Thank you for the chance to comment. I feel that your plans include too many social houses, your plans have much detail but why the disproportionate number of low cost houses. In all cases you are looking for 50%, which is just too many. Because of this I object to your plan. Additionally the link between the new school and the new houses is not wholly clear, but you are trying to make that link, perhaps to gain extra support for this biased proposal.			1045
518812	Mrs L Munn		CSO17 385	Option VWM 1	Object		With a population already larger than the county town, I feel Verwood has reached its optimum number of inhabitants. We are in danger of creating a dormitory living space with an increasing lack of community input: evidence the apathy with which the vastly ever expensive hub has been received. Stop now before we reach the point where Verwood is a soul-less place to live.			1045
518882	Mrs Doreen Knowlden		CSO17 399	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
518895	Mr Mark Gifford		CSO17 404	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is already overcrowded with housing. There are not enough local facilities to support the population; we need pubs, restaurants, better transport links and better facilities for younger people. There is no employment in the area; more houses will just increase the "dormitory" feel to the			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							town. The road system cannot cope with the traffic at peak times. We already need a secondary school as the number of children in the town is increasing – QE and Ferndown will not cope with future demand + a local secondary school would be a real benefit to the community. No more housing in Verwood please.			
518905	Mrs Burbidge		CSO17 412	Option VWM 1	Support		Over the last 30 years Verwood has expanded hugely, facilities have not increased, with intention to provide more affordable homes, hence families, surely have a plan to incorporate a indoor recreational facility aimed at the youth, with a refreshment area, affordable for youths, the hub is only ok for older people which is why hundreds of kids congregate at the park opposite Tesco express Verwood in winter + summer. Come on council think again wisely!			1045
519265	Mrs Pat Morrow		CSO17 428	Option VWM 1	Support		I am in favour, in principal, of the proposed developments provided that: 1) The infrastructure needed is in place before building. 2) That the transport situation is improved. 3) That parking in the town centre is reversed and all day parking is prohibited. The development of a park and ride system could be available for those wishing to use free bus passes – A Blake a possibility. 4) That facilities – doctors, dentists, and shops (not estate agents) land uses – are affordable.			1045
519400	Mrs Bailey		CSO17 440	Option VWM 1	Object		I moved to Verwood 23 years ago. Now everywhere is packed solid with shoppers at the only supermarket, upto 5 years ago you could get a doctor's appointment within a day, now because of the already great volume of people it's a week or more. The roads are full opposite my house, the evenings and weekends "Close" is like a parking lot only one garage for petrol unless you can get in Ringwood or Wimborne. No Verwood cannot cope now, so no more buildings please.			1045
519890	Mrs Christine Iley		CSO17 532	Option VWM 1	Support					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 578	Option VWM 1		General Comment	<p>Chapter 11 - Verwood and West Moors</p> <p>Our main concern regarding development area is foul drainage and the capacity of Palmersford Sewage Treatment Works (STW). This is discussed below.</p> <p>All options</p> <p>Foul Drainage</p> <p>The effluent capacity at Palmersford STW is currently unknown. This is particularly relevant because development in Verwood is believed to connect to this STW, and this settlement is part of the Core Strategy. The capacity of Palmersford STW and associated infrastructure must be established as part of the Core Strategy evidence.</p> <p>Overall issues for consideration are: surface water drainage; SUDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter</p>			1045
520657	Miss Claire Gibbins		CSO17 629	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
520671	P Hancy		CSO17 635	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
520737	S New		CSO17 659	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
520927	Ms I Jenson		CSO17 677	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>I like most residents in Verwood object because we have not got the doc. dentist, schools, shops, bus service, roads for all the cars ext ext.</p> <p>The old people have to go out of Verwood to get cloths ext. We already have a building going up, on the Ringwood road site, no one wanted, did anyone do anything to stop it for Verwood and Bristol went ahead. Would they like to live by it I don't think so.</p>			1045
520965	Mrs J		CSO17 685	Option VWM 1	Support					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lake									
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO18 025	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>SUMMARY: VWM1 LAND TO WEST OF TRINITY SCHOOL (30HOMES)</p> <p>We OBJECT to the proposed development on this site. It would have a severe detrimental effect on the openness of the countryside and on the environment. It is sited within, the AGLV.</p> <p>There are few local jobs so most travel to work would be by private motor car. If car journeys were not reduced it would have the potential to add 45 cars on the road. This is a conservative estimate of 1 ½ cars per household.</p> <p>Only 'B' and 'C' roads link Verwood to the main industrial and service centres.</p> <p>There is no access in the evenings to entertainment centres for Verwood's youth. This has the potential to lead to anti-social behaviour unless informal facilities are provided in Verwood.</p> <p>PURPOSES OF THE GREENBELT PPG2 (as applicable to this site)</p> <p>To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. This potential site is surrounded by an AGLV, although unfortunately a wedge shaped piece of land next to the school has been given planning approval. CPRE did send in some comments regarding this application..</p> <p>To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. This side of Verwood is completely open and unspoilt, very rural in character. No amount of Green Infrastructure would mitigate the damage on the openness.</p> <p>To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.</p> <p>Verwood was only a small village, so technically this purpose does not apply. However, the approach is through AGLV and the settlements first very visible buildings are the old Eastworth Farm House and on the other side of the road, an old converted cottage. It is a very rural approach from the Edmondsham Road.</p> <p>VISUAL IMPACT ON BOTH THE NATURAL AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPE</p> <p>This site is quite close to the proposed Eastworth Road site,</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the impact will be huge as Verwood spreads into the countryside once more. Apart from Eastworth Farm House, there are currently no buildings on this side between the school and the open rural stretch of the Edmondsham Road. There is a large sweep of open green fields on either side of the road that acts as a sharp divide between urban and rural. The Broadway Malyan Masterplan Report considered that the urban fringe at this part of Verwood has been breached by the building of Trinity School and therefore think this site and the one to the west of the Edmondsham Road suitable for development. We disagree. The school is very unobtrusive and should not be used as an excuse for further development of a very rural area.</p> <p>SUSTAINABLE LOCATION PPS1 Location Primary Schools Middle and Upper Daily shopping Post Office Doctors West of Trinity School Next door 2.0km M FD - Upper 0.7km – Town 1.8km Morr 0.7km 0.6km</p> <p>The school system in Verwood is very complex. There is a mixture of both the 2-tier and 3-tier system which has led to a great number of different schools. For this reason the measurements are unsound. Some children go to school in Cranborne and these generally move onto Wimborne as an upper school (not Ferndown). Others go to Ringwood to senior school as it has a 2 tier system. Until this system has been resolved, it is likely that this will lead to more car journeys making the potential housing sites less sustainable.</p> <p>EMPLOYMENT By bicycle 3.5km to Ebblake Industrial Estate, slightly longer by car, though local knowledge says this site is used more by</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Ringwood workers. The Woolsbridge site is 5 or 6 kilometres away by road and more likely to be accessed by car. Otherwise access to other sites of employment in East Dorset would be by car. The 2001 Census figures show that this is not a sustainable site for access to employment.</p> <p>Commuting Figures for Verwood. Source: 2001 Census Internal Commuters ... 1648 In Commuters1558 Out Commuters3331 Total commuters (in and out).....4889 90% of all commuters are drivers or passengers (Core Strategy)</p> <p>This would only be a sustainable site if the main employment centres can be accessed without the use of the private motor car. There is already a high level of commuting in this area.</p> <p>PUBLIC TRANSPORT</p> <p>The number 36, Verwood to Bournemouth bus. Hourly during the middle of the day, 3 buses before 9am on school days. These do not run when the school is closed. Last bus from Bournemouth leaves at 18.20 hours. Journey time: 1 hour to Bournemouth</p> <p>The number 37, Verwood to Poole, runs hourly, it takes 1 ¼ hours to get to Poole. Last bus from Poole is at 17.50 hours. Journey time: approximately 45 mins to FD and 1 hour 15 mins to Poole</p> <p>No trains.</p> <p>There is no access to Bournemouth or Poole in the evenings by public transport; therefor this restricts the recreational activities of the younger population.</p> <p>NEAREST CENTRE WITH FULL RANGE OF SERVICES Ringwood, Ferndown or Wimborne. There are hourly services to Ringwood and Ferndown but no direct bus to Wimborne. It is very likely the choice of transport will be by private car.</p> <p>PROVISION OF MULTI-FUNCTIONAL GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND OPEN SPACES: (Natural England's Green Infrastructure Guidance NE176 & PPG17 Planning for Open Spaces</p> <p>There would be a need for safe GI so that older children could walk or cycle to the middle school, if they had to travel by car it would create such a problem with cars travelling to</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Trinity School and others leaving the proposed estates close to Trinity School. It would be a potentially dangerous 2 way traffic. Added to this traffic would be the normal lorries and cars using this rural road as an access/short cut to and from Verwood.</p> <p>GI would also need to be provided to open spaces as the landscape area on site is very small. The PPG17 Open Space Study that covered the Verwood area recognised a need to improve the access to informal spaces/open countryside around the settlement that is not heathland.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS: Our comments on environmental aspects of the Core Strategy Options document are included in the Response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Community Partnership, which we fully endorse.</p> <p>ECOSYSTEM DAMAGE: disturbance to flora and fauna If this site and the Eastworth Road site were built on, much of the openness would be lost and so too the existing flora and fauna which would be in retreat once again.</p> <p>TRANQUILLITY: a sense of place. The large open area is lovely and peaceful to the eye. There is not much traffic, no planes, so one is wrapped in tranquillity which will be lost of course if these sites were built on. There can be no mitigation for this loss.</p> <p>LIGHT POLLUTION Please see the ETAG Response and comments by Bob Mizon.</p> <p>DRAINAGE PPS25 (causing increase in river flooding or surface water problems) This could be a problem on this site as it is next to an area that drains into a stream, the stream is a tributary of the Crane. This rather wet area has been given planning permission. Any additional run off from the proposed site could cause problems to the part that already has permission to build..</p> <p>PROXIMITY TO HEATHLAND AND AVAILABILITY OF SANGS FOR MITIGATION It is close to sensitive heathland so mitigation would be required. In conjunction with the Eastworth Road site, SANGS would be required due to the proximity of St</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Stephen's Castle Nature Reserve, Dewlands Common and Horton Common. The potential sites are not that far from Ringwood Forest but in order to reach the Forest the GI would take residents past Stephen's Castle and the likelihood would be they would not go any further, increasing the damage to this area. For this reason a large SANGS between the Edmondsham Road and Burrows Lane would be vital. PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE (schools etc)</p> <p>In view of the size of Verwood, nearly 15,000 people, it seems there really is a need for a new Upper School to be built. A school here would relieve Ferndown who could then provide spare capacity to relieve the Wimborne Upper school. The Hub provides an excellent Community Centre and there is a Leisure Centre by Morrisons. The main criticism of Verwood is that it is so spread out with too many services and not enough retail. Another doctor's surgery would be required if much development took place. Informal recreational/entertainment facilities need to be provided for young people as they have no evening access to Wimborne, Poole or Bournemouth.</p> <p>Parking in Verwood is an issue that needs resolving by providing more spaces. There are not enough car parks, the settlement sprawls over a large area, people are struggling to park at the shops and are being forced to go elsewhere. A survey needs to be done to check on the situation. There is also a suggestion that people are using the central parking to leave their cars, catch a bus using their bus passes, and so blocking shopper's spaces. Delivery vans also cause problems due to lack of space.</p> <p>IMPACT ON TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>There are very few jobs in Verwood so any potential development will put more cars on already overcrowded roads. The bus service is poor; there is very little employment accessible by alternate means of travel. The Edmondsham Road is a 'C' road without a speed limit so traffic calming would be required due to its proximity to Trinity School. Manor Road is also very busy and has some very bad bends; the junction at Three Legged Cross would get more difficult. The road to Ringwood is a little better in size but we</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>understand during wet weather it tends to suffer from surface water. There is no where in East Dorset you can build and not add to the congestion around the main employment centres. One of the problems with Verwood workers driving in the direction of Wimborne, is that they use the Holt Road as a 'rat run'. Hopefully the cattle grids may at least slow them down as they are a danger to walkers.</p> <p>East Dorset District Council has a target in the Transport Plan to introduce buses to take workers directly to industrial estates. This is an excellent idea. However, one such bus already exists, the number 29 from Bournemouth to Ferndown Industrial site. There are two early morning buses from Bournemouth, one leaving the estate at lunch time and two leaving in the evening. This service started in April 2010, without subsidies. The Yellow bus company confirmed that they do carry some regular passengers to and from the Industrial Estate. We suspect the buses are not that well used, one major problem influencing their use is the vast areas of free parking available on Ferndown Industrial Estate. It may be that the 'stick and carrot' needs to be introduced to get people out of their cars and into a bus. If less parking existed there would be more room for new business. We noticed a large new factory down Brook Road had a vast new car park, when parking is free and easy no-one will catch a bus. Perhaps spaces should only be allocated if there are no other means of reasonable travel.</p>			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 712	Option VWM 1	Object		We agree with the findings of the HRA in connection with the proposed housing sites within these areas. Consequently, until such time as assessment of the potential impacts of the options on European sites is determined we object to the following policies:			1045
476458	Mr Neil Bichard	Bradbury Bichard	CSO18 472	Option VWM 1	Support	General Comment	The new policies may facilitate an opportunity for a client	On behalf of clients I support the proposals and in particular the proposed policies VWM 1 and VWM 2 but would like to suggest that the Green Belt boundary be revised to		1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
								incorporate the dwelling at 51 Edmondsham Road and adjacent properties. These houses would have new development to the east and west and it would seem appropriate that the Green Belt boundary be redrawn to the road rather than the current arbitrary line. Initial sketch proposals would suggest that two new dwellings could be accommodated accessed from the existing entrance to Edmondsham Road. These initial proposals are available if required.		
478224	Mrs Julia Goodwin		CSO18 295	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>With regards to the recent Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Document, I would be grateful if you could please add this letter alongside the other comments concerning this proposal. As you are probably aware Sally Burrows has provided you with a plans document drawn up by herself, and has also consulted ourselves and Steve and Nicky Richards on the contents. I would like to make it clear that we have put our names to Eastworth Farm Ltd's document only in the event that this proposal goes forward to planning and in that event, because of our proximity to the proposed site we would have no choice but to be involved. This does not mean that we support this proposal in any way at this stage. I have raised my concerns against this proposal under separate headings below. If you are unclear on any comments I have made, then please do not hesitate to come back to me for further clarification.</p> <p>My concerns regarding this proposed document are as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Infrastructure, Facilities and Amenities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are currently two main roads in and out of Verwood. 			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>These roads are very populated and also very prone to disruption and bad weather. Over the last three years these roads have been closed due to ice and bad weather. The roads have also suffered severe congestion as a result of road works, accidents, rush hour periods. There are safety concerns on both roads with a number of fatalities occurring and indeed a regular speed camera alongside mobile speed units clarify that these roads are classed at high risk. The proposed planning documents will increase the amount of traffic using these roads, but there is little mention of how these roads will be improved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public transport is very poor to and from Verwood. Wilts and Dorset buses say that they would need a minimum of 25 people per bus to make the service profitable, and as such are not considering improving the service. The current service runs once per hour to and from Bournemouth, with the last bus leaving Bournemouth at 6.30pm and the last bus from Verwood around the same time. Transport to other local services such as Salisbury Hospital are even more difficult, as was highlighted in the recent public meeting held by Salisbury Hospital where transport was mentioned. Similar discussions around transport have taken place with Poole Hospital and Bournemouth Hospital. There are currently two GP surgeries operating within Verwood. Although individually the list sizes are comparable to other areas, it is important to note that time pressures often mean a wait of up to a week to obtain an appointment. Whilst the responsibility to improve waiting times rests with the surgery and the PCT, it is clear that a potential increase of up to a 1,000 residents will mean an increase in burden on the surgeries at a time when they themselves are under increasing pressure to reduce costs due to the Government white paper. The same is true looking at dentists. I have lived in Verwood for 10 years yet only managed to obtain an NHS dentist last October. As the Strategy Document is looking to provide affordable housing as part of the plans, then issues such as GP surgery, dentist, public transport are crucial. However, the document makes no mention on how these will be tackled. There is a small police station in Verwood that is now at risk 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>of closing. They are already having some services cut, such as rapid response. There has being an increase in petty crime such as vandalism, and with no facilities for youths, these have led to an increase of police activity to deal with disturbances outside the Tesco Express and Ferret Green particularly around weekends. With an increase in housing and a lack of facilities these problems will only get worse, whilst EDDC continue to refuse to action their own plans going back two years to provide an improvement in facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Core Strategy Document claims that Verwood has a vibrant Town Centre. There is no factual evidence to back this statement up, and it is clear that the company based in Weybridge who compiled this report have never visited Verwood. A vibrant Town Centre is formed through a mixture of a variety of shops and services together with a throughput population. Verwood by its geographic position does not have the through flow of traffic as Ringwood or Ferndown. Likewise the shops consisting mainly of Hairdressers, Estate Agents and Banks is hardly suitable for a vibrant Town Centre. Indeed the sprawl from Ferret Green down to Morrisons means that there is actually no Town Centre, and I welcome the idea that part of the plan is to create a Town Centre boundary. The next step is to create a Town Centre that residents feel bring the vitality and vibrant feel to Verwood. Would it not be better to simply seek the resident's opinion in an open questionnaire rather than a led set of questions outlined in the Town Plan document? Verwood is in desperate need for more shops, cafes, restaurants and areas to appeal to all age ranges and not a select few. • There is little to no facilities for the children and the youth of Verwood. The proposed planning document in building new houses will actually increase the number of children and youths in Verwood. How does EDDC place this alongside the lack of facilities that they themselves commented on some two years ago, yet have still done nothing to rectify? Public transport in Verwood ends around 6.30pm, which means that children are reliant on parents or friends to drive them about. There is a poorly used youth club, no sustained evening activities and a poorly used leisure complex. It is no wonder there is an increase in disturbances caused by children 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>hanging around recreational grounds when so little is made available to them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verwood schools currently provide facilities for primary only and not secondary. The schools themselves are near to capacity and an increase in population will only compound this problem. There is mention of a secondary school in the Strategy Document and land has already been set aside. However, at the recent meeting with EDDC it was publically said that there was no funding available to build a secondary school at present. What the Strategy Document proposes is to increase the population and housing with no thought or consideration for the structures. The two should go hand in hand so there is no crisis situation. Work also needs to be considered into the infrastructure around these schools. Trinity school currently shuts its gates causing parents to walk long distances, crossing busy and over populated roads. The same is true at Hillside, Verwood First and Emmanuel. These are problems already raised with EDDC, yet no action has being taken. Why is this? With an increase of up to 800 cars, and extra children how are these schools likely to cope? Is this not a disaster waiting to happen? <p>2. Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under section 1 I have already commented on the two roads servicing Verwood at present. However, there is also a risk to the smaller roads that would link the proposed developments to the main centre of Verwood. No mention is made to surveys or planning as to how these roads would be developed. If you look at Option 2, the road is deemed unsuitable at present for pedestrians, with no lighting, no pavement, blind corners and hills. To propose new building, then consideration needs to be given to access and exit points, safety concerns, and the impact on the current buildings. On a wider scale, I believe that the Verwood / West Moors bypass plans have now being scrapped, that will place even more pressure on an already congested and over used road system. • The drainage and sewerage systems in Verwood were designed to cope with a vastly reduced population than at present. Over the last few years this has led to flooding, burst pipes and indeed last year a complete new main pipe 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>installed. There is no survey in place and no mention to complete one. Can you please clarify if it is EDDC's policy to ignore the basic infrastructure needed, alongside the comments made by the EDDC Councillors who have also asked for this in their recent letter in response to the Strategy. In the response they sent to EDDC it clearly states, "All sites need to be surveyed for archaeological deposits and all require new access roads. Tree lines should be respected and two sites to the South of Verwood are close to the flood plain or watercourse. We would like EDDC to confirm that due to the ecology and rich biodiversity of both sites, that at least a one year cyclical survey is conducted by EDDC to cover the 4 seasons, these surveys to be conducted under the statutory requirements of Natural England, the Environment Agency, and other relevant bodies, both UK and EU, the results of these surveys to be made available for inspection."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southern Electric has also laid, at huge expense, seriously powerful electrical cables underneath the length of Edmondsham Road, this part of the road which will be heavily used by developers over a number of years during any potential new build. These cables are planned to do live in about 2 year's time. I would like to suggest that Southern Electric are consulted about any proposed damage to these cables. • An increase in housing does not necessarily mean an increase in employment. Although initially there may be an increase in short term work, it also goes without saying that contractors are likely to bring in a significant proportion of their own workforce and not rely on local tradesmen. If you consider the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate there is a significant number of people working there that do not live in Dorset and instead commute from other areas, so increasing the pressure on the roads and transport links. <p>3. Carbon Foot Print / Greenbelt / Light Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verwood currently has the highest car ownership in East Dorset, another 415 houses not to mention current new builds in progress, could potentially create another 800 + cars on our roads. This creates a huge carbon footprint alongside the increased risks and safety aspects already outlined in this 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>letter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By building on Verwood's last remaining greenbelt areas, we are damaging the Ecology and Biodiversity of the area. Building on these areas will seriously affect the Wildlife of Dorset, we have badgers, owls, bats, slow worms, snakes, foxes, birds of prey, door mice and deer to mention but a few, all of their habitats will be destroyed by these proposals and light pollution, which will especially affect the bats and owls. These areas especially in North Verwood are so I understand rich grade 2 arable land. Houses should not be built on greenbelt land full stop except in exceptional circumstances, especially not rich agricultural land and in order to do this would require a special application to the Secretary of State. Again a cost not mentioned at any point in the Core Strategy Document, but one made mention by Verwood local MP, Mr Bob Walter. • Greenbelt land is there for a reason is it to prevent urban sprawl, it is part of our heritage and it is being rapidly eroded. Verwood especially if these proposals go ahead will have little greenbelt land left to enjoy. The North Verwood site also has an area of great landscape value designation on it, although I understand this can be changed and reviewed by the Council it should be acknowledged. This is also the last rural entrance into Verwood and it is just going to become one big housing estate like to rest of Verwood. One of the last areas still with buildings of historic value close by. <p>4. Accessibility to North Verwood proposed sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These sites are situated on a narrow C road, with proposed entrances / exits two on Edmondsham Road and one on Station Road. • Station Road is currently a busy road so this entrance / exit would be very dangerous as visibility is poor and the road narrow. With an increase in use at certain parts of the day this poses a huge safety risk, whilst also causing the opportunity to congest and cause gridlock. • The two proposed entrances / exits on Edmondsham Road starting with the entrance before the hump back bridge. This is a narrow country lane, there are no pathways down this road and the potential for widening the road and creating pathways are near on impossible. Ourselves and Eastworth 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Farm Cottages are situated very close to the road side, so without compulsory purchasing houses this narrow road will be very dangerous. The other proposed entrance / exit on Edmondsham Road beside our house is completely blind / obscured to the right! It is narrow and without compulsory purchasing gardens and removing Tree Protection Order Oaks this would be catastrophic as an entrance / exit, with potentially 400 cars coming back and forward. We also recently had a collapsed culvert on this road, how on earth will this road cope with the heavy vehicles required to build these new developments? These roads and drainage were never designed for this!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the best will in the world green pathways are a great idea, but people are time restricted so they will generally go the most direct route to where they are going. For this reason again pathways from the new estates would be necessary to get children to Trinity School, I know myself that if I chose to walk down Edmondsham Road with my children it would take me 5 minutes, although we take our lives in our hands, but if I walk through the estate the safe quickest route it will take 15 minutes each way! Parents who are trying to get to work and time restricted will then end up taking their cars or using unsafe routes, causing utter chaos in the surrounding areas. <p>Finally on a personal note, we have lived in Verwood for 10 years our children were both born here and we consider it home. Verwood grew as a town very quickly and has not had time for the infrastructure and facilities to catch up or to mature and adapt to its' current population. We all understand that there is a need for housing in East Dorset, especially affordable housing but is Verwood really the right place in the long term? Is it not important to create a Town which is able to cope with its' current population, rather than creating one large housing estate, where people use it solely to commute. We were deeply saddened to hear about the North Verwood site proposals especially. It has caused extreme upset and embarrassment as you are aware amongst our neighbours, as they found it hard to believe that although our land appeared on the proposal document we knew nothing about this document until 2 days into the consultation. This simply shows how badly thought out the whole proposal document</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>is, that your own plans could not decide what was privately owned land. Nor was there any communication despite including our land on the planning documents. This is our family home and it is very hard for us to look at the positive side of this proposal not only for Verwood as a Town, but also for our personal environment. It is a beautiful part of Verwood, the last rural unspoilt entrance into Verwood, with historic and archaeological value and should be left to be enjoyed by all.</p> <p>The message is simple. Verwood needs to be made secure for its current level of population before increasing the population further. EDDC have a duty to maintain facilities and infrastructure for its current residents yet it continues to ignore proposals over the last few years. EDDC goes further to overrule the wishes of its own local Councillors and instead pursue a policy designed to bring income into the Council. To continue with this policy is to destroy an established Village</p>			
521457	Mr and Mrs M Daymond		CSO17833	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>VWM 1-4 4 different sites of development means 4 different groups of residents affected by the development on Green Belt; hence the outcry locally. Small Sites (VWM 1 & VWM3) : Affordable Homes – does this mean Social Housing? We do not agree with having social housing on the small sites. Social housing downgrades the value of private property and makes them less desirable. With the other development sites being much larger, the proposed affordable homes for the small sites, should be transferred to the larger sites; if there are starter homes on the same site, it will be easy for social housing tenants to upgrade to 1st time buyer status on the same estate. (recent Government initiative) Density We note that the number of houses is given as “approx.”. This can only mean that the total number is likely to exceed that stated. Otherwise it would say “up to” x number of houses. THE CORE STRATEGY LITERATURE Each development is described as benefitting residents with “additional valuable green infrastructure and divert pressures</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							away from heathlands". This is nonsense!! The majority of residents who walk or ride bikes off road go to Moors Valley Country Park. Walkers have the vast Ringwood Forest and it is only ramblers and horse owners who use the heathland and it is the horses that churn up heathland. Any green infrastructure within a development just improves the local environment but also needs maintenance.			
522203	Mr Nigel Reeves		CSO18076	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>As a Verwood resident, please see below my response and comments relating to the Verwood Options in the Core Strategy Consultation document.</p> <p>I object to any further substantial housing increases in Verwood, specifically VWM 2 and VWM 4 in the document, for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - why is suddenly okay to build on green belt land? - as noted, there are significant Verwood public transport issues, and I see no information as to how this will be dramatically improved to encourage residents out of private transports (cars) - as reported, most residents use their cars to commute, so this will just increase this usage - I see all the surrounding traffic problem areas noted (Ashley Heath, Spur Road, A31 etc) but see nothing of how these significant problems will be resolved. <p>Why increase the population in a town already noted as being small for its population and in a location with no decent transportation infrastructure in place (as above), no shopping centre, and, despite what it states in the report, inadequate facilities in terms of what a town of this population should have. Yes, there is a supermarket, but there is no real shopping centre, few shops other than hairdressers and estate agents, only one restaurant, and inadequate facilities for young people as the report states (I know as I have 4 children).</p> <p>In summary, before any further increase in housing, properly address the transportation and facilities issues raised, not to mention comments from others on your "dorsetforyou" website and other websites, and then maybe consider more housing.</p> <p>Finally, inviting comments on your paper copy form from</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>everyone on all of the options for each of the areas being considered simply turns it into a competition between each of them to no real benefit, and with Verwood the obvious loser. By that I mean why should a resident of Wimborne or Corfe Mullen, for example, object to new housing in Verwood, especially if they think that it may obviate the need for housing in their own town. A Verwood resident is far more likely to be aware of increased traffic problems connected to any potential new housing in Wimborne, Corfe Mullen or Ferndown as they have to leave Verwood and possibly drive through these areas to reach a hospital or a shopping centre etc, whereas mostly residents of other towns would infrequently travel through or to Verwood.</p> <p>For the most part therefore, I don't think it is fair to comment on the potential options for the other towns except that the current transport infrastructure problems common to all of our areas must be resolved until any further substantial house building. No one seems to also bear in mind that this is a major tourist area and the traffic is hugely increased by visitors and holidaymakers for much of the year, and at certain times many of the roads almost grind to a halt, and in the case of a serious accident on any one of a number of routes, they do come to a halt. Personally I regularly drive to and through Wimborne and Corfe Mullen, and occasionally through Ferndown, and dread to think how the options of high numbers of new houses will worsen these often already slow and painful journeys.</p> <p>Please, therefore, first try to address the issues raised before major increases in house building.</p>			
522240	Association Verwood Residents	Chairman Association Verwood Residents	CSO18092	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>5. THE PROPOSALS VWM 1 – 30 Homes – 12-15 affordable VWM 2 – 200 Homes – 80-100 affordable VWM – 20 Homes – 8-10 affordable VWM 4 – 165 Homes – 66-83 affordable Total – 415 Homes – 166-208 affordable These proposals are in essence simply going to exacerbate the problems and shortcomings outlined above in Paragraph 3. The Secretary of State for the Environment set out in the</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>vision for the area to: “develop the region in a sustainable way,....., where the quality of life for residents, the business community and visitors will be maintained and enhanced”. The Regional Planning Guidance for the region states: “.....minimise the need to develop on Greenfield sites and to travel” with the aims of protecting the environment and providing prosperity for communities.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how the proposed developments will support the above aims.</p> <p>Quality of life for residents would be decimated with loss of recreational land, increased traffic and associated pollution. This is in addition to the severe adverse impact on wildlife and SSSIs. The associated infrastructure within Verwood cannot sustain more housing development as there are limited employment opportunities within the town, particularly for executive roles. Therefore more housing will simply lead to a further loss of community identity and increased isolation for those living in Verwood.</p> <p>The fear is that the distinct and unique quality of Verwood and its environment would be further eroded by these developments. The EDDC plan states that “development in future should be based on the principles of sustainable development”. How is it proposed this will be achieved? Developer and or the new “Homes Bonus” contributions will be totally insufficient to correct the existing shortcomings that have been endemic over the last 25 years.</p> <p>Previous strategies and plans indicated Verwood could accept more housing development only if the West Moors Bypass was completed. This major road improvement scheme has now been abandoned completely removing a main motivator for future housing development in Verwood.</p> <p>In short these proposals will further: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erode more protected GREEN BELT LAND • Cause more traffic congestion • Cause more flooding • Cause more light pollution • Cause the loss of wildlife habitat • Cause the loss of protected ancient hedgerows • Increase demand on drainage systems beyond their capabilities 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase demand on overstretched Medical facilities • Compound the lack of adequate recreational and leisure facilities • Increase the danger to school children when arriving and leaving the school campus site at the junction of Howe Lane and Margards Lane <p>6.1 North Verwood VWM 1 & 2</p> <p>1. Wildlife</p> <p>There has already been a marked decline in wildlife populations in around the conservation area since the Holmlea Gate Development on the east side of Eastworth Rd was completed in 2001. The explosion in domestic cat numbers has drastically reduced the number and variety of bird species and small mammals in the area.</p> <p>As a result of this the local owl population has been severely affected and it is very quiet at night now compared to how it used to be in 2001. There are badgers and badger setts - a licence is required from Natural England to close a sett (we are not sure how many there are), but if there are no obvious setts nearby that the badgers could move into badger exclusion permission often requires that an artificial sett is build close by to house them.</p> <p>There are also reptiles such as adders and slow worms, bats, which are protected and some trees do indeed have a protection order.</p> <p>The proposed sites are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for much wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts.</p> <p>2. Green Belt</p> <p>These areas also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas • To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land <p>Once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. Our understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available.</p> <p>Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision.</p> <p>3. Railway Embankment The disused railway embankment/cutting far from making a natural boundary to the new development is a wildlife reserve in itself with larger animals using it as a concealed highway between the ANCI and more open country to the north (New Forest). New housing alongside it could seriously upset this corridor.</p> <p>4. The Play Park The play park and recreational area would likely become overpopulated and with the loss of its scenic rural outlook this amenity would lose its appeal to many established visitors. The risk of further antisocial behaviour after dark would be greatly increased. The land outside the play park has been used by families for years with open access.</p> <p>5. AGLV Area of Great Landscape Value</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>This is shown on Dorset Explorer maps on the version accessed via local plan www.dorsetforyou.com/localplan/east. The grassland has probably not been ploughed for many years and is likely to be of similar value to that described for Sutton Holms. Residents used to graze recreational livestock on some of the VWM2 land 14 years ago and the pasture appeared species rich then and has not been disturbed since.</p> <p>6. Access The access points to Eastworth Road will be dangerous and this small C road is not suitable for more traffic in either direction. The existing road has no pavements, is a narrow country lane and is currently unsuitable to cope with the increased traffic. There are many blind corners and unevenness that will pose huge safety issues for children. Without making the road wider the access will be impossible and the District Council have promised there will be no compulsory purchase of gardens.</p> <p>7. Statistics Verwood is the second biggest town in Dorset (2,000 people short of Dorchester) with the highest car population. Anyone in Verwood would have to travel at least 20 miles to shop for anything other than groceries. The local supermarket has no competition, and has the 5th highest profit per square foot in England. Even the supermarket cannot cope with the demand from Verwood Residents and constantly runs out of stock. The only garage in the Town regularly runs out of fuel the tanks can't be filled quickly enough. Jobs cannot be provided in the town for the new people that come. The Ebblake Estate is surrounded by Heathland and housing and therefore constrained for further development. Approximately 2850 people come into Verwood for work and similarly approximately 3800 go out of Verwood every day to work. The Core Strategy suggests at least 78% of workers Verwood leave the town and commute in excess of 5 miles to work on a daily basis. Currently school traffic causes severe congestion in the Margards Lane, Howe Lane together with parking difficulties in Hayward Crescent, Holly Grove and Keswick Way. This results in workers having to leave much earlier than</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>necessary to avoid being delayed by this congestion. Public transport is poor, and anyone moving to Verwood without a car would NOT be able to get to work. The buses for college in Bournemouth and Poole only run at certain times, making the day for students very long. All the children of Verwood in year 9 or above have to be bussed out to Upper Schools. Verwood's Carbon Footprint is HUGE; building more houses would dramatically increase this, where there should be plans to reduce it.</p> <p>6.4 STATISTICAL EVIDENCE</p> <p>1. Introduction</p> <p>All figures and statistics within this section have been obtained from one of the references. When extrapolations have been made the basis for that is clarified in the text. Whilst many of the statistics are taken from reports applying to East Dorset there is nothing in the reports to indicate that they do not apply proportionately to Verwood. Indeed since the reports have been commissioned to decide on future housing strategy and this has determined that Verwood is one of five locations where future building is appropriate it can be argued that they are either relevant statistics or the reports are irrelevant. In most of the reports EDDC report a maximum margin of error District wide of 1.6% at the 95% confidence interval.</p> <p>We believe all statistical evidence used for the basis of the Core strategy needs further analysis and independent verification because of its importance in developing what happens to Verwood in the future. The following paragraphs demonstrate where the figures used for the Core Strategy may well be incorrect and or inappropriate.</p> <p>2. Population and Housing</p> <p>The East Dorset Housing Need and Demand Report June 2008 estimated that there are around 37,600 households in the District, of these around 85% are currently owner-occupiers with 8% living in the social rented sector and around 7% in the private rented sector.</p> <p>Out migrant households tend to be employed, whereas in migrant households have a higher proportion of retired households. Although the differences are not very large, the results would suggest that the in-migrants into Dorset are</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order															
							<p>often wealthy households, retired or looking to retire.</p> <p>This is important on two fronts: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly retired populations are much more likely to want that sense of community that ironically this development plan will help to reduce. Consultation meetings run by the Council have shown very clearly that there is very strong support for conserving the sense of Community. • Secondly an ageing population places greater demands on infrastructure such as Doctors and Dentists. <p>3. Economic status in Verwood</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Working</td> <td>Unemployed</td> <td>Retired</td> <td>Other</td> <td>Total</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2611</td> <td>50.6%</td> <td>38</td> <td>0.7%</td> <td>2213</td> </tr> <tr> <td>42.9%</td> <td>294</td> <td>5.7%</td> <td>5156</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>In 1991 nine out of ten employed people found their employment in Verwood, by 2008 there were 730 firms in Verwood, but 88% of them only employed 1 – 10 people. Since 65.5% (1710) of employed people in Verwood are classed as Wealthy Achievers it is evident that they must be finding employment outside of Verwood. In addition 90.7% of the population of Verwood are classed as comfortably off or better.</p> <p>It is estimated that at the time of the survey there was a current stock of affordable housing of around 325 which could be used to meet this need (including dwellings becoming available as households in the social rented sector move to different dwellings). Hence it was estimated that the net backlog of need for affordable housing is around 386 units (711- 325). Annualised over 5 years (as recommended in the Practice Guidance) this becomes 77 households (386/5). The total future need for affordable housing is therefore estimated to be 525 units per annum.</p> <p>Reports show that overall there is expected to be a greater demand for housing than the current stock of housing can meet. Overall, across all tenures there is an apparent shortfall of 375 dwellings per annum (excess demand over supply) of which 48% is for affordable housing. However the Audit Commission report criticises for consistently allowing over</p>	Working	Unemployed	Retired	Other	Total	2611	50.6%	38	0.7%	2213	42.9%	294	5.7%	5156				
Working	Unemployed	Retired	Other	Total																					
2611	50.6%	38	0.7%	2213																					
42.9%	294	5.7%	5156																						

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>900 dwellings to lie empty for more than one year and having a record of only getting three such dwellings back into use per annum.</p> <p>In total the plan shows an intention to develop 2570 houses over a fifteen year period, 35% of this could be provided by getting existing stock back into use leaving Green Field sites unaffected. Since the references indicate that there is an anticipated annual need of 179 units and the plan would deliver 171 units, it is clear that the Council has no intention of addressing the Audit Commissions criticism of failing to bring long term empty stock back into use. This is a pity since as a strategy this has to be a much more sustainable and environmentally option.</p> <p>EDDC assume that any household with more than one spare bedroom is under-occupying their dwelling and nearly 50% of houses are in this category. An alternative strategy to new buildings could be to investigate incentive schemes to get existing stock more fully occupied.</p> <p>Since only a total of 65 households and an anticipated 43 households of inward migration have been identified as in need of housing in Verwood, the need for 415 units is questionable.</p> <p>Finally all of the data on housing need has been gathered prior to 2009 when the overall economic climate was very different. In view of the current economic climate it has to be worth reconsidering the demand for housing.</p> <p>A report run using the official Estate Agents and Land Registry Database shows that of the 100 properties marketed in the BH31 area in the quarter ending 9/1/11 only seven have been sold subject to contract with an additional nine under offer. Since this sample includes several new builds it calls into question the demand for such a high level of building in Verwood, and would be likely to result in even larger numbers of empty properties.</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that EDDC check officially with local Estate Agents the current state of the housing market before proceeding with this plan. In addition we have asked District Councillors to provide information on local waiting lists which are being used to justify the large percentage of affordable housing in the Core Strategy proposals. To date</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order															
							<p>this has not been made available.</p> <p>4. Roads and Vehicles</p> <p>Car ownership data suggests that there is an average of 1.49 cars per household in the District. There are however large differences by tenure with owner-occupiers (with mortgage) having an average of 1.88 cars per household.</p> <p>In Verwood the Core Strategy as it stands will exacerbate the number of people living in the town but commuting to work, since all the employment opportunities exist outside Verwood. Of the existing 730 firms in Verwood 88% only employ between one and ten people. Assuming the proportion of economically active people remains broadly the same at 69% and that car ownership figures remain static, then the proposed 415 houses will place an additional 780 vehicles on the roads out of Verwood.</p> <p>Since the plan requires new housing to blend with the existing and surrounding housing it is inevitable that a high percentage will attract Executives who certainly will not be able to find suitable employment without commuting. The net effect will be to reduce further the sense of Community, directly in contravention of the Central Governments concept of the Big Community, and to further enhance the feeling of a Dormitory Town.</p> <p>Current car ownership in Verwood is stated to be: -</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>None</td> <td>One</td> <td>Two</td> <td>Three or more</td> <td>Total</td> </tr> <tr> <td>437</td> <td>8.4%</td> <td>2209</td> <td>42.9%</td> <td>1924</td> </tr> <tr> <td>37.3%</td> <td>582</td> <td>11.3%</td> <td>5152</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>There is an intention to close off to vehicular traffic Manor Lane St Michaels Lane at the Manor Road end. If the intended Springfield Close relief road is put in place then there will be increased vehicular traffic in Howe Lane above the potential increase due to the proposed housing development. Since the eastern end of Howe Lane is part of the bridle and cycle path network increasing vehicular traffic in this area will significantly adversely affect this valuable leisure provision.</p> <p>Currently Howe Lane and Margards Lane are almost</p>	None	One	Two	Three or more	Total	437	8.4%	2209	42.9%	1924	37.3%	582	11.3%	5152				
None	One	Two	Three or more	Total																					
437	8.4%	2209	42.9%	1924																					
37.3%	582	11.3%	5152																						

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>impassable at school run time with vehicles parked on both sides of the road. It is just possible to get an ordinary car down the centre in these conditions, but an Emergency Vehicle would find it impossible. This situation would be made even worse with the introduction of probably over 1000 people in the additional 415 homes. Certainly any addition of a Secondary School would make a bad situation intolerable. The Howe Lane development has only two choices of access, one off Howe Lane which almost certainly would have an impact on established and protected trees as well as potential adverse impact on the curtilage provisions of the Listed Building.</p> <p>As mentioned above there are also significant traffic congestion problems around school run times, making this access at best problematic. The other access option is via Summer Fields, this option requires purchasing a substantial proportion of the front gardens of two dwellings. There are already parking problems for houses in the area resulting in existing homeowners parking their vehicles on the street. In addition, established hedging on front gardens hinders sightlines making the turn in or out of the Close blind and therefore extremely hazardous. The twenty proposed properties would add an additional nearly 40 vehicles to this narrow access.</p> <p>Although not contained within the plan it is understood that there is an intention to put a relief road through Springfields linking Manor Road with the Eastern end of Howe Lane. This road would reduce further the ability of the land to allow natural run off of surface water in an area already prone to flooding. It will also add vehicular congestion to an area that is already dangerously congested for much of the day.</p> <p>Since most of the new occupants will have employment outside of Verwood they will be forced to commute out of the own via either the Ringwood Road or through Three Legged Cross. Both of these routes are already crowded in rush hour and neither permit widening of the road. The Ringwood Road in particular has recently had its speed limit reduced in order to try to reduce the number of fatal accidents.</p> <p>5. General The plan states that Verwood amongst other towns has been</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>identified as an area suitable for development as it is a location where important facilities, services and employment are most accessible and readily improved. This is misleading as employment in Verwood is already inadequate for the existing population.</p> <p>With the exception of the Hub there are no entertainment facilities such as Restaurants, a permanent cinema or theatre and Youth activities are generally agreed to be inadequate. Even the Hub is plainly failing to meet the entertainment desires of the population as it is loss making and yet there is significant outward migration of people in the evening. Finally the town is served by a retained fire station, in the current climate this is unlikely to change, the latest figures from show that the engine was unavailable due to manning constraints for over 10% of the time, the seventh worst station in Dorset.</p>			
522257	Mr Richard Beaman		CSO18 100	Option VWM 1	Support		<p>My support for the additional housing proposed in Verwood and Wimborne is conditional, based on building the proposed secondary school in Verwood. The new school should start to be built prior to or at the same time as any of the proposed larger housing developments.</p>			1045
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	CSO18 117	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>Site VWM 1 is situated to the north of Edmondsham Road, in a location that is essentially rural in character, accommodating good quality farmland. The existing adopted East Dorset Local Plan identifies the site as falling within an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). It is therefore currently the subject of Policy LSCON 2, which 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, with a strong historical dimension, containing traditional cottages and farm buildings, forming varied human and natural landscapes. Site VWM 1 forms an important part of the AGLV in this part of East Dorset District. It gives north west Verwood an established rural setting, with Edmondsham Road providing a natural boundary between the village of</p>	Delete Option VWM 1 and retain the AGLV designation.		1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Verwood, to the south, and the open farmland to the north. The site, and the associated SANGS, extends into Grade 3 agricultural land. This good quality farmland would be lost in perpetuity if the site was developed.</p> <p>Development here would also be prominent in the landscape. The plan identifying the site shows that potential landscaping is required to the northern and western boundaries of the site. This demonstrates that mitigation measures would be required in order to reduce the adverse visual impact of the potential development.</p> <p>Additionally, the text of Paragraph 11.101 states that the field parcel is naturally buffered by existing built form to the west. This is misleading in that the 'development' comprises farm buildings (i.e. not a residential estate), which is an entirely appropriate group of buildings to be found in a countryside location.</p> <p>The potential allocation of Site WVM 1 could act as a precedent for future development in this part of the countryside. There are no natural, defensible boundaries to the north and west. Urban 'sprawl' may occur; contrary to the advice set out in PPG 2 "Green Belts".</p>			
522417	Mr G Flynn		CSO18 143	Option WVM 1	Object		Proposed developments WVM1 WVM2 will overload the existing infrastructure of the area. Continual development will erode the green belt.			1045
522671	Mrs K Thompson		CSO18 167	Option WVM 1	Object		<p>Verwood has expanded rapidly in terms of housing but what it lacks is any infrastructure. The facilities for the existing population are poor. If further housing is to be considered we first need to consider the existing residents and plan for and encourage retail and leisure businesses into the Verwood area. Compare Verwood with Ringwood, where there is a high street with a variety of retail outlets (book shop, delicatessen, fashion, restaurants, butcher, cook ware, pets and country stores etc) there is also the Furlong centre with nation chain outlets. Verwood on the other hand has no 'identity' and no heart to it. It is not cohesive and has no central area. Before further increasing housing in the locality planners need to take a good look at local amenities. We have very little here for the young, for example. We have a</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							high proportion of families, hence the perceived need for a new secondary school, but very little in the way of activities for children and particularly the teenagers. Local amenities must be improved before further increasing the resident population. Facilities at Potterne Park eg. The tennis courts are in a poorly maintained state, the Hub provides little for the teenagers and the leisure centre needs expanding. There are no decent restaurants/cafe and the place feels like a ghost town where people come to sleep but entertain themselves elsewhere. This needs to be addressed in a considered way rather than just building more housing. If these areas are to be built on why not take the opportunity to address some of the issues mentioned above rather than just expanding the resident population?			
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18 184	Option VWM 1	Support		Our clients support chapter 11 relating to the housing development proposed at Verwood. The development brief shows how up to 350 dwellings may be provided on the Northern edge of Verwood. Option VWM1 and VWM2 and an extension of the 2 to the north is supported as described above. General Comment – the proposed extension of VWM1 and VWM2 will enable the Edmondsham Road to be re-aligned with the removal of the disused railway bridge and re-profiling of the road to lower levels, removing the hump. In addition a proper roundabout or road junction would be able to be created to the north of Eastworth Farm in order to provide safe access to the proposed new development on both sides of the road. The existing proposal relating to access for VWM1 and VWM2 does not appear to be satisfactory.			1045
523262	Mr & Mrs Jones		CSO18 260	Option VWM 1	Object		We fundamentally disagree with any proposals to breach the Green Belt surrounding Verwood and would question the legality of any such development. The old railway line is cited as becoming a "natural" new northern boundary for the town but once dense housing development is allowed within Green Belt how can any further expansion beyond this new boundary be countered in the future? There is then the potential for the parish of Edmondsham to be swallowed up in			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							yet more "urban sprawl" which is systematically ruining much of rural England. We have no confidence in East Dorset Council being impartial in making any decisions regarding the expansion of Verwood as any development would generate huge Council Tax Receipts. This reason alone could render any decision the Council made open to a legal challenge. Furthermore we have no confidence in the planning department to approve only sympathetic plans. There are numerous examples of, quite frankly, grotesque developments of flats in Verwood, the most recent of which is the re-development of the old Fayrewood pub site on Ringwood Road. Once again this project is driven by greed without proper consideration of what local people really want. If we wanted to live in an urban sprawl we would live in a city. If the Council need revenue then may we suggest that measures are taken, as have been taken in the private sector, to be become more efficient.			
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		CSO18 300	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
523326	Mrs H Clark		CSO18 322	Option VWM 1	Object		I think the infra structure of Verwood would not be able to cope with this many new homes. We live off Margards lane which leads to Emmanuel School and the potential new secondary school. The road is already like a race track at school run times, with the increased housing and new school it would be impossible to get out of our road in the mornings, and even more problems pulling out onto Manor Road. Building on these plots will spoil the lovely aspect for the schools and also the people in Summerfields will loose their lovely quiet environment. I think Verwood is big enough and a housing project of this size is going to ruin a lovely place.			1045
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 177	Option VWM 1	Object		The Moors River system, including the River Crane, Ebblake Stream and Uddens Water has already been subject to excessive development within its catchment including the establishment of a number of very ill advised employment/industrial estates. It has suffered severely from all the above impacts resulting in temporary or permanent			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							losses to biodiversity. Continued development within the catchment, especially in close proximity to its water courses, and particularly of employment/industrial development, is wholly inappropriate. Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously impinging on the Moors River system and its corridor include KS3/ PC7 (St Leonards Hospital), KS4 (Woodland Walk), VM 1,2,3 and 4 (Verwood), PC4 (Blunts Farm), and PC 5 (Woolsbridge).			
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 298	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options.</p> <p>However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported.</p> <p>Options VWM1,2,3 and 4 Continued development in Verwood will progressively increase the demand for a by-pass for West Moors which will inevitably have very damaging</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>repercussions for biodiversity. Whilst such a scheme may not be possible in the present financial climate, the time will undoubtedly come when controversial road schemes will be back on the agenda and changes which have taken place in the interim will be weighed in the balance.</p> <p>All these sites in Verwood will drain into the River Crane and thence the Moors River.</p> <p>In summary all the sites are problematic in terms of pressure for a West Moors By-pass and drainage to the River Crane, while VWM2, and 4 have additional problems or currently improperly assessed issues which require at least reduction in extent, and potentially rejection.</p>			
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO18 973	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>Verwood has taken on more than its fair share of new homes. The town cannot expand any further - there are limited facilities and employment opportunities. People have to travel further afield, invariably by car as public transport provision is pathetic. I can see absolutely no justification for building houses on designated Green Belt land. As far as I can see, the only reason the sites proposed for new homes in Verwood have been put forward is that the land owners are offering it up for sale (and want to make profit out of it). What is the point in designating land as Green Belt if that designation can be changed, apparently, at will? It is being suggested that the disused railway line to the west of Eastworth Road makes a natural town boundary. I would argue that Eastworth Road makes a natural town boundary given that it is already the town boundary and the Green Belt boundary. After these developments go ahead (God forbid) what will be identified as the next natural al boundary? And the next.... Enough is enough!</p>			1045
527501	Eve Thompson		CSO18 781	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>Verwood has expanded too much and hasn't enough facilities i.e. dentist, shops etc to service the present population. The number of extra cars will impact on the narrow roads.</p>			1045
527512	Eric Thompson		CSO18 795	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>More houses mean more cars. 400 houses maybe 600 to 800 more vehicles, we are bursting at the seams. The roads in our town are generally in poor condition. More cars mean more pollution, more noise more traffic jams. You should be</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							thinking more of the people who already live in the town I have not found anyone who supports these proposals. We don't have the infrastructure to support hundreds of extra people. Statistically crime and anti social behaviour will rise. In these times of cut backs are we to get more police and more fire fighters to cope with the extra load?			
527740	Anne Parsons		CSO18 891	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood 1. Why should our children wait until a further 400+ homes are built before they get their long awaited Secondary School - one can only presume that the planning gain will pay for this. 2. Verwood needs more infrastructure before consideration is given to more homes. 3. What guarantee is there that affordable housing - IF built would not be sold on at the market rate in future years? If homes have to be built why not put a stipulation regarding affordable housing. Other areas of the country do this such as the Lake and Peak District. 4. TA1 how could developers contribute to transport improvements other than roads - its up to Wilts and Dorset Buses to put on extra public transport. 5. It was not a surprise that no Councillors either Town or District were at the Hub between 2-3pm today 11 Nov 2010 - I wonder why? I doubt that the views of the local residents will be listened to as they've not been in the past.			1045
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		CSO18 923	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
527818	Mr Nigel Lester	Synergy Housing Association	CSO18 969	Option VWM 1	Support		Having looked at the proposals for each of the geographical areas and the proposed sites within those areas we can see no reason to disagree with the Local Authorities assessment and findings in each case, and would be very keen to become involved in the provision of affordable housing on any of these sites.			1045
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO19 054	Option VWM 1		General Comment	Vehicular access would be achievable to the northern Verwood sites and pedestrian / cycle facilities to the centre either already exist or could be provided. Links to good quality public transport would be harder to secure and improvements to these services more difficult to provide from just 250 houses on the northern edge of the settlement.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
533834	Mr Tim Harris		CSO19 209	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
533862	Mr Paul Holman		CSO19 212	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
533905	Mr & Mrs A Kell		CSO19 248	Option VWM 1	Object		We cannot agree with the total amount of houses proposed for these sites although a much smaller number (50%) would be acceptable. The main reason for objecting is that almost all of the traffic arising from these developments would naturally be directed into the town, and out along Ringwood Road. The main road linking one side of town to the other already has several bottlenecks, the main one being caused by short term parking outside Tesco's. The roundabout by the fire station is already busy and dangerous with such a huge increase in volume. The car parks are full to capacity too during the day. By doing this you will generate more traffic jams and will annoy many people. Also, as previously stated the services (Medical, Dental, Leisure, Schools, Roads and Car Parking) are not fit to cope with the large increase in population being proposed.			1045
534820	Paul Batten		CSO19 436	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
534837	Mrs P Martin		CSO19 500	Option VWM 1		No Opinion	Horses need grazing land. No infrastructure in place for the total number of homes planned. I do not go out between 8.00 and 9.30 am and 3.00pm and 6.30pm because of the traffic on the roads now.			1045
534875	Brian Lane		CSO19 543	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
534904	Mr Martin Aldridge		CSO19 578	Option VWM 1	Object		I strongly object to any more development in Verwood it's time to pick on somewhere else. The road from Verwood to Ringwood is at capacity in the morning and evening rush-hours. My local road to the schools is at capacity and suffers from intense school traffic and no attempt has been made over the years to make up the unmade roads to provide			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							alternative routes to the schools. If I have to leave a car in the road overnight it causes chaos with the school run. Please build more houses in much more central locations where they are needed not in a saturated place out in the sticks. I know your destruction of Verwood as a place to live is almost complete but please please build elsewhere its only common sense. If you cannot drive Verwood is an expensive place of isolation. Ringwood has the advantage of a coach link. Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch have train links. As a minimum Verwood should have both a free bus service to Ringwood and a safe separate from the road tarmaced cycle path to Ringwood so that the fit and able can quickly get to Ringwood for free instead of a £6 return bus service that takes hours and goes around the houses. Planners - get real.			
534914	Mrs P Froud		CSO19 676	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
535040	Mr Tom Garnham		CSO19 592	Option VWM 1	Object		I have lived in Dorset for 15 years, the last 8 of which have been in Verwood. Verwood is unique in that in terms of population it can be considered a town but in all other respects it bears no resemblance to what most of us commonly think of as a town. Sandwiched by open countryside and Ringwood Forest, it is a wonderful location in which to live but in just the last 8 years I have seen changes. With the building of additional housing and the disappointing emergence of blocks of flats wholly out of keeping with the surrounding area, increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic has been noticeable. I would strongly urge you not to approve any further housing developments for Verwood. The process of development is irreversible. If any of the options under consideration are approved the beautiful landscape those developments would replace will be lost forever with incalculable consequences for the diverse wildlife they sustain. In addition, the increase in population we again amend the Green Belt boundary. Now is the time to take a long-term view and put conservation ahead of the seemingly inexorable tide of development. Despite many years of development, Verwood has somehow managed to retain its			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							rural character. For the benefit of its residents, the wildlife it sustains, the people of Dorset, and for future generations please do what you can to keep it that way.			
535049	Mr Ian Parsons		CSO19 597	Option VWM 1	Object		I object to the developments within Verwood. The main reason is that the infrastructure with the present population of Verwood cannot cope. Reasons as follows why we do not want more Developments: Our First Schools are over subscribed now, our only Middle School Emmanuel has had to have extra classes yearly to accommodate the increasing number of children that feed in from the three first schools. We have NO HIGH SCHOOL, which we need NOW. This would save the Council Tax Payers the costs of Transporting all the High School age children to either QE at Wimborne or Ferndown High School. There would need to be more Doctors surgeries and dental surgeries as the present number would not be able to cope. We are aware that there is NO MONEY available for a High School now. Also that no additional infrastructure will be built until such proposed developments are built - which means to us the council tax payers - that no extra infrastructure will be built even after new houses are occupied. Who is LOW COST housing for - this should only be limited to local people i.e. People of Verwood and there are many who need low cost/social housing. We do not want Verwood to become a SINK TOWN by the local authorities to DUMP unwanted Tenants in Verwood. Development will not contribute to Transport Costs UNLESS you are GOING to GIVE Planning Gain Monies to Wilts and Dorset for more Buses day and evening times.			1045
535055	R Knox		CSO19 602	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
535070	Mr Alan Reade		CSO19 631	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
535096	Mrs S M West		CSO19 655	Option VWM 1	Object					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535103	Neil Clarke		CSO19 669	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
535112	Mr Jack Tindall		CSO19 716	Option VWM 1	Object		The upper school will not be built within the life of this document, and will not be able to go ahead on the land proposed due to lack of access to the site and the close proximity to the heathland. If this issue were to be sorted out before the building of more houses then I would support the proposals but not until.			1045
535167	Lynda Lake		CSO19 763	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
535169	Mrs A Jarvis		CSO19 730	Option VWM 1	Object		I am totally against any further building in Verwood.			1045
535176	Mrs Krithia Blaker		CSO19 742	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is over populated...over built and under facilitated...We have had more than our fair share of houses built in Verwood. Let somewhere else have more housing built. People state Verwood is one of the fastest growing towns in Dorset. That is so dreadful. As I said before it is some other town that needs to take on the building of more homes. Let some other town take the strain. VERWOOD HAS DONE MORE THAN IT'S FAIR SHARE OF BUILDING. There are NO jobs here for people why bring hundreds more people here?? We are still in a recession businesses are closing down. Ferndown trading estate has lots of EMPTY units as does Ebblake. I agree it would be nice to have an Upper school nearer to Verwood...ideally between 3 legged cross/West Moors/Verwood. That would then suit 3 areas. The position the proposal suggests for the school is totally unacceptable already extremely dangerous for Children. Another school in this position would bring in hundreds more children.....and HUNDR EDS more CARS. I also feel building on Greenbelt land is unacceptable....You can't keep moving the *Goalposts* Greenbelt must remain greenbelt!!!!.			1045
535180	Mrs M Field		CSO19 751	Option VWM 1	Object					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535196	Mr R Field		CSO19 770	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
535206	Mr Calvert		CSO19 804	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support this type of development; it is still trying to catch up, from poor implementation and direction from past developments Buses: lack & frequency of service to neighbouring areas, Lack of Sporting and recreational facilities, Lack of Facilities for teenagers eg resulting in the current enforcement of the banning of Alcohol in certain areas Lack of local employment, Current centres of employment being in Bournemouth, Pool, Wimborne Resulting in Poor road / transport support in and out of Verwood along the B3081 and its intersections with other junction eg: A31 , Alderholt junction, and Cranborne / Wimborne, The withdrawal of the Ringwood road improvement and the A338 funding Lack social services with in the area Dentists etc .: How is the new school going to be funded and would this be built before the additional housing , would the funding for such a project be ring fenced in this current financial climate to ensure children do not have to be bussed out of the area . Currently the council can not find funding or land option for allotments for existing residents, we been waiting for over 3 years for this simple amenity.			1045
535209	Mr P Webster		CSO19 797	Option VWM 1	Object		Please liaise with NFDC and NPA, as the additional traffic generated by the extra housing and employment zones will increase the traffic problems at the already congested bottleneck at Ringwood and cause yet more problems for the people who live in New Forest hamlets such as Linwood, Brook and Burley as motorists try to find alternative routes. Can the New Forest take any more pressure from additional numbers of visitors? Has Dorset got enough sand and gravel in the landbank to meet the needs of the developers? Can you force Tarmac to start mining gravel by the Spur Road near Hurn? What will happen to the pollution levels close to the trunk roads e.g. at Ringwood, especially particulate pollution? Can Bournemouth Water meet the increased demands for water?			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535349	P Thomas		CSO19 830	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
535360	Mrs Phyllis Peach		CSO19 835	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		CSO19 979	Option VWM 1	Object		I think that this whole core strategy consultation needs a full review in light of the proposed changes being brought in under the new government. I particularly object to all the proposed Verwood development as the infrastructure is not in place to support the current population let alone adding even further to it by building a further 400 homes. Any EDDC councillor who has the affront to say that the infrastructure is in place to support this development does not know what they are talking about and obviously do not live in the town.			1045
535384	Mr R Beard		CSO19 872	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
535387	Mr Brian Cox		CSO19 960	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
535393	Jeremy Berg		CSO19 908	Option VWM 1	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			1045
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		CSO20 726	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
489765	Derek KEAREY		CSO19 511	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
535395	Clare James		CSO19 883	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
535404	Danika Irving		CSO19 898	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535421	Mr Roland Andrews		CSO19 914	Option VWM 1	Object		The existing infrastructure in Verwood does not support the current level of occupation - Doctors, dentist, schools, shops, car parks and mostly road system. Further building without improving the infrastructure is ridiculous. There is no significant employment in the Verwood area and therefore additional building will only cause increased traffic and congestion. Public transport is extremely limited - why aren't there any proposals to improve this?? I do not understand why land that is already designated as green belt is even being considered for new development, is nothing sacred. Why can't development be further out, why does it all have to be centred on existing towns??			1045
535457	Mr Matthew Newman		CSO19 970	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
535500	David Veevers		CSO20 018	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
535504	Mr Michael Beer		CSO20 081	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
535508	Bill Bowden		CSO20 041	Option VWM 1	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood would not support this amount of housing. It is no good deciding to build a large number of properties without first considering the road system. A large number of people leave the town in the morning to travel to work and this will undoubtedly increase with the introduction of new homes. Can the existing power supply, sewerage system, and water supply cope adequately with this number of houses?. Has a proper in depth survey been carried out?. The tendency to flood from water courses can change dramatically if green field sites are concreted and water run off is much more rapid during heavy rains. Have the appropriate surveys for protected and endangered species been carried out in areas where new housing is proposed?			1045
535509	Mrs S Durant		CSO20 123	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535512	J R Page		CSO20058	Option VWM 1	Object		1. Quite often the Ferret Green car park and the Doctors' Surgery car park at Station Road do not have any car spaces available. 2. To make an appointment with one's own Doctor can result in a two or three week wait. 3. It is nearly impossible to exit my drive on a school morning as there is continuous traffic streaming past my bungalow with double parking in Howe lane. With this and the volume of traffic cars come to a complete stop blocking the road. 4. If 400 houses are built plus an addition school, life will become impossible. Verwood has been overbuilt without the necessary infrastructure being in place.			1045
535517	Roy Rich		CSO20096	Option VWM 1	Object		We are happy as we are nice and peaceful. THAT'S WHY WE MOVED TO VERWOOD!! Please just leave a very dense population alone, to sort out all the mistakes already made by previous decisions!! We are full to overflowing, the amenities are VERY stretched. You try to get to a DENTIST for treatment, YOU TRY TO GET A DOCTORS appointment. FULL---FULL ---FULL I WISH YOU LOT LIVED HERE AND FIND THIS OUT. Ok rant over but PLEASE listen to US!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!			1045
535540	Mr Peter Weaver		CSO20125	Option VWM 1	Object		This group of proposals for Verwood displays a total lack of the 'joined-up thinking' which I trusted the planning system to provide. Verwood is seriously under-provided for in terms of infrastructure. The existing facilities, such as they are, struggle to cope with the mushrooming population that's been shoe-horned in over recent years. Due to the lack of employment opportunities within Verwood the majority of the working population exits the town early in the morning to commute to distant centres of employment, returning in the late evening - a simple observation of Ringwood Road will confirm this. The lack of adequate public transport means that the majority of these journeys are by cars with only one occupant. Apart from the environmental damage of this daily tidal flow, the town is empty during normal business hours resulting in little incentive for shops or businesses to set up, apart from the plethora of estate agencies. All but 20 of the 415 new homes are. I believe that all of those issues need to			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							be resolved before any further housing is allowed to commence and I'm disappointed that these proposals are presented without suggestion of any improvements to infrastructure. Developer Contributions are of little use at this scale of development - the town needs to see actual improvements before any development takes place, not just large sums of money being paid as a development tax.			
535547	Mr M Folland		CSO20 198	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
535550	Mrs D Mogg		CSO20 180	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
535554	Ms Anita Rigler		CSO20 191	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
535567	Ms Judy McMath		CSO20 275	Option VWM 1	Object		There are not enough spaces available at the local 1st and middle schools to take in the extra children that would be living in these new houses. They would have to be bussed to West Moors, Ferndown or Cranborne.			1045
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		CSO20 255	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
535591	A Walker		CSO20 294	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		CSO20 363	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
535621	Mrs T Brine		CSO20 352	Option VWM 1	Object		Even without additional housing in Verwood, there is clearly already a need for a secondary school here. However a concern with the suggested site in Howe lane, is the access and increased volume of traffic and parking on the school run. This is already considerable, with the two schools currently			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							on the site. Perhaps a better site might be the land west of Trinity school earmarked for housing (VWM1). Similarly, I am against any further housing development in Verwood as the infrastructure needs to be supported. We have the population of a large town, yet lack many of the facilities of towns smaller than us. Also doctors, dentists, Morrison's etc. struggle to cope with the demands of our population as it is!!Please don't spoil our beautiful town with yet more housing, but do improve our existing facilities !!			
535659	Fiona Kasey		CSO20 389	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
535670	Dave Allen		CSO20 413	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
535678	Andrew Bryant		CSO20 441	Option VWM 1	Object		Any further development for Verwood is unsustainable. An increase in the population will result in the SSSI sites attracting more people, despite what is said in the plan about new green space. If you are really bothered about green spaces in Verwood, you should leave the ones that are there. The land to the north of Eastworth Road has a lot of wildlife including deer, badgers, bats, owls as well as several smaller mammals and possibly lizards. The road network in Verwood is poorly laid out and built for much lower volumes of traffic. Do not even think of increasing traffic on the northern approaches. These roads are too small and dangerous as they are. There are no real shops to speak of (four estate agents and several ladies' hairdressers do not count as shops) A bigger Morrisons would be a benefit, but would attract even more traffic onto the inadequate road system as people come in from outlying areas. There is no public transport, save for a poor and expensive bus service - that contrives to charge school children full fare for the trip to Ringwood before 09:00 There is little opportunity for employment in Verwood and the volume of traffic coming into the town indicates that what jobs there are mainly taken by people from outside Verwood. The drainage and sewerage systems were built for a town of 3000 people. This needs addressing before any more houses are built. It really is about			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							time that the various councils of Dorset start to see Verwood as a real town that is trying hard to create a real town environment. I fear the councils see Verwood as a dormitory town and that the attitude shown is that few more housing estates can be squeezed in and around without anyone getting too upset. This is not the case. People don't want or need this extra housing until at least some of the amenities promised over the last 20-years start to materialise.			
535687	Shelley Romans		CSO20 453	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood has already experienced substantial housing development over the last 20 years and does not have adequate road links or other infrastructure to cope with further housing development. There are insufficient employment opportunities in Verwood and therefore increasing the population size would increase the pressure on existing roads particularly at commuting times. The green belt should be preserved and future housing development should take place on brown field sites. In the current public sector financial climate I do not believe planning to build new secondary school in Verwood is a realistic aim and I consider that there are adequate school places for Verwood children in nearby locations such as Ferndown.			1045
535688	Susan Hobbs		CSO20 531	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
535695	Robin Peirce		CSO20 465	Option VWM 1	Object		Both VWM1 and 2 both are extremely close to sites of SSI. The number of cars that would be leaving the new developments onto a small country road (Edmondsham Road) would cause major issues to the school . The headmistress as already closed the school car park because of danger to the children. Both sites are green belt . Verwood needs facilities and not more houses and has taken more that it's fair share to date.			1045
535701	Mr Andy Skeats		CSO20 488	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
535714	Joanna Bryant		CSO20 500	Option VWM 1	Object		When I moved to Verwood ten years ago the estate agents promised that there would not be any more building in			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Verwood. The town is lovely as it is and more houses would lead to traffic congestion and Verwood doesn't have the infrastructure to cope with an increased population - Why can't the village be left as it is.			
535718	Richard Green		CSO20505	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood has undergone the largest expansion of any East Dorset town expanding to 5 times its original population in 20 years. It was the fastest growing town in Europe for 5 years. Facilities and infrastructure have not kept pace with the population and elected councillors are not serving their constituents fairly. PPG17 show that Verwood is below the minimum requirement in active sports space, children and young people space and activities and allotments there are no allotments. The Hub is an ugly building out of character with the town. This is not used to its full capacity as car parking is restricted. The allocated land for further car parking behind the police station has been sold by the council. Flats are now being built on the site adding to the parking problem. PPS 1 and 3 and PPG13 show the need to have shops and leisure activities available without the need to use a car. Morrison's built for 3500 people is now completely overwhelmed. Although plans to extend se feeder will not change the position. Verwood has had more than is fair share of housing development enough is enough.			1045
535723	Steve Taylor		CSO20518	Option VWM 1	Object		Dear Sir, I object not only to the principle of developing green belt land in general. As a Verwood resident I also object to the nature of the Verwood options themselves, with the exception of the principle of VWM7 (although this is still on green belt land, which concerns me, although I understand why it here, in close proximity to the other schools). From what I can see the proposal is to build another 400 homes on green belt land in Verwood. There is an acknowledgement that such development will necessitate the upgrade of some roads' infrastructure. Many of Verwood' s roads are very busy already, and with one main road in and out, it does not take much to make a short journey to Ringwood quite time-consuming. There is however no commitment for the upgrade or provision of any other much needed facilities. I note VWM7 relates to a secondary school, but this is already required to			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							support Verwood' s population. 400 more homes means presumably 400+ new children and the running down St Michaels Road already flood when there is even a small amount of rain. This will presumably worsen as the work progresses, owing to reduced natural drainage opportunities. Furthermore, using St Michaels Road as a vehicular route and 'green linkage', whatever that is, will exacerbate this drainage issue. I am not a typical NIMBY, and I do believe that a properly thought through development strategy encompassing proper facilities for an already stretched community would be a benefit. I also live in the real world and I understand that private development will help generate the funds to pay for such a strategy. All I can really see in these proposals however is bulldozing your way through green belt land for 400+ houses, I'm afraid.			
535815	Mrs C M Davies		CSO20 558	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
535836	Peter Parsons		CSO20 585	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
535845	Oliver Greensmith		CSO20 597	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
535858	Robert Candy		CSO20 619	Option VWM 1	Object		The traffic situation in Howe Lane and St. Michaels road is already at bursting point with traffic delays of up to 10 minutes during peak hours. Further planned developments would exacerbate the existing problem and cause further misery not only to residents but those attending the proposed facilities. Verwood is a large town and does require an upper school however, Howe Lane is not the place for it, three schools in one road is plenty the road simply does not have the capacity to host another establishment!			1045
535862	Hannah Richards		CSO20 630	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
535865	Darren Charles		CSO20 649	Option VWM 1	Support					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Bryson									
535875	John Kitchenside		CSO20681	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood has too few facilities to support any major new developments. Medical and dental surgeries, middle school, etc. are over-subscribed and there is a lack of large-scale refuse disposal and recycling facilities - compare Dorset's attempt at Wimborne with the excellent and well-run facility provided by Hampshire County Council. There is a desperate need for an upper school (VWM7), which I support, although I doubt the existing residential roads could support the increased traffic this would bring. Travelling to Ferndown Upper or QE Wimborne each day does little for our children's education as they miss out on after-school activities, clubs, etc. Expansion of the village to the east would destroy green-belt land, one of the main things people like living here. Please, please, please if we really have to have more housing can it be built in a style that is more in keeping with the area e.g. not like the recent developments at the top of Crane Drive or at the corner of N Newtown Road and Ringwood Road. Whilst I appreciate the opportunity to air my views, I believe that Verwood is largely ignored by local government due to its location.			1045
360768	Cllr. Mr David Packer	Colehill West Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO21090	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
497471	Mr Robert Wilmott		CSO21423	Option VWM 1	Object	General Comment	According to the Governments New Homes Bonus consultation document from 11/2010 for 1000 new homes the required infrastructure to support those homes costs £20m. Based on the proposed maximum number of new homes for Verwood of 415 the proportioned infrastructure costs would be £8.3m. How do EDDC propose to fund these costs? I have estimated based on the figures in the document referred to above that if all the 415 homes were built and with 208 being affordable housing the 6 year bonus payment would be circa £4.4m so would not be sufficient to offset these costs. Therefore would you expect the various property developers under their required Section 106 agreements to meet all			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							these costs and use the Bonus payments as suggested by the Government to improve frontline council services and improve the local Verwood community facilities for the benefit of existing residents? Point 11.19 of your core strategy document informs readers that Verwood has good road links. As a r ted to accessible and supported housing for this section of the community? It is advised in your strategy document that 90% of commuters use a car as their means of transport this is because of the lack of public transport and the semi-rural location. The 2008 report highlighted the fact that one third of houses in social rented properties had no use of a car. If you locate these families in Verwood in the proposed affordable housing how can this be of benefit if they have no means of transport and a limited public transport system. Finally the erosion of further green belt land should only be considered once the other options such as brown field sites, development of vacant properties have been fully explored.			
518009	Mr D Heather		CSO21043	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		CSO20729	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
535914	Graham Cudmore		CSO20712	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
535921	Mrs Charlotte Miller		CSO20742	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
535933	Mr John Lister		CSO20755	Option VWM 1	Object		I think it is absurd to build any more housing in Verwood without first improving facilities. There is little life to Verwood - for instance there is only one sit-down restaurant to serve the whole population. The leisure centre is too small. There is no swimming pool. The existing schools are already oversubscribed. Improve facilities first BEFORE contemplating increasing the population.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		CSO20 842	Option VWM 1	Support		The majority of residents in this area relocated because of the permanent despoiling of their places of birth by elected local and national 'representatives' who would not listen or care about the needs of the people that voted for them. Do you want to be remembered as the people who finally ruined this area or the people who saved it. Do not forget that people still visit this area as tourists and we welcome them and accept their contribution to the local economy. They will stop coming if the developments continue. How many tourists visit the outer London sprawl? Can I quote p227 from the Core Strategy Options paper - Para 11.28 The Government's key housing policy is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. This is an impossible dream that can never and will never, be fulfilled. If the developments did go ahead what would be the effect of another 5000 cars on our local roads be ? If Morrison's developments go ahead where are the customers going to park? The parking within Verwood is just about adequate at the moment.			1045
535940	Mrs Linda Medler		CSO20 780	Option VWM 1	Object		Any additional building of houses will need to have a better road structure than exist at the moment to cater for all the extra traffic this will bring. I thought we were trying to bring about a greener environment to Dorset county?			1045
535948	Mr David Hadden		CSO20 787	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
535964	Mr Steven Old		CSO20 800	Option VWM 1	Support		I strongly support the building of additional housing in Verwood. However my support is only given in order that an Upper School is built OR the council look at changing the current three tier education system to the more sustainable two tier system. The council should also look at providing free transport for high achieving children to go to grammar schools should they wish to do so. The council should also look favourably upon anyone applying for permission to start a business in Verwood.			1045
535976	Mrs		CSO20	Option	Object		Until the plans show the improvements in road access, car			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Valerie Stilwell		820	VWM 1			parking, youth and leisure facilities, and above all school places which are needed to meet current demands, let alone increases of this size, there is no possibility of our absorbing 600 extra cars, 600 extra children into the infrastructure and social fabric many of us have worked very hard to engender in our 'new town' which has grown so fast over recent years. the school particularly is an absurd suggestion: a) it is within 400 metres of heathland, where development is forbidden b) we are told there is no budget currently for extra school spaces in this area in the foreseeable future c) the chaotic school traffic situation in Margards Lane is already stretching residents' patience to the limits (with enormous fears about what a leisure centre here would do, let alone a senior school)and d) the local staff of Dorset Police, with whom I work, are dismayed at the proposals : it has taken 5 special constables a und are unsupportable within the current infrastructure. our already struggling 'community' will be drowned with the proposed enormous influx of newcomers - so many of us came to Verwood as it was promised there would be no further development - we escaped from areas where no sense of community was possible, and we have tried to forge such an atmosphere here - we will not just sit by and watch it swept away, for the sake of the millions the government are offering to Councils who do succumb to their demands. Let us know just WHO locally is in such dire need of housing, and we will readily sit down and help plan for them to share in this community!			
536014	Mrs Dawn Tindall		CSO20877	Option VWM 1	Object		What about the new homes bonus? Why is it not being implemented instead of this core strategy? The upper school in Verwood will not happen within the life of this document, why is this carrot still being dangled.			1045
536025	Christopher Trim		CSO20855	Option VWM 1	Object		We are very concerned about the proposed development particularly around Eastworth Road. The area earmarked for development around Eastworth Road cannot support 200+ homes. We appreciate the proposal to leave the existing play park and surrounding field as a buffer zone - but we are really concerned that this will become a central 'hanging out' point for younger people as it will form the 'centre' of the proposed			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							development and the existing development around Field Place, which we believe will lead to anti-social behaviour problems - has this issue been considered? We understand that there will be 2 new access routes via the Station and Edmondsham Roads but are also concerned that Field Place will also be used as an access road - the road system cannot support the associated additional traffic through what is currently a very peaceful estate. We are also concerned about the loss of what is one of the few remaining unspoilt areas around Verwood as it encroaches onto the existing countryside. On a wider point about the development generally in Verwood : the town does not have the infrastructure to support another 400 homes. In the event that some or all of the proposed developments go ahead, where will children go to school in the short term as the 3 first schools are already oversubscribed? I can't see the logic of the proposals of building a new upper school - what about all the funding that has just gone into building a state of the art school in Wimborne (QE) where children from Verwood currently attend?			
536046	L Appleton		CSO20 898	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
536050	Mr Andrew Collin		CSO20 904	Option VWM 1	Support		It is important to have a policy of continuous improvement for housing and employment for the area. Many are concerned for our environment, sensitive and empathic development will take care of this, but to do nothing will benefit no one in the longer term. A mixture of traditional and affordable homes is desirable, backed by a development in industrial and business land and premises availability. It is important to maintain and improve all areas of housing and commercial opportunity to invest in the future of our area for all parts of the community, the young. The aspiring as well as the established and retired members. Establishing the right mix is essential for a sustainable future in our community.			1045
536077	Caroline Thomas		CSO20 915	Option VWM 1	Object		Moved to Verwood nearly 10 years ago due to the location and rural village feel for a better quality of life away from busy noisy town surroundings, for a better environment for			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							children. This is already changing since more and more housing developments have slowly taken away Verwood' s identity.. PLEASE NO MORE.. We were promised that there would be no more housing developments- but this would appear to be a lie if this should go through.. Without stereotyping, housing association or "affordable housing" developments statistically will at best do nothing but make the area a far less desirable place in which to live..... This has to be a concern for all current Verwood residents . Enough is enough.! do not ruin Verwood			
536085	Grahame Thomas		CSO20 925	Option VWM 1	Object		Strongly object to ALL proposals, due to the underlying fact that there have been more than necessary housing developments within Verwood area built in the past 10 years which is going against the rural village location that it once was, and the reason why so many people love Verwood "of old" as opposed to a more populated and busy town the likes of which it is to become....For any resident of 5 or more years it has become clearly evident that crime and unruly behaviour has become more of an issue- which can and will only increase.. Please do not ruin the once loved "Village "of Verwood any more...!!!			1045
536096	Katie Lacey		CSO20 947	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		CSO20 972	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536152	Mrs Alison OBrien		CSO20 978	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536159	Mr Chris OBrien		CSO20 989	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536165	Margaret Parker		CSO20 994	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536169	Mr Tony Treviss-Bell		CSO21 025	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536175	Mrs Claire Addiscott		CSO21 007	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536178	Mark Addiscott		CSO21 016	Option VWM 1	Object		I feel Verwood is at saturation point at the moment and any increase in the number of people living here would greatly reduce the quality and feel of the town. Increases in population always seem to have adverse effects including loss of community spirit, and increases in crime and anti-social behaviour etc. The town doesn't have the type of transport links which I feel would be needed for a greater population either.			1045
536183	Deric Burgess		CSO21 031	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536196	Mr J Spriggs		CSO21 047	Option VWM 1	Object		I feel that Verwood has reached its optimum size and retains a "village" atmosphere, which would be lost if it ended up as a dormitory town of Bournemouth with poor facilities.			1045
536204	Derek Kelly		CSO21 052	Option VWM 1	Object		I believe that too many new houses have already been built in Verwood during the past 10 years, and that the town does not have the infrastructure and amenities to cope with another 430+ families. The roads in and out of the town will be unable to cope (the road to Ringwood is already extremely busy) and there is nothing for young people to do - I would build a new leisure centre and other facilities first, before considering any more houses! As far as the two options affecting me most directly - VWM1 and VWM2 - I understood that the land bordering Eastworth Road is a) good arable land that should remain agricultural land, and b) is green belt and should therefore be protected. I don't see how destroying fields and the wonderful outlook will 'provide valuable green infrastructure' when in my view it is already exactly that! I also believe that building 230+ new homes in this area will adversely affect the local wildlife - the owls, buzzards and other birds, badgers, deer and slow worms etc. Finally, my			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							home backs on to the roundabout at the Champtoceaux Ave/Station Road junction and since the imposition of the one way system in the town centre the level of traffic - and traffic noise - has become intolerable, especially at weekends. Not only will another 200+ houses on Eastworth Road need to be accessed through the existing estate, vastly increasing the traffic in what is currently a quiet area, as well as making it more dangerous for our children, but the traffic from this and the Trinity Road option will all funnel onto the above-mentioned roundabout, making an already intolerable situation far, far worse. Please, please, no more houses in Verwood!!			
536206	Victoria Wiggins		CSO21 053	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536213	L Stevens		CSO21 062	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536220	Mrs J Heather		CSO21 067	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536252	Mrs Pamela Jakes		CSO21 073	Option VWM 1	Object		No more planning permission to erect ugly blocks of flats in Verwood.			1045
536255	Mrs J W Bryant		CSO21 079	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536257	Mr Graham Jakes		CSO21 080	Option VWM 1	Object		If further homes were to be built in Verwood, would the utilities be able to cater for the extra demand? Also, there is the matter of increased traffic, more homes = more cars. In Verwood, ugly blocks of flats should be completely ruled out. One can see what has happened to-date on unsympathetic design in Crane Drive.			1045
536258	Mrs Anne Jones		CSO21 098	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536259	Sandy Stockwell		CSO21 101	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
536260	Vicki Palmer		CSO21 113	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is big enough already!			1045
536263	Ryan Ward		CSO21 119	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536265	Adrian Cox		CSO21 127	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood has already been subject to over-development into green field land and infill throughout the village or as it is now known "Town". It has staggered me and many friends in Verwood that developers have been allowed to build huge eyesores in the shape of the blocks of flats around the "Hub" and now on Blackhill. Sadly it is a sign of the economic times when profit over-rides sustainable development and social integration. Flats break down neighbourhoods, discouraging social interaction. Houses support family growth and social development! More needs to be done to make appropriate housing more accessible, e.g. part ownership schemes, possibly making existing housing in towns accessible to first-time buyers and those indeed on lower incomes.. It requires two earners on £25k each per annum to buy a £200k house!! Verwood' s biggest problem at present is lack of appropriate facilities not lack of housing, enough is sat empty already!!			1045
536266	Mr Martin Cobb		CSO21 130	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
536267	Trish Wheeler		CSO21 164	Option VWM 1	Object		I feel that Verwood has enough housing at present and it would be criminal to lose greenbelt, disrupt the wildlife and nature. There are not enough facilities for the people of Verwood at the present. There are already groups of young children hanging around the streets bored, how many more do you really want to see around Verwood - personally I don't want to see any. I think a small town like Verwood needs to be left alone. Can't believe that people are thinking of building so many houses when there is a recession on - the cost is going to be huge - can't the money be spent on upgrading the facilities for the people who are already here.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536271	Mrs D Holt		CSO21 204	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536274	Mrs Annalicaia Cobb		CSO21 153	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536279	Mr Garry Whitham		CSO21 168	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536282	Mrs Doreen Kingaby		CSO21 196	Option VWM 1	Object		Bad enough traffic on Howe lane without adding to the Burdon. What about sorting Verwood out before adding to its problems. Such a lovely little village trying to be a big town, planners mess. Let surrounding areas expand like Verwood has, before any more houses. In 2005 Verwood was declared full, why the change of heart? Please do the right thing for the people of Verwood and say no to building on our last remaining green belt.			1045
536289	N Waters		CSO21 185	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536300	Mrs Caroline Burgess		CSO21 201	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536311	Shane Ward		CSO21 215	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536313	Mrs J Wilmott		CSO21 224	Option VWM 1	Object		According to the Governments New Homes Bonus consultation document from 11/2010 for 1000 new homes the required infrastructure to support those homes costs £20m. Based on the proposed maximum number of new homes for Verwood of 415 the proportioned infrastructure costs would be £8.3m. How do EDDC propose to fund these costs? I have estimated based on the figures in the document referred to above that if all the 415 homes were built and with 208 being affordable housing the 6 year bonus payment would be circa £4.4m so would not be sufficient to offset these costs.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Therefore would you expect the various property developers under their required Section 106 agreements to meet all these costs and use the Bonus payments as suggested by the Government to improve frontline council services and improve the local Verwood community facilities for the benefit of existing residents? Point 11.19 of your core strategy document informs readers that Verwood has good road links. As a r ted to accessible and supported housing for this section of the community? It is advised in your strategy document that 90% of commuters use a car as their means of transport this is because of the lack of public transport and the semi-rural location. The 2008 report highlighted the fact that one third of houses in social rented properties had no use of a car. If you locate these families in Verwood in the proposed affordable housing how can this be of benefit if they have no means of transport and a limited public transport system. Finally the erosion of further green belt land should only be considered once the other options such as brown field sites, development of vacant properties have been fully explored.			
536315	J Ward		CSO21 227	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536323	Anne Crew		CSO21 242	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536324	Paul Sumner		CSO21 288	Option VWM 1	Object		Wimborne has the land and facilities to support more houses. The other areas do not. Especially Verwood, as it has been built upon to the point where it is second only to Dorchester, in terms of population. Verwood should be left alone and other areas play catch up. Verwood has no vibrant town centre no realistic extra employment opportunities. No infrastructure, no buses after 6pm or police for that matter. One NHS dentist with a waiting list as long as your arm. Same with the meagre doctor's services. None of the houses are actually needed, only for the council to get social housing built. Not the attractive affordable homes it seems to like to label them as. Building on Green Belt land is supposed to be for exceptional circumstances, there are no homeless in			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Verwood. Do not destroy green belt land just because of a loophole. There is no need for social housing in Verwood, therefore no exceptional circumstances exist. I have looked at the proposed sites and they will all destroy habitat for local wildlife, VWM4 will also see SSSI sites, reed beds, ancient hedges etc. severely disrupted. Did you know that there is a flood plane? What about the scientific report on the river crane and fishing lakes down there? Common-sense please.			
536329	Mrs C Green		CSO21 251	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536332	Emmanuelle Hutton		CSO21 264	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536341	Adrian Bowyer		CSO21 316	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
536342	Lily Hutton		CSO21 291	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536346	Mr Ben Richards		CSO21 370	Option VWM 1	Object		Please note my following objections to the East Dorset Core Strategy consultation proposal to build 200 + affordable houses on Greenbelt land at Eastworth / Edmondsham Road. a.) The access (Roads) & infrastructure is inadequate for another 3 houses let alone the proposed 200+. In addition there are a number of blind spots which I understand was a key reason the decision was made to close Eastworth road, to reduce the traffic and potential accidents when accessing Edmondsham road. b.) Additional traffic next to a 1st school would surely add additional safety issues. c.) There is a footpath adjacent to both proposed sites which would add additional pressure onto heath land in direct contradiction to point 11.9 in the "Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 - Chapter 11 Verwood and West Moors Housing and Centre Options" which states: "Verwood lies adjacent to significant areas of protected heathland. The sites that are protected under European legislation, due to their fragility and nature conservation importance, are very sensitive to the impacts of nearby additional residential			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							development. Therefore, housing developments not permitted within 400m of these areas. This has an implication on the areas suitable for residential development, especially within the existing built up area, and the need to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces to reduce the pressure of existing and proposed residential development on these sensitive areas." d.) Effect on rare species and wildlife on current green belt land, such as badgers, which are a protected species.			
536349	Mrs C Bowyer		CSO21 386	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
536350	Melissa Taylor		CSO21 349	Option VWM 1	Object		Insufficient infrastructure to support additional housing			1045
536351	Mr John Hutton		CSO21 363	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536353	Chris Rowley		CSO21 369	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is already overcrowded with properties and not enough facilities to support this amount of housing growth.			1045
536384	Andy Brookes		CSO21 407	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is full to bursting already. Facilities are required before further housing. The school proposal is only mentioned to bribe people into allowing further housing. The housing will no doubt happen to some extent, the school will not.			1045
536392	Mrs Diana Evans		CSO21 412	Option VWM 1	Object		Already too many houses, the roads into and out of Verwood cannot take any more traffic. Also not enough shops to cater for more homes only one supermarket. PLEASE LEAVE OUR GREEN AREAS ALONE.			1045
536402	Mr P K Evans		CSO21 417	Option VWM 1	Object		Already too many houses with not enough facilities. The roads in and out of Verwood cannot take any more traffic.			1045
536449	Dave Isaacs		CSO21 454	Option VWM 1	Object					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536467	Kim Rich		CSO21 440	Option VWM 1	Object		There are not enough existing facilities in Verwood for the residents already living here. I.e. Doctors, dentists and a variety of local shops. We do not need additional housing. Social and affordable housing will attract the wrong sort of people. The new flats that have already been allowed to be built are an eyesore and do not fit in with the existing surrounding properties. We moved here years ago to get away from noise pollution and heavy traffic. We do not want our peace and quiet spoiled by your proposals. We want to continue living in a pleasant green environment, quiet and peaceful and unspoilt. That is the reason we chose to live in Verwood and your plans are not in keeping with the area.			1045
536479	Mr Jeff Maultby		CSO21 455	Option VWM 1	Object		Have you tried getting out of Holly grove or Hayward crescent when schools are open? inconsiderate parent parking causes dangerously blocked roads, one day a child will be hurt. A secondary school will make it utterly intolerable and impossible. Unless every child is forced to walk or cycle - which is never going to happen! How long will we have to queue on Church Hill if a secondary school is built! It's already ridiculous when the schools are open and will be impossible with a new school. The access roads are just not adequate. We should spend money on all the un-made roads and providing proper cycle lanes before building new houses. Verwood does not have sufficient infrastructure for 415 new homes. We will have even more kids hanging around on corners with nothing to do.			1045
536508	Mrs AJ Hayden		CSO21 488	Option VWM 1	Support		Transportation links should be improved around Verwood, including the 3LX distributor road.			1045
536537	Mrs Susan Isaacs		CSO21 493	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny PEARCE		CSO22 101	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
482494	Mrs		CSO21	Option	Object		Large scale developments damage the environment for			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Yvette Jones		883	VWM 1			everyone, and it is for ever. The open green spaces are valued by so many who have paid a premium to live in a semi-rural area. Desecration of this is an assault to the residents' wellbeing; an unwarranted invasion causing a wholesale change of character to what is home to thousands of people who chose a neighbourhood because of its history of modest gradual development. Not convinced there is a housing shortage. Keep 'social' housing in more 'affordable' areas. What is there to aspire to and work towards otherwise? Don't patronise us re. 'housing for local people' - occupants become 'local' by living in a 'location'. Small developments can be assimilated to the character of an area without destroying people's enjoyment of their homes. They can be developed with consideration, gradually and as appropriate. They do not have to cause illness through acute distress of residents just to line the developers' pockets and gratify councillors.			
498402	Mrs T Hughes		CSO22 239	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536543	Mrs Samantha Fysh		CSO21 539	Option VWM 1	Object		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD.. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!			1045
536546	Mrs Sarah Jupp		CSO21 510	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536548	Mr James Robinson		CSO21 509	Option VWM 1	Object		I feel that the building of these additional homes in Verwood is based on the greed of the developers and the landowners. It is not proven that there is a need to rip up more land in Verwood particularly green belt farm land in the case of Eastworth Road. There is the appalling example of the housing units built on the ring road opposite the Hub that have not sold and are a complete eyesore with the developers becoming insolvent and it becoming a protracted farce that should never have been sanctioned. In short a wholly unacceptable set of circumstances that is a blight on those who gave permission to construct them. It clearly			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>makes the case that planning has been granted filling the land with inappropriate housing and this has caused me to not trust the judgement of those responsible for making the decisions on development of housing in Verwood. In contrast Verwood has grown over the last three decades and recent efforts to; improve the centre, build the Hub and construct the ring road makes the balance between housing and services/facilities better. The planners deserve credit for improving those facilities and that is why the school is a good idea for Verwood, as it is a further step to providing a complete all-encompassing small town. It also has the obvious benefit of not having to bus all those children every day to the schools outside of the area. In conclusion I cannot see any need to increase housing in Verwood. We really do have a responsibility not to concrete and tarmac over for housing any more open space or the surrounding fields of Verwood it is simply an act of gross irresponsibility.</p>			
536553	Ms Michelle Hayter		CSO21 528	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>Totally object to the housing developments. Not enough facilities to cater for current population let alone a further 400 homes. Schools and facilities will suffer considerably.</p>			1045
536554	Mr B Tunstall		CSO21 529	Option VWM 1	Object		<p>The infrastructure of Verwood will not stand up to this amount of building and people. 400 houses will roughly equate to 800 extra cars, 1200-1600 extra people. The doctors, schools, leisure facilities and shops that are in place at the moment will not be able to cope and the current residents will find that the pleasant small town which it is at the moment, will no longer be just that. Yes I know other facilities will be put in place, but how many years are we going to be over-run with contractors etc., (as is the case with the present building going on at the site which used to be the Fairwood, and various other sites over the last few years). Please leave Verwood alone and let the money-greedy people who are trying to sell their land to the builders use the land for which it was intended - farming, and preserve the green belt status and Englands "Green and pleasant land" Are we to become a wildlife bare area and a traffic blackspot about to happen? Does no-one on the Planning Committee care for the welfare of the present current Verwood residents or is it all being</p>			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							done in the name of "Progress" ?			
536563	Mr David Hayter		CSO21 538	Option VWM 1	Object		Totally object to the housing developments proposed in Verwood. Not enough amenities to cope with the current population and therefore will in no way be able to sustain another 400 homes.			1045
536566	Mr Adrian Blow		CSO21 542	Option VWM 1	Object		1] lack of current facilities e.g. shops & other facilities; public transport poor so would increase car journeys 2] lack of infrastructure e.g. road access etc. at Eastworth site			1045
536571	Mr Craig Jerome		CSO21 556	Option VWM 1	Object		I will shortly be moving to Verwood and my partner lives in Pine View Road.			1045
536572	Mr Roger Fysh		CSO21 589	Option VWM 1	Object		I strongly object to the proposal to increase the housing in and around Verwood. Verwood has been extensively developed over the years and there is inadequate services to support the extra cars and people. Also having seen the housing density of the Ebblake housing estate it is clear that agreeing to more housing will only create 'no go' areas in the very near future. I also note that in and around Wimborne there are huge areas of open land, which could easily be developed, especially between Ferndown and Wimborne which also has excellent road networks in place as it could immediately open onto the A31			1045
536576	Mrs Valerie Green		CSO21 603	Option VWM 1	Object		I object to the core strategy. It will mean destruction of the green belt! The land owners will of course be in favour of development as the land will be worth a lot more as building land. There are 1.5m unoccupied homes in the UK plus an unknown number of empty homes in the rented sector. Central Government wants an extra 3M homes to be built. In total this will house 10 to 15M people. The population has increased by only 5M in the last 50 years why do we need these extra homes? Are there so many people who would choose to live in Verwood and have to travel to work? In view of economic uncertainty is it wise to plan a large increase in the number of new homes. You only have to look at the Irish situation to see how easily things can go wrong. Would the council really destroy the green belt and blight the lives of			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							existing residents if it were not for the Government housing bribe.			
536628	Mr C.A Wills		CSO21 659	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536631	Ms Carole-Ann Young		CSO21 631	Option VWM 1	Object		Totally object to the housing developments proposed in Verwood. The size of the developments are far larger than the current infrastructure can support. There are barely enough amenities for the current residents and these developments will create even more strain on already overstretched and poor facilities.			1045
536634	Mr Andrew Beal		CSO21 646	Option VWM 1	Object		Totally object to all future new housing developments in Verwood. Monies should be invested in infrastructure for existing residents instead. The proposed developments pay little or no attention to existing planning controls and make a mockery of the planning process in East Dorset.			1045
536635	Mr Ronald Helmers		CSO21 655	Option VWM 1	Object		It has been 5 and a half years since I moved to Verwood although I have been familiar with the town for many years prior to that move. Since coming I have been aware of the increase in houses/flats etc. over that time. It seems that everywhere I look one house is being demolished and replaced with several residential properties. Now there are these proposals for major residential developments at Eastworth Road and Howe Lane. Combined with the two smaller developments some 415 homes are involved. These, were they in one place could be considered a small town or at the least a very large village. On a separate issues where is the infrastructure to support all this development? Has the Council considered the implications of the increased traffic that will be generated not only on the area immediately surrounding the two major schemes but on the town generally? I fear that a modestly sized town is well on its way to becoming a size that many of the residents will find very much not to their liking. I for one object most strongly. I understand that the school proposed is an upper school and that such a school is lacking in the town. If this is the case then I would support its establishment.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536636	Mr Phil Jones		CSO21 662	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood doesn't have the infrastructure for any further such development			1045
536637	Mrs Geraldine Haigh		CSO21 669	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536642	Ms Clare Taylor		CSO21 675	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536654	Ms Maureen Castell		CSO21 692	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood does not need more houses, it needs a senior school, more shops and another doctor's surgery. Verwood is bursting with house. If Verwood is a Town it needs to be a town.			1045
536656	Charlotte England		CSO21 693	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536659	Mr Andy Longshaw		CSO21 705	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536660	Mr and Mrs N J Close		CSO21 706	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
536666	Mr C Thickett		CSO21 718	Option VWM 1	Object		Re: Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Consultation – Verwood I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI's and contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unacceptable strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood' s present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			
536678	Mrs L Thickett		CSO21730	Option VWM 1	Object		I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI' s and contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unacceptable strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses are built – the			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood' s present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			
536692	Richard Coulthard		CSO21 743	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood already has too much housing for the infrastructure available. Until schools and other facilities are actually built there should not be any more large developments approved. Permission for additional development should not be granted based on an intention to improve facilities at some point in the future.			1045
536694	Mr T Thickett		CSO21 745	Option VWM 1	Object		Re: Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Consultation – Verwood I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI' s and contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unacceptable strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							swimming pool. Verwood' s present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		CSO21 787	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536702	Mr Mark Hirst		CSO21 766	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
536718	Mrs J Durham		CSO21 800	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536723	P Pembroke		CSO21 805	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood has been developed enough in recent years. It now should be left alone without further intrusion into its green spaces to retain its rural identity and heritage. Further development of 400 homes has the potential for another 800 cars. There is already too much commercial traffic and too many cars coming into and through Verwood with little regard for the speed limit. The roads in Verwood are not large enough to cope with further increases in traffic, not to mention the amount of construction traffic a development of this size would bring. There is insufficient infrastructure in Verwood to accommodate any further development and this would need to be addressed before anything further should be considered.			1045
536766	A Pembroke		CSO21 820	Option VWM 1	Object		Insufficient infrastructure in Verwood. Already far too many cars and commercial traffic coming into and through Verwood with little regard for speed limit. Green belt should be left alone and Verwood retain its rural identity and heritage. Verwood is already an urban dormitory.			1045
536771	B Lusher		CSO22 071	Option VWM 1	Object		I object to any development that expands Wimborne and surrounding villages now and at any time in the future. Why is Wimborne such a beautiful town, could it be the Minster, old			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							buildings, steeped in history? probably all of these and many other attributes. Take a good look at that stunning photograph 'Wimborne Minster and Stour In Winter' by Roger Holman, fields and the town centre, all in one picture. This view of the landscape, identified as a scene of merit by the artistic eye of the photographer, often passes the layman by, until pointed out so graphically. This photograph, like others, is a measure of what we could lose. I wonder if there were other equally stunning scenes in the hills northeast of Wimborne, Colehill, now completely covered in houses. Can you imagine the equivalent photograph of that time, the town, with a backdrop of fields and trees rising above horizon. Too late, that moment has passed. The town, in close proximity to countryside, is ye has realised this and is making an effort to preserve old Singapore. We, on the other hand, seem to be quite happy to knock down our countryside in the name of development. If we really want to preserve Wimborne for generations to come, so they can see the town, be part of its unique character, situated amongst, close at hand countryside, then we must make a conscious decision now to preserve the green belt and green areas in the town forever, before Wimborne eventually becomes a quaint little roundabout that travellers come across on the way from somewhere to somewhere.			
536772	Mr J Stone		CSO21 848	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
536777	Karen Hodgkiss		CSO21 854	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood doesn't need more houses it desperately needs more facilities. We are a town, not a village anymore. We need a bigger supermarket, a public swimming pool and a high school.			1045
536781	Abigail Harris		CSO21 859	Option VWM 1	Object		As a home owner living on the junction of Church Hill and Margards Lane my Primary concerns are the future plans for a secondary school VWM7 and housing at Howe Lane VWM3. This would greatly increase the volume of traffic that already passes by on route to Emmanuel and Verwood First School. I feel this would have a huge impact on the local			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							residents and would have concerns with regards to road safety along this route. I also have concerns about the other possible development sites and the amount of new homes being built in Verwood. The town's facilities have not grown with the population of Verwood.			
536790	David Steadman		CSO21 901	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536796	Ann Coleman		CSO21 913	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536798	Peter Coleman		CSO21 918	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536800	Julieanne Sutherland		CSO21 925	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support 400 more homes - there will be increased traffic - the whole point of moving to Verwood is for its rural feel and quietness and safety . Who is going to benefit from these extra houses ?????? Certainly not existing residents , if this a good way to raise extra revenue on the council tax? The rationale behind this proposal to try and build more houses needs to be fully explained			1045
536802	Anida Griffiths		CSO21 951	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536803	Ian Hargreaves		CSO21 940	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536807	Paul Dayson-Smith		CSO21 950	Option VWM 1	Object		I feel Verwood has seen more than enough building in the last 30 years. There are nowhere near enough local jobs or a suitable level of infrastructure to support a higher population. Whoever proposed to build the, admittedly needed, new secondary school on Howe lane clearly hasn't tried to drive down that road at 8:30 on a weekday morning			1045
536808	Ms Yvette Allen		CSO22 013	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood does not need to increase its population is already too big for the local infrastructure.			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536811	Mr P Carey		CSO21 964	Option VWM 1	Object		I am a resident of Howe Lane, Verwood, and since moving to this location have had nothing but immense problems with traffic due to the Emmanuel/Verwood school campus. I have had a 4 year running battle with motorists parking, not only over my driveway; but also IN my driveway. I have complained to the local police on numerous occasions, only to be told that it is a council problem. I have applied for a 'white line' and complained to my local councillor - all to no avail. There are regular near miss incidents in and around the school campus. And only last week a parked car in Howe Lane was severely damaged. By building the new houses in Howe Lane this will create even more problems. The land to the south of Howe Lane will just compound the problem and then add a new school is just utterly ridiculous. There is no infrastructure within Verwood to accommodate all the proposed developments. If you, the council, wish the residents of Verwood to be amicable, then I suggest I find highly amusing. There is no money for this new school! There is an on-going situation with damaged vehicles and traffic problems within the school campus and outside. I do not see how this new school can be accessed unless the council is going to build many new roads, or compulsory purchased land. I will fight to my last breath to stop all of this!!!! We do not want this - it will not serve us - it will make our lives intolerable!			1045
536812	R H Barker		CSO21 991	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536816	Mr T C Clark		CSO21 995	Option VWM 1	Object		The village of Verwood has become a dormitory town because of all the most recent building which has taken place Any further builds would cause more of a problem for the residents already living in Verwood. The reasons being: Public Transport is inadequate Roads are inadequate for the amount of traffic which uses them. Shops are inadequate, other than Banks, Estate Agents or Hairdressers. We need more of a variety of shops within a specific area, not spread all over the town. There are no facilities for the younger element of the town, this needs to be addressed urgently. Keep them off the streets and out of mischief. Restaurants			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							are limited i.e. non-existent other than cheap pub food or Indian/Chinese take-aways and the local chippy. As for the new school (which is a requirement).If this is to be situated within the Campus of the current school this would lead to further problems with traffic flow and parking. Already both sides of Margards Lane/Howe Lane and adjoining roads are near to capacity. Which leads me to another point, Emergency vehicles would be unable to attend either house fires or life threatening situations. This means that people living within this area are under great risk.			
536817	Cheryl Evans		CSO22 014	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536819	Cathryn Biggins		CSO22 015	Option VWM 1	Object		I don't think there is enough local work in Verwood to support the proposed number of new homes and if people have to travel out of the area to work there will be increased traffic on roads that are already busy, particularly during school times and in the mornings and early evenings. In addition local services like the doctors, dentists, banks, the supermarket and petrol station are already busy and an increase in population numbers will increase waiting times for appointments and queues. I think a new secondary school would also create huge traffic and parking problems on roads that are already very busy with the first and middle school traffic in the mornings and afternoons. At the moment the students have the choice of several good upper schools and the network of bus stops allows them to walk to a local stop. A new school would result in increased traffic as students travel in from surrounding areas. Verwood is a pleasant place to live at the moment and has beautiful green areas surrounding it. Many green areas within Verwood have been infilled with housing during the last 15 years and I don't think the town should be expanded any further.			1045
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		CSO22 052	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536840	Mr Clive		CSO22 057	Option VWM 1	Object					1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Evans									
536841	Mr and Mrs N P Brunning		CSO22 064	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536848	Ola Steadman		CSO22 142	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536850	Mr Michael Hird		CSO22 154	Option VWM 1	Support		Assertions like "could", "may", "potential", "divert pressures away from heathlands" and "will contribute" are meaningless without guarantees and full explanation. The ratio of affordable homes to (un)affordable is far too high and will result in an unacceptable concentration of ghetto like small dwellings. Developments of more than 30 homes in the current economic climate and without clear plans for improved infrastructure and services is clearly foolhardy and shows a total lack of foresight. The results of the consultation should be published and no further action taken until the full consequences of cuts in Government expenditure are known. This is particularly important with respect to VWM7 - new secondary school.			1045
494436	Mr R D Turvil		CSO22 738	Option VWM 1	Object		We are against the proposals as they over extend Verwood, which has already been extensively developed and now seems taken for granted as the easy option. The town already suffers from limited community facilities and, what there is, is spread out, thus weakening any real sense of community. The Localism Bill currently before Parliament specifically identifies that residents are to be handed powers to approve/block developments .			1045
507730	Mr Vince Woolley		CSO22 763	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood has no infrastructure; we have trouble with anti-social behaviour from youths, dangerous level of traffic in front of Emmanuel Middle School. To have a new secondary school so close to Emmanuel Middle School plus 415 houses will only make the situation far worse! By email			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							having just viewed the plans for your redevelopment near Howe Lane Verwood you appear to be making what is a bad situation in Verwood worse at this moment in time there is no infrastructure in Verwood, anti-social behaviour by a large youth element who have been avoided in the new "Verwood Hub" so they have nowhere to go. Congested traffic which is extremely dangerous for children going to and from Emmanuelle School. The police are powerless to control the anti-social behaviour by youths that hang around this area, nobody will do anything about the traffic until a child is injured and yet you want to increase the traffic flow and build a new secondary school. I can sure that having discussed your intentions with local residents you will receive a strong protest from us all. Please stop this insanity before it starts.			
514507	Mr and Mrs C Macy		CSO22 767	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22 887	Option VWM 1	Object		Option VWM1 Strongly object to development Please see comments on the Masterplan report Support proposals for potential SANG subject to it being a real increase in terms of accessible area and biodiversity.			1045
536856	Mr and Mrs Ian Barnes		CSO22 145	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536860	Mrs Sparks		CSO22 190	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
536866	Emma Huns		CSO22 218	Option VWM 1	Object		I feel that Verwood needs more facilities (such as a secondary school, swimming pool, restaurants) before any further expansion			1045
536910	Ms Susan Bradley		CSO22 252	Option VWM 1	Object		I strongly object to the options VWM 1, 2, 3 and 4 for new houses in Verwood. In particular because they fall within Green Belt land. Green Belt land should be preserved as			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Green Belt. In the East Dorset SHLAA 2008 Report all of these sites were "considered unacceptable in context of Green Belt Policy". Why are they even being considered? I am horrified at the idea that each time new houses are needed the green belt will simply be redrawn to accommodate them! Please do not build on Green Belt land.			
536928	Mr Kevin Fyles		CSO22 278	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
536932	Paul Bason		CSO22 307	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
536944	Ian Lucking		CSO22 325	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood cannot take any more traffic because the road system will not cope. The infrastructure will be not be able withstand more population in this small town and will take away its charm.			1045
536966	Rachel Baulch		CSO22 330	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536972	Iris Baulch		CSO22 335	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536990	Steward Gates		CSO22 344	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
536993	Nicola Gates		CSO22 352	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
537012	Carole Lucking		CSO22 368	Option VWM 1	Object		I feel that the traffic in and out of Verwood is already quite considerable. Much more thought must be put in to the vehicular access to all these properties. I also feel we need more facilities in the town to cater for the needs of all the extra population.			1045
537018	Vanessa Scott		CSO22 379	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
537021	John and		CSO22	Option	Support		The population is growing in Verwood and I think there is still			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Susan Lewis		383	VWM 1			a need for more affordable family homes. An upper school is required which would eliminate the need for so much school transport to Ferndown and Wimborne. This would also improve our sense of community and be less divisive. The political movers in Verwood all seem to have a NIMBY attitude towards our community and use any excuse to prevent development.			
537026	Roy Cronk		CSO22 388	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
537030	E Lock		CSO22 393	Option VWM 1	Object		There needs to be a lot more facilities and better infrastructure in the Verwood area before adding any more strain. In particular increasing the bus routes, roads and another petrol station			1045
537050	Diane Fletcher		CSO22 413	Option VWM 1	Object		The infrastructure currently in place in Verwood is already sufficient to support the existing population without adding potentially 400+ more families. Public transport is woefully inadequate to service its working and social population, with no quick bus links to major employment and social hubs of Bournemouth, Christchurch, Salisbury and Southampton. The existing services are slow and infrequent, with the evening services stopping ridiculously early and Sunday services too infrequent to seriously entertain. There is nothing constructive for the existing youth to do and this is already manifesting itself in anti-social behaviour (openly drinking/smoking and causing a general nuisance late at night). Additional families would only add to this growing issue and the threat of closure of the current police station is very worrying. An additional 400+ vehicles would significantly add to the risk of accidents, especially around the first and middle schools, all of which are already oversubscribed and could not cope with upto 400 additional children (probably double or more than 400 realistically). The additional stress on the existing drains and sewage systems would put existing housing at risk. The existing shopping centre is more akin to a small village and does not service the existing population with a range of goods and service that could be reasonably expected of a town of its existing size, let alone having so many more people to			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							service. All in all, Verwood does not have the infrastructure, school capacity, leisure/social facilities or public transport to support its existing population. The proposals to add another 400+ families into these limited facilities and services is ill advised and impractical and will only add to anti-social behaviour problems and pressures on the existing infrastructure that would be disastrous for the existing population.			
537075	Mrs Elaine Holt		CSO22 447	Option VWM 1	Object		1. I strongly object to the failure to consult in Verwood regarding our suggestions for building options to fulfil local housing needs when the Regional Spatial Strategy was revoked. I feel we were disenfranchised in this respect, and our current option for expressing our views is inadequate. 2. As most commuter traffic out of Verwood is to Ringwood and Ferndown, more large scale development (400 homes) will overload the already crowded and dangerous roads, (up to 800 more cars). Even traffic problems arising from the Trinity School development have not yet been solved. 3. Paragraph 11.60, 11.62 and 11.71 (Option VWM 1 and VWM 2): I strongly object to the development outlined in VWM1 and VWM2, which I believe compromise the 'Area of Great Landscape Value' rendering it invisible to most, and intruding into the most inspiring view of this landscape from the popular beauty spot and viewpoint at Stephen's Castle SSSI. The raft of houses will be a clearly visible scar in an otherwise rare spread of rolling hills. 4. Paragraph 11.60: When we raised concerns around the development of Trinity School we were informed that the school was a 'special case' for the green belt, and so it should not be an argument used in favour of further housing development. It would not be a properly transparent reason. 5. Transport issues etc.: I strongly object to the practice of some developers promising to pay sums to the council for roads etc., or to other bodies such as English Nature, as part of the permission process, as this appears to muddy the basis on which permission is given especially in terms of green belt, or sensitive land.			1045
537104	J R Bardi		CSO22 459	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
537106	C Hebditch		CSO22 478	Option VWM 1	Object		The more homes we build the more roads we need. The homes and roads get filled up then we're back to square one. When will it ever end? The notion expressed in some of the planning, about trying to get people out of their cars, off the roads, and into public transport, is a joke. For example, building on the Cuthbury allotments in Wimborne means that those who have one of the new allotments will have to get their cars out to drive to them, whereas at present there are many people in Wimborne who can walk to their allotments. Most of the areas designated as fit for development will mean even more chaos on our local roads because public transport is not going to improve to the state where those of us who are fortunate to have a job to go to will all be able to get to work on time using a bus. The size of the proposed developments, in my opinion, is too big and will put undue pressure on local services for which we do not at present have funding to improve. I suppose though that these new homes will bring some new council tax payers to the area and therefore, maybe, help with the budget deficit ... until we have to build the new roads			1045
537122	Christopher Hill		CSO22 490	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
537312	Mr Barry Goldsmith		CSO22 501	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
537314	Mrs Penelope Goldsmith		CSO22 506	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
537318	Daniel Parkin		CSO22 511	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
537326	Harold Bowskill		CSO22 516	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood continues to lack sufficient amenities and facilities to support its local community now, especially the young with few leisure or entertainment facilities. Verwood has one supermarket serving the entire town with two convenience stores and little else. Adding more homes will simply increase people's frustrations and anger and due consideration should			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							be given to the existing populous. Increasing the population of Verwood by adding a further 415 homes is clearly a means of increasing council revenue and nothing more, the infrastructure of Verwood simply cannot handle this, the roads, sewers and services will need extensive improvement and in this era of austerity, is it really economically viable.			
537362	Peter Constable		CSO22 536	Option VWM 1	Support		The larger residential building proposals are completely out of character for the area and will consume large tracts of green belt. The infrastructure to support development on a large scale is simply not in place. The smaller developments appear to be a better fit e.g. Cuthbury, Leigh Park and Stone Lane.			1045
537435	Ms Pauline Burton		CSO22 564	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
537529	Mrs C White		CSO22 591	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
537542	Mrs M Wake		CSO22 602	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
537548	Mr C Wake		CSO22 607	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
537557	Batchelor		CSO22 612	Option VWM 1	Object		We feel Verwood have Enough houses/flats/dwellings and schools in this area lack of decent shopping facilities and coffee shops and good cafes in the area - so feel Verwood should concentrate on making itself user friendly love the green belt area and this should not be removed or made smaller thank you			1045
537562	Dan Cartmale		CSO22 617	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
537566	Patricia		CSO22	Option	Object		We live in Burrows Lane and have to go past the Trinity			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Adlem		623	VWM 1			school, which is nearly impassable at the dropping off and collection time of these school children. The parents park their cars both sides of the road, without any due care and attention for other drivers. So putting up more housing in this area is just adding to the turmoil of the residents that already live there. Why can they not have a drive in and drop off area in the school grounds as there seems to be plenty of space on the school premises?			
537571	Nick and Marion Leatherdale		CSO22 643	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
537580	Ruth Brown		CSO22 655	Option VWM 1	Support					1045
537582	Wendy Stacey		CSO22 661	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
537731	Mr Colin Ward		CSO22 666	Option VWM 1	Object					1045
537762	Peggy Marshall		CSO22 671	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is a country town with surrounding fields and forest. Therefore there should be no building on green belt 515 homes could mean at least 800 + cars which the roads are unable to cope with. The support services such as drainage was not designed to cope with the proposed rise in number of the population. Existing shops would be inadequate. "Let the people decide"----Cameron's slogan			1045
537806	Mrs P Arnold		CSO22 689	Option VWM 1		No Opinion				1045
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter Griffiths		CSO22 721	Option VWM 1	Support		Approve of provision of affordable housing, however, agreement with Housing Association must be watertight so housing stock for rent remains constant and stock can never be sold. These houses will be near to facilities, schools, shops, transport, and work and will alleviate pressure on rural communities with no facilities to provide affordable housing in			1045

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							the Green Belt.			
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		CSO22 842	Option VWM 1		General Comment	Again, a point that was made both strongly and clearly at the Public meeting in the Memorial Hall, was that, with all the growth of housing development that has been undertaken in recent years, there needs to be space for 'Verwood to find itself! The general feeling is that too much is happening, too quickly and the community needs more time to 'bed down'. Whilst it is appreciated that the proposed housing developments will probably not take place within the next five years, in the life of a community, that still seems a rather short time frame.			1045
539805	Mr Philpot		CSO22 801	Option VWM 1	Object		Margards Lane is busy and dangerous for the school children as it is now. Too many houses/flats are ruining Verwood, the landscape and community feeling. In eight years of living here it has grown immensely with ugly flats. The more people living in Verwood the more chance of crime as it no longer has a community feel and people lose their sense of pride in their area. Verwood still has a village feel - let's keep it that way.			1045
583759	Mr A Craddock and Mrs D Goodenough		CSO22 953	Option VWM 1	Object		Verwood is the fastest growing town in Europe with insufficient infrastructure (i.e. access roads into Verwood) to support these 415 new homes being planned. We already have to wait up to 5 mins to leave Noon Hill Road to access the main Ringwood Road; it's very frustrating even now. The traffic along Ringwood Road is already travelling well in excess of the speed limit and it seems no one is interested in doing anything to curb it. With all the proposed extra dwellings and the new school run there will be even more traffic exceeding the speed limit. Therefore it will be even more difficult for the elderly residents to survive this traffic.			1045
478222	Mrs Yvonne Kemsley		CSO42	Option VWM 2	Object		The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. • Once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers.</p> <p>Email received 19 October 2010, added the following text</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel this increase would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses which are directly opposite the fields in Eastworth Road. How First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my doctor in under two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.			
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO229	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
361055	Mr David OAKLEY		CSO1020	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
490570	Mrs Patricia RYAN		CSO1035	Option VWM 2	Object		As a resident of Verwood I feel that it already does not have the facilities to support a town of this size, so an increase in housing seems like madness. The main Ringwood road is already very hard to access at the best of times, without more cars being added.			1049
490846	Karen COOMBS		CSO1059	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
490854	D MUTTON		CSO1067	Option VWM 2	Support		I only support the home development south of Howe Lane and south of Manor Road if Howe Lane and St Michael Road are adopted and improved to provide additional access to the additional homes etc. (school). Margards Lane/Church Hill already have more than enough traffic congestion at times. From SNAP: The support of those areas of Verwood marked as 'supported' is dependent on an improved road access - especially in respect of Howe Lane, which needs to be adopted. Margards Lane/Church Hill are already over-loaded with traffic at certain times of the day. This could be relieved by re-opening			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							the northern arm of Church Hill onto Manor Road - with 'left turn only' at this point			
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO13 16	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>"The development could provide valuable green infrastructure that would benefit residents and divert pressures away from heathlands."</p> <p>This area is already valuable green infrastructure which is why it has been designated as Green Belt land. Anybody (including the authors of this Core Strategy) can read more about Green Belt land at http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/ppg2</p> <p>Here is an extract...</p> <p>Intentions of policy</p> <p>1.4 The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. Green Belts can shape patterns of urban development at sub-regional and regional scale, and help to ensure that development occurs in locations allocated in development plans. They help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They can assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development (see paragraph 2.10).</p> <p>Purposes of including land in Green Belts</p> <p>1.5 There are five purposes of including land in Green Belts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> x to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; x to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; x to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; x to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and x to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>The use of land in Green Belts</p> <p>1.6 Once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play in fulfilling the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> x to provide opportunities for access to the open countryside 	Suggested amendment to the option - remove it!		1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>for the urban population; x to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas; x to retain attractive landscapes, and enhance landscapes, near to where people live; x to improve damaged and derelict land around towns; x to secure nature conservation interest; and x to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses.</p> <p>1.7 The extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. For example, although Green Belts often contain areas of attractive landscape, the quality of the landscape is not relevant to the inclusion of land within a Green Belt or to its continued protection. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives.</p> <p>There is also a map of Green Belt land across the UK at http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/mapgreenbelt.pdf</p> <p>It is a tiny proportion of the countryside and a very small portion of Dorset. As such it is very precious and must be protected at all costs.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENT RECEIVED FROM ONLINE WEB SURVEY: Verwood has taken on more than its fair share of new homes. The town cannot expand any further - there are limited facilities and employment opportunities. People have to travel further afield, invariably by car as public transport provision is pathetic. I can see absolutely no justification for building houses on designated Green Belt land. As far as I can see, the only reason the sites proposed for new homes in Verwood have been put forward is that the land owners are offering it up for sale (and want to make profit out of it). What is the point in designating land as Green Belt if that designation can be changed, apparently, at will? It is being suggested that the disused railway line to the west of Eastworth Road makes a natural town boundary. I would argue that Eastworth Road makes a natural town boundary given that it is already the town boundary and the Green Belt</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							boundary. After these developments go ahead (God forbid) what will be identified as the next natural al boundary? And the next.... Enough is enough!			
495558	Linda Raybould		CSO14 97	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
495562	Mr MJ Banting		CSO15 17	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
495625	Mr Michael McMath		CSO15 44	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>While I support the building of a new upper school in Verwood which I think has been needed for years my main concern is that if 415 new houses are to be built in Verwood where are all the children who will be living in these houses be going to school? I would assume that 415 houses would mean about 700 or more children, the current 1st and middle schools do not have the capacity to take in this number of new pupils so they would have to be bussed to schools outside Verwood.</p> <p>My other concerns are the extra traffic that would be generated by another 700 cars. There are times when pedestrians can wait 5 minutes or more to cross Manor Lane to the Monmouth Ash car park for access to Morrisons, this will just get worse. Where are all these residents going to work? I assume they will be commuting in and out of Verwood every day thus adding to the already busy roads.</p>			1049
496188	Mr RE Vogel		CSO16 24	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
496338	Mr John Clough		CSO16 49	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>Recent roadworks on the B3081 have demonstrated how fragile the routes in and out of Verwood are. More housing will make the situation worse. Recent disastrous developments including the Fairwood site clearly demonstrate the insensitivity of planning within Verwood. I can see no need for supporting further development when it is clear the needs of existing residents are being disregarded and our environment damaged without thought or consideration for the future. I continue to travel to Ringwood and Ferndown for</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							town amenities until such time as these are available in Verwood. I strongly object to further development.			
496396	Mrs Jill Freer		CSO16 61	Option VWM 2	Object		I always understood this was Green Belt land, and that could not be built on. (Eastworth Road). My main objection is that Verwood is already quite densely built up. The doctor's lists are full. The NHS dentist is full. There is no senior school and junior's schools are pretty full. Also the one road in and out of Verwood is extremely busy at all times now - without adding hugely to the amount of traffic.	No more building. We already have two lots of flats being erected on inappropriate sites. This town cannot take any more. Please let us enjoy our Green Belt.		1049
496462	Mr and Mrs Guy Jameson		CSO16 77	Option VWM 2	Object		Before developing hundreds of homes the local infrastructure in Verwood requires enhancements. If a senior school is required in Verwood then a suitable site needs to be found. Land that is protected by green belt status must be respected and adhered to.			1049
496479	Charlotte Dixon		CSO17 19	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
496526	Mr Dennis Barrow		CSO17 35	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
496564	JH Lockwood		CSO17 58	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
496588	Mr and Mrs Richardson		CSO17 86	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
496612	Mr and Mrs JP Lovell		CSO18 07	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
496707	Mr David Richards		CSO18 46	Option VWM 2	Object		This site I find unbelievable to be included for development for 200 homes. Firstly why does the Green Belt finish along the dismantled railway line on one side of Edmondsham Road but it is stopped along the boundary of VWM1 on the opposite side. This site I would say goes against all the considered points put forward for development. It is a massive intrusion into the countryside. Drainage wise it will all	Area of land between school and rear of Coopers Lane area of land bounded by Moorlands Road / Coopers Lane and Coronation Road.		1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							need pumping. One of your plans shows a boundary coming out onto Edmondsham Road just below the old hump back railway bridge. This site if being considered should be reduced to give protection to the countryside and be reduced in size to give a barrier along the railway line strip and moved back from Edmondsham Road to give the open countryside a chance to survive and should be served if considered from Eastworth Road to give access to Station Road.			
360714	Carol Morgan		CSO2031	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO2344	Option VWM 2	Object		ARC would have to object to this proposal. 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 SANG could not militate against this.			1049
361111	Mr Raymond Brown		CSO2082	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
361170	Mr TR HARVEY		CSO2854	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
484088	Mr David Price		CSO2531	Option VWM 2	Object		If correct guidelines and environmental studies for wildlife etc. are conducted along with consultation on all aspects of development then they could proceed with developments but scale in relation to services and infrastructure for these developments is completely out of balance. The relatively short open period for consultation on a document that has clearly been developed over quite some time is a concern in order to formulate a serious plan of objections. The descriptions of local infrastructure and improvements has been met with much derision along with the continued failure to upgrade the supportive infrastructure required. This is not surprising with the consultants being in Weybridge and clearly have only visited the area briefly. Additionally I note that the environmental impact has been glibbed over as the Bat, Badger, Deer, Slow worm and newt	A period of FULL public consultation should be entered into and the council should provide a clearer information pack to local councils and remove the fear that everyone has that this is a done deal and residents will not be listened to,.		1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							populations have risen considerably. Living on Eastworth itself I cannot see how the council proposes to make the road safe to use as they are narrow and protected by houses, nor is there room for the required pedestrian walkways.			
491311	Mr Kevin GILLING		CSO2713	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
495971	T A Reith		CSO2247	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
496958	Mrs J Beech		CSO1938	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
497026	Doreen Smith		CSO1999	Option VWM 2	Object		This amount of building will create extra traffic in Ferndown and Parley which already has a lot of road build up in the busy morning and evening travel. Also taking a lot of natural land for our wild life.			1049
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		CSO2110	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
497184	Mr Hilling		CSO2218	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
497223	AJ Marvin		CSO2232	Option VWM 2	Object		My prime objections to Verwood developments are 1 Loss of green belt. What is wrong with the Boundary Lane area? 2 Over 20 years Verwood has expanded out of all proportion, to a level infrastructure is barely able to support. 3 Car parking in the village centre i.e. Pottery, surgery and limited roadside parking is totally inadequate at present (certainly am) shops have been approved with no parking or at least very limited-how will it cope with 400 new families In favour An upper school will reduce traffic in and out of town save money and environmentally friendly-needs access road improvement from Margards/Church Hill.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
497343	Sharon Sutcliffe		CSO22 81	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
497467	MR OLIVER RODWAY		CSO23 57	Option VWM 2	Object		Would overreach a naturally formed edge to the town defined by the line of Oak tree towards the southern edge of the proposed development area. It is also a beautiful green grass grazing field next to a children's park, it would be a sad day seeing Bellway's/Wimpey/Persimmon etc. roll in to dig up a bit of Dorset countryside!			1049
497479	Mr Barry Nicholl		CSO23 78	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I object most strongly to the proposed Eastworth Road development of 200 houses. How can the Council say occupants will have access to important services, which are already strained or non-existent? The roads into Verwood are little better than the country lanes they once were, there is lack of infrastructure and I am sure the schools could not possibly cope with the huge influx of hundreds of young children.</p> <p>Medical services are under pressure at present with the existing population and, despite the glowing view of Verwood portrayed by the Council; there are few real facilities available.</p> <p>Why do the Council think there are job opportunities in Verwood? The large influx would mean yet more cars on the pathetic road system with more accidents as occupants drive to jobs outside the town.</p> <p>We have all seen the monstrosities passed by planning such as the new Co-op and flats on the Fayrewood site and the flats by the fire station without any thought for the residents of the town and these latest proposals are yet another example of them trying to develop before provision is made by way of roads, infrastructure, services and facilities.</p>	Dismiss all thoughts of further development in Verwood		1049
497773	R Johnstone		CSO24 84	Option VWM 2	Object		Regarding Verwood proposals, I think the town needs more infrastructure before expansion. There is no cinema, swimming pool and a lack of small shops in the centre. Morrison's is not the "be all and end all". The traffic at present (connected with VWM7 proposal) is already clogging our roads twice a day. New facilities (housing and schooling) will			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							increase the street parking problems for residents as there is no sensible drop off points in the school's campus. New roads invariably draw in more traffic. More needs to be done to encourage children to walk to school and for cars to be left in the garage. I have witnessed ladies who arrive early for the pick-up to "reserve" their street parking and when I challenged one lady for parking on the pavement, found she lived in Haywards Cres.			
498044	Carolyne BANKS		CSO26 82	Option VWM 2	Support		Use the newer out-of-town developments to extend housing - after all that's what they were created for i.e.: Verwood, Corfe Mullen, Sturminster Marshall. Don't cram more development into existing residential areas in town.			1049
498047	CD Bradford		CSO26 58	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
498051	Mrs Mary Connor		CSO26 65	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		CSO27 41	Option VWM 2	Support		Although I live in Ferndown, I work and travel a lot in the local area so feel I can voice my opinion on developments around the area.			1049
498078	G Sims		CSO27 25	Option VWM 2	Support		Gives the young a chance of buying affordable homes and a secondary school which is needed.			1049
498084	Mr P HARTLEY		CSO27 62	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
498122	Williams		CSO27 76	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is full!!! Infrastructure does not cope with existing populace. Limited supermarket facilities, garage (fuel) etc. High rise flats are not conducive to a country town. However they seem to be springing up all over - more than a blot on the landscape!			1049
498125	Mr and Mrs P DASHWOOD		CSO28 00	Option VWM 2	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	D									
498133	Mrs Dowling		CSO2793	Option VWM 2	Object		The opinions of Verwoodians seem to count for nothing, the unsightly, unwanted, unneeded building at Blackhill being a good example.			1049
359583	Mr Richard DURHAM		CSO3773	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>A housing development on this site would have significant detrimental consequences on the natural environment and the lives of local people who greatly value this scenic landscape for leisure / recreation purposes. The following points should be considered:</p> <p>1: The Site of Nature Conservation Interest adjacent to the proposed site would be seriously affected. There has already been a marked decline in wildlife populations in and around the conservation area since the housing development on the east side of Eastworth Road was completed in 2001. The explosion in domestic cat numbers has drastically reduced the number and variety of bird species and small mammals in the area. Owls for example, so numerous ten years ago are scarcely seen or heard in the area now. Further development around the perimeter of the SNCI would aggravate the situation further and go against all conservation principles.</p> <p>2: The disused railway embankment / cutting on the western perimeter of the site currently serves as a wildlife sanctuary with larger animals using it as a concealed route between the SNCI and more open country to the north. New housing alongside it would seriously jeopardize this habitat.</p> <p>3: The play park and recreational area alongside Eastworth Road would likely become seriously overpopulated and with the loss of its scenic rural outlook to the west, this amenity would lose its appeal to many established visitors.</p> <p>Additionally, there would be more occurrences of anti-social behaviour after dark than there is at present, given the size of the proposed housing development.</p> <p>4: Eastworth Road and its adjoining residential roads are too narrow and restrictive to support any increased traffic flow as a result of new access into an adjoining housing development.</p>			1049
360037	Mr		CSO40	Option		No				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Dave BARNES		53	VWM 2		Opinion				
361041	Mr & Mrs G K HAMPTON		CSO4025	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
361106	Mr and Mrs Robin and Janet WALL		CSO3679	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO3279	Option VWM 2	Support		Verwood already has a population of about 14,000 and doesn't yet benefit from the infrastructure or vibrancy which its residents deserve. Nevertheless, I support a limited amount of development in the town in the hope that it will contribute to improving Verwood's infrastructure, its vibrancy as a town and its green spaces. I also support limited development to provide desperately needed affordable homes as part of a mixed community.			1049
498160	Mrs Gwendoline Martin		CSO2861	Option VWM 2	Object		No housing development without infrastructure-road in Verwood cannot carry any further traffic Station Road is a death trap we are only waiting for an accident to happen Shop deliveries should be controlled-and not allowed to happen at rush hour. When a satisfactory road scheme is planned-housing could be considered. Developer must be made to pay-towards the above.			1049
498169	Mrs D WEAVER		CSO2903	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
498184	Mrs Angela BARKER		CSO2930	Option VWM 2	Object		Not every area needs affordable housing - if a lot of people are retired and/or own their own homes, does it matter?			1049
498268	Mr and Mrs R		CSO3012	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Cullen									
498271	Mandy CHEESEM AN		CSO3062	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
498335	Mr and Mrs Lester		CSO3220	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
498376	Mrs Helen Holman		CSO3120	Option VWM 2	Object		We object to the development proposals on the grounds that the proportion of "affordable" housing is too high and on the lack of appropriate plan to improve services within Verwood – including the provision of an appropriately sized supermarket, competition for petrol station, leisure centre. Definition of 'affordable' housing not given in documents.			1049
498385	Ms Sarah Cosgrove		CSO3125	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is already over populated. There are not enough facilities to accommodate these small or huge developments. The roads in and out of Verwood would not withstand an extra 400+ cars. We have no secondary school and the current primary schools would not cope with such an influx of people. You cannot have a development of this size without additional services and facilities which you have failed to plan for.	No amendments to be made. It is a ridiculous suggestion to develop this many houses in such a small area.		1049
498386	Mr & Mrs DL & MD Thompson		CSO3132	Option VWM 2	Support		The scheme meets government demands for future housing using land which will not cause problems to existing residents - good planning to incorporate ancillary components of the scheme - i.e. balance cost for housing, transport needs and schooling. Overall a well thought out scheme which hopefully will reduce the need for high density schemes to be built within the town's current planning belt. NB If The Hub had been as well thought out at planning we would not have been facing the current problems.			1049
498428	Ms Helen Puttock		CSO3194	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood has expanded enough. There are blocks of flats that keep appearing already. The infrastructure of the village is not enough as it is. The roads will be clogged up more than they are at the moment without the minimum of an extra 300 plus cars to cope with. Verwood does not need any more housing. Are we aiming for city status?			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
498477	Mr Terry Puttock		CSO32 48	Option VWM 2	Object		Clogged roads. Infrastructure is insufficient. Lose small town/village atmosphere.			1049
498518	Mr & Mrs Grieg and Ruth Brown		CSO32 85	Option VWM 2	Object		The proposed land is good arable land and should remain of an agricultural usage only. Poor quality land should be used for redevelopment. The proposed land is designated Green Belt. There are no TPO's on many of the trees in the fields. The roads in and out of the proposed development and Verwood cannot cope with another 300+ vehicles per day. Verwood's infrastructure (education, sports facilities, shops, roads) are already overloaded, especially with regards to secondary education. Devaluation of local properties including affecting some home environments. Verwood already has a glut of affordable housing; new built flats and houses plus existing bungalows suitable for the elderly. The roads in and out of the proposed development (and Verwood) cannot cope with another 300+ vehicles per day. Verwood's infra-structure (education, sports facilities, shops, roads) are already overloaded (esp. with regards to secondary education). Devaluation of local properties including affecting some home environments. Verwood already has a glut of affordable housing, new built flats and houses plus existing bungalows suitable for the elderly.			1049
498523	Mr Peter Thompson		CSO32 88	Option VWM 2	Object		Destruction of green space and disturbance to wildlife that live there such as deer, badgers, foxes, owls all seen in our garden. Too many more people and cars for a town already with too few facilities			1049
498527	Mr John Edgar		CSO32 90	Option VWM 2	Object		The sellers of the proposed land and the Council have no consideration of the impact of the proposals on Verwood's infrastructure, existing retail and manufacturing employment facilities or even transport route.	Amend the proposals by reducing the new homes plans by no less than 75% and share the proposed houses between		1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							The town does not need any more "housing association" style estates with all the problems such areas often bring to areas. Furthermore, why is Verwood the only East Dorset town to be targeted for such unreasonable numbers of extra profiles (1200 - 1500) a further growth of 10%+, especially as the existing infrastructure hardly copes with today's population. Verwood was given to understand that the town had now received its "quota" of new builds. Most or all of the proposed "sell off" area are farmland or green belt which this area is fast losing to the exasperation of all residents.	other less affected towns such as Ferndown, Wimborne, and Blandford etc., all of which have far less populations.		
498563	Mr & Mrs Peter Baulch		CSO33 17	Option VWM 2	Object		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We purchased our property to enjoy its rural environment and surroundings. This option will put our property on the edge of a vast housing estate. 2. Following the purchase of our property, we attended various planning and appeal hearings to extend our property. The green belt restrictions were upheld with extremely high regard with a result that our paddock are now has to be defined from our garden and our stable is unable to be converted to living space. We feel that this option would relax the green belt issues which have in the past been scrutinised for. 3. We are extremely concerned for the security of our properties and land. There are open boundaries to adjacent land being considered in this option. We cannot see how security can be upheld without any trespass over our land by children playing or indeed adults taking a shortcut to the Albion Inn Public House. 4. The housing estate may de-value our property. 5. We moved to Verwood as we understood the original village had developed into a small town which had reached its maximum potential. This was confirmed by the planning office. 6. The building and the occupancy of the housing estate will cause extreme disruption to local wildlife and in particular, long eared bats and a herd of Roe Deers which both live and use the wooded areas you plan to build on. 7. The building of the housing estate will cause tremendous noise disruption to us and local wildlife. 8. The additional traffic caused by the increase in population 			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							in Verwood will put excessive pressure on the 3 main roads in and out of the town. 9. There appears to be numerous new properties unoccupied in the Verwood already we do not need any further houses.			
498711	Mr Tam Chant		CSO33 95	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
498996	M E CLARKE		CSO34 59	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
499044	Mrs Carolyn MASKELL		CSO34 88	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
499231	Mrs A Lathbury		CSO35 37	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
499236	J PIPE		CSO35 51	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
499245	Mr and Mrs N BUTLER		CSO35 84	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
499261	Mrs Norma JACKSON		CSO36 19	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
499271	Mrs P Giles		CSO36 14	Option VWM 2	Object		No new building should take place in Verwood without consideration being given to improving public transport for existing residents. There is no transport after approx 18.30 to enable people to enjoy existing facilities like The Hub and Club 31. A large proportion of the elderly do not have their own cars, taxis are expensive and therefore these venues are not well frequented and are running at a loss. Verwood should be made more 'user friendly'.			1049
499290	Mrs		CSO36	Option	Object		SNAP: No opinion			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lisa TURNBULL		51	VWM 2						
499291	R S Welch		CSO3654	Option VWM 2	Object		The extension of housing at VWM1 and VWM2 will constitute an enormous traffic problem due to the existing poor roads, and is a considerable intrusion into green belt land which is wholly unnecessary.			1049
360685	Mr M.P HOSE		CSO4642	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
498495	Mr John Williams		CSO3726	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
499384	Mr A I ROSE		CSO3723	Option VWM 2	Support		Verwood seems to be a dormitory with no town centre (scattered development). All the talk when I moved to the area in 1978 was 'Wessex City'. What happened? Is this the first stage of completing the arc around the Poole/Bournemouth conurbation? If this is so, develop southwards, west of the Moors River, flood plains permitting and there is the planner's utopia for the 22nd century.			1049
499481	Mr John MARTIN		CSO3795	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
499533	Mr & Mrs A & C Clein		CSO3813	Option VWM 2	Object		I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised. The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers,			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499537	C Ayling		CSO38 16	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.			
499551	Rachel TYLER		CSO38 28	Option VWM 2	Support		The main focus of my support is for a new upper school in Verwood. Even without the increase in housing there is a desperate need for this, along with the added community facilities this will bring. For children from outlying villages, they have a longer journey than Verwood children to QE currently. A new upper school would also shorten their travel distances considerably, i.e.: Cranborne / Sixpenny Handley etc. As a parent of 2 children aged 8 and 3; I just hope it comes in time for them. I have real concerns about the travel involved for my girls to Wimborne, especially as they currently walk to school.			1049
499559	Mrs S E Ayling		CSO38 39	Option VWM 2	Object		I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised. The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499592	Mr & Mrs David & Mary Hockaday		CSO38 51	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>As residents of Verwood, we are dismayed to see that there is a proposal to build 450 new houses on Green Belt land. Apart from violating the principal of encroachment of the Green Belt the infrastructure of Verwood has never kept pace with the number of new houses in the town. For this reason we wish to register our objection to this proposal.</p>			1049
499635	Mr Lee Thornhill		CSO38 59	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499649	Ms Janet Bentick		CSO3864	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another 			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.			
499735	Mr & Mrs Mary & Bernard Fox		CSO3896	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the 			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499748	Ms		CSO39	Option	Object		I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Soozi Cooper		01	VWM 2			<p>Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision.</p> <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499759	Mrs Freda White		CSO39 12	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499763	S.E. Portnell		CSO3920	Option WVM 2	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499771	Mr & Mrs Helen and Clive Bonner		CSO39 22	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another 			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.			
499774	Mr S Weatherill-Podbury		CSO3925	Option WVM 2	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the 			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499777	Mr		CSO39	Option	Object		I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	J.E. Podbury		27	VWM 2			<p>Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision.</p> <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499779	Mr & Mrs J Wilson		CSO3930	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499780	Ms Patricia Wykes		CSO39 34	Option WVM 2	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499781	Mrs R Collins		CSO3937	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another 			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.			
499782	Mrs A.G. Cox		CSO3940	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the 			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499785	R.B.		CSO39	Option	Object		I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Humphries		42	VWM 2			<p>Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied and has indeed been consulted? • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision.</p> <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
499873	Mr Graham Holt		CSO3994	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>11.60 states that this is an "Area of great Landscape Value" already compromised by the development of Trinity School. The school was designed as a low development on low ground. The proposed filed is at roof level to the school and development will destroy the "Valued" landscape. This is not "infill" or "contained development". Try viewing this area and VWM2 from Stephen's Castle.</p>			1049
500060	Mr		CSO40	Option		No				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Stuart PIDDOCK		81	VWM 2		Opinion				
500222	S Hartley		CSO44 40	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
500350	Mr P H BARTLETT		CSO42 26	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
500361	Mr and Miss N and A Middleton and Turner		CSO42 67	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
500394	Mrs Sandra HOWES		CSO42 88	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
500418	Mr and Mrs S H YATES		CSO42 97	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood already has too many houses because there is an inadequate infrastructure, especially roads. Howe Lane in particular needs to be improved to provide alternative access to the existing schools. A new school on this site, even with Howe Lane improvements, would create gridlock with only 2 means of access.			1049
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		CSO43 16	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
500558	A Baker		CSO43 68	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
500697	Mr Thomas SMITH		CSO44 92	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
500706	R & J Jeans		CSO45 37	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
500720	Mrs		CSO45	Option	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	VALLIER		40	VWM 2						
500748	Mrs Lauren MATTHEWS		CSO4593	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
500802	J Hayward		CSO4718	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
500807	Mr and Mrs K E EYRES		CSO4664	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>Paragraph 11.9 of the Core Strategy options document for Verwood and West Moors states that Verwood has a GOOD ROAD LINK to the A31 (T) and the A338. This road, part of the B3081, is TOTALLY INADEQUATE for the volume of traffic it carries in both directions. An unacceptable number of FATAL ACCIDENTS between Verwood and Ringwood have occurred in recent years. This road should be UPGRADED TO DUAL CARRIAGEWAY before any further development is allowed in Verwood.</p> <p>Furthermore, most of the other routes through the town which link to the B3081 - Manor Road, Lake Road, Woodlinken Drive, Burnbake Road, Newtown Road, Newtown Lane - to name but a few, are in a TERRIBLE STATE OF REPAIR, mainly due to adjacent development accessing the underground services, followed by POOR QUALITY, and often TEMPORARY repairs to the road surface. Again these issues need to be addressed before further development is permitted.</p> <p>A new Secondary school is a definite requirement for a Town of Verwood's size, but it must have ADEQUATE VEHICULAR ACCESS. Surely the land to the West of Trinity School, close to the Southern and Western relief roads, would be a better option than the Emmanuel Campus. This would give some relief to the long suffering residents of St. Michaels Road, Howe Lane and Margards Lane.</p>			1049
500836	Mrs Sylvia Hines		CSO4732	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
500903	Mr and Mrs		CSO47	Option		No				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	S and R Harris		86	VWM 2		Opinion				
500999	Mrs JD Burton		CSO4804	Option VWM 2	Object		Regarding Verwood. We need more doctors, shops, buses, to cope with extra property			1049
501012	Louise ARNOLD		CSO4880	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		CSO4911	Option VWM 2	Object		Station Road Verwood and Eastworth Road are presently overloaded with vehicle traffic. Heavy vehicles traffic has increased by 400% in the past ten years and it is now essential that heavy vehicle numbers passing through the centre of Verwood be reduced, diverting to other routes. It is also very necessary to improve Station Road footpath before a serious accident occurs.			1049
501069	Mr and Mrs R Rich		CSO4917	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood does not have enough existing facilities for us who already live here. 1 - Doctors 2 - Dentists 3 - Local shops. We moved here years ago to get away from continuous road noise and heavy traffic and to have a nice green environment which will be spoilt by your plans.			1049
501090	Mr and Mrs Gee		CSO4936	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
501106	Mr John Victor Rogers		CSO4950	Option VWM 2	Support		Verwood needs more housing to ensure that we have a secondary school and an increase in population will help to secure the future of the "Hub". And Morrisons will have to enlarge which will benefit us all and the land in this area is only suitable for housing not "crops".			1049
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		CSO5027	Option VWM 2	Object		The impact of the proposed development in Verwood would be to fundamentally change the feel of the town. There will be no increased employment opportunities for the growing population. We are concerned about the congestion that will occur in Springfield Road if it is adopted and linked to Howe			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Lane and also have great concerns about the decrease in the value of our property if our front garden decreases in size due to more land being needed for the distributor road. This in turn would lead to large compensation payments being made to residents in a time of economic hardship.			
501118	Mr Ron Cook		CSO5020	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
501135	Charlie Wassell		CSO5045	Option VWM 2	Support		Only homeless people should be able to object to the building of new homes. Residents should consider how to improve facilities. Developers should contribute to improving facilities.			1049
501235	Mr and Mrs J Churchward		CSO5132	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is big enough; the infrastructure just can't take any more homes and people. Our supermarket struggles to cope; the doctors are full and maybe before planning is granted trips should be made in and out of Verwood during the rush hour. Both roads out are like the M25 a constant stream of traffic, and then when an accident occurs and they do it grinds to a halt all the roads are gridlocked. Imagine the extra cars adding to this situation. This is Green Belt land, keeping Verwood the size it is, adding houses and the necessary road system will ruin this rural town.			1049
501261	Mr and Mrs Jeffries		CSO5145	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
501351	Mr and Mrs R D'Cruze		CSO5248	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
501485	Mrs J JACKSON		CSO5296	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
501488	Chris LAMB		CSO5330	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
501502	Mr Michael		CSO5376	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	WAREHAM									
501512	Donald Gray		CSO54 01	Option VWM 2	Object		Due to over development Verwood will be unable to support any increase in population and the facilities involved i.e. doctors, shops, traffic will not be able to cope. It would be good to have some green spaces left!! Verwood was once a pretty village - no more! Just a miss match of 'eyesore' flats etc.			1049
501515	Mrs A Ryan		CSO54 06	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
501520	Mrs Z Merrifield		CSO54 49	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
501523	Rita Gilbert		CSO54 86	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
501525	G Pearson		CSO54 72	Option VWM 2	Object		For over 20 years the council planners have rode roughshod over resident's wishes, totally ignoring the fact everyone wanted no more housing development in the town. The council's obsession with high density and so called 'affordable housing' was neither wanted or desired by the majority of residents. The monstrosity being built on the former Fairwood Pub site is just one example of council attitude.			1049
501533	A I Pearce		CSO54 67	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood has one road through it, and one road out of it. Traffic has already increased enormously and is becoming unmanageable. Parking in Verwood is poor. People will park on roadsides. There will be traffic chaos. Verwood needs more infrastructure and facilities before any new building of houses takes place. Eastworth Road, West end is used by hundreds of parents and children by schools.			1049
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		CSO55 29	Option VWM 2	Support		Please do not accept any community centre / halls or leisure centre as a corporate inducement from developers of housing developments. In my experience they hardly ever work and cost a great deal in subsidy for councils each and every year.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							i.e. Verwood Hub; Lenham, Kent; Ditton, Nr Maidstone, Kent. My ref: 10 years as a Parish Councillor in Ditton, Kent.			
501560	Mr Christopher CLARKE		CSO5586	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
359908	Mr F.D.A REVILL		CSO6260	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
359927	Mrs Ann BISSEX		CSO6370	Option VWM 2	Object		The green belt should not be encroached on any further. No building should be allowed on flood plains. Much more serious effort needs to be put into reducing necessity of relying on car travel.			1049
501364	Mr M Devetta		CSO5865	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
501583	Mrs Jean Russell		CSO5687	Option VWM 2	Object		This has been considered before, e.g. when the new houses were built in Howe Lane and beyond St. Michael's Cottage, what happened to that money? Also the developer's statement 'will contribute to transport improvements' will they? I rather doubt it considering their previous track record. The holes in Howe Lane and St. Michael's Road bear testimony to this. Try driving along these roads! An accident waiting to happen. No one in this area wants this dreadful plan implemented. It seems to have escaped your notice that we shall all end up under water. There should not be any more houses / flats in this particular area, there are far too many dreadful flats and developments in gardens and how could all those dreadful developments on the edge of the town ever gained approval? They are a disgrace. Verwood used to be a pleasant place to live when we moved here 39 years ago. Look at it now! Are you proud of the 'improvements'?!! No one else is. I realise that housing is needed. To go ahead with this plan will be a disaster and how did you decide to fall in with the plans / request to sell off this land, just because the owners could sell it at a very good profit? It is possible that they will not be living in the water? I			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							think not. The present infrastructure will not sustain such a large project as this and the drains in Manor Road are at full capacity now. Even more water will accumulate as the leaves fall.			
501616	R J Joyce		CSO6000	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
501626	Mrs J A Russell		CSO5762	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
501694	Mr R BRYAN		CSO5797	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
501699	B THOMAS		CSO5824	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
501720	Dr and Mrs D HARLOW		CSO5922	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
501761	Mr D Curtis		CSO6020	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
501867	Mrs I M Marks		CSO6306	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
501873	Mr and Mrs Harold A and D Joan Lilley		CSO6256	Option VWM 2	Object		All proposals of this nature have a number of basic needs. One of the most important is infrastructure. Subject to finance being available Canford Bottom Roundabout is to be drastically amended for the Olympic Games. The reference to "Improvements to Canford Bottom therefore appear to have been superseded. Since I cannot find any intention to improve the road network all these proposals will only add to our present problems and cannot be supported.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501876	J Long		CSO6214	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
501881	B W Deverill		CSO6287	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		CSO6275	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502022	Mr HWR Stevens		CSO6393	Option VWM 2	Object		Dorset's villages and small towns should be preserved as such. So called "developers" are only concerned with profits. There'll always be an England? Not when it has been built over and occupied by strangers.			1049
502029	Mr J MacArthur		CSO6437	Option VWM 2	Support	General Comment	Quality of materials and road layout is a key requirement to any new house building. More 2 bed homes to give small families a chance at being housed. Houses and roads can be attractive (Look at Poundbury, Nr Dorchester). Enough parking is a must - no 1.25 spaces per plot, plus a couple of visitors bays, will not suffice. Plenty of 'part rent - part buy' should be included to give all young people a chance to have a home. Try to get away from open plan frontages. Terraces of even small boundary fenced homes look better and give a feel of being established houses.			1049
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		CSO6453	Option VWM 2	Object		The whole area is congested, there is no real provision for new TRANSPORT OR services for new homes i.e. doctors, local shops or community centres. There are already MANY EMPTY industrial units. Building more industrial is only viable if a tax loss for developers. Verwood has lost its soul now, and does not need any more ad-hock development. Wimborne will follow if the development of this (at present) lovely Town is carried out in the same way as Verwood has been.			1049
502059	Mr R Seddon		CSO6506	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502061	J and M Jeater and Tilley		CSO6488	Option VWM 2	Object		The current infrastructure is insufficient as it is. Priority should be given to improving this before enlarging Verwood to the extent suggested. Verwood has become a dormitory town by design. All this has happened in 20 years or less. Has not Verwood developed enough? Several more shops and another filling station is the very minimum expected.			1049
361113	Mr Alan Meade		CSO7201	Option VWM 2	Support		.I like the rate of affordable housing to private homes. We all know that there is a shortage. Jobs will be created, money brought in, good for all in East Dorset, Christchurch			1049
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		CSO6781	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		CSO6975	Option VWM 2	Object	General Comment	The area cannot sustain this quantity of new homes which would also require jobs for the vast majority. This proposal of 2,570 homes would also add another 5,000 cars to an already congested junction at West Parley. This area is already over stretched private and industrial vehicles. Jobs are already at a premium with companies moving out of the area or even closing. Warehouses are lying empty and shops are being converted into living accommodation. The young local people are not able to find homes due to the vast majority going to people moving into the area. This vast development will destroy this rural area. Just look at Bournemouth if you require any proof.			1049
501940	Mr M J Godfrey		CSO7200	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502076	Kay Stead		CSO6562	Option VWM 2	Object		A new secondary school is VITAL for the Verwood area. Verwood has quadrupled in size since we came here 8 years ago. There are enough new homes - many haven't sold. There are not enough facilities in the town to sustain any more residents. The leisure centre is dire; however, the Hub is a triumph.			1049
502077	Douglas Poole		CSO6520	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is already an overcrowded and congested area. Further developments will contribute to make this town a			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							ghetto like place - what for?			
502078	Mr R Marlow		CSO6540	Option VWM 2	Object		Why waste more tax payer's money!!! Too much now!!! These proposals are ridiculous, as any further work prospects in this area are "zero". So why more homes and cars when the road/transport structure is obsolete for modern days need, let alone provision for the future 20/30 years. Just building more houses will not solve the long standing problems in Dorset i.e. jobs and road structures.			1049
502092	Mr and Mrs A Watkinson		CSO6555	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
502099	Carolyn Lourens		CSO6596	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502114	Mr P Foster		CSO6643	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
502117	Mr P A Beard		CSO6621	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		CSO6688	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502138	Mrs E Mason		CSO6702	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502253	Mrs Lesley Jane Franklin		CSO6753	Option VWM 2	Support		I support all options for Verwood, Wimborne and Colehill because I feel there is a great need for more affordable housing in these areas, especially for young families and vulnerable elderly people in rural areas.			1049
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		CSO6803	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502317	Cllr Peter Lucas		CSO6837	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
502326	Mr and Mrs T Bennett		CSO6885	Option VWM 2	Object		With more homes will need more employment, a vicious circle. Our roads are too busy now. We surely have enough community areas and centres.			1049
502329	Mrs Rosemary Rooke		CSO6891	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
502345	Mr and Mrs Ray and Irene Coulson		CSO6951	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
502347	Sarah Cobb		CSO7093	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502381	Mr Cyril Josey		CSO7070	Option VWM 2	Support		Why is it necessary to include affordable homes (low value) in with others (of higher value), thus lowering the value of other properties in the area. Put low value homes of high density in low value areas. People are not going to accept paying high prices for property when other houses nearby are run by housing associations or the council renting to tenants. 50% affordable housing in any area is too much. Local infrastructure, road improvement, services etc. must be provided in all cases.			1049
502387	Mr George Kilpatrick		CSO7055	Option VWM 2	Object		I would like to see the justification for increased housing in East Dorset e.g., demographics, immigration, increased work opportunities etc. I would also like to understand how transport strategy (and infrastructure) is coordinated with this in such a way to make expansion sustainable.			1049
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		CSO7165	Option VWM 2	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502468	Robert Lambert		CSO7387	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502568	Sarah Morgan		CSO7281	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		CSO7309	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502570	Mr Samways		CSO7337	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502579	Mr & Mrs R L Thorne		CSO7366	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502595	Mr Colin House		CSO7460	Option VWM 2	Object		All these developments will cause an impact on the local heathland and the proposals in all areas will cause road chaos on the A31, Ferndown, Parley and Wimborne. A new road structure is required before any development takes place.			1049
502610	John Jackson		CSO7498	Option VWM 2	Object		The population of Verwood is already larger than that of Ringwood without the civic amenities and the people of Verwood deserve better, a proper leisure centre including a swimming pool and adequate shopping facilities. However good the service from the existing retail businesses; is a tiny post office, one petrol station; a handful of shops, and a small dated supermarket really adequate?			1049
359598	Mr A KETCHLEY		CSO8003	Option VWM 2		No Opinion	Unfortunately whatever is finally decided on the following well known saying will occur: 'You can please some of the people all the time, You can please all of the people some of the time, But you cannot please all of the people all of the time!' I wish you well in whatever is decided. Some will see it as inevitable due to the area's population increases, whereas others will see it as a necessary evil, and some will accept it without question			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359873	Mrs M HUGHES		CSO8626	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
359977	Miss M.G. EARP		CSO8074	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		CSO8293	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
361123	Mr Iain STEVENSON		CSO8231	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		CSO7461	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502673	Mrs A Powell		CSO7569	Option VWM 2	Object		The infrastructure in this area needs to be sorted out before anymore building goes ahead. There are times you cannot move on the roads. The area is being ruined with all this building works that are already going on.			1049
502701	Mrs M Williams		CSO7596	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502708	Ms Julia Owen		CSO7649	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502745	Mrs J.M Kenny		CSO7687	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		CSO7918	Option VWM 2	Object		There should not be any more large scale house building in the East Dorset area as the roads cannot cope with any more traffic			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502921	Mr and Mrs L Forinton		CSO7797	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>We moved to Verwood a year ago. When considering whether to buy the bungalow we contacted East Dorset District Council (EDDC) future policy planning department. We were told that under the existing policy (incorporating the Regional Spatial Strategy) the council had decided that Verwood had reached its capacity after many years of rapid growth and they would only allow infill housing development in future i.e. no large scale housing development would take place. We realise that the Regional Spatial Strategy has been scrapped however nothing in Verwood has changed therefore we were astonished that the council has done a U-turn and are now considering building up to 415 new houses in the town.</p> <p>We assume these sites have only been included in the core strategy options because landowners have said they would be prepared to sell their land for housing development. We trust therefore that after due consideration the council will conclude that these sites are unsuitable for housing development for the very valid reasons that lead to the previous policy outlined to us in 2009.</p> <p>Our reasons for objecting to further large scale development in Verwood are as follows:</p> <p>Green Belt (South East Dorset). As a general comment building on green belt land should be a last resort, all other options should be considered first. In particular, the site (VWM2) West of Eastworth Road is green belt land and is of particular importance as it is rich arable land (only poor quality land should be used for residential development) and for this reason should remain agricultural land; and has been designated an area of outstanding natural beauty. This part of the green belt is an asset to the town and should be preserved as such, once gone it can never be got back – gone forever. In addition it is understood that there may be rare species of plant and animal inhabitants in this area that need to be protected and preserved which would make the site unsuitable for development. No doubt the council as part of its responsibility will be commissioning a full environmental survey of the site to establish this and I would be pleased to receive a copy once available. Also there are tree preservation orders on many of the trees in these fields, the</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>roots of these trees will be interfered with to get services to these properties.</p> <p>Employment. There are no plans in the core strategy to increase employment opportunities in Verwood; employment presently is very limited indeed, meaning that most people have to travel miles to their place of work. It makes obvious sense to build houses where there are jobs and good public transport. This is particularly important due to the high number of affordable houses being proposed so that low income families would have access to jobs locally with an economical means of getting to work. This is essential in the present climate to ensure people have easy and affordable access to jobs otherwise the council may be creating a problem whereby people end up on benefit through no fault of their own; the ramifications of which do not bear thinking about. On top of this are the obvious environmental benefits of people not travelling long distances to work i.e. pollution, carbon footprint etc.</p> <p>The conclusion being that the housing development should be built in places like Ferndown, West Parley and Three Legged Cross where proposals have been put forward for additional land for employment. Also as the council have a wider environmental responsibility they should not be creating a core strategy which encourages more cars on the roads with the resultant increase in pollution, carbon footprint, congestion etc.</p> <p>Amenities. Verwood population has doubled since 1991 to 15,000 however the amenities have not kept pace with the expansion; in fact facilities, shops etc. have actually reduced in recent years. Doctors, NHS dentists, opticians are all hard pressed to cope with present demand as are schools. Those shops we do have are woefully inadequate or consist of Estate Agents, Hairdressers galore. The bottom line is we do not have enough amenities / facilities to cope at present and as these are largely private enterprises we cannot just magic more out of thin air, it has to be viable to attract businesses and clearly from recent experience we are not a viable proposition. The same can be said about doctors, NHS dentists and schools during this period of austerity when public money will be in very short supply severely limiting the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>possibility of expansion. Contrary to the council's consultant's report Verwood does not have a vibrant town centre; you just have to look at Ringwood a town with a similar population to see what we mean.</p> <p>Additionally, facilities for leisure, children and young people are also woefully inadequate and again seem unlikely to improve for years to come during this period of austerity. There isn't enough for the youth of Verwood to do now but with the prospect of 415 houses, possibly 830 more young people, they are going to cause problems roaming the streets. There are no buses after early evening to take them into Bournemouth or Poole they won't have anything to do. The conclusion is that Verwood cannot cope with anymore large scale housing development.</p> <p>Infrastructure and Transport. It's the same old story I'm afraid the population doubles but infrastructure, roads and public transport fail to keep up with the expansion. It's as if the council approve large scale residential housing development, see it built, and then turn their back and walk away from doing anything significant to improve the infrastructure. We were staggered to see the number of unmade roads serving housing development when we moved here, take Springfield Road as an example. We also understand that Verwood has suffered in the past with so called 'bolt on solutions' which don't work. The fear is that EDDC, based on past record, will build the houses and then leave the residents of the outpost which is Verwood to deal with the consequences. This cannot be allowed to happen. The result is that we have two main routes out of Verwood, Station Road and Edmondsham Road which are no more than country lanes which cannot take the extra cars 415 houses would produce. Public transport (buses) doesn't help much as it too is woefully inadequate, too few houses during the daytime and no buses after early evening at all. We also understand that Wessex Water are in the process of producing a report on foul and surface water sewage and drainage which will make interesting reading; again we would appreciate a copy when it is produced.</p> <p>Affordable Housing. We are very concerned about the high percentage of affordable housing per site being proposed; 40-50% is far too high a figure. Not only would it have an</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>adverse effect on the new estate it would also adversely affect the social harmony of Verwood itself. People would be moved into the area for social housing reasons – low income families, there are very few jobs in Verwood they can't afford to travel to work and so end up on benefit. It is an unfortunate fact, learnt in other parts of the country that having such a high proportion of affordable housing (social housing and shared ownership) brings with it many problems. The council should review this aspect in the light of experiences elsewhere; a more sensible figure would be 5-10%.</p> <p>WVM2 Land west of Eastworth Road (200 homes). More specifically we object to housing development on this site for the following reasons: -</p> <p>1) Shouldn't build on Green Belt land – for all the reasons given in our earlier comments Green Belt (South East Dorset).</p> <p>2) There could be up to 400 more cars as a result of this development, on local roads. Station Road and Edmondsham Road are no more than country lanes unable to cope with the increased traffic. As proposed vehicular access along Eastworth Road is preposterous, it is a very narrow lane inadequate for the purpose. In addition, exit and entry onto Station Road and Edmondsham Road from Eastworth Road by this volume of traffic would be inherently dangerous as would exit and entry from the other entrance onto Edmondsham Road. This is a very significant safety aspect.</p> <p>3) Eastworth Road forms a natural boundary to the town; the new housing estate would by its nature be remote and detached.</p> <p>In conclusion, we feel that EDDC as custodians of the built environment have a responsibility to the environment and the people of Verwood to ensure any development is in-keeping with the town and preserves and protects residents way of life and maintains Verwood as a nice place to live. We would also like to quote two extracts from the EDDC Core Strategy Consultation Document relating to Verwood.</p> <p>a) "The specific outcomes that the planning system should deliver are housing developments in suitable locations which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure".</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							b) "The area of great landscape value area should largely be retained comprises open and gently undulating countryside which forms a key strategic structural landscape element". It is with these in mind that we end by saying that the housing proposals for Verwood in the Core Strategy Consultation Document and in particular site VWM2 land west of Eastworth Road will not fulfil the specific outcome that the planning system should deliver as set out in a) nor that set out in b) for the reasons we have given above.			
502935	Mr Roger Parker		CSO78 21	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503044	Mr and Mrs R Setchfield		CSO79 28	Option VWM 2	Object		We strongly feel, before any further development in Verwood the infrastructure needs to be vastly improved.			1049
503056	Mr and Mrs Semmens		CSO79 46	Option VWM 2	Object		Beautiful countryside!			1049
503062	Mr and Mrs D C Hubbard		CSO79 52	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
503085	Mr P.A. Scott		CSO79 77	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503156	Richard and Jackie Blunderfield		CSO80 45	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
503162	Mr Marcus J Huggins		CSO80 28	Option VWM 2	Object		The road from the A31 into Verwood is not good enough to support extra traffic - rough estimate - 1000 more cars using this road (3081) more people and cars would create extra dangers. There have been many deaths on this road in the past. Improve the roads before considering any big developments!			1049
503171	Sally		CSO80	Option	Support		Build homes so people have somewhere to live BUT what			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Cooke		91	VWM 2			about Verwood's infrastructure? Where are our facilities? Secondary school must be a priority.			
503183	B Chissell		CSO81 65	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503193	Julie Richardson		CSO81 28	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
503197	Mr M Smith		CSO81 44	Option VWM 2	Object		Why build more houses, when there are a lack of facilities, i.e. shops, nothing for the younger generation to do or use. In my opinion, Verwood is just one big housing estate - all you are encouraging is for gang warfare in the future because the kids have nothing to do. Verwood used to be a village - what do you call it now!!!			1049
503203	Mr and Mrs M Squire		CSO81 58	Option VWM 2	Object		Having lived in Verwood for over 30 years we have seen continuous development with poor thought to road systems and town centre shops. Verwood is already a large town in comparison other town populations in Ringwood, Wimborne, Fordingbridge etc., yet has no town centre facilities. Residents are forced to travel at least 7 miles to find a range of shops. Verwood is no longer a village so why pretend that it is? (This is the excuse given for no town centre shops). In fact Verwood offered a wider range of shops 30 years ago when it was a small village than it does now. Please do not allow any further building in Verwood before we have town facilities and fore-thought re - roads to any new properties, especially a school. Margards Lane cannot cope with more traffic.			1049
503218	Mr Chris Beaven		CSO81 72	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood already lacks the facilities to support the current number of houses. This is further development for builder profit and little benefit for the community. Health facilities are already fully stretched, poor public transport and road network to support expansion. Limited shopping facilities exist and the sports centre lacks sufficient facilities.			1049
503230	P Andrews		CSO81 86	Option VWM 2	Object		I would be shocked if plans were passed to increase housing yet again in Verwood. Provision has not been made to cope			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							with existing traffic and shopping problems. This is a town existing in a village environment. It's time to deal with present problems before creating more.			
503233	F Parkes		CSO8256	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503250	Mrs Helen Poole		CSO8275	Option VWM 2	Object		Too many new homes in Verwood, not enough resources for those of us who already live here. Stop filling up our green space! There are far too many new buildings going up in Verwood - We can't cope with more cars on the road, and we do not have enough shops or facilities for more residents - please stop!			1049
503303	Mr Anthony Roberts		CSO8314	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		CSO8341	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
359889	Mr and Mrs P CLARK		CSO8494	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
359920	S PARKER		CSO9548	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		CSO9605	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
360288	Mr & Mrs E T SPENCER	E T Spencer (Heating)	CSO9630	Option VWM 2	Object		The area is growing far too fast with inadequate facilities. We need to keep Green Belt land.			1049
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E		CSO8514	Option VWM 2	Support					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	HACK									
503024	Valerie Measey		CSO8898	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503347	Ms Hardwick		CSO8370	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
503355	Mr Robert Griffiths		CSO8398	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503358	H C Hoare		CSO8427	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503444	R Hobbs		CSO8574	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503463	Mrs Rita Lockyer		CSO8591	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
503477	Mr Edward Fiddler		CSO8636	Option VWM 2	Support		<p>Housing Development in Dorset</p> <p>I am receipt of your publication re the above and other items. During the 1960's certain councils allocated land for development, divided it into plots of about 1/4 acre and sold these plots to individuals. The owners of these plots produced building plans which were submitted for approval. Once approved the owners hired tradesmen to carry out the building work.</p> <p>Most of the owners were relatively new to the housing market. They had limited resources but they were ready to muck in to help with construction. Banks were willing to then to provide stage payments to help cash flow.</p> <p>The end result of all this was a series of beautiful estates with every house different. For some reason this arrangement ceased and I have never found out why.</p> <p>Could I ask you if this facility could be repeated? Such a plan would produce lovely estates and encourage people to act on their own initiative.</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		CSO8676	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503554	Mr D Verguson		CSO8781	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503598	Mr John Turner		CSO8779	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503603	Mrs DJ Morley		CSO8804	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503621	A G Haines		CSO8854	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503624	Mr RT Jackson		CSO8849	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503635	Mr J Gough		CSO8905	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		CSO8945	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503640	N J and S A White		CSO9104	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503644	Mr J Riley		CSO8977	Option VWM 2	Object		Re. Housing / xxx Options Reasons for objections is that as proven on many occasions in our area of Verwood no thought has been given on the visual effect / blending in of new with old and existing properties i.e. flats on main road behind The Hub and the redevelopment of Fayrewood Pub on Blackhill. Also the impact of traffic congestion is always underestimated			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							especially if there is a traffic incident on a main route. More thought needs to be put into providing more facilities for the people/children of our area.			
503666	A H J Paul		CSO9006	Option VWM 2	Support		Re. your statement concerning the District car ownership level, I trust, that despite financial restrictions, that road surfaces are maintained at a high level on the grounds of safety, noise and vehicular damage.			1049
503687	Mr Nick Smith		CSO9078	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		CSO9136	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503695	Mr and Mrs N White		CSO9095	Option VWM 2	Object		If Verwood is to continue to expand, facilities other than a new school are needed. Other towns of a comparable size in Dorset have better/larger more diverse sports and leisure facilities, medical centres, large supermarket, better public transport. Verwood is just becoming one large housing estate with little else. Planning permission should also be considered for new restaurant businesses other than pubs, to enhance the area for residents - Ferndown/Wimborne both have an abundance of these.			1049
503705	B B Morgan		CSO9111	Option VWM 2	Object		Strongly object. Green fields will be destroyed and MORE HEAVY TRAFFIC on Station Road. Where has the Green Belt disappeared to?			1049
503706	Mr David Portnell		CSO9119	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood has very few amenities and this proposed development will just make things worse.			1049
503709	Mr and Mrs A Fairclough		CSO9132	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
503759	Mr		CSO92	Option		No				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	D.J. Middleton		50	VWM 2		Opinion				
503787	Mrs P A Dent		CSO9270	Option VWM 2	Object		I am totally against the development of large housing estates as they are not popular with the public. Also the cost of providing infrastructure will be phenomenal and impact on existing communities detrimental. Far better to use small existing areas of land rubber stamped as Green belt land but of no benefit to the community. These parcels are mainly within residential areas and give immediate access to facilities without overloading them. With a small number of houses built, people can get to know their neighbours better. I, of course, am part owner of such a piece of land.			1049
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		CSO10015	Option VWM 2	Support		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I want to know the projected time scale for these options to start to become active. 2. It is most important that there is adequate employment to accommodate the houses to be built. 3. More attention must be made to supply of affordable housing. 4. The green belt must be respected where possible. 5. The estates around Wimborne must be consulted fully. 			1049
360029	Mr David LANIGAN		CSO10287	Option VWM 2	Support		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy Document, Managing Growth and Development up to the year 2027. I agree with the preamble stating that we need to meet local housing needs, with the emphasis on growing the main settlements where we have good access to facilities that people require. Some development of smaller communities should continue however, especially the provision of low cost housing. The community as a whole needs the services of teachers, nurses, firemen, postmen, and policemen who are poorly paid because they commit to a vocation rather than a high salary job. We also need the services of skilled people such as builders, electricians, plumbers, gas fitters, and motor mechanics, the essentially blue collar professionals. They must not be priced out of the market in terms of being able to buy a starter home, in the community that they serve. Having bought my first home in 1963, a two bedroom</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>bungalow for £2,200 I am aware that locally such a property is currently one hundred times as much. This makes things difficult for young couples with the ratio of house prices to wages being the highest in the country. Many struggle with getting mortgages that now require typically a 25% deposit on an already expensive property.</p> <p>I moved to West Moors 15 years ago and appreciate the planning decisions that have taken place affecting this village. We now have a new build shopping centre on Station Road, complete with flats, good pavements, lighting, pelican crossing and trees. I am pleased to have seen built several small, three storey, blocks of retirement and two bed flats close to the village centre. I support the gradual expansion of the</p> <p>Village, current population around 7,500 as we have good schools, a large Memorial hall, Churches with halls, two public houses, doctors, dentists and good bus services to both Poole and Bournemouth. We have footpath access to open land such as Holt Heath, as well as being able to use the old railway line route through the village to Ringwood, - the Castleman Trail. Recently St Marys Church has had built a new Church Hall which will serve the community and thanks to the National Lottery grant we now have an excellent Bowling Club. I support the continued slow expansion of the village as currently we have many facilities for people of all ages to enjoy.</p> <p>My current house was built in the mid-70s, and has trebled in value since my wife and I moved here 15 years ago. In the 1970s West Moors doubled in size and acquired new schools and since then other infrastructure improvements. In recent years the Library was refurbished. The facilities for retirees in West Moors, with access to Ferndown and Verwood, are very good, and coupled with excellent hospitals at Poole, Bournemouth and Wimborne, and I have felt no need to move from East Dorset area in the conceivable future.</p> <p>I therefore support the proposals for additional housing as outlined in the Core Strategy Consultation, as well as the proposals for business sites for employment. I also support provisions for new schools particularly a new Secondary School at Verwood, and recreation areas to cater for the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							population increase. I understand that net immigration into Dorset is running at two thousand people a year so clearly we need to plan for housing, jobs, education, recreation, road improvements especially at busy junctions, and off road car parking in town centres and on new housing estates. There are many reasons why East Dorset and Christchurch, are attractive places for people to live, work and retire to. Long term planning that caters for the needs of a steady population increase is sensible and is to be welcomed.			
360095	Mr & Mrs John & Barbara POLKINGHORN		CSO9827	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
361105	Mr John GOOCH	Also member of Colehill Parish Council	CSO9915	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
497752	Kelly		CSO10299	Option VWM 2	Object		First build the infrastructure to support any extra housing. Then consider the environment surrounding the proposed developments. It is highly likely that badger and bat colonies are within and/or adjacent to the sites, although I doubt any housing developer will find them before work begins. Where, in Verwood, is the Town centre?			1049
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		CSO9318	Option VWM 2	Object		My objections to the housing are simply the fact that as a Verwood resident, there is already enough houses - far too many for the present infrastructure. Verwood is a joke. It is just a massive, massive, pile of houses in the middle of the forest. Why is it referred to as a 'town'? It has no centre!! New Milton, Christchurch, Ringwood, Ferndown.... they all have healthy centres with lots of amenities. Not enough shops, supermarkets, petrol stations etc. No more houses till this mess is sorted. Soulless.			1049
503861	Mr E Hawkins		CSO9347	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503878	Mr Peter Smith		CSO9404	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503879	Mr S Smithson		CSO9428	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
503943	Mr & Mrs Rumball		CSO9457	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
504093	Mr & Mrs Vivian		CSO9484	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
504101	Mrs Mary Treviss-Bell		CSO9511	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
504193	Mrs Shauna Green		CSO9525	Option VWM 2	Object		We have far too many homes in Verwood for the facilities we have. The Ringwood Road is so busy now it's hard to get out of The Chase now and far too much traffic.			1049
504203	Kate Pursglove		CSO9538	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood does not have sufficient facilities and infrastructure for its present population (shops, sports facilities, high school etc.). It has a growing youth population with nothing for them to do/occupy them. The roads in and out of Verwood are too small to support the current population with frequent accidents, long delays for the slightest disturbance in the traffic and no safe alternative way to get in and out (no dedicated cycle tracks, poor bus service)			1049
504207	L S Dean		CSO9552	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
504216	Mr Mark Rich		CSO9577	Option VWM 2	Object		The facilities which already exist in Verwood are not enough for the community already living here. Doctors, Dentists, Variety of local shops. We moved here to enjoy a peaceful and green environment from a place where there was heavy traffic and continual road noise. I do not want the proposals to go ahead as it will spoil our			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							peace and quiet and your plans are not in keeping with the area.			
504232	Rachel and Paul Higgins		CSO96 06	Option VWM 2	Object		The reason we enjoy living in Verwood is due to its size and community feel. I do not want to live in another Ferndown. The roads and shops will not support more residents.			1049
504241	Mr and Mrs Ansell		CSO96 17	Option VWM 2	Object		Will generate more traffic in Station Road area. Will also generate more traffic, and in Howe Lane, people there cannot get in and out of their own properties there now!! Comments from Verwood Housing leaflet Will generate at least 2 to 3 hundred extra cars per day passing along Station Road which is already difficult to negotiate now.			1049
504243	G Haskell		CSO96 24	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
504285	Mr P Miller		CSO96 57	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
504288	Tracey Doherty		CSO96 39	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
504297	C Johnson		CSO96 67	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood does not need more homes but if you have to build then 30 it is!!			1049
504300	Paul Cocker		CSO96 72	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
504307	Lucy Cocker		CSO96 77	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
504311	Mr Victor Steeden		CSO96 82	Option VWM 2	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood is already heavily overstretched and incapable of giving a good service e.g. poor clearance of debris, road repairs etc. and further housing will do nothing but to add to the already paucity of 'service'!			1049
504314	Ms		CSO97	Option	Object		Regarding key benefits, the current play area is used by			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Selina Roper		17	VWM 2			teenagers for drinking parties. They also intimidate younger children. Fail to see how this would benefit, for instance what pressures would be diverted. The proposed entrances to the site could potentially mean up to more than 400 cars on roads already heavily used by through traffic. The village will become too big and lose its charm.			
504318	R V and P Reeks		CSO9688	Option VWM 2	Object		Parking outside schools horrendous. Cycle tacks in the town needed to encourage use of bicycles. Traffic congestion on town centre frequently caused by loading and unloading at retail stores. Pavements already too narrow for push chairs/buggies.			1049
504344	B Blake-Coleman		CSO9696	Option VWM 2	Object		Lack of facilities for increased population - no NHS dentists, limited medical care, only one supermarket etc. Facilities and amenities need to match increased demand.			1049
504349	A Hall		CSO9701	Option VWM 2	Object		Council have made a complete mess of Verwood - once a good place to live. Where are needed facilities, no infrastructure. A so - called town with one shop, village road, unable to cope. We have enough houses - leave the Green Belt alone. This is Wessex City by the back door. As a lifelong Verwoodian it saddens me to experience the mess the Council have erected.			1049
504468	Mrs M Last		CSO9757	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
504477	Mr Martin Turner		CSO9764	Option VWM 2	Object		I believe there is enough housing in the Verwood area, small developments are ok up to say 20 homes. It is the amenities that need improvement say an upper school for example. The infrastructure i.e. roads are already crammed at rush hour times. The development around Albion Way has produced a lot more traffic that end of town another large development would cause untold misery. We are an old Verwood family and have seen many changes but this is one too far.			1049
504512	Mr E and		CSO97	Option	Object		Population of Verwood already too big for the facilities i.e.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Mrs B Appleby		68	VWM 2			doctors surgeries, public transport too infrequent considering the number of elderly people.			
504517	Mrs T Otton		CSO9771	Option VWM 2	Object		Would the Planning Committee remember that Verwood is a country town? The recent developments, The Hub, Co-op stores and flats just off Crane Drive, look suitable for a substation in outer space - poorly designed and out of keeping.			1049
504530	Christine Phipps		CSO9776	Option VWM 2	Object		The town is over populated now, how will it cope with more families moving here?			1049
504541	Mrs S Newham		CSO9781	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
504572	Carly Bull		CSO9794	Option VWM 2	Object		Land provides valuable habitat and biodiversity including protected species such as owls, bats and badgers. Town does not currently have facilities to support additional residents.			1049
504641	Elizabeth Gresty		CSO9800	Option VWM 2		General Comment	I was born in Verwood in 1920. We do not want any further development - Verwood has been ruined enough - it was once a beautiful little village - you have ruined and wrecked it - the people and residents and awful buildings are not to be admired at all - we need opportunity for the young people. The new people have done nothing to give to give them that.			1049
505273	Mrs Lorraine Hubbard		CSO9854	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
505288	Mrs S Cramer		CSO9889	Option VWM 2	Support	General Comment	As a married mother of 3 children, 2 girls and 1 boy, living in a 2 bed Council flat (first floor), I welcome more housing to the Wimborne area for young families needing affordable housing / rented housing.			1049
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		CSO9961	Option VWM 2	Object		East Dorset cannot supply all the services required to build these houses - electric, water, waste, roads, gas There has already been a study on this subject. Please review!!!			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
505369	J Young		CSO9988	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		CSO10064	Option VWM 2	Object	General Comment	Building more houses has NOTHING to do with meeting the needs of (existing) local residents. We do not need or want more houses in our area. Planning to build more houses is driven by the 'need' to meet externally imposed quotas based on false assumptions on the desirability of further population and economic growth. Instead of wasting resources on building more housing which is ecologically unsustainable, we should be using them to make a transition to a low energy sustainable future for our children. Please listen to local residents and reject further development.			1049
505561	Mr D. Calvert		CSO10114	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
505590	M Spalding		CSO10144	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		CSO10180	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
505742	L. J. Ashplant		CSO10206	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
505802	Mr RGH Chapman		CSO10257	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
360146	Mrs Marilyn A WARBURTON		CSO11163	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
498775	Mrs P L		CSO10762	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Buckler									
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		CSO10 331	Option VWM 2	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			1049
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		CSO10 360	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
506754	Mr Derek E Marsh		CSO10 395	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I have signalled objection to all Verwood development since the town already has significant new build expansion. It is in danger of losing its "village" community ways. Important to planners? – maybe not. The definition of and integration of "affordable homes" is another danger to this.</p> <p>Finally, any development that is made really needs to have: roads and sight-lines etc. in place before house building begins; access to schools and shops provided in plenty of time for new residents; low density development would be more in keeping with this town if any!</p> <p>Am I a nimby or am I trying to protect a rare and valuable asset of English life?</p> <p>I have lived through 2 phases of Basingstoke development, and though at poorly run "infill" in Benbridge - a town much like Verwood!</p>			1049
506934	Mrs R Hall		CSO10 400	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I strongly object to any further building, housing or otherwise, in Verwood as the infrastructure cannot even cope at the moment! The doctors are so busy any appointment within 2 – 3 days is virtually impossible. The bus service is atrocious, nothing after 6pm and during the day it's only hourly. There are no decent shops and not a great deal of evening entertainment for adults without hordes of children running around. Traffic some days is really at a standstill at school times. I have to go to Muscliffe for a dentist as I can't get in here!</p>			1049
506975	Mrs V Kesler		CSO10 405	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>There is already horrendous traffic down Margards Lane with school traffic; more traffic (school) will make matters much worse for us residents.</p> <p>There are no humps to slow the traffic which does speed</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							down at well over 30mph. There is no speed camera to slow traffic, Margards Lane has become rather a "rat run" speed is awful, several cats have been killed, and the noise and shouting of school children and parents – leaves a lot to be desired! Verwood RA form- Verwood does not need any more/further developments and in particular NO MORE SCHOOLS. Margards Lane is already a nightmare with the awful school traffic.			
506984	Mr T Newnham		CSO10 410	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood needs improvements for existing residents. More dedicated play space for young adults, new provision for youth clubs. There is a 'need' for improved services for food shopping and fuel for cars. Up to a potential of 1000 new residents with an estimate 300+ cars would congest and degrade the road system. Also medical provision and education would be put under strain and degrade present services to existing residents.			1049
506989	Mrs Barbara Harris		CSO10 415	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood needs a bigger super-market and another filling petrol station prior to more housing. Morrisons wants, and needs to be enlarged prior to any more houses being built. Verwood is a large village as it is.			1049
507026	Mr David Craig		CSO10 440	Option VWM 2	Support	General Comment	I would like to see priority given to projects which have a higher concentration of social housing inclusion, and also include a higher green/renewable energy provision. Particular concentration on family areas, playgrounds and social/community facilities should be considered.			1049
507032	Mr David Oliver		CSO10 466	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
507033	A R Twaits		CSO10 492	Option VWM 2	Support	General Comment	Despite improvements to public transport, cycling and walking, the reality is that the vast majority of journeys will continue to be made by car. Local roads are already congested and the extent of development proposed is not acceptable without significant increases in the capacity of these roads for cars. In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.			
507132	Ms L Joyce		CSO10 535	Option VWM 2	Support		Plans for Verwood: In supporting options VWM 2, 4 and 7 it is essential that consideration should also be given within these plans for a new large food store as currently the Morrisons store is far too small and does not meet the needs of the current community let alone the development of new homes as well. Also we desperately need a new secondary school but within that! I would like to see plans for a new leisure centre and swimming pool for Verwood. Otherwise I would be very reluctant to support any new developments and would urge the council to re-consider the current options with a view to inclusion of: extensive food store; new leisure centre, that developers could contribute to these two things alone would alleviate traffic pressures, pressure on QE and Ringwood plus wider area.			1049
507136	Mrs S A Segal		CSO10 543	Option VWM 2	Object		I have lived in Verwood for 26 years. When my husband and I first arrived here there were more small and varied shops and also four banks. I do not think that we could happily and safely sustain the amount of new residents that is being planned for.			1049
507141	Smallman		CSO10 548	Option VWM 2	Object		All you ever want to build in Verwood is more houses. Where are you going to promote and build commercial/ business areas to create local facilities/ employment? Building a school next to 2 existing schools will create massive road jams. This should be built next to Trinity school where the road system is better.			1049
507144	Paul Brewer		CSO10 554	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507152	Mrs A E J Dolan		CSO10 559	Option VWM 2	Object		There are no work opportunities in Verwood therefore roads through Verwood will be further clogged fighting to get to cities south and north for work. We have not the infrastructure for this vast amount of housing. I object most strongly to the whole concept.			1049
507160	Mrs		CSO10	Option	Object		I think that Verwood's infrastructure will not be able to cope			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	H Walker		564	VWM 2			with any further development. Even if a new upper school is built the amount of cars would be unacceptable as Verwood is so spread out not many children would walk to the school.			
507170	Miss A K Jukes		CSO10 588	Option VWM 2	Object		When I moved to Verwood in 2000 I was informed and read for myself that Verwood would not expand any further. As houses have been sold and subsequently demolished, there have been many infill homes built to replace them. I am under the impression that sites VWM 1, 2 and 3 are sites of old munitions dumps therefore unsuitable. Anywhere on flood plain e.g. VWM 4 and 7 are without question, unwise. More facilities required e.g. swimming pool and more shops – not hairdressers or supermarkets!			1049
507178	Mr Paul Banning		CSO10 596	Option VWM 2	Object		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is disingenuous to show the proposals without showing existing planned development – please publish these plans. • In the past 20 years Verwood has experienced exponential expansion of residential property and now need a period of time to mature and create an identity and community. • These proposals will lead to the increase of motor vehicles (c.500) and daily vehicles journeys measured in excess of 1000. This increases atmospheric and noise pollution and leads to a reduction in quality of life for existing residents. Because Verwood is a dormitory town it already experiences high levels of road usage as it is essential to use a car for most activity. • EDDC will fail in its promises (especially 1+3) if these plans proceed. • The parking on the public highway at Trinity school is already a danger to pupils and local residents (no access for emergency services) and this will greatly exacerbate the problem. <p>Additional comments were made in a letter dated 12.1.11: In our view it would be inappropriate to expand the town of Verwood, as it has already experienced almost exponential population growth since the beginning of the nineties and now needs time to mature and establish a sense of identity. For a town the size and population of Verwood the facilities and shopping areas are only adequate, and they need more time to develop before making a significant increase in new</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>houses. For this reason, and the more detailed points that we make below, we are against the proposals.</p> <p>The main concern is the proposed use of greenbelt for further encroachment of suburban sprawl into the countryside. A main attraction of Verwood is that it still retains a rural feel, especially at its northern edges and its boundary with Ringwood Forest. We believe this should be maintained, and not jeopardised for the future by a further sprawl of relatively high density housing. You do not publicise the capacity for additional houses within the existing non-greenbelt boundaries of Verwood, and this is a serious omission to the integrity and transparency of the planning process. This should be addressed in the next round of the planning process.</p> <p>There is also a lot of detail on the proposals to build houses, but very little on facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>An example of this, are the proposals for VWM 1 and 2, totalling 230 homes many of which will have young children. My understanding is that the existing Trinity School is already full, and so First School capacity would need to be increased, or provided elsewhere in Verwood. An increase in capacity at Trinity School would lead to an increase in volume in traffic at the start and end of the school day. The parking and delivery of children is already chaotic, often making the roads impassable if emergency vehicles need access to the houses accessed through Edmondsham Road and Coopers Lane. This in itself reflects poorly on the organisational abilities of the school and local authorities to provide a suitable solution. The attitude appears to be move the problem outside of the school premises (for reasons associated with litigation) onto the surrounding roads, without concern for general public and pupil safety. The proposals for mitigation of traffic volumes (walking trains etc.) fell away very quickly. It would be interesting to understand how Trinity now compares with best practice in this regard.</p> <p>As an example of town planning, this is a microcosm of poor implementation and follow through that must be a concern for any changes proposed by a planning function at local authority level. My household experience of EDDC planning since moving to Verwood is very poor. In my previous 30+ of</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>home ownership I have experienced reasonable responses in my interactions with the local authority. With EDDC I have had to make a letter of complaint, also escalated another issue to the LGO. This does not give any confidence that EDDC can manage the changes proposed in the Town Plan to a successful conclusion.</p> <p>We are concerned that the Consultation document makes no attempt to set out a financial plan for the strategy. I have to say that in my years of working in large business the idea of strategic planning without an indication of the financial implications would have been anathema. In the 8 years that we have lived in Verwood we have experienced above inflation levels of Council Tax increases without any obvious changes in services. Having compared the Council Tax payable in Verwood with a number of houses in the same band in Dorset and Devon, I have been surprised that Verwood is more expensive than most. This is particularly surprising since the value of our house in Verwood is usually substantially less than the houses in these other areas.</p> <p>So the Plan makes no commitment to the existing Council Tax payers that any proposals will be at least financially neutral to them. Indeed the majority of the proposals will not bring benefit to the existing Tax payers, but the contrary. While Verwood retains a rural feel, it is essentially a commuter town. Most people whose to live here but work elsewhere – as shown in the planning documentation. We see little scope to change this, so any increase in housing brings with it increased traffic noise and atmospheric pollution. An increase of more than 400 houses will, we estimate, bring 1 – 2000 additional car journeys per day, mostly during peak hours for work commuting and school runs by runs by parents. This will again further tip the balance from Verwood retaining a rural character, to just becoming a noisy, crowded suburban sprawl.</p> <p>We are also concerned about some of the proposed Key Features and Benefits that are shown in the planning documentation. For example, under VWM 2 it says the proposal 'could provide valuable green infrastructure....divert pressure away from the heaths to the north of Edmondsham Road.'</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Firstly, it is unusual to claim to provide valuable green infrastructure by turning green belt into housing development. Secondly, we regularly (twice daily) walk into Ringwood Forest to the North East of Edmondsham road, often without meeting another soul! So where is the pressure? These types of claim bring into question whether anybody writing the plan has been to these places, and indeed the accuracy and veracity of what is being written.</p> <p>So, in summary our views are that the plan should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preserve the greenbelt wherever possible. 2. Retain as much rural character in Verwood as possible. 3. Address existing noise pollution and not exacerbate this. 4. Focus on meeting the needs of existing Council Tax payers, as prime stakeholders in the community. 5. Promote organic growth in the provision of both housing and facilities. 			
507183	Mr G Roberts		CSO10 591	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507207	Paula Edwards		CSO10 600	Option VWM 2		No Opinion	<p>I live in Verwood and I wanted to make comment about the proposed developments. As we are one of the fastest growing towns in Europe I would like to add that its great having all this housing but we do need more facilities to accommodate the needs of each and every family, i.e. a super leisure centre with swimming and great sporting facilities for young people to adults is needed. More improved bus facilities for quicker access to neighbouring towns, and cheaper fare so that people will be encouraged to use the bus rather than the car (the Spanish bus was so cheap and so well used it was great).</p>			1049
507213	Ieuan and Janice Davies		CSO10 606	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>We have lived in Verwood for 32 years. It was a village and now a town which has always lagged behind its growth in terms of amenities and infrastructure. We need a period when we reverse that trend. Let's have more parks/play areas/ proper shopping areas and sports facilities, even a municipal public swimming pool before more houses and hideous blocks of flats.</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507218	Mr and Mrs J Smith		CSO10 628	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507219	Mrs Louise Spencer		CSO10 621	Option VWM 2	Object		I object to any more new homes in Verwood as at the moment all the facilities are overstretched, schools are full and doctors are full. Not enough shops and HSBC bank closed. Buses are only every hour only one petrol station, 3 pubs all for very different tastes. No leisure facilities for teenagers. The parking at Emmanuel middle and Verwood first schools is absolutely dreadful and the roads couldn't cope with more traffic if more places were available. A new secondary school would need a very big car park and new road. Some roads in Verwood are in a dreadful unmade state e.g. Manor Lane, St Michaels Road and Howe Lane (in places).			1049
507220	R Sharples		CSO10 622	Option VWM 2	Object		The land between Verwood and Three Legged Cross appears appropriate for new housing as it almost represents infill between the two settlements, whereas any significant building to the other (West, North, East) sides of the town encroaches too much on the countryside. VWM Housing leaflet- No Opinion			1049
507235	Mrs Margaret Chalk		CSO10 634	Option VWM 2	Object		Don't spoil Verwood anymore. The new road was bad enough and the new shops aren't at all inspiring, not enough thought was given to the choice as far different ones were needed as there are not any really decent shops in Verwood. There are three hairdressers also estate agents all within a stone's throw of each other. We only really have small village facilities considering the large number of houses that there already are in Verwood.			1049
507253	Joyce Smith		CSO10 643	Option VWM 2	Object		Please no more! Verwood will end up being a place that no one wants to live.			1049
507264	L F J Garratt		CSO10 649	Option VWM 2	Object		The area is overcrowded at present. The majority of the residents (voters) do not want change. Listen to the majority voice.			1049
507269	Michael and		CSO10	Option	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Alexandra King		659	VWM 2						
507272	A E Cook		CSO10 665	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507274	Miss M Kettless		CSO10 684	Option VWM 2	Object		3 buildings which have ruined Verwood. 1) the flats which look over the Hub, and another 44 which nobody wants, there should have been a green area. 2) the flats with the stupid wavy roofs. 3) the Co-op which is being built onto of the traffic lights this is so dangerous vans park on the bend it is going to be an accident plus 3 flights flats people around this building are so angry. We would like to see these buildings pulled down, no-one new there was an application for the Co-op until it was passed, and people say we did not need another food shop as we already have 3 and why was it passed in Bristol, did anyone bother to come down and look where the building was and to see how dangerous it is going to be, and now 44 flats looking over the Hub, the police, and the fire station said no to it, the people of Verwood don't want any more housing, what builders have done to Verwood have ruined it with their designs.			1049
507275	A Saxby		CSO10 673	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood has had more than its share of development during past 10 years. Housing development will put undue pressure on roads and facilities in town.			1049
507279	Anne Tubbs		CSO10 676	Option VWM 2	Support		It would be very good to have affordable homes for our young ones.			1049
507286	Mr N P Butler		CSO10 700	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood needs more infrastructure before more homes are contemplated i.e. facilities such as a leisure centre, supermarket etc., incentives for more businesses to set up here to stop it continuing to be simply a dormitory town. I am not surprised that Dorset has the highest level of car ownership in the country. A large percentage of it can be seen leaving Verwood between 7am and 8.30am every morning!			1049
507326	Mr and Mrs M		CSO10 715	Option VWM 2	Object		There should be no further 'major' housing developments in Verwood. Verwood is becoming over crowded, the roads are			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Salter						very busy, doctors' surgeries and the schools are overcrowded. Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support more people! It does however need a secondary school, swimming pool / leisure centre and decent shops. Access in and out of Verwood is very poor given the amount of people who already live here!			
507330	Mr Malcolm Lay		CSO10 716	Option VWM 2	Object		Transport and infrastructure has to be a priority in Verwood prior to any new homes. To even be thinking about building more homes is irresponsible of the council, unrealistic and will result in the local area being ruined. The council also need to attract new companies, entrepreneurs to the area to stimulate jobs as unemployment will increase substantially otherwise. Comments from Verwood Housing leaflet Until Verwood has a proper infrastructure no new homes should be built. We require urgently a proper, updated, expanded supermarket together with petrol station, new doctor, dentist, a proper bus service and a large leisure centre. Also the roads cannot handle the current level of traffic.			1049
507335	Mr J Bridges		CSO10 735	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507336	Mr John Page		CSO10 767	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
507345	Mr B Hodgkins - Wright		CSO10 753	Option VWM 2	Object		I am against the two larger developments as the facilities in Verwood are already stretched and are inadequate for further medium sized housing development. Housing tends to increase in numbers, but a short fall in amenities is in many cases years behind subsequent developments. The tipping point here will be the increase in traffic as a result of a poor public system.			1049
507353	Mr and Mrs M		CSO10 790	Option VWM 2	Object		How can you consider building on the beautiful greenbelt land opposite my house is frankly unbelievable. This is a quiet			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Morgan						safe place I bought to bring up my children. How would you like it if someone suddenly built 200 homes in front of your house. I don't think that would happen!!			
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		CSO10 860	Option VWM 2	Object		We strongly object to any housing development in Verwood, there are not enough facilities to cater for this amount of proposed development and we are particularly concerned about the effect it will have on the first schools that are already at full capacity and the middle school which could become oversubscribed! It would also have a fundamental effect on our children not having enough spaces at QE School in Wimborne. Verwood is a nice green and safe place to live; we do not need any more development!			1049
507361	Mr Kenneth Archer		CSO10 816	Option VWM 2	Object		SNAP:A big issue concerns the A31 motorway which would need to be developed into dual carriageway to join up with the A35 motorway. As already stated on all the other survey's Verwood is so lacking in essential facilities to build new housing before sorting out this problem would turn Verwood into one very large housing estate and little else ,especially the figure of 40% being ear-marked as so-called social housing the town would see a massive exodus of its existing residents who have grown to love being part of Verwood's community.			1049
507362	Mrs J F Preece		CSO10 811	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		CSO10 894	Option VWM 2	Object	General Comment	The area alongside the A31 between St Leonards Hospital and Tricketts Cross is an area where many houses could be built. Currently this area is an eye-sore and gives a bad impression to visitors as they cross into Dorset from Hampshire. Why are nearly all your proposals on greenbelt land? There are many areas in East Dorset on non Green Belt land which could be built on. Your proposal (FWP 4 and 5) will put more pressure on Parley Common as well as introduce more traffic on an already busy road system.			1049
507366	Dennis A		CSO10	Option	Object		Larger Morrison supermarket to be extended to meet the			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Pattensen		824	VWM 2			demands of the current population together with the addition of a petrol outlet.			
507372	Andrew Innis		CSO10 837	Option VWM 2	Object		EDDC uses Verwood to fund other areas - the infrastructure needs to be improved before any more houses are built.			1049
507378	Ms Anni Dencher		CSO10 857	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507379	Mr J M Leno		CSO10 858	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood do not have infrastructure for total number of houses proposed and object to green belt development of houses, or commercial use.			1049
507386	D Hobbs		CSO10 881	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507388	Mr David Huggins		CSO10 917	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood in my opinion has seen many housing developments in the last 12 years. There seems to be no sympathy for the character of Verwood. Blocks of flats are built where a single location two storey dwelling once was (Fayrewood Public House Location). Verwood has become an area in which any architectural style is 'nodded' through by planners. I would like to see small developments of houses (at the most) and old buildings replaced by similar size and shape, new build if absolutely necessary.			1049
507395	Geoffrey and Valerie Coates		CSO10 898	Option VWM 2	Object		No more houses until bigger supermarket and better roads out of town - another school, and doctor's surgeries can't cope already with numbers.			1049
507402	Mrs V Crout		CSO10 920	Option VWM 2	Object		Building should not take place on Green Belt land. Church Hill already suffers from too much school traffic. Manor Road is always extremely busy. With more housing it will become even worse.			1049
507409	John Crout		CSO10 939	Option VWM 2	Object		My concern is that you planners have allowed piece meal development with very little regard to the infrastructure, and the roads in particular. I would suggest that Church Hill and Manor Road already exceed their design capacity.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507418	Mrs J Alexander		CSO10 950	Option VWM 2	Object		Strongly object to building on Green Belt land! Verwood would not be able to accommodate further building of new homes given its present infrastructure, it would destroy the area!			1049
507425	E M Connick		CSO10 958	Option VWM 2	Object		Having been familiar with 3 Cross and Verwood since the early 60's when my sister and family lived in 3Cross, later my parents in Verwood and now 2 brothers living in the area, I would like to object to this huge development. Verwood was a relatively small village in the 60's that has grown and grown with little improvement to the infrastructure. The Green Belt has been nibbled away and the narrow roads are quite dangerous for the youngsters and the elderly. We ourselves have lived here since 1993 and we feel this development would be a step to far. We lack so much including facilities like a swimming pool.			1049
507435	J Barnacle and S Bennington-Fewsey		CSO10 969	Option VWM 2	Object		We would oppose any further developments in Verwood with the infrastructure that is in place at present, and the alarming amount of affordable housing being proposed, coupled with the erosion of what's left of open fields and land in Verwood.			1049
507451	F Williamson		CSO10 986	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507461	Mr G J Babb		CSO11 004	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507487	Mr W A Linter		CSO11 038	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
507499	Mr M Ward		CSO11 053	Option VWM 2		No Opinion	These developments do not affect me directly. But. The infrastructure cannot cope. Supermarket not large enough. Doctors have long waiting times for consultation. Chemists cannot cope. Suggest supermarket is rebuilt immediately incorporating leisure centre. Centre to be transferred to land at 'the hub' which is not economically viable.			1049
507524	Mr		CSO11	Option	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	C G Richardson		086	VWM 2						
507555	Mr and Mrs C Lamond		CSO11 113	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
359890	Mrs G.M. PROWSE		CSO11 347	Option VWM 2	Support		VWM 1 - This area and part of VWM 2 is the only grade 2 land in the parish. WWM 1 is well suited for much needed allotments.			1049
361037	Mr P STRATFORD		CSO11 324	Option VWM 2	Object		I expect that my objection to everything is not very practical. However, I have lived in the area for most of the last fifty years. In that time there has been a constant cycle of the council saying we need more housing, followed by we need more industrial areas to provide extra jobs for all the new homes. Then in turn the council says we require extra jobs for the new homes, then in turn the council says we require extra homes for the new workers. This process is never ending. During this time I've witnessed the creation and expansion of the industrial estates at Ferndown, Uddens, Ebblake and Wimborne. A whole new housing estate at Tricketts Cross, Glenmoor Rd Ferndown, the expansion of West Moors, Colehill, Verwood turned from sleepy village into a town. In this time I am not aware of any developed area being returned to its natural state from a developed one. Please let me know if you think differently. I hope you agree that my objection to development is rational and that the never ending cycle of expansion is stopped.			1049
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary Hendy		CSO11 741	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
507580	Mr and Mrs P & J Gardner		CSO11 146	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507595	Mr D		CSO11 181	Option VWM 2	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Johnson									
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		CSO11 224	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
507668	Mr Gavin Lee		CSO11 236	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507693	Mrs P Carter		CSO11 276	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507699	Mr Robert Rawles		CSO11 254	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood lacks a vibrant town centre but are close to having the population equivalent to Ringwood.			1049
507708	Mr Powell		CSO11 279	Option VWM 2	Object		We object to all the development if there are no plans to improve the infrastructure - 415 houses = potentially 830 more cars. No leisure facilities, no decent bus services, no cinema, swimming pool, bistros.			1049
507716	G R Cridlan		CSO11 294	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507721	Mr M O'Kelly		CSO11 300	Option VWM 2	Object	General Comment	Existing facilities in Verwood are inadequate for the existing population. To increase the population by circa 2,000 will only acxxxxx what is currently a poor situation. You really need to show how you will improve bus routes, roads, centre of town etc. etc.			1049
507723	Oliver Stonehouse		CSO11 305	Option VWM 2	Object		I strongly object to further large developments in Verwood. Verwood is being overdeveloped, without adequate infrastructure of local amenities and services being available. Roads cannot cope with the extra industrial traffic. The town has been spoilt, with ugly buildings and long traffic delays due to poor roadworks. Children have been put at risk of road accidents. Verwood town centre and residential areas are an eyesore with masses of uncollected rubbish. Council cannot cope. Building planning is not thorough enough.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Consideration must also be given to the damage caused to wildlife and woodlands, something the Dorset is famous for.			
507730	Mr Vince Woolley		CSO11 310	Option VWM 2	Object	General Comment	<p>Verwood has no infrastructure, we have trouble with anti-social behaviour from youths, dangerous level of traffic in front of Emmanuel Middle School.</p> <p>To have a new secondary school so close to Emmanuel Middle School plus 415 houses will only make the situation far worse!</p> <p>By email having just viewed the plans for your redevelopment near Howe Lane Verwood you appear to be making what is a bad situation in Verwood worse</p> <p>at this moment in time there is no infrastructure in Verwood, anti-social behaviour by a large youth element who have been avoided in the new "Verwood Hub" so they have nowhere to go. Congested traffic which is extremely dangerous for children going to and from Emmanuelle School.</p> <p>The police are powerless to control the anti-social behaviour by youths that hang around this area, nobody will do anything about the traffic until a child is injured and yet you want to increase the traffic flow and build a new secondary school. I can sure that having discussed your intentions with local residents you will receive a strong protest from us all. Please stop this insanity before it starts.</p>			1049
507733	Mrs Susan Phillips		CSO11 315	Option VWM 2	Object		Close to SSSI land. Green Belt.			1049
507737	Mrs S Philpot		CSO11 319	Option VWM 2	Object	General Comment	<p>I believe that crime and vandalism will rise in Verwood if more houses/people come to the area as the community feeling will be lost. A larger school will also mean that housing near the school will be subject to rubbish, vandalism and graffiti, too many extra cars when there is already a problem at present. Getting in and out of driveways at present is a precision manoeuvre so as not to run anyone over! there is not a problem with the children travelling out of Verwood to upper</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							schools, QE has just spent a lot of money to accommodate the intake of children and this will be irrelevant if you take away the children from a very good school.			
507744	D Timpron		CSO11 330	Option VWM 2	Object		The large new developments proposed will seriously reduce the (apparently) rural aspect of the town by being visible when approaching Verwood. The VWM1 development would also be visible on approach but at least it is a relatively small development.			1049
507752	Mr Glen Bailey		CSO11 339	Option VWM 2	Support		Bring it on more jobs.			1049
507755	Maureen Niblock		CSO11 355	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to accommodate another fifteen hundred people. There is nothing there - particularly for teenagers or adults. The Council ignored the wishes of the inhabitants and built The Hub instead of the swimming pool, which most people wanted, and which would have been great for young and old alike. At present there is little vandalism. This will change with a large influx of teenagers from big towns and cities. Traffic problems will increase. Doctors and dentists will be overwhelmed making it even more difficult than ever to get an appointment.			1049
507760	Mr and Mrs R Gardner		CSO11 367	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507768	John Niblock		CSO11 377	Option VWM 2	Object		We moved here because, like many other people who moved here, we wanted to live somewhere quiet in the countryside. Since we arrived ten years ago there has been almost non-stop building. There are insufficient amenities in Verwood to serve the present community let alone another fifteen hundred people and eight hundred extra vehicles. The road between Verwood and the A31 is already dangerous and with extra traffic will get worse.			1049
507771	Mrs P M Coventry		CSO11 379	Option VWM 2	Object	General Comment	Lack of shops. 70 people waiting for allotments, objection to taking land designated green belt. Why not in-fill between Verwood, 3X, Ashley Heath and West Moors and allow a			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							smaller Castle Point, to serve these areas, thus saving trips to Bournemouth or Salisbury. You assured me some time ago that there was to be no more estates built in Verwood, only in-fill, i.e. knock down and put 3 - 4 up.			
507780	V R Strickland		CSO11 392	Option VWM 2	Object		I am sorry but I think you have already spoilt our lovely Verwood. PLEASE, PLEASE leave us alone.			1049
507782	Jennifer Baxendale		CSO11 397	Option VWM 2	Object		Too many			1049
507786	Ms Helen Scriven		CSO11 406	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		CSO11 454	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507795	A M Baxendale		CSO11 412	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507805	Mrs N J Wareham		CSO11 422	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
507808	Mrs J V Atyeo		CSO11 427	Option VWM 2	Object		We need more shops, as people are coming to retire in Verwood they may not be able to travel out of the town to shop. Also the school should have been here years ago.			1049
507812	Mr D Masters		CSO11 432	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507817	Mr R Gulliver		CSO11 445	Option VWM 2	Object	General Comment	The new housing does not improve anything in Verwood. We do not need more homes!! We need a Secondary school to build a future for our children. We should not be held to ransom, that if we allow the housing, we will get a Secondary School, because we all fear that you will just walk away and leave us with nothing.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Why use Green Belt land, when the council has brown land that it can use. i.e. land behind the Police Station for Social Housing. The Nursery's, Pre-schools, Schools, Doctors, Dentist etc. cannot cope. 400 homes will create another 800+ cars and 1,245 to 1,660 people. NO! NO! NO more!			
507833	Mrs Johnson		CSO11 462	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507839	Margaret Williams		CSO11 479	Option VWM 2	Object		When my husband and I came to Verwood nearly 12 years ago, it was a delight to walk into the village centre along Ringwood Road. Not anymore. The amount of traffic has increased dramatically in proportion to the growth of what was then a small town. The growth of Verwood has been noted as the fastest growing town in the country. I suggest it is big enough.			1049
507869	B O'Kelly		CSO11 496	Option VWM 2	Object		Current facilities are moderate - to add up to 2,000 additional occupants is foolish and unacceptable. It is time our elected representatives began to represent us.			1049
507891	Mr R W Johnson		CSO11 509	Option VWM 2		No Opinion	Further Bus services or more frequent existing routes (36, 36a, 37) or Yellow Buses to extend to Verwood from West Moors? Depending on these being practicable of course.			1049
507899	R J Potts		CSO11 514	Option VWM 2	Object		There should be no more houses built without adequate infrastructure, in particular more shops and a second supermarket in the centre of the town.			1049
507909	G Waterton		CSO11 522	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507915	R Waterton		CSO11 527	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507931	Mr and Mrs R S W Spicer		CSO11 539	Option VWM 2	Object		We are new to Verwood but feel that Verwood is very much over houses with very little infrastructure. Verwood was and still should be a village.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507941	Mr and Mrs Avril and George Jeavons		CSO11 544	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507946	Mr and Mrs K Carter		CSO11 547	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
507957	Mr and Mrs L R Vining		CSO11 556	Option VWM 2	Object		415 x 2 cars per household plus 1 petrol station and only single carriage roads = gridlock! We don't have enough doctors' surgeries or infrastructure to cope!! with this there is almost zero public transport!			1049
507965	Mr Jack Harvey		CSO11 578	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>We consider Verwood housing has already outgrown the size of the town. There would be insufficient services to support what would be at best another 400 families.</p> <p>There are still many unmade-up roads in Verwood awaiting the promises of 20 years ago. These roads have got progressively worse with all the new building work - Manor Lane in particular as the builders got away with not repairing the damage done during the build of the Spring Close area and new houses on what was an open field.</p> <p>Traffic that should use Margard's Lane persists in using Manor Lane as a short cut and with a new secondary school this would increase.</p> <p>We understand that the Health and Safety rules say that there should be at least two made-up roads to the school to provide IN/OUT access in the event of an emergency - Margards lane or Springfield Road /Close to Howe Lane as was on the ORIGINAL PLAN.</p>			1049
507968	Philip Chivers		CSO11 567	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>The larger developments are too big. large amounts of social housing will be detrimental to the area - crime will rise, unemployment will lead to anti-social behaviour. Council tax already ridiculously high so how can we fund extra facilities, police etc. required.</p> <p>Email</p> <p>I would like to comment on the new proposed housing developments in Verwood. Although new houses are inevitable, I believe that there are a number of issues which</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>need to be addressed.</p> <p>The infrastructure in and around Verwood is just not in place yet and the town needs time to develop and get things in place before so many houses are built.</p> <p>Schools - there are insufficient places in schools which means either an additional school or extensions will need to be built. Who will pay for this?</p> <p>Medical - The Dr's surgery is already stretched to the limit and will never be able to cope with such an influx. who will pay for new services?</p> <p>Road systems - I believe that the roads will simply not be able to cope and am particularly interested in access for the vwm2 area? I note from the document that you talk about bike lanes, these aren't required as if you live in Verwood you need a car to get anywhere else!</p> <p>Water - The water pressure is already a problem due to the number of new flats built in Verwood. What will another 400 homes mean?</p> <p>Employment - during the recent meeting at the Hub we heard about how half the population of Verwood leave the area to work so lack of jobs wouldn't be an issue - Half leave because there are no jobs in Verwood. Working for a national company I understand about recruitment and profiles of various people. With 50% of people in social housing, I know for a fact that on average they won't travel more than 5 miles and won't be working from home and creating new business. If we therefore intend to move people here from other "council estates/waiting lists" this will simply create a poorer life for all. I grew up in social housing so know better than most the result of this policy! We will certainly need more police and other social resources. Who will pay? Will the residents in social housing be paying full council tax? If not who will make up their shortfall. As it is our council tax is already ridiculously high!</p> <p>So what is the best way forward? Provided access and roads have been considered I think the developments should be smaller in particular VWM2 which is a really large development. Why not build 1/4 of the proposed homes spread across all zones and phase the overall growth over 15 years to allow time?</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							No doubt this is a done deal and council members have hidden interests in this but I think you should be really consider the size and impact of what you are proposing.			
507980	Sylvia Allen		CSO11 594	Option VWM 2	Support		Any extra traffic at Parley Cross and Longham would be unbearable without major road improvements. Re more homes at Parley Cross.			1049
508383	Ms Emma Hayter		CSO11 709	Option VWM 2	Support		Think it is important for East Dorset to have affordable housing. At the moment I work in East Dorset and am looking to buy my first home, places in East Dorset are very expensive and am having to look outside the local area. I really don't want to move too far from my job.			1049
508413	Mrs S Best		CSO11 769	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
508529	Jackie Chivers		CSO11 862	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
508532	L C E Leman		CSO11 869	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
508535	D G Sandy		CSO11 883	Option VWM 2	Object		There is not enough facilities at present for Verwood other than food shopping i.e. Morrisons you have to travel several miles to the next nearest town for any other goods, Verwood has become a hotch potch of housing developments, with no effort for other facilities and infrastructure. We don't want any more houses.			1049
508545	Dorothy Goodenough & Alan Craddock		CSO11 894	Option VWM 2	Object		There is insufficient infrastructure/facilities etc. shops, swimming pool to sustain an increase in the population of Verwood. Until Verwood has better facilities and a more frequent bus service (currently one hour service) increased housing puts a greater strain on our community.			1049
508554	Mr P Mitton		CSO11 903	Option VWM 2	Object		No more houses! We need more facilities - especially a swimming pool.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508560	Mrs Coral Collins		CSO11 912	Option VWM 2	Object		The roads and facilities in Verwood cannot cope with any extra houses, it will spoil what is a very nice place to live.			1049
508577	Mr and Mrs R J Ribbons		CSO11 923	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure, e.g. buses, shops, leisure facilities, parking etc. to support yet more housing.			1049
508580	Mrs Kirkcaldy		CSO11 933	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
508588	Michelle Hocking		CSO11 948	Option VWM 2	Object		There are already too many empty properties in Verwood. Some remain half built for months and become an eyesore. The planning office don't appear to have any control over the building. The height of the properties is excessive in a small town totally out of proportion.			1049
508596	Whyberd		CSO11 958	Option VWM 2	Object		The area does not have enough facilities to support all the extra people that the new homes would bring.			1049
508609	Patricia Thorley		CSO11 984	Option VWM 2	Object		I have lived in Verwood since 1976 and strongly object to any further development. The once rural location has been over-developed - and many other properties have been lost or inappropriate houses have been built in gardens. I would question the need for more housing - it seems to satisfy a buy - to -let market only - our roads are over-burdened with traffic. I believe enough is enough - we need to protect rather than destroy our environment.			1049
508611	Mrs Rosamond Heaven		CSO11 989	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
508628	Martyn Heaven		CSO12 006	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
508635	Mrs I A Jordan		CSO12 013	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
508642	P		CSO12	Option	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Williams		022	VWM 2						
508650	Mrs M Peters		CSO12 030	Option VWM 2	Object		I would not like to see any further large developments in Verwood as it would lose its character. Also it would need improved facilities (perhaps a swimming pool in the new school which the public could use at times). I am also concerned about the extra traffic.			1049
508656	Mr and Mrs J Fry		CSO12 044	Option VWM 2	Object		Although we are all for improving Verwood and its facilities, we feel that the above future plans will only cause problems within the town. If land is registered as Green Belt then it should not be built on for a reason. We don't have enough facilities for the residents of Verwood as it is, what it would be like with another 415 houses would be a complete nightmare! No No No!!!			1049
508664	Mrs Sharon Hak		CSO12 058	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
508671	Barry and Carole Bull		CSO12 084	Option VWM 2	Object		The plans for yet more housing is lunacy. Roads in and out of Verwood are few and already totally inadequate at the busy times of day for the amount of traffic, particularly the Ringwood Road. Where are the new inhabitants of these 415 houses going to work? Not in Verwood! So even more cars to clog up the road to Ringwood for hours each day. Any sane person can see that Verwood is already overdeveloped for the infrastructure it can sustain. It's about time we stopped these lunatic planners from using Verwood, only just in Dorset, as the repository for all their county housing requirements, so that they can avoid the difficult issues which challenge them in development of towns and villages in the rest of the County. Now's the time to say enough is enough - they have already wrecked Verwood enough already with overdevelopment and equally lunatic road systems			1049
359931	R E PETERS		CSO12 856	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
477753	Mr Stephen		CSO12 629	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood's infrastructure cannot handle this level of house building. There are insufficient jobs and poor public transport.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Saville						Each new family adds approx 2 cars and the roads cannot cope. VWM 4 in particular is completely unsuitable for any additional traffic. Crime will inevitably rise with the addition of social housing.			
508690	E and R Wood		CSO12 095	Option VWM 2	Object		No more homes! Sell what is built first then think of the amenities etc. - Council and builders are the only people who will benefit.			1049
508696	Kate and David Fuller		CSO12 101	Option VWM 2	Object		Apart for the lack of infrastructure and facilities, indiscriminate (and ghastly) new buildings and ridiculous alterations to traffic flow have already resulted in the decline of Verwood. Our car parks have become 'Park and Ride' facilities for people living long distances away and using their free bus passes.			1049
508709	Mr and Mrs Bennett		CSO12 107	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
508711	Tina Alexander		CSO12 117	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood has already developed too quickly. Facilities have not been reflected. The recent new homes are out of character and shoe horned in. There is overflow of flats already, let these be taken up before considering further new development.			1049
508715	David Drayton		CSO12 128	Option VWM 2	Object		Not enough infrastructure to support more families living in Verwood.			1049
508718	Sienna Drayton		CSO12 133	Option VWM 2	Object		Not enough infrastructure.			1049
508735	Mr Peter Barham		CSO12 143	Option VWM 2	Object		I have lived in VERWOOD for 28 years from the start of the original building boom. Population growth from 3000 to 14000 and a town. A school since constructed at the bottom of my road and the traffic has been increasing substantially to the point where 2 times a day there is gridlock with cars up and down Margards Lane. Before any new houses or school expansion is even considered there must be a solution to the traffic both around the school and in other areas of Verwood. There will be a			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							serious accident / injury waiting to happen with children and pedestrians.			
508738	Mankin		CSO12 149	Option VWM 2	Object		We have enough traffic problems as it is.			1049
508826	Mr R.G. Smith		CSO12 160	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is already over developed, from a pleasant country village into now a sprawling dormitory town without a heart or character. As a villages laced with lanes and sandy tracks, consecutive councils have eroded its natural beauty until we now have vast tracts of housing. Refuse these developers plans and call a halt to these cancerous estates, remember this, once granted, the damage to the countryside is irreversible.			1049
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		CSO12 194	Option VWM 2	Object		The Council is always after land for housing or business development. Whatever is granted is never enough and a few years later they want more. This process has been going on for over 50 years and it is time it came to a stop. Enough is enough as it is ruining the area.			1049
508842	M G Carlyon		CSO12 208	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>The facilities have not kept pace with present housing situation so approx 400 new homes will only make matters worse. Verwood lacks the infrastructure to support more houses. Traffic is bad at present, more houses will increase this.</p> <p>Comparisons: RINGWOOD - 2 supermarkets, Upper school, Boots, Iceland, Smiths and High Street of shops. WIMBORNE - 2 supermarkets, Upper school, and square of shops with more leading shops in roads leading off The Square. FERNDOWN - 3 supermarkets, Upper school, Boots and numerous shops. VERWOOD - 1 small supermarket, no Upper school, and some very small shops. A Post Office which was here when Verwood was a village. Some people use Three Legged Cross or Cranborne P.O. because of the long queues. This shows that Verwood has a long way to go to catch up with any of the other towns. More houses will make the situation worse.</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508848	M Lardner		CSO12 210	Option VWM 2	Object		General comment - I would like the results published so all can see them - i.e. not in local papers which are not always delivered.			1049
508852	Mrs L.A. Chesshire		CSO12 255	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
508853	Charlotte Rout		CSO12 220	Option VWM 2	Object		Not enough infrastructure.			1049
508857	Mrs and Miss EJ and P D Goode and Smith		CSO12 238	Option VWM 2	Object		There is an insufficient infrastructure of roads and services for a large increase of housing in Verwood. The B3081 (leading to M27 and M3), already under pressure, would see a significant increase of traffic. The Edmondsham road is a country lane completely unsuitable for a large increase of traffic. Large tracts of unspoilt countryside would be built on and nearby wildlife would be threatened. NW7 and 3 already struggle with traffic problems in school term times. Such an increase of residents would inevitably lead to a demand for more shops, services and leisure facilities - and where would they be built?! Verwood really is big enough NOW!			1049
508859	Matilda Rout		CSO12 234	Option VWM 2	Object		Not enough infrastructure			1049
508863	Mrs L A Seward		CSO12 249	Option VWM 2	Object		These developments VWM 1 and VWM 2 are very near SSSI sites. The road from Edmondsham is not sufficient to deal with the increased traffic.			1049
508865	Miss B A Page		CSO12 264	Option VWM 2	Object		A secondary school needs to be around Potterne Park area (if at all: even one of 500 pupils will have a wage bill of £1 million p.a.) (I was a clerk to the Governors of a large secondary school). The Howe Lane one would be impossible for people to drive to - and parents won't use a bus if at all possible. NB. Ferndown Upper is under-subscribed. I am pleased that the area around Doe's Lane (Dewlands Farm and into Horton) has been left undeveloped: it would be the death knell of the nature reserves on Dewlands Common			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							if it were developed, and a problem to fulfil the EU directive on river valley protection (The Crane flows across the end of Doe's Lane.)			
508867	Mrs J Martin		CSO12 270	Option VWM 2	Object		I moved to Verwood in 1985 - we have no more amenities now than we did then! The road system is to serve a rural village and cannot cope with the volume of traffic and you want to make the situation worse??? You apparently have orders from 'upstairs' to provide 415 more houses - and you will - so why send these forms - I guess you have to show that you did!			1049
508874	Mr Orkney		CSO12 277	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		CSO12 321	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
508890	Mr L Rackham		CSO12 291	Option VWM 2	Object		Would it not be best to just leave well alone.			1049
508898	K Banning		CSO12 304	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
508907	Heather Teasdale		CSO12 314	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
508923	Mrs L Earl		CSO12 386	Option VWM 2		No Opinion	My opinion would only be valid if the proposal was either put into place or dropped. For the Proposal. We know the local government have to abide by government's ruling for more sustainable housing therefore it is inevitable that building will eventually come. More population should create a livelier environment adding to events we already have in place, such as farmers markets, carnivals, rustic fayres, shows at the Hub (which must be badly attended as they are always short of cash), and Memorial Hall, Heritage centre etc. Obviously more rates would help local government which should help create extra			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>amenities for local people.</p> <p>We already have a lack of shops. West Moors which has a smaller population has far far more shops . We also have 1 petrol station which denies us the benefit of competition. 400 more homes would probably increase the population by over 1000 making the area more desirable for business. Extra money from rates could help create more places of leisure or expand those we have for our teenagers who hang around with nothing to do, perhaps a skate park or club. I would like to see any extra cash put to use making a hard surface cycle lane on one side of the Verwood to Ringwood road. Going south there is a path already for most of the right hand side, but not suitable for cycling.</p> <p>Against the proposal</p> <p>Large areas of council type housing. Nice family houses are always acceptable with interspersed council run at say 5% - 10% this would stop the rough teenage element that most people fear. Roads are not good enough to take the extra traffic that an increase of about 800 - 1000 extra cars would cause. Schools would have to be enlarged as well as the proposed new school. Well in advance of the housing, and has the Council got enough funding for this. Will the extra population cause problems for our car parking, which is often full, making it necessary to enlarge it, making us have to pay for it in the future?</p> <p>If the plans go forward may I suggest that the roads are made up by the developers. Verwood already has far too many roads that are a hazard if one has to drive down them, it is totally unfair to tradesmen, doctors, ambulances, postmen, etc. who through no fault of their own risk flat tyres and broken suspensions.</p>			
508938	Mr Michael Smith		CSO12 369	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
508956	Mr T Webb		CSO12 378	Option VWM 2	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508973	Mr Kevin Reynolds		CSO12 397	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
508975	A W J Seaward		CSO12 398	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
508985	Mr N Meyrick		CSO12 437	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
509040	J W Hislop		CSO12 443	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
509043	Mrs P Craven		CSO12 465	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is getting too overcrowded. Lack of facilities is a big factor. So many people - more cars and reduced to only one petrol station!			1049
509053	Mrs B Macfarlane		CSO12 458	Option VWM 2	Object		More population will make Doctor's surgery appointments even longer - already over one week.			1049
509062	Clare Symons		CSO12 468	Option VWM 2	Object		1. Verwood has more than its fair share of modern housing estates. 2. Development southwards is least favourable. Need to retain green space between Verwood and Three Legged Cross. 3. Transport improvements? Few people in Verwood, buses too slow for commuters. Latter mainly drive via Ringwood or West Moors, much congestion. Would developer fund dual carriageway or new road?			1049
509065	Mrs B Burge		CSO12 502	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
509072	Juliet Garratt		CSO12 486	Option VWM 2	Object		There are too many houses now for the current infrastructure. If more are built it will only lead to increased problems with roads, services i.e. doctors, lack of garages and shops. Surely it would be more appropriate to build on less congested sites. Perhaps the site of the old hospital at St			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Leonards which must already be marked as a 'brown site'. If East Dorset District Council persist with this plan the area will be irrevocably destroyed by over development. Despite Verwood being called a 'town' because of the increase in population it is in real terms a village. A town has facilities and shops which we do not. I like the area as it is, that is why I moved here and any attempt to turn the area into a suburban sprawl is resented by yours truly. Verwood will see the movement from a caring population to a transient population. The residents will only live here because of access to work, they will not be the life force of the village. In other words they will not care because Verwood will be like a lot of other villages that have been swallowed and become dormitory towns of other larger conurbations. I have seen it happen, don't let it happen here.			
509099	Mrs L S Timberlake		CSO12 514	Option VWM 2	Object		These plans will instigate the demise of Verwood socially and economically. Current infrastructure is inadequate - Roads/Doctors/Dentists/shops Begg's belief that we were refused permission to relocate the access to the front of our house, but there are now plans to completely reshape and redevelop the whole area.			1049
509116	E I Sams		CSO12 534	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
509128	Susan J Cheese		CSO12 542	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
509251	Frances Hudson		CSO12 595	Option VWM 2	Object		Leave Verwood alone, it's grown too much already - the infrastructure and the facilities cannot cope as it is. Verwood is a beautiful place to live - don't spoil it with more houses, more cars and more kids on the streets with nothing to do. This is just a recipe for disaster.			1049
509293	Caroline Laraman		CSO12 616	Option VWM 2	Object		I understand the need to develop and support a growing town, which is the case in the current climate. But my concern is that the Government can afford to build a secondary school, secondly maintain the school for the forthcoming years. Also the schools especially primary and pre-school are			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							currently oversubscribed, so what will be done to resolve this with more families? Also what other facilities are available, e.g. swimming pool etc.			
509421	Mr J Dowling		CSO12 648	Option VWM 2	Object		Unless Ferndown and Wimborne schools are oversubscribed, I think the building of a secondary school in Verwood is not a good idea, as it only breeds local gang culture into our youths. It is far better for young people to mix with people from other areas, as it lessens the us and them culture.			1049
509861	Mrs V Aitken		CSO12 877	Option VWM 2	Object		The objection to the bigger sites is that facilities and amenities in Verwood have not kept up with the building of new homes in the last 30 years! Fine to encourage young people with affordable houses but they will bring in even more cars because Public Transport is not there! Can Verwood road structure stand all the extra traffic? Verwood needs the Secondary School but how about all the extra traffic. It is bad enough with the First and Middle Schools.			1049
509899	Mr Peter Harfleet		CSO12 891	Option VWM 2	Support		With all the additional housing there must be an improvement in the bus services and local facilities, especially the only large supermarket in the area 'Morrisons', which cannot maintain its services for its customers at present, let alone with more residents. It should be encouraged and helped to expand its present site.			1049
509922	Mr and Mrs V Feltham		CSO12 922	Option VWM 2	Object		Very serious consideration should be given to the following: 1. Verwood has no proper infrastructure - Doctors surgeries are already at bursting point and there are no available places on NHS Dentists waiting lists. 2. There's nowhere in Verwood (other than the charity shops) to purchase clothes, shoes, bedding and other household essentials. 3. Would it not be better to build the school at VWM 4 where sporting facilities and open spaces are already available at nearby Potterne Park? This in turn would relieve traffic congestion which would arise at VWM 7 if the school was sited there.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							4. To erect the number of homes outlined in the document would mean a tremendous increase in traffic. Verwood is already a commuter town with people already having to travel to work, and with no proper facilities for shopping have to go to Ringwood, Bournemouth and Poole. To increase the volume of traffic would seriously affect safety and the environment.			
361121	Mrs Elizabeth JONES		CSO14 018	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
482795	Mr and Mrs N F Steel		CSO13 875	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
500746	Mrs J Lothian		CSO13 797	Option VWM 2	Object		Where are the jobs for all these households? A part from the fact that 415 houses means 600 - 800 cars extra (Not allowing for teenagers on future) people will have to travel to work daily. In recent years the traffic through West Moors has doubled. Traffic from Verwood every hour of the day. The 'sleeping policemen' road hump at the end of Pinehurst Road/Moorside Road junction/Station Road is useless as the cars drive straight across the hump, in fact 1 in every dozen cars drives to the right hand side of the 'hump', into the oncoming traffic from the A31 and flyover from Ferndown! There should be a stop sign to pull out onto this roundabout before we have hundreds more vans and lorries to cope with.			1049
509952	Tracey Legge		CSO12 951	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
510420	Mr Peter Stevens		CSO13 159	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		CSO13 249	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
510532	W.W.		CSO13	Option		No				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Chant		294	VWM 2		Opinion				
510623	Mr Douglas Priest		CSO13 394	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
510798	Mr F Sullivan		CSO13 537	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
510844	Mr Michael Guilmany-Cush		CSO13 581	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R. Mayes		CSO13 629	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
510974	Mr Jim Cullumbine		CSO13 657	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
510993	R.A. Cherrett		CSO13 693	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
511001	Mr Paul Few		CSO13 689	Option VWM 2	Object		A larger population means crime WILL rise, at a time when police cuts are huge. Less officers to deal with road safety issues. With many more children living in the area, Doctors, Schools and other vital services will suffer at a time when all are looking to make cuts. The population of Verwood is BIG ENOUGH!			1049
511015	Mr Christopher White		CSO13 745	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
511020	Mrs E Derbyshire		CSO13 719	Option VWM 2	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511030	K Derbyshire		CSO13 736	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
511044	Mr B L Buckman		CSO13 752	Option VWM 2	Support		It's ok to build all these new homes so long as we can have a swimming pool built. Years ago this idea was rejected because of the lack of population in Verwood. Also we need a good shopping centre much like West Moors. Also a B and Q or Homebase save having to travel to Bournemouth to help the DIY man in Verwood. We also need another petrol station (I hear Morrisons may have this soon).			1049
511047	Mr Andrew Bull		CSO13 749	Option VWM 2	Object		VWM 2 requires Green Belt boundary to be moved. Development would be inappropriate to urban scene. Land currently provides valuable habitat and biodiversity. Land houses protected species including owls and bats.			1049
511056	K H Saunders		CSO13 775	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
511058	Mr W Taylor		CSO13 773	Option VWM 2	Object		I feel that 99% of new homes will be for new arrivals, and that all services cannot cope, no matter what the developers promise.			1049
511069	Mr John Cheese		CSO13 798	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
511076	Mr Ian Burden		CSO13 832	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
360097	Mr John DOWLING		CSO14 502	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
511095	Mrs Warburton		CSO13 844	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
511117	Mr and Mrs G McConnell		CSO13 846	Option VWM 2	Object		Our particular objections to the proposed new homes are as follows:- 1) Medical services - We already have difficulty in getting			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							reasonably prompt appointments to see a doctor. An extra 1,000 (?) inhabitants would make matters much worse. 2) Telephones - We live next door to the BT exchange. Within the last year or so, increased overheating of equipment has required the installation of noisy, forced ventilation. Another 400+ phones has the potential for creating really objectionable ventilation noise.			
511128	Eileen Housden		CSO13 859	Option VWM 2	Support		The new secondary school should be built before the houses are developed. This has been proposed since I moved into the 'village' in 1979 when the population was a fraction of what it is today. Verwood is now just a dormitory town totally lacking in character and identity. The planning is appalling and hopefully no more blocks of flats will be allowed - the blocks of flats near The Hub are monstrous.			1049
511135	S D and N Richards		CSO13 872	Option VWM 2	Object		In relation to the proposed development of schemes VWM1 and VWM2 and the attached plan from Mrs S Burrows we would like to raise the following concern: At present we run a holiday letting business with three cottages from Eastworth Farm that are marketed as being in a rural area with country views and walks. Obviously if the above schemes become a reality, it would ruin our business because there would be no rural aspect and the volume of traffic passing about 3m from the front doors would be horrendous. This aside from our personal aspect, which we enjoy living at Eastworth Farm with the views and reasonably quiet road yet have the facility of a town nearby. From our point of view, we feel the following point is relevant to the proposed development: Should development take place along Eastworth Road with any of the above schemes, the conservation boundary be taken around the boundary of Eastworth Farm. Therefore, our land would be included in the 'brown field' area giving us the possibility of including our land in the development proposal and the opportunity to lift the section 106 agreement, thereby changing the cottages to residential units. We have had discussions with Mrs Burrows regarding the proposals and have agreed that our land can be included in			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							their scheme should the inevitable take place and the development goes ahead.			
511137	Sarah Barrow		CSO13 867	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
511175	Webber		CSO13 888	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
511181	Pauline Barrow		CSO13 897	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
511189	Miss Pamela A Stannard		CSO13 920	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>My comments and reasons for objection General comments. Verwood has grown by 500% in the last 20 years. During this time very little has been done to improve the infrastructure to support all this development. Much of the character of this former village (now town) has already been destroyed. We have a duty to protect what remains. The greenbelt, areas of special scientific interest and areas of 'special character' (in the proposed South Verwood Development area) have so far survived. The proposed development on this very special part of South Verwood would be on greenbelt land and runs close to the River Crane (a triple SSI). This must not be allowed. The residents of Verwood and EDDC have in my opinion a duty to protect this very special area and our heritage.</p> <p>Transport issues. Increase in traffic. The current infrastructure/roads in Verwood are already inadequate. The West Moors bypass originally planned to ease traffic problems in Verwood following previous developments was scrapped in favour of new homes. No doubt this would give more revenue to EDDC than any bypass!!!! What I want to know is when are you going to give something back to Verwood???? How do you propose to deal with the increase in traffic and the problems this will cause if these developments go ahead? Potential increased risk of flooding and drainage problems. How would any new development be drained?? I understand the river Crane is a triple SSI so I assume water will not be drained there? I also understand that according to Councillor Flower the drains in Manor Road are 'not fit for purpose' and</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>already 'full to capacity'. I therefore assume water cannot be drained there either? People have shown me photos of flooded fields in the Verwood South area that would serve the Manor Road development. I know the water levels are high in parts of St Michaels Road and peoples gardens are already waterlogged during winter months. Surely further development of land in this area can only make things worse. You only have to look at what happened to the listed cottage in Burnbake Road following land development in that area, The cottage and grounds were so damaged the cottage had to be pulled down!! Do you want this to happen to St Michaels Cottage (also Listed) as well??? Increase in development means increase in surface water. Are you prepared to take the risk and increase flooding in the Verwood South area? Are you prepared to be accountable for your actions and responsible for any damage you cause to privately owned property????</p> <p>Encroachment on greenbelt.</p> <p>I have lived in St Michaels Road for 22 years. I understand that land beyond Howe Lane is and always has been greenbelt. This area must be protected for our future heritage. You only have to walk down the farm and beyond to realise how peaceful and special this area is. St Michaels Road and part of Manor Road are also areas of 'special character'. This is confirmed in the Council Plan (2004). What will happen to wild life that depends on areas like this? This area will be destroyed if this development goes ahead.</p> <p>In the 22 years I have resided in St Michaels Close I have seen much change. This change has not been for the better. I feel privileged to live where I do and have direct access to the delights of walking up St Michaels Road and beyond the farm on a summers evening or a Sunday afternoon. I am able get away from the hustle and bustle in the Manor Road area. I witness bats in my garden on a late summer evening despite living toward the developed end of the road. Much wild life depends on this area for its survival. I have seen evidence of badgers in my back garden and have witnessed many rare birds visiting my garden. For example, woodpeckers, chaffinch, green finch, jackdaws to name but a few.</p> <p>Ten years ago Verwood was described as the most rapidly</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							developed town in Europe. We have had enough now. If this council is so concerned with providing affordable housing why did it sell land adjacent to the hub to a developer who I understand will not be providing affordable housing? There is plenty of brown belt land around Verwood that could be used. I understand that during a recent Dorset study, the majority of survey respondents said they were against housing construction on the countryside, yet the report's conclusion was in favour of development?! I would ask EDDC what evidence they have that suggests there is a 'need' for housing in this area? If the evidence for housing need is bogus, as has been suggested to me, and if the wishes of the local community are being ignored, surely there is no justification for building on otherwise protected land in the open countryside?			
511200	Audrey Barrow		CSO13 906	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
511211	Mr Peter Hodges		CSO13 931	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
511236	G Thomas and J R Thomas		CSO13 932	Option VWM 2	Object		Church Hill is already blocked with traffic at school times. Enough is enough!			1049
511246	Mr and Mrs Daniels		CSO13 941	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
511252	Ms Mary Harris		CSO13 950	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
511294	Mr Alan Dorey		CSO13 979	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and Diana		CSO14 067	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Froud									
511430	A.D. May		CSO14 198	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
511489	Mr H G Holden		CSO14 180	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
511571	Colin Alborough		CSO14 235	Option VWM 2	Support		We are in desperate need of more affordable housing in the East Dorset area. There is also a shortage of employment opportunities in the area. The provision of more houses should help to push house prices down to give young people a change of getting on the property ladder.			1049
511618	Mrs V Blunden		CSO14 303	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
511621	Ms Mary A Combe		CSO14 281	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
511711	Coombes		CSO14 441	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
511997	Mr Tom Saville		CSO14 807	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is big enough; it doesn't need or can cope with any further development. More traffic as a result of more houses will be a disaster for the town; Verwood should not be turned into a dormitory Town.			1049
360809	Mr Brian Skyrme		CSO15 414	Option VWM 2	Object		New secondary school in Howe Lane is the wrong location – support new school on land west of Trinity school. This to be built and opened before housing the middle house building period is finished. Also all roads and parking facilities to be completed at the opening date of the school. House building on the scale suggest in ridiculous without the infrastructure to support it. By this I mean, transport, shops, leisure, doctor surgeries, etc. etc.			1049
476264	Mr		CSO15	Option	Support					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	David Reddaway		684	VWM 2						
500817	Mr L Lothian		CSO15 367	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>1) Re use or develop existing empty houses.</p> <p>2) Each house has 2 – 3 cars not 1 car. There is too much traffic and congestion in west moors. We do not need a bypass either.</p> <p>3) There are no jobs here, build the houses were there is work i.e. Bournemouth or Poole, not our green land.</p>			1049
511374	Mr Shane Smith		CSO15 186	Option VWM 2	Support		<p>We have been concerned regarding the volume of traffic along Howe Lane already, and the addition of any additional housing would in our opinion cause too much strain on these old roads. As it is a fire engine could not pass during school runs. The two main roads leading out to the A31 already too busy during peak times and the addition of this number of houses would be a problem we think. Also we are worried about ruin our view – which is why we bought our house in the old area of Verwood as it was quite rural feeling.</p>			1049
511376	Mr Filip De Kock		CSO15 197	Option VWM 2	Support		<p>I support the development simply because it will hopefully enable my land to become development land rather than devalue my property.</p>			1049
511383	Mrs Jean Archer		CSO15 253	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>Existing infrastructure needs greatly improving before any new building could be considered – need senior school but build it next to trinity.</p> <p>Morrisons needs updating and competition, need another petrol station and dentist, doctor can't cope now (waited 9 days for appointment).</p> <p>In fact we need a decent shopping centre and road system. You can't have it all ways. With the amount of houses it's no longer a village more like a town with few amenities.</p> <p>SNAP:A big issue concerns the A31 motorway which would need to be developed into dual carriageway to join up with the A35 motorway. As already stated on all the other survey's Verwood is so lacking in essential facilities to build new housing before sorting out this problem would turn Verwood into one very large housing estate and little else ,especially the figure of 40% being ear-marked as so-called social housing the town would see a massive exodus of its existing</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							residents who have grown to love being part of Verwood's community.			
511449	Mr K F Armstrong		CSO15 261	Option VWM 2	Object		Option VWM 7 must have new road access developed first along Howe Lane and into Manor Road. Margards Lane is not suitable for construction traffic and is already grid-locked twice per day.			1049
511453	Mr & Mrs Weeks		CSO15 277	Option VWM 2	Object		We object to any further housing in Verwood as there is not sufficient infrastructure to support it. We appreciate that a senior school is needed but are extremely concerned re the access to it and parking. The traffic in Margards Lane is now sometimes grid-locked and a further school would make this an even worse situation. We are amazed that a further school could be built in this vicinity. Safety is also an issue here as is access to emergency vehicles.			1049
511508	Mr & Mrs J E Maiden		CSO15 288	Option VWM 2	Object		Virtually no infrastructure has been provided to Verwood in the last 20 years despite the explosion in population and development. Already the road system towards Bournemouth is at breaking point if ever maintenance is required. I believe Verwood has twice the population of Wimborne but only a small fraction of the facilities, I don't want to move again!			1049
511549	Ms Debby Andrews		CSO15 319	Option VWM 2	Object		There are barely any facilities for current residents and they certainly will not stretch to 400 more homes. Provide infrastructure first and then maybe I wouldn't object.			1049
511564	Ms Emma Prince		CSO15 336	Option VWM 2	Support		I support these proposals providing that any developers are required to provide allotments sites to the north and south of Verwood to meet the current huge level of demand. And also the facilities in Verwood (leisure etc.) need to be improved to cope with additional demand.			1049
511620	Mr Neil Hudson		CSO15 342	Option VWM 2	Object		You simply cannot go ahead with major expansion of Verwood (already grown from 3000 – 13000 approximate residents in 25 years) without addressing the infrastructure of Verwood itself. The roads are a classic example most			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							residents commute out of Verwood to work. Most of this is either towards Ringwood or towards West Moors. There is already traffic build up at junction points. The access to Emmanuel school is currently down Church Hill and Margards Lane. I have recently written to the county council over the current vehicle situation affecting residents of Margards Lane, Haywards Lane, Howe Lane, Keswick Road, Lancaster Drive with drivers on the school run (in an 8 min spell I counted 250 car movements). The noise pollution is currently unbearable. When it rains we are close to gridlock (with the implications of emergency vehicle access) Margards Lane was never designed as the main school access. Any further expansion will make matters worse; you need a school access relief road built now!			
511827	Mr J Kennard		CSO15 354	Option VWM 2	Object		I'm sure there are many good reasons why affordable housing could be increased in Verwood; however access and increased traffic issues have been touched on by the community. Public transport is poor for people living in Verwood: Serious investment is needed to improve transport infrastructure between Verwood and neighbouring towns and cities without constantly increasing the size of the town.			1049
511836	Mr J Middleton		CSO15 361	Option VWM 2	Object		Build all amenities first (i.e. more useful shops, sporting facilities, better bus services, more doctors etc. etc. etc.) more exit roads out of village??			1049
511850	Mr & Mrs R C Williamson		CSO15 385	Option VWM 2	Object		I believe the town of Verwood is unprepared for such expansion. Also building on agricultural or woodland is short-sighted, as in long term the country will need land to grow our food. The council should use brown sites as there seems to be quite a few.			1049
511855	Mr Alan Thorn		CSO15 393	Option VWM 2	Object		It would be crazy to build 400 new homes without major investment in the infrastructure, with only one road in and out of Verwood and not enough doctors and dentists and only one major supermarket for 15,000 people. If the government took responsibility for building affordable housing you would only need to build 180 new homes not the current 400 proposed. This would work out cheaper in the long run as you would not			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							have to make major investment in the infrastructure.			
511868	J Weedon		CSO15 445	Option VWM 2	Object		Any increase in housing in Verwood has an impact on the traffic through West Moors. No consideration has been given to this. Improved infrastructure is needed before housing developments.			1049
511878	Mr Paul Seymour		CSO15 500	Option VWM 2	Object		I support limited development around the Trinity school area as the road system has been 'improved' in that area. I believe a small development would have no further detriment to the area. I do not support any further large scale development in Verwood or infilling of green field in Howe Lane as the area is already 'busy' with existing houses and traffic for the schools.			1049
511980	Mr Stuart Folley		CSO15 506	Option VWM 2	Object		The school is required to meet the requirements of existing population. Additional homes will put increasing strain on an already highly populated town.			1049
512072	Mr W B Chung		CSO14 829	Option VWM 2	Object		No homes in green belt.			1049
512125	Mrs Julie Long		CSO14 902	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
512145	Mr & Mrs J Dutton		CSO14 928	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support any big development of houses, i.e. – shops are insufficient in the village, Morrisons is far too small to cope with the population as it is now. Also doctors surgeries could not cope and what about water and sewage? Could you open the old railway line – what a boom this would be for our busy roads!			1049
512175	Mr Noel Baugh		CSO15 146	Option VWM 2	Support		The larger concern is one of a village infrastructure (Verwood) through shops and facilities (lack of) supporting a population of 17000 already. Look at Ringwood. It's no greater population but has a better 'high street'. A larger Morrisons will not alter this per se..			1049
512281	Graham Roberts		CSO15 008	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
512326	Mr Ian Willis		CSO15 065	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
512431	Mr & Mrs Lee		CSO15 160	Option VWM 2	Object		No further development of Verwood should take place until improvements have been made to facilities available to existing residents. Transport links, health facilities, shopping and work places are sadly lacking and its short sighted of council to propose putting pressure on these. Keep Verwood as a small town where it is currently a pleasant place to live. Leave us alone.			1049
512557	Ms Karen French		CSO15 179	Option VWM 2		No Opinion	It is a 'catch 22' situation in that in order to have a new secondary school we need new housing. The main concern is the lack of facilities for an increased population. Although Verwood is a town it has the feel and facilities of a village.			1049
513509	Mr Roy Brodie		CSO15 405	Option VWM 2	Object		As residents of Verwood for the past 16 years we would like to comment on the proposed Core Strategy. We are concerned that during our time here the population of our town has doubled but the infrastructure has stayed the same. It's true we have had a new community centre built and Ferret Green has been made a pleasant area but very little has been done to improve our roads. There are only two roads to connect us with the A31. These are extremely busy during the early hours and evening rush. Often cars entering Ringwood Road from side roads have a long wait. Huge delivery lorries block the traffic at Tesco and Baileys. The prospect of another four hundred plus cars frightens us. Surely we have had our fair share of new houses built in recent years, indeed it was once rumoured that Verwood was the fastest growing town in Europe. Many young families who moved in during that time no have children able to drive. Let's sit back now and improve what we have then think about building more houses.			1049
513545	Mr and Mrs J H Butcher		CSO15 387	Option VWM 2	Object		Please see my letter dated 17.11.10 to Head of Policy Planning. Dear Sir, Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Consultation			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>My Objection to VWM 2 re Land to West of Eastworth Road My wife and I attended the Verwood Hub on November 11th and met the Council Planning staff. It was helpful because previously there had been so little information available, we and our neighbours, were in a state of bewilderment of what was being proposed.</p> <p>I think it is fair to say that the land it is proposed to build on, is designated Green belt and it is a surprise the boundary can be changed with so little formality. I had the mistaken impression land was designated in this way to protect the countryside.</p> <p>I do not know if you are any member of your staff live in or near Verwood. My wife and I have a good knowledge of the town, and though it must be considered a town, we have always had the pleasure of feeling we are living in a village. This will go for ever if these proposals are approved.</p> <p>The land in question is right next door to my bungalow. I can understand there is a need for affordable housing in Verwood but why so many in this location? It will change the local atmosphere in so many ways and it will be hard for the town to digest so many new families.</p> <p>Yours faithfully J H Butcher</p>			
513581	Nicola Beesley		CSO15 408	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>In 1987 the population of Verwood was less than 10000 and the figure available for 2009 was 14820, representing an increase of 51%. However the Verwood Town Council has stated, 'that the population is expected to rise to a peak of 15000 and then hopefully stay at that level.' Obviously the figure of 15000 was determined as a result of the Council undertaking full and proper assessments of the facilities that exist in the town to support the citizens and with the due cognizance of the East Dorset District Council Structure Plan. However much the District and Town Councils deserve praise for achieving their own objective, it should be argued that there is currently an inadequacy of proper facilities to serve the needs of the existing population and they must now apply policies to ensure that the needs of the Town inhabitants are properly addressed before additional dwelling places are built.</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>The population of Verwood is already larger than that of Ringwood without the civic amenities and the people of Verwood deserve better, a proper leisure centre including a swimming pool and adequate shopping facilities. However good the service from the existing retail businesses: is a tiny post office, one petrol station; a handful of shops, and a small dated supermarket really adequate?</p> <p>Traffic in Howe Lane is atrocious particularly during rush hours with additional hazards of the school parking - emergency vehicles cannot get through now at key school times. To build adjacent to St Michaels too will mean the unmade section of Howe Lane will become a proper metalled road with the consequences of speeding increased traffic levels.</p> <p>The area between St Michaels Road and Manor Road is currently designated Green Belt land by the existing East Dorset Structure and Local Plans. Environmentally these developments are a potential disaster with the loss of much needed green space for relaxation and the habitat for local flora and fauna in addition to increased traffic and pollution volumes such development will undoubtedly bring!</p> <p>Heavy traffic flow on Manor Road currently causes congestion and safety hazards at busy times without the extra volumes which can be expected from another 165 homes - potentially 330 cars BEFORE the offspring enter the market for vehicles.</p> <p>Under each succeeding structure plan East Dorset District Council has consistently, met and exceeded the housing targets set for it, while protecting the Green Belt and the environment of the District.</p> <p>Approval of these proposals can only lead to the destruction of the Green Belt and the local environment and future development MUST only be allowed to proceed on brown field sites within the jurisdiction of East District Council.</p> <p>The Town Council should continue with the objective of maintaining the population at its own pre-determined level and reject these proposals, restricting any development to that which improves the amenities and lifestyle of that population.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Nicola Beesley			
513617	Valerie J Brown		CSO15 419	Option VWM 2	Support		<p>In moderation. I support moderate increase in housing but the following issues must be addressed first. 1) access to Verwood via Ringwood Rd- a dangerous road too narrow for the present traffic in rush hour. 2) Access to all the sites should protect present residents 3) General services to Verwood suitably increases 4) Money for new school (and services) definitely available 5) Woodland areas e.g. St Michaels/Howe Lane corner protected. ^ St Michaels Rd left xxxxxx and unlit. No xxxxstreetxxxxxlot of traffic on this narrow side road. No access from Summerfields-quite wrong,xxxxxxxcurrent properties. (This wording unreadable due to water spill prior to receiving the form)</p>			1049
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A Kirby		CSO15 456	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I live in the beautiful countryside of Verwood and would like it to stay that way. This is why my wife and I decided to move here some 11 years ago. We object to the proposed building of more houses around Verwood and Three Legged Cross. These areas already have an over population of houses without the required facilities. We need better road networks, larger supermarket, another petrol station, more dentists, doctors and all the NHS services are under pressure. We do not have sufficient facilities to support these additional homes. We must have better infrastructure to sustain further development FIRST including secondary school, shops and swimming pool. Also Verwood and West Moors Housing leaflet</p>			1049
513651	Mrs W Pearsall		CSO15 446	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>1 Increase bus frequency and to Wimborne. More buses on Saturdays and Sundays. 1 per hour is not sufficient. 2 Increase transport to all hospitals, Bournemouth, Poole, St Leonards, Wimborne, Salisbury and Southampton. 3 Verwood needs direct links to all railway stations and airports.</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>4Verwood needs allotments. Council land (including County Council) needs to be immediately available at an economic rate. Suggest land parallel to Potterne Way alongside river. land being auctioned on Potterne Way. Part of land VWM 4 in flooding area away from river.</p> <p>5 VWM4 Access via Manor Rd and St Michaels Lane. Already congested and impeded vision around new gas station. Suggest small roundabout junction these 2 roads. Would slow traffic on this dangerous road and be safer for school children.</p>			
513671	Mr and Mrs G Green		CSO15 472	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>Unless we get infrastructure in place first Verwood cannot sustain more homes in such high numbers. Our facilities at present are used by other villages too and what we have here is not nearly enough. Doctors, dentists, shop, a garage, leisure facilities are really inadequate now and would not be able to support more homes. More traffic will be generated, so roads more congested and public transport is nigh on unavailable at times now.</p>			1049
513719	Mr and Mrs E Roberts		CSO15 495	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>Verwood is sadly not the place we moved to 31 years ago. We feel we already have enough new building. If all these houses are built, where are the people going to work? Will they commute out of the town and make the B3081 even busier than it is now.? Another reason, has adequate thought gone into health, i.e. doctors surgeries which are already overcrowded, also hospital accommodation. Also where are these extra people going to shop?</p>			1049
513880	Mr Derek Martin		CSO15 511	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>No development without infrastructure including road improvement. Station road cannot carry any further increase in traffic. Developers must pay for this first before any building.</p>			1049
513883	Mr West		CSO15 516	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>The town could not support the extra people (at least 1245) if you say 3 people per house - probably a lot more. Doctors surgeries, schools, car parks could not cope. The centre of the town does not have or could not have shops of enough interest to stop people just driving on their way to larger towns.</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
513891	Mr RA Parsons		CSO15 536	Option VWM 2	Object		Leave Verwood as it is. Give us more sensible shops and better roads and the allotments promised 20 years ago. We cannot keep up with the housing we already have. No more.			1049
513900	Mr P Wall		CSO15 593	Option VWM 2	Object		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed e.g. road improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			1049
513915	Mrs PA Parsons		CSO15 571	Option VWM 2	Object		I object to any more houses in Verwood. We have very little in shops less now than 20 years ago. Roads need a lot of attention. No concessions for allotments-if green spaces found for housing why could you not find green space for allotments. Disgrace to you East Dorset Council.			1049
360838	Cllr. Mrs Carol Holmes	Parish Councillor West Moors Parish Council	CSO16 655	Option VWM 2	Object		1) How would you ensure new homes were for local people? 2) Verwood needs competitive retail outlets like Waitrose etc. to offer consumer choice and competition with Morrisons. It is not right to have just one supermarket for a town the size of Verwood. It would cut back on traffic movement too. 3) All the proposed housing developments would put further strain on Station Road, West Moors. 4) Give serious thought to using St Leonards' Hospital site for major retail e.g. B and Q to cut down travel to Castle Point.		Not changed to processed until clarification of status of response received. L King	1049
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		CSO16 364	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
361196	Mr J.M BULLIVANT		CSO16 282	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
491252	Margaret Wareham		CSO16 589	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511639	Paul Hockey		CSO16096	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
513974	Mr A Moore		CSO15823	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
513988	Mr & Mrs S.G Smith		CSO15654	Option VWM 2		No Opinion	It is absolutely essential for new road to be forthcoming if new school proceeds. In House Lane, let alone the further housing planned.			1049
514049	Mrs E Hellier		CSO15751	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
514091	Mr RJ Potts		CSO15828	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
514092	Ms Natasha Saville		CSO15804	Option VWM 2	Object		I think that there should be no more building in Verwood without more infrastructure, shops. Doctors Etc. Verwood is big enough; the green belt should be saved for future generations.			1049
514099	Mr and Mrs T C Blakeley		CSO15858	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
514100	Mrs Eileen Gibbs		CSO15836	Option VWM 2	Object		The infrastructure in Verwood is not sufficient to accommodate all the extra cards and people.			1049
514111	Penelope Webiery		CSO15902	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
514121	Mr David Dencher		CSO15904	Option VWM 2	Object		Any development should have improvement in the road network.			1049
514136	Mrs J		CSO15962	Option VWM 2	Support					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Crumb									
514225	Mr Simon Dixon	Secretary West Moors Traders Association	CSO16 007	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon Chaffey		CSO16 013	Option VWM 2	Object		Our feeling is this is yet another token gesture by the Council. This is clearly obvious by the planning permission that seems to be given for the most grotesque buildings in Verwood. The corner of Ringwood Road and Black Hill Road as a typical example. Also all those other awful flats in the middle of Verwood. If you are going to build then think before giving planning permission. Also speed up the development of Morrisons to keep in line with the increased population to Verwood.			1049
514274	Mr Showell		CSO16 084	Option VWM 2	Support		Instead of new housing there should be a new strategy of providing more public open space. The lessons of the Edwardians/Victorians should be learnt. New public parks like Poole Park, Queens Park and Kings Park save an area from urban crowding. Perhaps all the land proposed for housing could be reallocated to public parks.			1049
514282	Ian Bignell and Sally Hinchliffe		CSO16 041	Option VWM 2	Object		If Verwood gets more houses, it will need more facilities. There are lots of houses on the market at the moment, most of which aren't selling, so this proves we don't need any more houses. I agree with secondary school, as long as the middle school system is maintained.			1049
514287	Mr Brian Walker		CSO16 055	Option VWM 2	Object		Over the last few years Verwood's population has increased above 16,000 due to building expansion, I feel that Verwood has already contributed our duty to the housing problem. Any more house building would put even greater pressure on our limited infrastructure, transport services, roads, parking etc. Also within this proposal for more than 40% of affordable houses, where are these people expected to find employment in the Verwood area? No Green Belt land should be allowed to be built upon.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							B3081 main road out of Verwood is already over congested in the rush hours.			
514344	Ms Emily Saville		CSO16 119	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
514355	Mr T Gee		CSO16 126	Option VWM 2	Object		Living on Station Road we have noticed the massive increase in traffic over the years. An increase of a further 400 homes would probably bring another 800 cars to an already congested town. most people who live in Verwood work elsewhere hence the high number of people travelling at commuting times. There are no employment opportunities in Verwood and no one can guarantee that firms or businesses would open up in Verwood. This is a dormitory town with a high percentage of OAP's. Building on Green Belt land in a semi-rural area would directly adversely affect the quality of life of existing residents and the council must do all it can to prevent further building on Green Belt land.			1049
514367	Mr R S Coates		CSO16 155	Option VWM 2	Support		We need started homes (housing assessment). We need a plan for traffic management.			1049
514379	Mrs Denise Bannister		CSO16 139	Option VWM 2	Object		There are already many properties for sale in Verwood and the need to build others is questionable. An increase of 400 homes in this area potentially means 800 more cars. Access to and from Verwood is likely to become more problematical. There are very few jobs in Verwood and to increase housing further is likely to mean that more people will be travelling out of and back to Verwood each day. Whilst building a secondary school does have some merits, access to the existing schools is already difficult and at a time of serious financial constraints it would make sense economically to develop existing secondary school sites and thus minimise the effects upon the local community. Congestion within Verwood does not need to increase and it terms of environmental concerns, any further destruction of the Green Belt land around this area must be strongly and forcefully opposed. There are plenty of brownfield sites within local communities that could be enhanced by developments before			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							encroaching on greenfield sites. Finally facilities such as shopping and community facilities would not support more housing.			
514392	Alison Frost		CSO16 150	Option VWM 2		No Opinion	Please can you leave land to provide allotments for the residents of Verwood? They are a vital part of health and wellbeing for residents with little or no garden and are much needed in the town.			1049
514429	Joan and Ann Humphries		CSO16 172	Option VWM 2	Object		The proposed areas not compatible for whole of the area. Infrastructure non-negotiable. Traffic conditions not generally good at this present time. Amount of homes suggested - quite ridiculous. 200 here and there - what about the people to fill - need into 1000's. Build on brown sites and not green open spaces.			1049
514455	Mrs Christine Groves		CSO16 164	Option VWM 2	Object		There are enough homes and people in Verwood and enough traffic on our roads.			1049
514467	Mrs Lesley Cripps		CSO16 206	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
514482	C E T Gilbert		CSO16 241	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
514499	Mrs S H Chung		CSO16 226	Option VWM 2	Object		No homes in greenbelt.			1049
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		CSO16 319	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
514703	Mr S Harvey		CSO16 370	Option VWM 2	Object		The village has enough housing stock already and is too densely populated with a need for a better public transport network that operates beyond the hours of 6pm! We need to build a secondary school and more shops offering local goods and not just estate agents!			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514752	Claire Richardson & Jamie Shirley		CSO16 395	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
514812	Mr C Sawyer		CSO16 431	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		CSO16 487	Option VWM 2	Object		Seeking the opinion of the general public on planning issues is all very commendable - but setting aside all political persuasion my feeling is that this is no more than a Public Relations exercise because in the end the final decisions are always to the advantage of the developers whoever they may be because of money, greed and looks good on paper. My general view is that density levels for new homes should be kept down, East Dorset has become so over developed that it's now just one big urban sprawl. Infact it has lost so much of all the natural character and charm that it used to enjoy it is hard to know where the so called green belt begins and ends.			1049
514913	Mr and Mrs M Clark		CSO16 467	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
514939	D Porter		CSO16 511	Option VWM 2	Object		The more land you concrete over the more you have to because you just increase demand. Infill best option.			1049
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		CSO16 540	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
360167	Mrs Pippa WHEATLEY		CSO17 448	Option VWM 2	Object		As Options comments are requested on separate sheets, I will make points which are general to the four Verwood Options (VWM1 to VWM4) first, and then make comments relating to this particular site. Comments general to the 4 Verwood Housing Options Opportunistic This does not appear to be a 'strategy'. It appears to be a Phew! Someone's offering us land for housing. Let's try and	Delete Option VWM 2		1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>make the facts fit.</p> <p>Complete reversal of intentions in RSS</p> <p>Under RSS there was no intention to roll back Green Belt and subject Verwood to yet more large areas of housing. There was indeed the sentiment that Verwood had far more than its share over the past few decades. In your Vision Para 3.10 you tell us that PPS 12 advises that the Vision should be in general conformity with the RSS and closely relate to any Sustainable Community Strategy for the area. As far as Verwood is concerned there has been a complete turnaround on both these issues</p> <p>Sustainability</p> <p>All sites have rich biodiversity.</p> <p>Sites generally appear to be unimproved grassland, probably not ploughed for many decades, good hedgerows and mature trees. These are increasingly being recognised for their role in carbon capture.</p> <p>Verwood is noted for high car ownership and high usage to get to work which is largely out of Verwood. No increased employment sites are put forward for Verwood so any newcomers will inevitably add to the traffic going out and returning home to Verwood on a daily basis. Increased traffic will be generated by the needs of these developments for supplies to local shops, home deliveries and people having to shop for many items in outlying towns.</p> <p>The road system in and around Verwood is incapable of coping with increased traffic and there is no plan to improve the main access route B3081 or to make it safer. The roads will be continually jammed up with traffic queues, burning up oil and puffing out carbon.</p> <p>Climate change means likelihood of more impact from flooding. All these sites are going to affect the Moors river system where there is already concern.</p> <p>Green Belt</p> <p>I have commented on Option KS2. The Green Belt is being treated far too casually. Three of the four Verwood sites require movement of the Green Belt. I do not think sufficient attention is being given to national guidance. Have the following in PPG2 been properly considered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposes of the Green Belt, in particular to check 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>unrestricted sprawl and to safeguard our countryside</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability – to consider consequences for sustainability including effects of car travel if channelling development toward areas of Green Belt • Permanence – the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence <p>In 06 Green Belt Key Issue paper Para 2.14 you tell us the Core Strategy will only propose alteration to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate recognised local needs in sustainable locations. Most Verwood people I have talked to do not agree we need these houses and it is difficult to argue these are sustainable locations.</p> <p>I notice the Masterplan document in its appraisal on Green Belt seems to find very little justification for moving it. The only thing that is mentioned is maintaining key gaps and key edges.</p> <p>Overdevelopment</p> <p>Verwood has too much housing. Your figures show Verwood has five times more houses than in the early 1960s, resulting in a population of around 15,000. It was known as the fastest growing town in Europe. The facilities are only still that of a village. It is not viable as a fully functioning town while there is the daily exodus of the majority of the workforce.</p> <p>It is a distortion to mention in Para 11.3 that 300 houses were unable to be built without saying 'However, a large number of houses and flats have been, and are still being, built on Bakers Farm land which was to have been reserved for Community facilities / supermarket in a previous plan. Also part of the land at Ebblake Industrial Estate has been used for houses when it was previously reserved for employment.'</p> <p>Further comments relating to VWM 2</p> <p>Landscape and Nature Conservation</p> <p>As well as being Green Belt this is in the AGLV and is rather misrepresented by the pictures in the Masterplan document. Indeed I don't know where the one with the bungalow roofs comes from. The photograph of the houses in Eastworth Road only serves to remind me of the removal of a particularly ancient species rich hedgerow which was down in a local plan to be protected. I would recommend a view taken from Eastworth Road with the woodland to the left, meadow,</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>and beautiful specimens of ancient oak trees of huge girth set in the grassland. The old railway hedgerow, running across the far end, appears a haven for wildlife, and then beyond that open countryside towards Cranborne Chase. This provides a rich habitat for wildlife and as far as I know the grassland has not been ploughed for many decades and when our pony used to graze part of it some years ago it appeared to be species rich unimproved meadow which is becoming increasingly rare.</p> <p>Gateway?</p> <p>In Para 11.62, I do not know what is meant, and find it a bit offensive, the way you say this proposal 'allows the opportunity for an improved gateway to the town'. This again conjures up the idea that someone was sitting at a desk dreaming up something without having set foot in the area. If you are referring to Edmondsham Road, you would have a job to improve the current entry visually when you come over the bridge to beautiful countryside and drive between two well-kept historic rural buildings to reach the built up area. If you are referring to Eastworth Road, you will have to chop off part of several gardens and remove a number of trees to make any access for two way traffic towards Station Road.</p> <p>Access and roads</p> <p>It is difficult to see how safe access can be achieved. There are limited places for access and it is just not possible to find a selection of safe points as the roads they emerge onto are busy and dangerous. The huge volume of traffic this proposal would generate is far in excess of what the already busy Verwood Roads can accommodate.</p>			
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		CSO16 891	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
508562	K Clayson		CSO16 947	Option VWM 2	Object		More houses will create more congestion on the roads.			1049
511936	Mrs G Anstey		CSO16 963	Option VWM 2	Object		I am in agreement with a new secondary school as Verwood needs one badly. I am NOT in agreement with more homes being built in Verwood. The roads are crowded enough as it			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							is one of these days a terrible accident is going to occur. There is NO INFRASTRUCTURE here, and for children and young families a dead loss. I came here more than 20 years ago when Verwood was a village and it has been spoilt by over-building, ugly flats and stupid bureaucracy! All the open spaces are going, the fields with houses and our wildlife. WHEN IS IT GOING TO END???			
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		CSO16 574	Option VWM 2	Object		The area is already over-developed and congested - further development on the scales proposed would lead to deterioration of the environment and a reduction in the quality of life. I am particularly dismayed by continued threats to the Green Belt, especially as this Government pledged to protect it. I do not believe that such massive development is necessary or beneficial to the vast majority of inhabitants. Pressure on our area should be reduced by Government tackling such issues as population growth through immigration control and regeneration of brownfield sites in Midlands and North. There is a need for limited affordable and social housing locally, but not more executive homes. It is wrong to build new homes while second homes and investment properties continue to exist.			1049
515033	Mr T Crump		CSO16 612	Option VWM 2	Object		These proposals are typical of the failures contrived by Council and Consultants to address short term solutions to Government edict. Fundamental to any significant further development is the need for joined up thinking for transportation. All of these proposals further the burden on traffic flow through and around conurbation centres. These major roads are the responsibility of the government highways department. They should foot the bill for their improvements prior to further development. Some of these proposals virtually adjoin 100 instance flood lines. This is totally unacceptable. Any proposal to move allotments, away from the housing that uses them, increases road usage and has a negative impact on the community.			1049
515086	Mrs		CSO16	Option	Object		Verwood is lacking facilities to accommodate more homes			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Elaine Pugh		623	VWM 2			and pressure on services is too much. Services must deteriorate. The main roads are already overwhelmed and can only get worse with yet more traffic. Most of the land is what is green belt and should stay green belt. Verwood has doubled in the last 10 years (approx.) enough is enough!			
515114	M J Porter		CSO16 637	Option VWM 2	Object		VWM 2 and 4 are too excessive in their size. Verwood is still coping with the growing pains of extensive development in recent years and really needs a period of time to settle. One of the main attractions of living in Verwood is the access to green space. Option 2 and 4 would cause irreparable damage to the local environment with significant increase in traffic plus increased demand for limited local facilities.			1049
515148	Mr E G Howarth		CSO16 643	Option VWM 2	Object		Until it is clear how the infrastructure to support additional housing is to be provided it is not possible to support any of these proposals. Will the type of housing result in increased anti-social behaviour?			1049
515255	Mr and Mrs C Beck		CSO16 649	Option VWM 2		No Opinion	No problem with extra homes being built if facilities are increased – i.e. 1) Medical facilities – another surgery, more doctors, (we already have to wait for appointments!) nurses, dentists, opticians, chiropodists 2) Transport improvements 3) Extra police 4) Extra shops, larger post office and library 5) Leisure facilities – especially swimming pool 6) Elderly retirement homes			1049
515287	Mr L Jackson		CSO16 686	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
515354	Mr Walker		CSO16 713	Option VWM 2	Object		I object very strongly to any further development in Verwood, especially of the size that has been proposed. Green belt land in this overcrowded island of ours is precious and should			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							not be encroached upon by yet more homes. Verwood has more than played its part over the past 20 years in providing extra housing. I do not think the infrastructure will take the strain.			
515367	Mr & Mrs J Pottinger		CSO16 810	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
515786	Mrs A M Bright		CSO16 827	Option VWM 2	Object		As a recent inhabitant of Verwood I am happy to support plans which will enable others to move to a town I have grown to love. It would be selfish to try to keep the town just for those of us already here. However I do not support the large development as I see the influx of over 2000 people creating a number of problems. Large developments seldom encourage community spirit and many house buyers are reluctant to purchase on an estate with large proportion of social housing. We do not need more empty properties. I am also concerned that without improvement to our infrastructure (more schools, shops, etc.) Verwood may become ever more of a dormitory town.			1049
515919	Mrs E E Sims		CSO16 902	Option VWM 2	Support		I can confirm that I am a significant land owner in the above preferred option, and that I fully support its inclusion as a preferred option, and I can also confirm that my land is available for development, and that it has no known constraints that would affect it from coming forward.			1049
516343	Mrs J Stebbings		CSO16 953	Option VWM 2		General Comment	My concern is that a full infrastructure be in place to cope with the extra pressure on amenities, in particular doctors/dentists surgery Transport Employment opportunities Facilities for young people Taking into consideration population growth in the whole areas in the scheme extra pressure on hospitals-already under strain.			1049
517572	Mr D Alexander		CSO17 000	Option VWM 2	Object		We object to large scale development as the town infrastructure is inadequate now.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
517717	Mr Frederick Thorne		CSO17122	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>General Comments</p> <p>Verwood has grown by 500% in the last 20 years. During this time very little has been done to improve the infrastructure to support all this development. Much of the character of this former village (now town) has already been destroyed. We have a duty to protect what remains. The green belt, areas of special scientific interest and areas of 'special character' (in the proposed South Verwood Development area) have so far survived. The proposed development in this very special part of South Verwood would be on greenbelt land and run close to the river Crane (a triple SSSI). this must not be allowed. The residents of Verwood and EDDC have in my opinion a duty to protect this area and our heritage.</p> <p>Transport Issues</p> <p>Increase in traffic. The current infrastructure/roads in Verwood are already inadequate. The West Moors bypass originally planned to ease traffic problems in Verwood following previous developments was scrapped in favour of new homes. No doubt this would give more revenue to EDDC than any bypass!!!! What I want to know is when are you going to give something back to Verwood???? how do you propose to deal with the increase in traffic and the problems this will cause if these developments do go ahead?</p> <p>Potential increased risk of flooding and drainage problems. How would any new developments be drained?? I understand the river Crane is a triple SSI so I assume water will not be drained there? I also understand that according to Councillor Flower the drains in Manor Road are 'not fit for purpose' and already 'full to capacity'. I therefore assume water cannot be drained there either? People have shown me photos of flooded fields in the Verwood South Area that would serve the Manor Road development. I know the water levels are high in parts of St Michaels Road and peoples gardens are already waterlogged during winter months. Surely further development of land in this area can only make things worse. You only have to look at what happened to the listed cottage in Burnbake Road following land development in the area. the cottage and grounds were so damaged the cottage had to be pulled down!! Do you want this to happen to St Michaels Cottage (also listed) as well??? Increase in development</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>means increase in surface water. Are you prepared to take the risk and increase flooding in the Verwood South Area? Are you prepared to be accountable for your actions and responsible for any damage you cause to privately owned property????</p> <p>Encroachment on Green Belt</p> <p>I have lived in St Michaels Road for 56 years. I understand that land beyond Howe Lane is and always has been Green Belt. This area must be protected for our future heritage. St Michaels Road and part of Manor Road are areas of 'special character'. This is confirmed in the Council Plan (2004). What will happen to wild life that depends on areas like this? This area will be destroyed if this development goes ahead. In the 56 years I have resided in St Michaels Road I have seen much change. This change has not been for the better. I feel privileged to have lived where I do. I witness and watch wildlife that depends on this area for its survival. I have badgers that frequent my back garden and I spend hours there watching the nuthatch and long tailed tits feeding in the bushes. We have woodpeckers, chaffinch, green finch and robins are always present. Then there are the butterflies in the summer and the hedgehogs hibernating in the winter. This area is so special.</p> <p>I am now 86 years old now so your proposed development, if approved may not be witnessed by me. I do however feel the need to strongly verbalise my concern about what in my opinion would be total destruction of this peaceful, quiet and very special part of Verwood. The area is a haven for wildlife. What will happen to them?</p> <p>Ten years ago Verwood was described as the most rapidly developed town in Europe. We have had enough now. If this council is so concerned with providing affordable housing why did it sell land adjacent to the hub to a developer who I understand will not be providing affordable housing? There is plenty of brown belt land around Verwood that could be used. I understand that during a recent Dorset study, the majority of survey respondents said they were against housing construction in the countryside, yet the report's conclusion was in favour of development?! I would ask EDDC what evidence they have that suggests there is a 'need' for housing</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							in this area? If the evidence for housing need is bogus, as has been suggested to me, and if the wishes of the local community are being ignored, surely there is no justification for building on otherwise protected land in the open countryside?			
517741	Mr and Mrs Reid		CSO17 127	Option VWM 2	Object		That there should not be any new housing developments on green belt land. It is a well-known fact that fuzzie fields has planning permission for a housing estate in the near future, this will create pressure on our road systems. Bearing all of the above the road infrastructure will not be able to cope. As it stands today Station Road footpath is inadequate and crossing the roundabout is a matter of taking your life in your hands. So let's not ruin a lovely village!			1049
517818	LT. CDR R Bennett RNR RETD.		CSO17 226	Option VWM 2	Object		The ratio of affordable homes is a major concern 400 extra dwellings will put further overload onto public services including sewage and drain systems. This number of dwellings will introduce at least an extra 1000 people + around 600 cars to the area. All this when we have virtually lost our fire service and police station Edmondsham Road still has no lighting, no footpath and no drains, how's that for progress.			1049
517892	Mr and Mrs R S Gee		CSO17 258	Option VWM 2	Object		I write to strongly object to the Christchurch and East Dorset launch Core Strategy 12 week consultation Option VWM2. We moved as a family to Eastworth Road seven years ago as it is surrounded by beautiful countryside and we considered it a safe environment for our three children to grow up in. We demolished our property and have since built a new home. We worked with the council on this, as they made it clear that it had to fit in with the surrounding houses and area. the proposal to build affordable housing is not a welcome one, as it is not in keeping with the area and will devalue our property that we have worked hard to achieve. The heavily wooded area opposite our property is full of wildlife and with the proposed development and extra traffic pollution created; these animals would be severely affected. There are a lot of trees in these fields, which have Tree			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Protection Orders again the roots of these trees will be interfered with to get services to these properties.</p> <p>As a mother of children, I am very concerned with one of the proposed accesses from the corner of Eastworth Road and Station Road. This is already a restrictive corner and difficult to turn into or out of. The entrance does not allow two cars to pass and with the extra vehicles this proposal would create could cause a potential hazard. Moreover, this road is used, as a safe option, by parents walking their children to Trinity First School and again the extra traffic could cause potential problems.</p> <p>As we understood it, the land in question is good rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural land; only poor quality land should be used for this purpose. Moreover, the land is Green Belt and an area of great landscape value. Verwood does not have the amenities to cope with 200+ more families. There are already insufficient facilities for children and young people to do, let alone another estate's worth. Before more housing is built, then the infrastructure of Verwood needs to be in place.</p>			
517935	J H Stacey		CSO17 262	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>Before any development can take place on the lands indicated the section of road from the roundabout to the railway bridge must be improved to the same standard as Champtoceaux Avenue, and the bridge either removed or new brick safety parapets built. In its present condition the bridge is unsafe.</p> <p>I support the proposal VWM2 since the subject land is not in primarily agricultural use.</p> <p>Comment: before any further housing is added to the Verwood area at all, major attention must be given to all the services - i.e. it must be ensures that the main utilities, namely electricity, gas, water and telephone have sufficient capacity to serve the extra number of dwellings. The roadways which will serve the new residential areas will have to be upgraded for the increase in traffic. The sewage and storm water systems will also have to be upgraded to cope with the extra volume that will be created by the new dwellings. It is well-known that the system can only just handle the current volume now, and</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							tends to be blocked from time to time by thoughtless and/or uncaring householders and businesses discharging inappropriate materials into the system. Unless the above infrastructure improvements are implemented I cannot support any of the above options, notwithstanding support given in the first two paragraphs. I have lived in Verwood since 1982 as a householder and thus a ratepayer/council-tax payer, and therefore trust that the views expressed in this document will be respected. I should also add that my wife is in agreement with the above views.			
517946	Mr and Mrs Jon Parsons		CSO17268	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>We are writing to express the strongest objection possible to any proposed building under Option reference VWM 1 and VWM 2.</p> <p>We have for the last 6 years lived along the Edmondsham Road that takes traffic from Verwood to Fordingbridge. We have in that time been absolutely staggered at the amount of traffic this road takes.</p> <p>Traffic of all types from cars, lorries, white vans, buses and heavy trucks. We have on numerous occasions had to take evasive action leading to damage to our cars. There are regular accidents and cars in hedges. Two last week alone. None of our family can ride bicycles or walk into Verwood because the road is terrifying. Currently, we are spending Christmas isolated and inconvenienced because the road has been closed to repair a collapsed culvert caused by this excessive traffic. The Old Hump backed Railway bridge is quite lethal and was being repaired again two weeks ago. The proposed locations for new houses will add further traffic and congestion to this road.</p> <p>There is nowhere near enough parking at the local school and in the mornings and afternoons the area near the school is extremely dangerous.</p> <p>We ourselves had to battle with EDDC for 3 years over planning permission to link two buildings on our land that could only be seen by ourselves and nobody else. The reason - our property was on green belt land. How therefore can it be justified that 230 new properties can simply be built on Green Belt Land where they interfere with so many local</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>people. The Edmondsham Road cannot possible take more traffic created by extra properties. it is just not right that new properties can be enforced on green belt land. The local infrastructure - schools, shops, facilities will not cope with more people created by this and it creates a dangerous precedent for further building on the Green Belt as and when the authorities see fit. We did not move to the countryside to have modern housing estates thrust on us and built close to our land, and I do not believe that it is right that people should be allowed to build any more in this particular area. We strongly object to the proposal.</p>			
518035	Mr Peter Pugh		CSO17 284	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>In my opinion Verwood is lacking the facilities to accommodate more homes and the pressure on services is too much the service must deteriorate!! The main roads are being overwhelmed now without more cars being added. Most of the land is low lying or subject to flooding which is why it should stay greenbelt. This town/village has doubled in the last ten years (approx.) enough is enough!</p>			1049
518058	Mr and Mrs Glendinning		CSO17 295	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>This is just to express a letter of concern and objection to the proposed options for the Verwood area. As you can see from my address this concern is justified. My main issues are the lack of facilities to support such over concentrated proposals, there is already a two week waiting list to get an appointment with the only doctor's surgery nearby to Eastworth Road. I doubt if local schools could cope with such an influx and as for local shops and amenities this is just a joke. If you want a hairdo or buy a house or TV - fine! Try to buy anything to wear, no chance, not even a pair of knickers. Even the two small supermarkets run out of essentials, especially at weekends. What are younger people going to do here? As far as I am aware there isn't even a table-tennis table they could use. This would mean parents having to transport them</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>everywhere by car by putting more traffic and pollution on the roads.</p> <p>On the subject of environmental issues, what about the desecration of such a lovely part of the Green Belt land, not to mention all the indigenous wildlife it supports. As for building on arable land this is surely unacceptable, when we are trying to decrease the amount of imported food into this country.</p> <p>The other worrying fact is what is 'affordable' housing? Whilst I agree with the admirable sentiment that we should help local people who are working and providing a service and contributing to the economy of the town, how is this going to be controlled, monitored and decided?</p> <p>Please register our concerns and objections.</p>			
518073	Mrs S Williams		CSO17309	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>Several of the areas are on green belt. It is against the planning guidance to build on green belt and so I think these options should be declined. The land affected is beautiful and the building will totally spoil these areas. It will also create a precedence that will be used in the future. This affects VWM1, VWM2, VWM4 I think.</p> <p>The building is too near protected heathland and woodland. VWM1 and VWM2 are too near Ringwood Forest. VWM3 and VWM4 are too near Heathy How which is a beautiful wood and I think has an SSI order on it. Even if areas for sport are provided as part of the developments you will not be able to stop people using the heathland/woodland areas and people's pets will damage/kill the wildlife. This building would be against the national guidelines on building near protected areas.</p> <p>There are currently not enough facilities to support the present population of Verwood. We do not have things that people living in much smaller settlements take for granted, e.g. allotments. In the 10 year plan produced shortly after we moved to Verwood in 1989 there was a leisure centre with a swimming pool and that has still not been built - in fact it's not even in the plans now. You are now talking about building on the land put aside for this - VWM3. For this reason I'm against VWM3, but also I think you need to sort the facilities out for the current population and not add to the problems by</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>building more houses - so I'm against all the other options on this basis.</p> <p>Like many people we moved to Verwood as it was a village, with plans to increase to a small town. Further large scale building work is going to harm that feel and make it into a large conurbation. This will detract from the quality of life in Verwood. Over the last 20 years there has been a massive amount of building work here and lots of new houses.</p> <p>Verwood has done its bit to provide extra houses for East Dorset and I think its someone else's turn now. The people need some time to settle and grow into a community without the disruption of having further large-scale additions to the population.</p>			
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 500	Option VWM 2		General Comment	<p>As part of an area of county biodiversity interest and local landscape value, we consider the biodiversity interests of this site should be established to inform this option.</p> <p>This option brings new housing in close proximity to the Romford Bridge Copse SNCI (SU00/58), which is a broadleaved semi-natural woodland and pond, without public access. This option 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. The site currently suffers from fly tipping and disposal of garden waste from nearby properties and we would recommend provision of a significant natural buffer against the SNCI at least as wide as that indicated against the old railway line and Eastworth Road.</p> <p>Additionally we have concerns over the provision of a SANG to the west that includes a significant area of SNCI (Ironmongers Copse SU00/41). This SANG would need to be carefully planned to ensure that the provision of green infrastructure to divert pressures away from the heaths also protects the biodiversity of the two SNCIs and other features of biodiversity interest.</p> <p>This option lies within the Crane/Moors River catchment and thus will require Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems in place to avoid any further pollution of this important and sensitive river corridor and care to protect and enhance the biodiversity and quality of the tributaries.</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359477	Ms Natasha Mackenzie	Clerk Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council	CSO17 710	Option VWM 2	Object	General Comment	<p>In reality, however, the 2001 Census advised a working population of 5000 in Verwood, of which 1/3rd worked locally and 2/3rd commuted out. The working population is estimated to have increased to 6.500 today. There is a significant disconnect in looking to alleviate an already over stretched road network identifying further housing provision in the town, but nearest additional employment opportunity in St Leonards and Ferndown. Until a new secondary school is built in Verwood any new housing will also mean even more journeys to Ferndown and Wimborne.</p> <p>The proposed additional housing and employment areas will therefore only increase the traffic problems at Ringwood and thus on the roads in our Parish, especially on the B3081, A338 and Linwood Road if the A31 is blocked. The junction at Bakers Hanging will also become even more saturated. The Parish Council agree that these developments should only go ahead if road improvements at Bakers Hanging and the junction of the A338 and A31 are carried out.</p>			1049
359547	Mrs V BRIGHT	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17 948	Option VWM 2	Support	General Comment	<p>We realise that there has been a rapid growth of population locally in recent years but that with it we have seen a reduced number of young adults in the 20-40 age group compared to the number of older working residents, retired elderly and children. There was also little forethought put in place by EDDC to improve infrastructure and amenities when the new developments were built over the last 10 years, resulting in a rapid expansion of footfall, traffic and pollution and bolt-on solutions to try and remedy problems that ensued later. The rise in house prices has outstripped wage levels, due to high demand coupled with the development of 3-4 bedroomed houses, which local people, on local salaries, could not afford. In fact, there are virtually no starter homes, and only a small amount of 2 bedroomed houses have been built over the last decade. If this trend is allowed to continue the District Council is faced with the difficult task of providing a range of houses to include affordable homes, both to retain the workforce and to reduce the existing long waiting lists. It is important that any affordable homes built should be for local people, and not made available for people living outside East Dorset.</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>The proposed sites immediately adjoining the existing urban area are not prime agricultural land and in planning terms can be construed as suitable for development. Whilst we understand and could support the proposals, we must stress that any development would require improvements in the infrastructure which should be in place before any houses are built, or at least alongside with the construction and before occupation. Therefore, when the statutory core strategy is prepared we feel it is important that timescales are included within the document which sets out not only the timings of the programme of works, but should include details and timings of the infrastructure proposed, which should complement the works programme.</p> <p>If we are to support the individual sites, both on housing need and the provision of open space not currently available, we would require more infrastructure and environmental improvements. All sites need to be surveyed for archaeological deposits and all require new access roads. Tree lines should be respected and two sites to the south of Verwood are close to the flood plain or watercourse. We would like EDDC to confirm that, due to the ecology and rich biodiversity of both sites, that at least a one year cyclical survey is conducted by EDDC to cover the 4 seasons, these surveys to be conducted under the statutory requirements of Natural England, the Environment Agency, and other relevant bodies, both UK and EU, the results of these surveys to be made available for inspection.</p>			
359552	Ms J WEEDON	Clerk West Moors Parish Council	CSO17 909	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>The Parish Council has expressed deep concern with regard to any further developments located in Verwood due to the impact that future developments would have on traffic through West Moors.</p> <p>West Moors is fully aware of the impact over the previous 20 years that the growth of Verwood has had on West Moors and would like to stress that they feel that investment in infrastructure is required before further developments in Verwood are considered.</p>			1049
359891	Mrs Susanne		CSO18 352	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Parkin									
359894	Mr D.S Medlycott		CSO17 552	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>Parking problems - Public car park surgery Station Road When planning permission was granted for the Hub it was stated the overflow car park was the public car park adjacent to Verwood Surgery. Likewise the same was said again when planning permission was granted for The Herons when only 1 space per flat was allowed. Again when approval was granted for the proposed 29 flats (rear of the Police Station) with only 1 parking space per flat allocated it was stated that any additional vehicle overflow could use the above public car park.</p> <p>These planning applications were all dealt with individually without any thought to the combined collective consequences of the pressures it would place on the above car park. At the present moment there are constantly days when patients of the Verwood Surgery (including disabled) are unable to find a parking space and in addition staff at the surgery have also been unable to find a space in the staff car park</p> <p>The Practice Manager at the Surgery will confirm this as they have received many complaints from patients.</p> <p>The problem will be acute during the building of the 29 flats and will be exacerbated if the proposed 230 homes at the land west of Trinity School and land west of Eastworth Road went ahead.</p> <p>The reality is that the majority of people will not walk into town from these sites and in fact the elderly or disabled will be unable to do so.</p> <p>The idea that people will be discouraged from using their cars if no parking provision is made whilst laudable is totally unrealistic.</p> <p>Recently the paved footway area outside the surgery has had to be re-laid and bollards have been erected to prevent vehicles driving up to the surgery door and also to prevent parking on the paved footway by those vehicles unable to find a parking space.</p> <p>In addition to all the problems outlined above people do park their vehicles there all day and catch the bus to Bournemouth or Poole using their free bus passes.</p>	<p>I suggest</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Adequate parking provision is provided at new developments for both residents and visitors as often minimum requirements are insufficient. 2) Use of the Hub car park during daylight hours for additional public parking. 3) Notice in the Public Car Park to be erected saying "parking limited to two hours 7am - 7pm. Alternative parking available at Potter's Wheel Car Park". No parking charges to be applied. <p>Transport</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) An east-west bypass be included in the Core Strategy (this was on the agenda 20 years ago when traffic flow was significantly lower) 2) The town centre to be pedestrianized vehicular traffic only for access, parking and deliveries. 3) consideration of one way system for through traffic. 4) alternative bypass routes using existing road infrastructure. On the 14th November 2010 during the remembrance service at Ferret Green all through traffic was diverted away from the town centre for some 30 minutes. This shows that other than building a new east-west 		1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Traffic B3081 Dorset County Council Traffic Counts undertaken in 1989, 1997, 2004 and 2007 show that there has been a hugely significant increase in traffic flow of 101% on 12 hour flow and 97% on 24 hour flow 7 day average. (Traffic is substantially lower on Sunday and therefore weekday figures will be in excess of the percentages stated above). Year Increase 12 hours 24 hours Increase 1989 3938 4670 1997 5368 6309 2004 40% 5505 6529 40% 2007 101% 7915 9181 97% 2007 8567 9895 5 day average Up to 2004 there was a 40% increase in traffic flow which at that time Mr Paul Willis (DCC Group Policy Planning Manager) considered to be highly significant. As shown above that percentage increase has now risen from 40% to 97% and 101% in the space of three years from 2004 to 2007. I would regard this as hugely significant. There are no figures available for 2010 but I would suggest that since 2007 there has been a further substantial increase in traffic flow, one of the factors being the use of Sat Nav's which has increased both HGV and cars using the B3081 through Verwood to get to places further afield. This increase in traffic has a detrimental effect on the town centre by way of Noise, Pollution, Vibration, Road Safety and Environmental Concerns. Traffic will increase further in the coming years and could even double by 2027 particularly if there is further housing development in Verwood and this increased traffic flow will have serious consequences for the town centre. In looking forward to 2027 and a Town Centre 'Fit for the Future' with an increasing elderly population it is essential that other options are considered. Housing I consider there is a need for more affordable housing for the Verwood Area, with a mix of 2/3 bed semi-detached and terraced houses with adequate provision for off road parking and/or garages. However, unless the infrastructure is put in place in the first</p>	<p>bypass traffic could be diverted using Home Farm Road/Manor Road/Burnbake Road/Blackhill Road or Vicarage Road/Home Farm Road. 5) Traffic calming measures or reduced carriageway or speed humps should be avoided due to emergence services in Station Road (e.g. Police, Fire Ambulances re Verwood Surgery) and the environmental impact on the town centre. The slower the traffic the greater the pollution and congestion. It is also well documented that speed humps damage vehicles (types, wheel joints etc. thus creating road safety concerns), adversely affect disabled drivers/passengers and created vibration damage to the immediate surrounding area. 6) A large retail store such as Wilkinson's should be encouraged to come to Verwood and also a traditional restaurant for midday and evening meals.</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							instance and the problems I have outlined earlier relating to the Town Centre and parking are resolved I cannot support the present proposals.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 752	Option VWM 2	Support		As in the case of the other potential urban extensions, the Agency supports the development of the evidence base to inform any strategic growth retained in the Verwood and West Moors area, notably the use of SEDMMTS. Given the very high level of car dependency evident at Verwood and the direct link between the town and the A31 east of Ashley, the area of search south of Verwood (Options VWM3 and VWM4) is likely to be of greater concern to the Agency compared to areas north of the town (Options VWM1 and VWM2).			1049
478398	Mrs Diana Saville		CSO17 687	Option VWM 2	Object		I strongly object to building houses on green belt. The green belt is there for a reason, to protect the countryside. Verwood does not have the infrastructure to cope with more development. In particular the roads cannot cope with more traffic. Most people work and do shopping outside Verwood. More houses would just create a bigger dormitory town.			1049
515763	Mr V S Harris		CSO17 794	Option VWM 2	Object		The growth of Verwood is beyond sensible limits and there is a strong need for all facilities to catch up with the current population. The development of green belt is totally unacceptable, brown field sites abound in the area and any new development must be restricted to these whatever the additional costs.	Scrub it!!		1049
518079	Mr Harold Foster		CSO17 305	Option VWM 2		General Comment	My comments and concerns for the future housing, job opportunities, shopping and entertainment in Verwood are mainly concerned with suggested options VWM 1 and VWM 2. I fully support the urgent need for more affordable housing in our town; I have lived in Verwood since 1968 and so have witnessed many changes and many of them I believe for the good of the community. My main concern regarding the VWM 2 proposal is the lack of a safe entry and exit for the many vehicles that will need to gain access to the housing estate. It would appear to me that this entrance will have to be on the Verwood to Alderholt Road just before the dangerous bridge which takes you over			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							a long-gone railway line. It may well be that a developer may be able to level out the dangerous corner just 300 yds or so further along the road. There is also the issue with the safety of children crossing a dangerous stretch of road to reach Trinity First School.			
518095	Mrs M R Owen		CSO17 314	Option VWM 2	Object		I am objecting to the listed developments because of my concerns over land and mains drainage. Also there is no information on access to the proposed new school and also the proposed closure of Verwood police station as reported in the daily echo. There are not enough facilities for healthcare i.e. doctors, dentists for existing population as things are now never mind another 400+ houses.			1049
518105	John Maskell		CSO17 320	Option VWM 2	Object		I have read the Core Strategy Options document issued for voluntary consultations and object to the construction of a further 415 homes in Verwood as described in VWM 1 - 4 inclusive. Verwood has suffered from massive and uncontrolled expansion for many years and we are left with a 'messy' town with no single centre and a series of other problems relating to infrastructure, highways, shopping facilities, folding, drainage systems and lack of acceptable recreational facilities. Most residents have to use cars just for the basic essentials such as food, employment, recreational facilities with round trips being at least 10 and in most cases more like 20 or more miles. The Verwood 'carbon footprint' is enormous and these proposals will only make it worse. We really do need substantial improvements to correct the existing problems that exist in Verwood today before we should even think about more housing. For example we need to : -Improve the highways including the B3081 through the town, Manor Road from Vicarage Road junction to Newtown Road junction, construct the Springfield Distributor Road and provide adequate crossing facilities in sufficient quantities on these roads to allow safe crossing locations. -The Sewage systems are running at full capacity and need substantial improvements.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>-We need more adequate leisure centre facilities.</p> <p>- We need more retail outlets to reduce the need to car travel.</p> <p>-As the second largest town in Dorset we do not have a senior school (the proposal to build one on the site adjacent to Emanuel School is not feasible).</p> <p>-We need time to consolidate before more homes are built.</p> <p>I understand that previous plans/strategies stated that Verwood could stand more housing developments when the West Moors bypass was constructed. Since this major road improvement scheme has now been abandoned perhaps it would be a good idea to abandon additional homes.</p> <p>A major concern is the erosion of further green belt land on the outskirts of the town and the resultant loss of amenity, wildlife and natural habitat.</p> <p>We have reduced the green areas within the existing town boundaries to a couple of reasonable size areas in the Recreation Ground and Bugdens Copse and now you want to re-align the protected green belt areas so we can build more homes and lose more green space. This is totally unacceptable; the green belt has been protected all these years to prevent urban crawl which is what you are now proposing to do. OK if the District Council does implement these proposals and we lose the areas of green belt what is to stop the next landowner from offering his land for development, are we to expect houses all over what is now Verwood Manor Farm. Before long Verwood will join Three Legged Cross, which will join West Moors, Which will join Ferndown and so on until we in Verwood become part of the Bournemouth/Poole Urban Conurbation.</p> <p>All of the proposed future development is very close to the protected Dorset heathland and to the established Sites of Special Scientific Interest, including the River Crane Valley. I strongly urge the District Council not to proceed with the proposals under VWM 1 - 4.</p> <p>To conclude I think it is time for Verwood to be left to consolidate as we are managing improvements as we can and as money becomes available.</p> <p>Improvements provided they are the right improvements, generated by the Morrison's expansion are welcome and should be encouraged.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>The other towns in East Dorset may think too much investment has been made in Verwood but Ferndown, Wimborne, Christchurch and the like have not expanded at the same rate as Verwood and have not been left in such a mess either.</p> <p>I have been a resident in Verwood since 1986 and have seen most of the rapid expansion and along with a large number of others have sat back and done nothing about it. The Verwood apathy is no more, please listen to what we have to say. I appreciate some of it will be highly emotive, probably vitriolic and some downright rude but amongst all of it there will be a great deal of sense and constructive comments. Please Listen!</p>			
518195	Mr M Willcocks		CSO17331	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I wish to make the following comments regarding the proposals set out for Verwood:</p> <p>1. Verwood has already experienced a period of very rapid housing growth and development in recent years. I understand that Verwood now has a population of around 14,000 people and like myself, many residents believe that the town developed on a piecemeal basis such that we now suffer from many problems through lack of careful planning and development in recent times. My wife and I moved to Verwood in 2002 by which time the majority of rapid housing growth had already taken place. However, since 2002, housing expansion has still continued at a pace with two significant flat developments on Home Farm Road, a new Care Home on Station Road, a new block of flats at the junction of Station Road/Black Hill, a pocket of new houses close to the Cemetery, and recently there has been planning approval for 26 Flats behind the Police Station.</p> <p>2. TRANSPORTATION</p> <p>Links to Verwood are already up to capacity especially the main roads to Ringwood (B3081) and Three Legged Cross/West Moors (B3072). Verwood is very much a commuter town and a lot of the population works outside Verwood in places like Southampton, Bournemouth and Poole. So the main roads to and from Verwood already carry a high volume of traffic on a daily basis. There is a particular 'bottleneck' along the Ringwood Road at the 'Tesco Express'</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>where parking of cars along the main road has led to a situation where cars cannot travel in opposite directions at the same time, thereby causing tailbacks on both sides of the road. The B3081 already suffers from the heavy lorry use to and from Bluehaze landfill site, as well as the significant car traffic to the Somerley domestic waste site. Because of these waste sites, the number of heavy lorries travelling through the centre into Verwood (coming from the West Moors and Cranborne directions) has also increased in recent times adding to the heavy road usage.</p> <p>3. SCHOOL/HEALTHCARE/EMERGENCY SERVICES The already rapid population expansion has led to our Verwood infant/junior schools being at risk of running at beyond their current capacity. I understand there is very little, if any, spare capacity to cope with significant population growth.</p> <p>I am aware that the emergency services, especially the ambulance service are already struggling to deal with the level of emergency calls they already have to deal with. We already have a considerable number of residents who are elderly and this adds pressure to the problem.</p> <p>Then of course there is the question as to whether the current medical practices could handle a greater number of patients. The Medical Practice that I belong to already seems to be extremely busy.</p> <p>4. SHOPS Complaints about the lack of shops in Verwood has been an issue for several years now, and further population growth will only serve to exacerbate this on-going problem.</p> <p>5. Housing Proposal VWM 2 – Land west of Eastworth Road I understand this land is currently Greenbelt. With so much other potential land available between Verwood and Three Legged Cross/West Moors, which is not classed as Greenbelt, I cannot understand why VWM 2 development should be considered at all. It was stated by one of your Planning Officers at a recent meeting of the Verwood LAG that the adoption of the Core Strategy will prevent outside developers from gaining planning consent, on appeal, on all sorts of parcels of land that we do not wish to be developed (e.g. Greenbelt). However, the proposal to develop VWM 2</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							flies in the face of this logic, since the Core Strategy would be confirming for development the very Greenbelt land we wish to preserve. 6. In summary, it is highly questionable whether Verwood is able to absorb the high level of new housing proposed, firstly because after such a rapid expansion in recent years, it now needs time to mature as a town. Secondly, there are strong questions about whether the transport links, schools, emergency and medical services could cope with such expansion. And finally, I believe a strategy based upon such a high proportion of affordable housing in a town where plentiful employment opportunities are not available or even within a short travel distance will ultimately fail the constituents of Verwood. I should be grateful if you could give consideration to these comments.			
518281	Adrian Palmer	Clerk to Governors Emmanuel Middle School	CSO17 348	Option VWM 2		General Comment	I have been asked to send you the following extract from the minutes of our Full Governing Body Meeting on Tuesday 11th January 2011. "JW (Head teacher) explained the potential implications for EMS should additional housing be approved. Already the school hall is too small for our purposes. Also we do not have any spare classrooms, so any additional pupils would mean additional buildings for new classrooms."			1049
518303	Mr P R Owen		CSO17 354	Option VWM 2	Object		Nothing in the plan about access to the school. Also concerns about land surface water drainage with ref to Howe Lane site (V3) also main drainage. With reference to Burnbake Road. Some years ago when a development behind Elmtree Cottage caused surface water to engulf the site and the cottage had to be demolished. As I am sure you can remember this would be a problem for VWM 3 and 4 sites.			1049
518433	Chris Holmes		CSO17 363	Option VWM 2	Object		Thank you for the chance to comment. I feel that your plans include too many social houses, your plans have much detail but why the disproportionate number of low cost houses. In all cases you are looking for 50%, which is just too many. Because of this I object to your plan. Additionally the link			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							between the new school and the new houses is not wholly clear, but you are trying to make that link, perhaps to gain extra support for this biased proposal.			
518812	Mrs L Munn		CSO17 386	Option VWM 2	Object		With a population already larger than the county town, I feel Verwood has reached its optimum number of inhabitants. We are in danger of creating a dormitory living space with an increasing lack of community input: evidence the apathy with which the vastly ever expensive hub has been received. Stop now before we reach the point where Verwood is a soul-less place to live.			1049
518882	Mrs Doreen Knowlden		CSO17 400	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
518895	Mr Mark Gifford		CSO17 405	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is already overcrowded with housing. There are not enough local facilities to support the population; we need pubs, restaurants, better transport links and better facilities for younger people. There is no employment in the area; more houses will just increase the "dormitory" feel to the town. The road system cannot cope with the traffic at peak times. We already need a secondary school as the number of children in the town is increasing – QE and Ferndown will not cope with future demand + a local secondary school would be a real benefit to the community. No more housing in Verwood please.			1049
518905	Mrs Burbidge		CSO17 417	Option VWM 2	Support		Over the last 30 years Verwood has expanded hugely, facilities have not increased, with intention to provide more affordable homes, hence families, surely have a plan to incorporate an indoor recreational facility aimed at the youth, with a refreshment area, affordable for youths, the hub is only ok for older people which is why hundreds of kids congregate at the park opposite Tesco express Verwood in winter + summer. Come on council think again wisely!			1049
519265	Mrs Pat Morrow		CSO17 429	Option VWM 2	Support		I am in favour, in principal, of the proposed developments provided that: 1) The infrastructure needed is in place before building. 2) That the transport situation is improved.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							3) That parking in the town centre is reversed and all day parking is prohibited. The development of a park and ride system could be available for those wishing to use free bus passes – A Blake a possibility. 4) That facilities – doctors, dentists, shops (not estate agents) land uses – are affordable.			
519400	Mrs Bailey		CSO17 441	Option VWM 2	Object		I moved to Verwood 23 years ago. Now everywhere is packed solid with shoppers at the only supermarket, up to 5 years ago you could get a doctor's appointment within a day, now because of the already great volume of people it's a week or more. The roads are full opposite my house, the evenings and weekends "Close" is like a parking lot only one garage for petrol unless you can get in Ringwood or Wimborne. No Verwood cannot cope now, so no more buildings please.			1049
519890	Mrs Christine Iley		CSO17 613	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 579	Option VWM 2		General Comment	Chapter 11 - Verwood and West Moors Our main concern regarding development area is foul drainage and the capacity of Palmerford Sewage Treatment Works (STW). This is discussed below. All options Foul Drainage The effluent capacity at Palmersford STW is currently unknown. This is particularly relevant because development in Verwood is believed to connect to this STW, and this settlement is part of the Core Strategy. The capacity of Palmersford STW and associated infrastructure must be established as part of the Core Strategy evidence. Overall issues for consideration are: surface water drainage; SUDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
520657	Miss Claire Gibbins		CSO17 630	Option VWM 2	Support		VWM 2 would have much less impact in terms of ruining the current look of the area. VWM 4 is a much more scenic area.			1049
520671	P Hancy		CSO17 654	Option VWM 2	Object		Object VWM 2 this is taking good agricultural land in the green belt, which you seem able to move when it suites your means. Why on earth don't you use all the scrub-land on either side of the road to Three-Legged-Cross. I suppose it would be too much of a job for the developers. But I suppose all the protest in the world won't put you off the course you have in mind after all the ghastly buildings you have already allowed in Verwood. Cellblock H opposite the ski slopes top of crane drive and the monstrosity being built on the site of the Fayewood Pub also the white elephant the Hub!!			1049
520737	S New		CSO17 668	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
520927	Ms I Jenson		CSO17 679	Option VWM 2	Object		I like most residents in Verwood object because we have not got the doc, dentist, schools, shops, bus service, roads for all the cars. The old people have to go out of Verwood to get cloths ext. We already have a building going up, on the Ringwood Road site, no one wanted, did anyone do anything to stop it for Verwood and Bristol went ahead. Would they like to live by it I don't think so.			1049
520965	Mrs J Lake		CSO17 692	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO18 026	Option VWM 2	Object		SUMMARY: VWM2 LAND TO THE WEST OF EASTWORTH (200 HOMES) We OBJECT to the proposed development. It would have a severe detrimental effect on the openness of the countryside and on the environment. It is surrounded and within the AGLV. It would destroy the approach to Verwood from the old Edmondsham Road. No mitigation would reduce the impact. There are few local jobs in Verwood so travel to work would			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>be by private motor car. If car journeys were not reduced it would have the potential to add 300 cars on the road. This is a conservative estimate of 1 ½ cars per household.</p> <p>Only 'B' and 'C' roads link Verwood to the main industrial and service centres.</p> <p>There is no access in the evenings to entertainment centres for Verwood's youth. This has the potential to lead to anti-social behaviour unless informal facilities are provided in Verwood.</p> <p>PURPOSES OF THE GREENBELT PPG2 (as applicable to this site)</p> <p>To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.</p> <p>This potential site is surrounded by an Area of Great Landscape Value.</p> <p>To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>This side of Verwood is completely open and unspoilt, very rural in character. No amount of Green Infrastructure would mitigate the damage on the openness.</p> <p>To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.</p> <p>Verwood was only a small village, so technically this purpose does not apply. However, the approach is through the AGLV and the settlements first very visible buildings are the old Eastworth Farm House and on the other side of the road, an old converted cottage. It is a very rural approach from the Edmondsham Road.</p> <p>VISUAL IMPACT ON BOTH THE NATURAL AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPE</p> <p>This site is quite close to the proposed site west of Trinity School, the impact will be huge as Verwood spreads into the countryside once more. There is a large sweep of open green fields on either side of the road that acts as a sharp divide between urban and rural. The two sites would cover so much that the remaining fields would not compensate for this loss.</p> <p>The Boadway Malyan Masterplan Report considered that the urban fringe at this part of Verwood has been breached by the building of Trinity School and therefore think this site and the one to the east of the Edmondsham Road suitable for development. We disagree. The school is very unobtrusive and should not be used as an excuse for further development</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>of a very rural area.</p> <p>SUSTAINABLE LOCATION PPS1</p> <p>Location</p> <p>Primary Schools</p> <p>Middle and Upper</p> <p>Daily shopping</p> <p>Post Office</p> <p>Doctors</p> <p>West of Eastworth Rd</p> <p>0.5km</p> <p>2.2km M</p> <p>FD - Upper</p> <p>1.3km – Town</p> <p>2.3km Morr</p> <p>1.4km</p> <p>0.9km</p> <p>The school system in Verwood is very complex. There is a mixture of both the 2-tier and 3-tier system which has led to a great number of different schools. For this reason the measurements are unsound. Some children go to school in Cranborne and these generally move onto Wimborne as an upper school (not Ferndown). Others go to Ringwood to senior school as it has a 2 tier system. Until this system has been resolved, it is likely that this will lead to more car journeys making the potential housing sites less sustainable.</p> <p>EMPLOYMENT</p> <p>By bicycle 3.6km to Ebblake Industrial Estate, slightly longer by car. We believe many people come in from Ringwood to work at this site, the workers in Verwood travel further afield. Access to other sites of employment in East Dorset would be by car.</p> <p>Commuting Figures for Verwood. Source: 2001 Census</p> <p>Internal Commuters ... 1648</p> <p>In Commuters1558</p> <p>Out Commuters3331</p> <p>Total commuters (in and out):4889</p> <p>The Core Strategy shows figures of 90% of commuters who drove or who were driven.</p> <p>PUBLIC TRANSPORT</p> <p>The number 36, Verwood to Bournemouth bus. Hourly during</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the middle of the day, 3 buses before 9am on school days. These do not run when the school is closed. Last bus from Bournemouth leaves at 18.20 hours. Journey times: 1 hour to Bournemouth The number 37, Verwood to Poole, runs hourly, it takes 1 ¼ hours to get to Poole. Last bus from Poole is at 17.50 hours. Journey times: 45 mins to FD and 1 hour 15 mins to Poole No trains There is no access to Bournemouth or Poole in the evenings by public transport, therefor this restricts the recreational activities of the younger population NEAREST CENTRE WITH FULL RANGE OF SERVICES Ringwood, Ferndown or Wimborne. There is an hourly service to Ringwood and Ferndown, but it is likely the chosen form of transport would be by car. PROVISION OF MULTI-FUNCTIONAL GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND OPEN SPACES: (Natural England's Green Infrastructure Guidance NE176 & PPG17 Planning for Open Spaces There would be a need for safe GI so that older children could walk or cycle to the middle school, or could access the school bus stop safely. If they had to travel by car it would create such a problem with cars travelling to Trinity School and the pre-school if those on the housing estates used the roundabout by the school to exit. It would be a potentially dangerous 2 way traffic. Added to this traffic are the cars and lorries who use this 'C' road to either leave or access Verwood. The potential for injuries to families walking to school are considerable. The large landscaped area would be very necessary as the PPG17 Open Space Study that covered the Verwood area recognised a need to improve the access to informal spaces/open countryside around the settlement that is not heathland. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS: Our comments on environmental aspects of the Core Strategy Options document are included in the Response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Community Partnership, which we fully endorse. ECOSYSTEM DAMAGE: disturbance to flora and fauna</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>If this site and the Trinity School site were built on, much of the openness would be lost and so too the existing flora and fauna which would be in retreat once again. A survey would be required to find out what flora and fauna exist on this site.</p> <p>TRANQUILLITY: a sense of place.</p> <p>The large open area is lovely and peaceful to the eye. There is not much traffic, no planes, so one is wrapped in tranquillity which will be lost of course if these sites were built on. There can be no mitigation for this loss.</p> <p>LIGHT POLLUTION</p> <p>Please see the ETAG Response and comments by Bob Mizon.</p> <p>DRAINAGE PPS25 (causing increase in river flooding or surface water problems)</p> <p>We are not aware of any problems on this site other than the normal one in Verwood of unstable heathland soil.</p> <p>PROXIMITY TO HEATHLAND AND AVAILABILITY OF SANGS FOR MITIGATION</p> <p>It is close to sensitive heathland so mitigation would be required. In conjunction with the Trinity School site, SANGS would be required due to the proximity of St Stephen's Castle Nature Reserve, Dewlands Common and Horton Common.</p> <p>The potential sites are not that far from Ringwood Forest but in order to reach the Forest the GI would take residents past Stephen's Castle and the likelihood would be they would not go any further, increasing the damage to this area. For this reason a large SANGS between the Edmondsham Road and Burrows Lane would be vital, also to the north of the proposed site. This should divert people from the heathlands. It will need to be managed by east Dorset's Countryside services.</p> <p>PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE (schools etc.)</p> <p>In view of the size of Verwood, nearly 15,000 people, it seems there really is a need for a new Upper School to be built. A school here would relieve Ferndown who could then provide spare capacity to relieve the Wimborne Upper school. The Hub provides an excellent Community Centre and there is a Leisure Centre by Morrisons. The main criticism of Verwood is that it is so spread out with too many services and</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>not enough retail. Another doctor's surgery would be required if much development took place. Informal recreational and entertainment facilities are required for the youth of Verwood as they have no access in the evenings to Wimborne, Poole or Bournemouth.</p> <p>Parking in Verwood is an issue that needs resolving by providing more spaces. There are not enough car parks, the settlement sprawls over a large area, people are struggling to park at the shops and are being forced to go elsewhere. A survey needs to be done to check on the situation. There is also a suggestion that people are using the central parking to leave their cars, catch a bus using their bus passes, and so blocking shopper's spaces. Delivery vans also cause problems due to lack of space.</p> <p>IMPACT ON TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>There are very few jobs in Verwood so any potential development will put more cars on already overcrowded roads. The bus service is poor, there is very little employment accessible by alternate means of travel. The Edmondsham Road is a 'C' road without a speed limit so traffic calming would be required due to its proximity to Trinity School. Manor Road is a very busy road with a narrow bridge and has some very bad bends, the junction at Three Legged Cross would get more difficult. The road to Ringwood is a little better in size but we understand during wet weather it tends to suffer from surface water. There is nowhere in East Dorset you can build and not add to the congestion around the main employment centres. One of the problems with Verwood workers driving in the direction of Wimborne is that they use the Holt Road as a 'rat run'.</p> <p>East Dorset District Council has a target in the Transport Plan to introduce buses to take workers directly to industrial estates. This is an excellent idea. However, one such bus already exists, the number 29 from Bournemouth to Ferndown Industrial site. There are two early morning buses from Bournemouth, one leaving the estate at lunch time and two leaving in the evening. This service started in April 2010, without subsidies. The Yellow bus company confirmed that they do carry some regular passengers to and from the Industrial Estate. We suspect the buses are not that well</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							used, one major problem influencing their use is the vast areas of free parking available on Ferndown Industrial Estate. It may be that the 'stick and carrot' needs to be introduced to get people out of their cars and into a bus. If less parking existed there would be more room for new business. We noticed a large new factory down Brook Road had a vast new car park, when parking is free and easy no-one will catch a bus. Perhaps spaces should only be allocated if there are no other means of reasonable travel.			
359482	Ms Helen POWELL	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18759	Option VWM 2		No Opinion	This option could be detrimental to designated nature conservation sites in the locality but the development also offers an opportunity for significant green infrastructure that could remove this detriment and increase the value of the locality for biodiversity. our opinion on this option will therefore be shaped by the strength of policy on delivery of the green infrastructure as an integral part of the development and the requirements to be met by the green infrastructure. The following requirements for the green infrastructure are essential: 1 Suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG) of a scale and design generated by the residential development away from near-by heathland European sites, Ramsar site and SSSI and the habitats of European protected species. 2 Provision of a comprehensive package of Sustainable Urban Drainage solutions within the potential developable and landscape areas and in the potential SANG. The SUDs should both ameliorate flood volumes to the Moors River System SSSI and reduce and clean water of poor quality from urban surfaces and drainage thereby protecting a high water quality in the river SSSI.			1049
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18717	Option VWM 2	Object		We agree with the findings of the HRA in connection with the proposed housing sites within these areas. Consequently, until such time as assessment of the potential impacts of the options on European sites is determined we object to the following policies:			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
476458	Mr Neil Bichard	Bradbury Bichard	CSO18 475	Option VWM 2	Support	General Comment	The new policies may facilitate an opportunity for a client	On behalf of clients I support the proposals and in particular the proposed policies VWM 1 and VWM 2 but would like to suggest that the Green Belt boundary be revised to incorporate the dwelling at 51 Edmondsham Road and adjacent properties. These houses would have new development to the east and west and it would seem appropriate that the Green Belt boundary be redrawn to the road rather than the current arbitrary line. Initial sketch proposals would suggest that two new dwellings could be accommodated accessed from the existing entrance to Edmondsham Road. These initial proposals are available if required.		1049
478224	Mrs Julia Goodwin		CSO18 298	Option VWM 2	Object		With regards to the recent Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Document, I would be grateful if you could please add this letter alongside the other comments concerning this proposal. As you are probably aware Sally Burrows has provided you with a plans document drawn up by herself, and has also consulted ourselves and Steve and Nicky Richards on the contents. I would like to make it clear that we have put our names to Eastworth Farm Ltd's document only in the event that this proposal goes forward to planning and in that event, because of our proximity to the proposed site we would have no choice but to be involved. This does not mean that we support this proposal in any way at this stage. I have raised my concerns against this proposal under separate headings below. If you are unclear on any			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>comments I have made, then please do not hesitate to come back to me for further clarification.</p> <p>My concerns regarding this proposed document are as follows:-</p> <p>1. Infrastructure, Facilities and Amenities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are currently two main roads in and out of Verwood. These roads are very populated and also very prone to disruption and bad weather. Over the last three years these roads have been closed due to ice and bad weather. The roads have also suffered severe congestion as a result of road works, accidents, rush hour periods. There are safety concerns on both roads with a number of fatalities occurring and indeed a regular speed camera alongside mobile speed units clarify that these roads are classed at high risk. The proposed planning documents will increase the amount of traffic using these roads, but there is little mention of how these roads will be improved. • Public transport is very poor to and from Verwood. Wilts and Dorset buses say that they would need a minimum of 25 people per bus to make the service profitable, and as such are not considering improving the service. The current service runs once per hour to and from Bournemouth, with the last bus leaving Bournemouth at 6.30pm and the last bus from Verwood around the same time. Transport to other local services such as Salisbury Hospital are even more difficult, as was highlighted in the recent public meeting held by Salisbury Hospital where transport was mentioned. Similar discussions around transport have taken place with Poole Hospital and Bournemouth Hospital. • There are currently two GP surgeries operating within Verwood. Although individually the list sizes are comparable to other areas, it is important to note that time pressures often mean a wait of up to a week to obtain an appointment. Whilst the responsibility to improve waiting times rests with the surgery and the PCT, it is clear that a potential increase of up to a 1,000 residents will mean an increase in burden on the surgeries at a time when they themselves are under increasing pressure to reduce costs due to the Government white paper. The same is true looking at dentists. I have lived in Verwood for 10 years yet only managed to obtain an NHS 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>dentist last October. As the Strategy Document is looking to provide affordable housing as part of the plans, then issues such as GP surgery, dentist, public transport are crucial. However, the document makes no mention on how these will be tackled.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a small police station in Verwood that is now at risk of closing. They are already having some services cut, such as rapid response. There has being an increase in petty crime such as vandalism, and with no facilities for youths, these have led to an increase of police activity to deal with disturbances outside the Tesco Express and Ferret Green particularly around weekends. With an increase in housing and a lack of facilities these problems will only get worse, whilst EDDC continue to refuse to action their own plans going back two years to provide an improvement in facilities. • The Core Strategy Document claims that Verwood has a vibrant Town Centre. There is no factual evidence to back this statement up, and it is clear that the company based in Weybridge who compiled this report have never visited Verwood. A vibrant Town Centre is formed through a mixture of a variety of shops and services together with a throughput population. Verwood by its geographic position does not have the through flow of traffic as Ringwood or Ferndown. Likewise the shops consisting mainly of Hairdressers, Estate Agents and Banks is hardly suitable for a vibrant Town Centre. Indeed the sprawl from Ferret Green down to Morrisons means that there is actually no Town Centre, and I welcome the idea that part of the plan is to create a Town Centre boundary. The next step is to create a Town Centre that residents feel bring the vitality and vibrant feel to Verwood. Would it not be better to simply seek the resident's opinion in an open questionnaire rather than a led set of questions outlined in the Town Plan document? Verwood is in desperate need for more shops, cafes, restaurants and areas to appeal to all age ranges and not a select few. • There is little to no facilities for the children and the youth of Verwood. The proposed planning document in building new houses will actually increase the number of children and youths in Verwood. How does EDDC place this alongside the lack of facilities that they themselves commented on some 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>two years ago, yet have still done nothing to rectify? Public transport in Verwood ends around 6.30pm, which means that children are reliant on parents or friends to drive them about. There is a poorly used youth club, no sustained evening activities and a poorly used leisure complex. It is no wonder there is an increase in disturbances caused by children hanging around recreational grounds when so little is made available to them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verwood schools currently provide facilities for primary only and not secondary. The schools themselves are near to capacity and an increase in population will only compound this problem. There is mention of a secondary school in the Strategy Document and land has already been set aside. However, at the recent meeting with EDDC it was publically said that there was no funding available to build a secondary school at present. What the Strategy Document proposes is to increase the population and housing with no thought or consideration for the structures. The two should go hand in hand so there is no crisis situation. Work also needs to be considered into the infrastructure around these schools. Trinity school currently shuts its gates causing parents to walk long distances, crossing busy and over populated roads. The same is true at Hillside, Verwood First and Emmanuel. These are problems already raised with EDDC, yet no action has being taken. Why is this? With an increase of up to 800 cars, and extra children how are these schools likely to cope? Is this not a disaster waiting to happen? <p>2. Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under section 1 I have already commented on the two roads servicing Verwood at present. However, there is also a risk to the smaller roads that would link the proposed developments to the main centre of Verwood. No mention is made to surveys or planning as to how these roads would be developed. If you look at Option 2, the road is deemed unsuitable at present for pedestrians, with no lighting, no pavement, blind corners and hills. To propose new building, then consideration needs to be given to access and exit points, safety concerns, and the impact on the current buildings. On a wider scale, I believe that the Verwood / West Moors bypass plans have now being scrapped, that will place 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>even more pressure on an already congested and over used road system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The drainage and sewerage systems in Verwood were designed to cope with a vastly reduced population than at present. Over the last few years this has led to flooding, burst pipes and indeed last year a complete new main pipe installed. There is no survey in place and no mention to complete one. Can you please clarify if it is EDDC's policy to ignore the basic infrastructure needed, alongside the comments made by the EDDC Councillors who have also asked for this in their recent letter in response to the Strategy. In the response they sent to EDDC it clearly states, "All sites need to be surveyed for archaeological deposits and all require new access roads. Tree lines should be respected and two sites to the South of Verwood are close to the flood plain or watercourse. We would like EDDC to confirm that due to the ecology and rich biodiversity of both sites, that at least a one year cyclical survey is conducted by EDDC to cover the 4 seasons, these surveys to be conducted under the statutory requirements of Natural England, the Environment Agency, and other relevant bodies, both UK and EU, the results of these surveys to be made available for inspection." • Southern Electric has also laid, at huge expense, seriously powerful electrical cables underneath the length of Edmondsham Road, this part of the road which will be heavily used by developers over a number of years during any potential new build. These cables are planned to do live in about 2 years' time. I would like to suggest that Southern Electric are consulted about any proposed damage to these cables. • An increase in housing does not necessarily mean an increase in employment. Although initially there may be an increase in short term work, it also goes without saying that contractors are likely to bring in a significant proportion of their own workforce and not rely on local tradesmen. If you consider the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate there is a significant number of people working there that do not live in Dorset and instead commute from other areas, so increasing the pressure on the roads and transport links. 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>3. Carbon Foot Print / Greenbelt / Light Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verwood currently has the highest car ownership in East Dorset, another 415 houses not to mention current new builds in progress, could potentially create another 800 + cars on our roads. This creates a huge carbon footprint alongside the increased risks and safety aspects already outlined in this letter. • By building on Verwood's last remaining greenbelt areas, we are damaging the Ecology and Biodiversity of the area. Building on these areas will seriously affect the Wildlife of Dorset, we have badgers, owls, bats, slow worms, snakes, foxes, birds of prey, door mice and deer to mention but a few, all of their habitats will be destroyed by these proposals and light pollution, which will especially affect the bats and owls. These areas especially in North Verwood are so I understand rich grade 2 arable land. Houses should not be built on greenbelt land full stop except in exceptional circumstances, especially not rich agricultural land and in order to do this would require a special application to the Secretary of State. Again a cost not mentioned at any point in the Core Strategy Document, but one made mention by Verwood local MP, Mr Bob Walter. • Greenbelt land is there for a reason is it to prevent urban sprawl, it is part of our heritage and it is being rapidly eroded. Verwood especially if these proposals go ahead will have little greenbelt land left to enjoy. The North Verwood site also has an area of great landscape value designation on it, although I understand this can be changed and reviewed by the Council it should be acknowledged. This is also the last rural entrance into Verwood and it is just going to become one big housing estate like to rest of Verwood. One of the last areas still with buildings of historic value close by. <p>4. Accessibility to North Verwood proposed sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These sites are situated on a narrow C road, with proposed entrances / exits two on Edmondsham Road and one on Station Road. • Station Road is currently a busy road so this entrance / exit would be very dangerous as visibility is poor and the road narrow. With an increase in use at certain parts of the day this poses a huge safety risk, whilst also causing the 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>opportunity to congest and cause gridlock.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two proposed entrances / exits on Edmondsham Road starting with the entrance before the hump back bridge. This is a narrow country lane, there are no pathways down this road and the potential for widening the road and creating pathways are near on impossible. Ourselves and Eastworth Farm Cottages are situated very close to the road side, so without compulsory purchasing houses this narrow road will be very dangerous. The other proposed entrance / exit on Edmondsham Road beside our house is completely blind / obscured to the right! It is narrow and without compulsory purchasing gardens and removing Tree Protection Order Oaks this would be catastrophic as an entrance / exit, with potentially 400 cars coming back and forward. We also recently had a collapsed culvert on this road, how on earth will this road cope with the heavy vehicles required to build these new developments? These roads and drainage were never designed for this! • With the best will in the world green pathways are a great idea, but people are time restricted so they will generally go the most direct route to where they are going. For this reason again pathways from the new estates would be necessary to get children to Trinity School, I know myself that if I chose to walk down Edmondsham Road with my children it would take me 5 minutes, although we take our lives in our hands, but if I walk through the estate the safe quickest route it will take 15 minutes each way! Parents who are trying to get to work and time restricted will then end up taking their cars or using unsafe routes, causing utter chaos in the surrounding areas. Finally on a personal note, we have lived in Verwood for 10 years our children were both born here and we consider it home. Verwood grew as a town very quickly and has not had time for the infrastructure and facilities to catch up or to mature and adapt to its' current population. We all understand that there is a need for housing in East Dorset, especially affordable housing but is Verwood really the right place in the long term? Is it not important to create a Town which is able to cope with its' current population, rather than creating one large housing estate, where people use it solely to commute. We were deeply saddened to hear about the North Verwood 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>site proposals especially. It has caused extreme upset and embarrassment as you are aware amongst our neighbours, as they found it hard to believe that although our land appeared on the proposal document we knew nothing about this document until 2 days into the consultation. This simply shows how badly thought out the whole proposal document is, that your own plans could not decide what was privately owned land. Nor was there any communication despite including our land on the planning documents. This is our family home and it is very hard for us to look at the positive side of this proposal not only for Verwood as a Town, but also for our personal environment. It is a beautiful part of Verwood, the last rural unspoilt entrance into Verwood, with historic and archaeological value and should be left to be enjoyed by all.</p> <p>The message is simple. Verwood needs to be made secure for its current level of population before increasing the population further. EDDC have a duty to maintain facilities and infrastructure for its current residents yet it continues to ignore proposals over the last few years. EDDC goes further to overrule the wishes of its own local Councillors and instead pursue a policy designed to bring income into the Council. To continue with this policy is to destroy an established Village</p>			
521457	Mr and Mrs M Daymond		CSO17 841	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>VWM 1-4 4 different sites of development means 4 different groups of residents affected by the development on Green Belt; hence the outcry locally.</p> <p>VWM 2 and VWM4 These 2 sites are each just a little larger in area than the Ebblake housing estate of Liederbach Drive, Kiln Way and Ebblake Close and VWM4 has a wet area that will in fact reduce its development area; the Ebblake estate accommodates at least 174 dwellings which includes 2 blocks of flats. A proposal of at least 200 for VWM2 and at least 165 for VWM4, means that density could be even worse than at Ebblake.</p> <p>Flats are not appropriate on the edge of Green Belt; (at Ebblake they are built on the industrial estate side of the development which eases the impact).</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Density</p> <p>We note that the number of houses is given as “approx.”. This can only mean that the total number is likely to exceed that stated. Otherwise it would say “up to” x number of houses.</p> <p>THE CORE STRATEGY LITERATURE</p> <p>Each development is described as benefitting residents with “additional valuable green infrastructure and divert pressures away from heathlands”. This is nonsense!! The majority of residents who walk or ride bikes off road go to Moors Valley Country Park. Walkers have the vast Ringwood Forest and it is only ramblers and horse owners who use the heathland and it is the horses that churn up heathland. Any green infrastructure within a development just improves the local environment but also needs maintenance.</p>			
522203	Mr Nigel Reeves		CSO18077	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>As a Verwood resident, please see below my response and comments relating to the Verwood Options in the Core Strategy Consultation document.</p> <p>I object to any further substantial housing increases in Verwood, specifically VWM 2 and VWM 4 in the document, for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - why is suddenly okay to build on green belt land? - as noted, there are significant Verwood public transport issues, and I see no information as to how this will be dramatically improved to encourage residents out of private transports (cars) - as reported, most residents use their cars to commute, so this will just increase this usage - I see all the surrounding traffic problem areas noted (Ashley Heath, Spur Road, A31 etc.) but see nothing of how these significant problems will be resolved. <p>Why increase the population in a town already noted as being small for its population and in a location with no decent transportation infrastructure in place (as above), no shopping centre, and, despite what it states in the report, inadequate facilities in terms of what a town of this population should have. Yes, there is a supermarket, but there is no real shopping centre, few shops other than hairdressers and estate agents, only one restaurant, and inadequate facilities for young people as the report states (I know as I have 4</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>children).</p> <p>In summary, before any further increase in housing, properly address the transportation and facilities issues raised, not to mention comments from others on your "dorsetforyou" website and other websites, and then maybe consider more housing.</p> <p>Finally, inviting comments on your paper copy form from everyone on all of the options for each of the areas being considered simply turns it into a competition between each of them to no real benefit, and with Verwood the obvious loser. By that I mean why should a resident of Wimborne or Corfe Mullen, for example, object to new housing in Verwood, especially if they think that it may obviate the need for housing in their own town. A Verwood resident is far more likely to be aware of increased traffic problems connected to any potential new housing in Wimborne, Corfe Mullen or Ferndown as they have to leave Verwood and possibly drive through these areas to reach a hospital or a shopping centre etc., whereas mostly residents of other towns would infrequently travel through or to Verwood.</p> <p>For the most part therefore, I don't think it is fair to comment on the potential options for the other towns except that the current transport infrastructure problems common to all of our areas must be resolved until any further substantial house building. No one seems to also bear in mind that this is a major tourist area and the traffic is hugely increased by visitors and holidaymakers for much of the year, and at certain times many of the roads almost grind to a halt, and in the case of a serious accident on any one of a number of routes, they do come to a halt. Personally I regularly drive to and through Wimborne and Corfe Mullen, and occasionally through Ferndown, and dread to think how the options of high numbers of new houses will worsen these often already slow and painful journeys.</p> <p>Please, therefore, first try to address the issues raised before major increases in house building.</p>			
522240	Association Verwood Residents	Chairman Association Verwood	CSO18095	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>5. THE PROPOSALS</p> <p>VWM 1 – 30 Homes – 12-15 affordable</p> <p>VWM 2 – 200 Homes – 80-100 affordable</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Residents					<p>VWM – 20 Homes – 8-10 affordable VWM 4 – 165 Homes – 66-83 affordable Total – 415 Homes – 166-208 affordable These proposals are in essence simply going to exacerbate the problems and shortcomings outlined above in Paragraph 3.</p> <p>The Secretary of State for the Environment set out in the vision for the area to: “develop the region in a sustainable way,....., where the quality of life for residents., the business community and visitors will be maintained and enhanced”. The Regional Planning Guidance for the region states: “.....minimise the need to develop on Greenfield sites and to travel” with the aims of protecting the environment and providing prosperity for communities. It is difficult to see how the proposed developments will support the above aims. Quality of life for residents would be decimated with loss of recreational land, increased traffic and associated pollution. This is in addition to the severe adverse impact on wildlife and SSSIs. The associated infrastructure within Verwood cannot sustain more housing development as there are limited employment opportunities within the town, particularly for executive roles. Therefore more housing will simply lead to a further loss of community identity and increased isolation for those living in Verwood. The fear is that the distinct and unique quality of Verwood and its environment would be further eroded by these developments. The EDDC plan states that “development in future should be based on the principles of sustainable development”. How is it proposed this will be achieved? Developer and or the new “Homes Bonus” contributions will be totally insufficient to correct the existing shortcomings that have been endemic over the last 25 years. Previous strategies and plans indicated Verwood could accept more housing development only if the West Moors Bypass was completed. This major road improvement scheme has now been abandoned completely removing a main motivator for future housing development in Verwood. In short these proposals will further: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erode more protected GREEN BELT LAND 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cause more traffic congestion • Cause more flooding • Cause more light pollution • Cause the loss of wildlife habitat • Cause the loss of protected ancient hedgerows • Increase demand on drainage systems beyond their capabilities • Increase demand on overstretched Medical facilities • Compound the lack of adequate recreational and leisure facilities • Increase the danger to school children when arriving and leaving the school campus site at the junction of Howe Lane and Margards Lane <p>6.1 North Verwood VWM 1 & 2</p> <p>1. Wildlife</p> <p>There has already been a marked decline in wildlife populations in around the conservation area since the Holmlea Gate Development on the east side of Eastworth Rd was completed in 2001. The explosion in domestic cat numbers has drastically reduced the number and variety of bird species and small mammals in the area.</p> <p>As a result of this the local owl population has been severely affected and it is very quiet at night now compared to how it used to be in 2001. There are badgers and badger setts - a licence is required from Natural England to close a sett (we are not sure how many there are), but if there are no obvious setts nearby that the badgers could move into badger exclusion permission often requires that an artificial sett is build close by to house them.</p> <p>There are also reptiles such as adders and slow worms, bats, which are protected and some trees do indeed have a protection order.</p> <p>The proposed sites are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for much wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts.</p> <p>2. Green Belt</p> <p>These areas also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas • To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land <p>Once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. Our understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available.</p> <p>Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision.</p> <p>3. Railway Embankment The disused railway embankment/cutting far from making a natural boundary to the new development is a wildlife reserve in itself with larger animals using it as a concealed highway between the ANCI and more open country to the north (New Forest). New housing alongside it could seriously upset this corridor.</p> <p>4. The Play Park</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>The play park and recreational area would likely become overpopulated and with the loss of its scenic rural outlook this amenity would lose its appeal to many established visitors. The risk of further antisocial behaviour after dark would be greatly increased. The land outside the play park has been used by families for years with open access.</p> <p>5. AGLV Area of Great Landscape Value This is shown on Dorset Explorer maps on the version accessed via local plan www.dorsetforyou.com/localplan/east. The grassland has probably not been ploughed for many years and is likely to be of similar value to that described for Sutton Holms. Residents used to graze recreational livestock on some of the VWM2 land 14 years ago and the pasture appeared species rich then and has not been disturbed since.</p> <p>6. Access The access points to Eastworth Road will be dangerous and this small C road is not suitable for more traffic in either direction. The existing road has no pavements, is a narrow country lane and is currently unsuitable to cope with the increased traffic. There are many blind corners and unevenness that will pose huge safety issues for children. Without making the road wider the access will be impossible and the District Council have promised there will be no compulsory purchase of gardens.</p> <p>7. Statistics Verwood is the second biggest town in Dorset (2,000 people short of Dorchester) with the highest car population. Anyone in Verwood would have to travel at least 20 miles to shop for anything other than groceries. The local supermarket has no competition, and has the 5th highest profit per square foot in England. Even the supermarket cannot cope with the demand from Verwood Residents and constantly runs out of stock. The only garage in the Town regularly runs out of fuel the tanks can't be filled quickly enough. Jobs cannot be provided in the town for the new people that come. The Eblake Estate is surrounded by Heathland and housing and therefore constrained for further development. Approximately 2850 people come into Verwood for work and similarly approximately 3800 go out of Verwood every day to</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>work. The Core Strategy suggests at least 78% of workers Verwood leave the town and commute in excess of 5 miles to work on a daily basis.</p> <p>Currently school traffic causes severe congestion in the Margards Lane, Howe Lane together with parking difficulties in Hayward Crescent, Holly Grove and Keswick Way. This results in workers having to leave much earlier than necessary to avoid being delayed by this congestion.</p> <p>Public transport is poor, and anyone moving to Verwood without a car would NOT be able to get to work. The buses for college in Bournemouth and Poole only run at certain times, making the day for students very long. All the children of Verwood in year 9 or above have to be bussed out to Upper Schools. Verwood's Carbon Footprint is HUGE; building more houses would dramatically increase this, where there should be plans to reduce it.</p> <p>6.4 STATISTICAL EVIDENCE</p> <p>1. Introduction</p> <p>All figures and statistics within this section have been obtained from one of the references. When extrapolations have been made the basis for that is clarified in the text.</p> <p>Whilst many of the statistics are taken from reports applying to East Dorset there is nothing in the reports to indicate that they do not apply proportionately to Verwood. Indeed since the reports have been commissioned to decide on future housing strategy and this has determined that Verwood is one of five locations where future building is appropriate it can be argued that they are either relevant statistics or the reports are irrelevant. In most of the reports EDDC report a maximum margin of error District wide of 1.6% at the 95% confidence interval.</p> <p>We believe all statistical evidence used for the basis of the Core strategy needs further analysis and independent verification because of its importance in developing what happens to Verwood in the future. The following paragraphs demonstrate where the figures used for the Core Strategy may well be incorrect and or inappropriate.</p> <p>2. Population and Housing</p> <p>The East Dorset Housing Need and Demand Report June 2008 estimated that there are around 37,600 households in</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order																														
							<p>the District, of these around 85% are currently owner-occupiers with 8% living in the social rented sector and around 7% in the private rented sector.</p> <p>Out migrant households tend to be employed, whereas in migrant households have a higher proportion of retired households. Although the differences are not very large, the results would suggest that the in-migrants into Dorset are often wealthy households, retired or looking to retire. This is important on two fronts: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly retired populations are much more likely to want that sense of community that ironically this development plan will help to reduce. Consultation meetings run by the Council have shown very clearly that there is very strong support for conserving the sense of Community. • Secondly an ageing population places greater demands on infrastructure such as Doctors and Dentists. <p>3. Economic status in Verwood</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Working</td> <td>Unemployed</td> <td>Retired</td> <td>Other</td> <td>Total</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2611</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>50.6%</td> <td>38</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.7%</td> <td>2213</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>42.9%</td> <td>294</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.7%</td> <td>5156</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>In 1991 nine out of ten employed people found their employment in Verwood, by 2008 there were 730 firms in Verwood, but 88% of them only employed 1 – 10 people. Since 65.5% (1710) of employed people in Verwood are classed as Wealthy Achievers it is evident that they must be finding employment outside of Verwood. In addition 90.7% of the population of Verwood are classed as comfortably off or better.</p> <p>It is estimated that at the time of the survey there was a current stock of affordable housing of around 325 which could be used to meet this need (including dwellings becoming available as households in the social rented sector move to different dwellings). Hence it was estimated that the net backlog of need for affordable housing is around 386 units (711- 325). Annualised over 5 years (as recommended in the Practice Guidance) this becomes 77 households (386/5). The total future need for affordable housing is therefore estimated</p>	Working	Unemployed	Retired	Other	Total	2611					50.6%	38				0.7%	2213				42.9%	294				5.7%	5156						
Working	Unemployed	Retired	Other	Total																																				
2611																																								
50.6%	38																																							
0.7%	2213																																							
42.9%	294																																							
5.7%	5156																																							

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>to be 525 units per annum.</p> <p>Reports show that overall there is expected to be a greater demand for housing than the current stock of housing can meet. Overall, across all tenures there is an apparent shortfall of 375 dwellings per annum (excess demand over supply) of which 48% is for affordable housing. However the Audit Commission report criticises for consistently allowing over 900 dwellings to lie empty for more than one year and having a record of only getting three such dwellings back into use per annum.</p> <p>In total the plan shows an intention to develop 2570 houses over a fifteen year period, 35% of this could be provided by getting existing stock back into use leaving Green Field sites unaffected. Since the references indicate that there is an anticipated annual need of 179 units and the plan would deliver 171 units, it is clear that the Council has no intention of addressing the Audit Commissions criticism of failing to bring long term empty stock back into use. This is a pity since as a strategy this has to be a much more sustainable and environmentally option.</p> <p>EDDC assume that any household with more than one spare bedroom is under-occupying their dwelling and nearly 50% of houses are in this category. An alternative strategy to new buildings could be to investigate incentive schemes to get existing stock more fully occupied.</p> <p>Since only a total of 65 households and an anticipated 43 households of inward migration have been identified as in need of housing in Verwood, the need for 415 units is questionable.</p> <p>Finally all of the data on housing need has been gathered prior to 2009 when the overall economic climate was very different. In view of the current economic climate it has to be worth reconsidering the demand for housing.</p> <p>A report run using the official Estate Agents and Land Registry Database shows that of the 100 properties marketed in the BH31 area in the quarter ending 9/1/11 only seven have been sold subject to contract with an additional nine under offer. Since this sample includes several new builds it calls into question the demand for such a high level of building in Verwood, and would be likely to result in even</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order															
							<p>larger numbers of empty properties.</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that EDDC check officially with local Estate Agents the current state of the housing market before proceeding with this plan. In addition we have asked District Councillors to provide information on local waiting lists which are being used to justify the large percentage of affordable housing in the Core Strategy proposals. To date this has not been made available.</p> <p>4. Roads and Vehicles</p> <p>Car ownership data suggests that there is an average of 1.49 cars per household in the District. There are however large differences by tenure with owner-occupiers (with mortgage) having an average of 1.88 cars per household.</p> <p>In Verwood the Core Strategy as it stands will exacerbate the number of people living in the town but commuting to work, since all the employment opportunities exist outside Verwood. Of the existing 730 firms in Verwood 88% only employ between one and ten people. Assuming the proportion of economically active people remains broadly the same at 69% and that car ownership figures remain static, then the proposed 415 houses will place an additional 780 vehicles on the roads out of Verwood.</p> <p>Since the plan requires new housing to blend with the existing and surrounding housing it is inevitable that a high percentage will attract Executives who certainly will not be able to find suitable employment without commuting. The net effect will be to reduce further the sense of Community, directly in contravention of the Central Governments concept of the Big Community, and to further enhance the feeling of a Dormitory Town.</p> <p>Current car ownership in Verwood is stated to be: -</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>None</td> <td>One</td> <td>Two</td> <td>Three or more</td> <td>Total</td> </tr> <tr> <td>437</td> <td>8.4%</td> <td>2209</td> <td>42.9%</td> <td>1924</td> </tr> <tr> <td>37.3%</td> <td>582</td> <td>11.3%</td> <td>5152</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>There is an intention to close off to vehicular traffic Manor Lane St Michaels Lane at the Manor Road end. If the intended Springfield Close relief road is put in place then</p>	None	One	Two	Three or more	Total	437	8.4%	2209	42.9%	1924	37.3%	582	11.3%	5152				
None	One	Two	Three or more	Total																					
437	8.4%	2209	42.9%	1924																					
37.3%	582	11.3%	5152																						

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>there will be increased vehicular traffic in Howe Lane above the potential increase due to the proposed housing development. Since the eastern end of Howe Lane is part of the bridle and cycle path network increasing vehicular traffic in this area will significantly adversely affect this valuable leisure provision.</p> <p>Currently Howe Lane and Margards Lane are almost impassable at school run time with vehicles parked on both sides of the road. It is just possible to get an ordinary car down the centre in these conditions, but an Emergency Vehicle would find it impossible. This situation would be made even worse with the introduction of probably over 1000 people in the additional 415 homes. Certainly any addition of a Secondary School would make a bad situation intolerable. The Howe Lane development has only two choices of access, one off Howe Lane which almost certainly would have an impact on established and protected trees as well as potential adverse impact on the curtilage provisions of the Listed Building.</p> <p>As mentioned above there are also significant traffic congestion problems around school run times, making this access at best problematic. The other access option is via Summer Fields, this option requires purchasing a substantial proportion of the front gardens of two dwellings. There are already parking problems for houses in the area resulting in existing homeowners parking their vehicles on the street. In addition, established hedging on front gardens hinders sightlines making the turn in or out of the Close blind and therefore extremely hazardous. The twenty proposed properties would add an additional nearly 40 vehicles to this narrow access.</p> <p>Although not contained within the plan it is understood that there is an intention to put a relief road through Springfields linking Manor Road with the Eastern end of Howe Lane. This road would reduce further the ability of the land to allow natural run off of surface water in an area already prone to flooding. It will also add vehicular congestion to an area that is already dangerously congested for much of the day. Since most of the new occupants will have employment outside of Verwood they will be forced to commute out of the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>own via either the Ringwood Road or through Three Legged Cross. Both of these routes are already crowded in rush hour and neither permit widening of the road. The Ringwood Road in particular has recently had its speed limit reduced in order to try to reduce the number of fatal accidents.</p> <p>5. General</p> <p>The plan states that Verwood amongst other towns has been identified as an area suitable for development as it is a location where important facilities, services and employment are most accessible and readily improved. This is misleading as employment in Verwood is already inadequate for the existing population.</p> <p>With the exception of the Hub there are no entertainment facilities such as Restaurants, a permanent cinema or theatre and Youth activities are generally agreed to be inadequate. Even the Hub is plainly failing to meet the entertainment desires of the population as it is loss making and yet there is significant outward migration of people in the evening. Finally the town is served by a retained fire station, in the current climate this is unlikely to change, the latest figures from show that the engine was unavailable due to manning constraints for over 10% of the time, the seventh worst station in Dorset.</p>			
522257	Mr Richard Beaman		CSO18 101	Option VWM 2	Support		My support for the additional housing proposed in Verwood and Wimborne is conditional, based on building the proposed secondary school in Verwood. The new school should start to be built prior to or at the same time as any of the proposed larger housing developments.			1049
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	CSO18 118	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>Site VWM 2 is situated to the west of Eastworth Road. The location is similar to Site VWM 1, to which separate objections have been submitted. 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. As with VWM 1, it is</p>	Delete Option VWM 2 and retain the AGLV designation.		1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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, with a strong historical dimension, containing traditional cottages and farm buildings, forming varied human and natural landscapes. Site VWM 2 forms an important part of the AGLV in this part of East Dorset District. It gives north west Verwood an established, rural setting. Eastworth Road is the natural transition point 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. The proposed creation of two points of vehicular access from Eastworth Road will substantially harm the character of the area. Vehicular access from Edmondsham Road will also adversely affect the rural character of the area, given the need to create a junction of sufficient dimensions and forward visibility. The majority of the site 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.</p> <p>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 Edmondsham 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 mitigation measures would be required in order to reduce the adverse visual impact of the potential development.</p>			
522417	Mr G Flynn		CSO18 145	Option VWM 2	Object		Proposed developments WVM1 WVM2 will overload the existing infrastructure of the area. Continual development will erode the green belt.			1049
522671	Mrs K Thompson		CSO18 168	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood has expanded rapidly in terms of housing but what it lacks is any infrastructure. The facilities for the existing population are poor. If further housing is to be considered we			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>first need to consider the existing residents and plan for and encourage retail and leisure businesses into the Verwood area. Compare Verwood with Ringwood, where there is a high street with a variety of retail outlets (book shop, delicatessen, fashion, restaurants, butcher, cook ware, pets and country stores etc.) there is also the Furlong centre with nation chain outlets. Verwood on the other hand has no 'identity' and no heart to it. It is not cohesive and has no central area. Before further increasing housing in the locality planners need to take a good look at local amenities. We have very little here for the young, for example. We have a high proportion of families, hence the perceived need for a new secondary school, but very little in the way of activities for children and particularly the teenagers. Local amenities must be improved before further increasing the resident population. Facilities at Potterne Park e.g. the tennis courts are in a poorly maintained state, the Hub provides little for the teenagers and the leisure centre needs expanding. There are no decent restaurants/cafe and the place feels like a ghost town where people come to sleep but entertain themselves elsewhere. This needs to be addressed in a considered way rather than just building more housing. If these areas are to be built on why not take the opportunity to address some of the issues mentioned above rather than just expanding the resident population?</p>			
522815	Mr Edward Dyke	Chesterton Humberts	CSO18185	Option VWM 2	Support		<p>Our clients support chapter 11 relating to the housing development proposed at Verwood. The development brief shows how up to 350 dwellings may be provided on the Northern edge of Verwood. Option VWM1 and VWM2 and an extension of the 2 to the north is supported as described above. General Comment – the proposed extension of VWM1 and VWM2 will enable the Edmondsham Road to be re-aligned with the removal of the disused railway bridge and re-profiling of the road to lower levels, removing the hump. In addition a proper roundabout or road junction would be able to be created to the north of Eastworth Farm in order to provide safe access to the proposed new development on both sides of the road.</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							The existing proposal relating to access for VWM1 and VWM2 does not appear to be satisfactory.			
523262	Mr & Mrs Jones		CSO18 261	Option VWM 2	Object		We fundamentally disagree with any proposals to breach the Green Belt surrounding Verwood and would question the legality of any such development. The old railway line is cited as becoming a "natural" new northern boundary for the town but once dense housing development is allowed within Green Belt how can any further expansion beyond this new boundary be countered in the future? There is then the potential for the parish of Edmondsham to be swallowed up in yet more "urban sprawl" which is systematically ruining much of rural England. We have no confidence in East Dorset Council being impartial in making any decisions regarding the expansion of Verwood as any development would generate huge Council Tax Receipts. This reason alone could render any decision the Council made open to a legal challenge. Furthermore we have no confidence in the planning department to approve only sympathetic plans. There are numerous examples of, quite frankly, grotesque developments of flats in Verwood, the most recent of which is the re-development of the old Fayrewood pub site on Ringwood Road. Once again this project is driven by greed without proper consideration of what local people really want. If we wanted to live in an urban sprawl we would live in a city. If the Council need revenue then may we suggest that measures are taken, as have been taken in the private sector, to be become more efficient.			1049
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		CSO18 302	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
523326	Mrs H Clark		CSO18 324	Option VWM 2	Object		I think the infrastructure of Verwood would not be able to cope with this many new homes. We live off Margards lane which leads to Emmanuel School and the potential new secondary school. The road is already like a race track at school run times, with the increased housing and new school it would be impossible to get out of our road in the mornings, and even more problems pulling out onto Manor Road.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Building on these plots will spoil the lovely aspect for the schools and also the people in Summerfields will lose their lovely quiet environment. I think Verwood is big enough and a housing project of this size is going to ruin a lovely place.			
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 178	Option VWM 2	Object		The Moors River system, including the River Crane, Ebblake Stream and Uddens Water has already been subject to excessive development within its catchment including the establishment of a number of very ill advised employment/industrial estates. It has suffered severely from all the above impacts resulting in temporary or permanent losses to biodiversity. Continued development within the catchment, especially in close proximity to its water courses, and particularly of employment/industrial development, is wholly inappropriate. Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously impinging on the Moors River system and its corridor include KS3/ PC7 (St Leonards Hospital), KS4 (Woodland Walk), VM 1,2,3 and 4 (Verwood), PC4 (Blunts Farm), and PC 5 (Woolsbridge).			1049
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 299	Option VWM 2	Object		The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options.</p> <p>However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported.</p> <p>Options VWM1,2,3 and 4 Continued development in Verwood will progressively increase the demand for a by-pass for West Moors which will inevitably have very damaging repercussions for biodiversity. Whilst such a scheme may not be possible in the present financial climate, the time will undoubtedly come when controversial road schemes will be back on the agenda and changes which have taken place in the interim will be weighed in the balance.</p> <p>All these sites in Verwood will drain into the River Crane and thence the Moors River.</p> <p>VWM4 in particular is in very close proximity to the Crane river corridor. The scale of the development at VWM4 will inevitably put additional and unacceptable public pressure upon Potterne Hill SNCI and have indirect impacts (described above) upon the woodland habitats of Heathy Howe. This is also a site whose immediate intrinsic wildlife interest merits close examination.</p> <p>VWM2, has the additional particular problem of the indirect impacts (described above) on important woodlands, Romford Mill Copse SNCI being hard up against the development boundary and Ironmongers Copse SNCI being very close by. Development of land to the east has already demonstrated the undesirability and difficulty of enforced badger relocation. Again there has been no assessment of the immediate intrinsic value of any of this site which is currently largely unknown.</p> <p>In summary all the sites are problematic in terms of pressure for a West Moors By-pass and drainage to the River Crane, while VWM2, and 4 have additional problems or currently improperly assessed issues which require at least reduction in extent, and potentially rejection.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
523419	HLF Planning	HLF Planning	CSO18 394	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>2.17 In terms of transportation then, none of the proposals which are directly affected by the A31 road network improvements can be progressed until the works are implemented according to the emerging Transport Plan. Given the current economic climate, this could be some years away if at all and would cast huge doubt about FWP3 or any other scheme in West Parley, Corfe Mullen, Verwood or Wimborne Minster being deliverable and as much is admitted in page 130 of the Masterplan Report 'the outcomes of the 2010 spending review and of subsequent decision making processes by the Department for Transport, Dorset County Council and Highways Agency about how to achieve required budget savings could have a significant impact on strategic infrastructure delivery in Dorset'.</p> <p>VWM2 - Verwood</p> <p>3.33 The Masterplan Report also assesses sites in Verwood and particularly objectionable is the VWM2 site at land west of Eastworth Road. This proposes 200 homes again within the Green Belt and on highly sensitive bio-diverse and archaeological land with clear transportation constraints.</p> <p>3.34 VWM2 is the only site identified in the Verwood search area that is contained within an Area of Great Landscape Value. The EDDC Local Plan (2002) confirms that such areas contribute to the local area as 'they are of high value as areas of unspoiled countryside, with a strong historical dimension...as such they warrant recognition and protection'. It is baffling therefore on this ground alone why EDDC would want to lose all of this special land when there are alternatives available elsewhere within and on the periphery of Verwood.</p> <p>3.35 Added to this is the transport issue with the site only accessible via a 'C' road. Edmondsham Road is narrow and any further access points to the new development along it will be hazardous and this is evidenced by the fact that page 92 of the Masterplan Report recommends a 30mph safety limit in order to achieve sufficient visibilities. This will of course by definition suggests that as soon as a motorist drives in excess of 30mph along this stretch then other motorists' safety will be significantly compromised.</p> <p>3.36 An important factor to be taken into account in the wider</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>area concerns the Highways Agencies comments at recent Examinations in Public for both the Borough of Poole Core Strategy and the now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>3.37 During both examinations, the Highways Authority confirmed that given the current congested nature of the A31, it is likely that any development in South East Dorset shown to have a material impact upon traffic flows on the A31 will have to wait for the provision of major transport interventions as identified by the South East Dorset Multi-Modal study.</p> <p>3.38 In terms of Green Belt issues, as Verwood is very much a product of 20th century growth, it lacks the historic centre that the villages of West Parley and Corfe Mullen and the town of Wimborne Minster do and so development opportunities within the town will detract from the existing character far less and must be explored in greater detail in order to preserve the purpose and objectives of the Green Belt.</p> <p>3.39 As set out in paragraphs 2.22 and 2.23 of this Objection Statement the purposes and objectives of the Green Belt should be sacrosanct unless exceptional circumstances are forthcoming and given the particularly spacious layout of the existing urban areas within Verwood, any housing shortfall should be met with smaller scale developments within and on the periphery of the town rather than in Green Belt locations.</p> <p>3.40 Much of this Green Belt land contains valuable biodiversity that the Masterplan Report does not do justice to in assessing the impacts upon wildlife. VWM2 provides a valuable habitat for many wildlife including deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, adders, slow-worms, grass snakes and newts. In addition, the Report confirms that the south western element of VWM2 is a SNCI. The need to protect biodiversity is set out in PPS3 which states that a number of factors should be taken into account including 'the need to protect natural resources e.g. biodiversity'.</p> <p>3.41 A benefit highlighted by the Report suggests that the proposal at VWM2 would incorporate valuable green infrastructure that would benefit local residents and divert pressures away from the heathland to the north and to the south. Surely an explosion of 200 households in closer proximity to the heaths can only add to the pressure upon</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>them rather than act as any kind of diversion.</p> <p>3.42 Given the fact that the Report confirms that Dorset County Council have already purchased land adjacent to Emmanuel Church of England Middle School, with a view to providing additional educational facilities at that location, results in VWM2 (and VWM1) becoming even less suitable options in terms of sustainable development. VWM3, VWM4 and VWM7 will all be in walking distance to the new development and are also closer to existing facilities such as the Morrisons supermarket and have easier access to the centre of Verwood in comparison with VWM2.</p> <p>3.43 There are few local jobs in Verwood and the majority of residents travel to the Bournemouth and Poole conurbation to work (see 2001 census and data forming the evidence base of the emerging Core Strategy). An additional 200 households in this location will mean an undoubted reliance upon the private motor car so there will be a significant increase in pressure upon an already congested local road network. All of which is contrary to the aims and objectives of Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development).</p> <p>3.44 This central government guidance states (paragraph 5) that good spatial planning should ensure that 'development supports existing communities and contributes to the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities with good access to jobs and key services for all members of the community'. The proposal at VWM2 does not promote sustainable development as the core principle underpinning planning as advised in PPS1.</p> <p>3.45 The schools system in Verwood is very complex due to a combination of two-tier and three-tier schools. As such this results in a large number of school trips being made to Cranborne Middle School and Queen Elizabeth School in Wimborne for children and parents making further growth in and around Verwood unsustainable in transportation terms until this schools system is satisfactorily resolved.</p> <p>3.46 Given that the population of Verwood is 15,000 it is unbelievable that there is no Upper School to serve the catchment area - this must surely be an essential addition to the existing infrastructure if this proposal goes ahead but the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Masterplan Report suggests that the infrastructure will come later putting more pressure on the existing transport network and schools further afield which cater for Verwood's educational needs.			
527501	Eve Thompson		CSO18 782	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood has expanded too much and hasn't enough facilities i.e. dentist, shops etc. to service the present population. The number of extra cars will impact on the narrow roads.			1049
527512	Eric Thompson		CSO18 796	Option VWM 2	Object		More houses mean more cars. 400 houses maybe 600 to 800 more vehicles, we are bursting at the seams. The roads in our town are generally in poor condition. More cars mean more pollution, more noise more traffic jams. You should be thinking more of the people who already live in the town I have not found anyone who supports these proposals. We don't have the infrastructure to support hundreds of extra people. Statistically crime and anti-social behaviour will rise. In these times of cut backs are we to get more police and more fire fighters to cope with the extra load?			1049
527740	Anne Parsons		CSO18 892	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood 1. Why should our children wait until a further 400+ homes are built before they get their long awaited Secondary School - one can only presume that the planning gain will pay for this. 2. Verwood needs more infrastructure before consideration is given to more homes. 3. What guarantee is there that affordable housing - IF built would not be sold on at the market rate in future years? If homes have to be built why not put a stipulation regarding affordable housing. Other areas of the country do this such as the Lake and Peak District. 4. TA1 how could developers contribute to transport improvements other than roads - it's up to Wilts and Dorset Buses to put on extra public transport. 5. It was not a surprise that no Councillors either Town or District were at the Hub between 2-3pm today 11 Nov 2010 - I wonder why? I doubt that the views of the local residents will be listened to as they've not been in the past.			1049
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		CSO18 924	Option VWM 2	Support					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
527818	Mr Nigel Lester	Synergy Housing Association	CSO18 970	Option VWM 2	Support		Having looked at the proposals for each of the geographical areas and the proposed sites within those areas we can see no reason to disagree with the Local Authorities assessment and findings in each case, and would be very keen to become involved in the provision of affordable housing on any of these sites.			1049
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 312	Option VWM 2	Object		Woodlands Ancient woodland is of course of recognised biodiversity importance, but developing secondary woodland is also valuable for biodiversity, carbon retention and landscape. Impacts can be both direct, when the habitat itself is replaced, but also indirect through access by humans and domestic pets. While problems caused by these factors on heathlands is now generally recognised, (predation by pets, disturbance by both humans and pets, dumping, trampling, and light pollution) they are also of relevance to other habitats, including and perhaps especially, woodland. Preferred Options in the Core Strategy which impact directly or indirectly upon woodland include KS4 (Woodland Walk), VW2 and VWM4.			1049
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO19 056	Option VWM 2		General Comment	Vehicular access would be achievable to the northern Verwood sites and pedestrian / cycle facilities to the centre either already exist or could be provided. Links to good quality public transport would be harder to secure and improvements to these services more difficult to provide from just 250 houses on the northern edge of the settlement.			1049
533834	Mr Tim Harris		CSO19 210	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
533862	Mr Paul Holman		CSO19 216	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is the second largest town in Dorset yet has minimal facilities. A population of 15,000 has distinctly limited leisure options and restaurants in comparison to Ringwood with a similar population. Transport links/bus routes/roads are inadequate at present. Poor connections to Ringwood with a dangerous road with lack of cycle lanes. Need regular bus links and safe cycle lane from Verwood to Ringwood. Teenagers cannot cycle safely to Ringwood yet no real	More restaurants/cafe's and shops in Verwood Improved road links B3081 Ban cars parking outside Tesco Put on cycle lane to Ringwood		1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							facilities in Verwood. At edge of county becoming a housing dumping ground.			
533905	Mr & Mrs A Kell		CSO19 249	Option VWM 2	Object		We cannot agree with the total amount of houses proposed for these sites although a much smaller number (50%) would be acceptable. The main reason for objecting is that almost all of the traffic arising from these developments would naturally be directed into the town, and out along Ringwood Road. The main road linking one side of town to the other already has several bottlenecks, the main one being caused by short term parking outside Tesco's. The roundabout by the fire station is already busy and dangerous with such a huge increase in volume. The car parks are full to capacity too during the day. By doing this you will generate more traffic jams and will annoy many people. Also, as previously stated the services (Medical, Dental, Leisure, Schools, Roads and Car Parking) are not fit to cope with the large increase in population being proposed.			1049
534820	Paul Batten		CSO19 440	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
534837	Mrs P Martin		CSO19 501	Option VWM 2		No Opinion	Horses need grazing land. No infrastructure in place for the total number of homes planned. I do not go out between 8.00 and 9.30 am and 3.00pm and 6.30pm because of the traffic on the roads now.			1049
534875	Brian Lane		CSO19 545	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
534904	Mr Martin Aldridge		CSO19 579	Option VWM 2	Object		I strongly object to any more development in Verwood it's time to pick on somewhere else. The road from Verwood to Ringwood is at capacity in the morning and evening rush-hours. My local road to the schools is at capacity and suffers from intense school traffic and no attempt has been made over the years to make up the unmade roads to provide alternative routes to the schools. If I have to leave a car in the road overnight it causes chaos with the school run. Please build more houses in much much more central locations where they are needed not in a saturated place out in the sticks. I know your destruction of Verwood as a place to live			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							is almost complete but please please build elsewhere its only common sense. If you cannot drive Verwood is an expensive place of isolation. Ringwood has the advantage of a coach link. Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch have train links. As a minimum Verwood should have both a free bus service to Ringwood and a safe separate from the road tarmaced cycle path to Ringwood so that the fit and able can quickly get to Ringwood for free instead of a £6 return bus service that takes hours and goes around the houses. Planners - get real.			
534914	Mrs P Froud		CSO19 677	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535018	Mr M.R Watson		CSO19 586	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood development - Any developments should be restricted to smaller pockets of land and why not consider developing land between Verwood and Three Legged Cross with a view to the two being physically rather than just conveniently connected.			1049
535026	Mr Andy Thompson		CSO19 588	Option VWM 2	Object		Talk of green infrastructure is fine and accept that travel to distant schools is not as good an option as learning in your own community but Verwood will become a ghetto without effective urban infrastructure to support it - swimming pool/adequate health facilities, space for what local people want such as a couple of restaurants, shops selling more than groceries and nick nacs etc. A pub in a car park at Morrisons is charmless and this area perfectly describes the hollow feel that will be generated across all Verwood as more people are brought in without building community facilities trouble is brewing and developers/retailers etc. need to be pressured to deliver for the community as well as their shareholders. If the council systems cannot negotiate this effectively then simply ask for help from those in the community who can add value and demand more of these developers I lived in Milton Keynes as a boy when it was growing and it was a disaster for many children en			1049
535040	Mr Tom Garnham		CSO19 593	Option VWM 2	Object		I have lived in Dorset for 15 years, the last 8 of which have been in Verwood. Verwood is unique in that in terms of population it can be considered a town but in all other			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>respects it bears no resemblance to what most of us commonly think of as a town. Sandwiched by open countryside and Ringwood Forest, it is a wonderful location in which to live but in just the last 8 years I have seen changes. With the building of additional housing and the disappointing emergence of blocks of flats wholly out of keeping with the surrounding area, increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic has been noticeable. I would strongly urge you not to approve any further housing developments for Verwood. The process of development is irreversible. If any of the options under consideration are approved the beautiful landscape those developments would replace will be lost forever with incalculable consequences for the diverse wildlife they sustain. In addition, the increase in population we again amend the Green Belt boundary. Now is the time to take a long-term view and put conservation ahead of the seemingly inexorable tide of development. Despite many years of development, Verwood has somehow managed to retain its rural character. For the benefit of its residents, the wildlife it sustains, the people of Dorset, and for future generations please do what you can to keep it that way.</p>			
535049	Mr Ian Parsons		CSO19 598	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I object to the developments within Verwood. The main reason is that the infrastructure with the present population of Verwood cannot cope. Reasons as follows why we do not want more Developments: Our First Schools are oversubscribed now, our only Middle School Emmanuel has had to have extra classes yearly to accommodate the increasing number of children that feed in from the three first schools. We have NO HIGH SCHOOL, which we need NOW. This would save the Council Tax Payers the costs of Transporting all the High School age children to either QE at Wimborne or Ferndown High School. There would need to be more Doctors surgeries and dental surgeries as the present number would not be able to cope. We are aware that there is NO MONEY available for a High School now. Also that no additional infrastructure will be built until such proposed developments are built - which means to us the council tax payers - that no extra infrastructure will be built even after new houses are occupied. Who is LOW COST housing for -</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							this should only be limited to local people i.e. People of Verwood and there are many who need low cost/social housing. We do not want Verwood to become a SINK TOWN by the local authorities to DUMP unwanted Tenants in Verwood. Development will not contribute to Transport Costs UNLESS you are GOING to GIVE Planning Gain Monies to Wilts and Dorset for more Buses day and evening times.			
535055	R Knox		CSO19 606	Option VWM 2	Object		I agree with objections of the majority of residents in Springfield Road(published recently in local press)with, regards to the development proposed. If it is as is stated in "transport issues" at least one car is introduced with each new house,. implementation of VWM2 or VWM4 would significantly increase the number of cars entering and leaving Verwood At peak times			1049
535070	Mr Alan Reade		CSO19 632	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
535096	Mrs S M West		CSO19 658	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535103	Neil Clarke		CSO19 672	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535112	Mr Jack Tindall		CSO19 717	Option VWM 2	Object		The upper school will not be built within the life of this document, and will not be able to go ahead on the land proposed due to lack of access to the site and the close proximity to the heathland. If this issue were to be sorted out before the building of more houses then I would support the proposals but not until.			1049
535167	Lynda Lake		CSO19 764	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
535169	Mrs A Jarvis		CSO19 733	Option VWM 2	Object		I am totally against any further building in Verwood.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535176	Mrs Krithia Blaker		CSO19 744	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is over populated...over built and under facilitated....We have had more than our fair share of houses built in Verwood. Let somewhere else have more housing built. People state Verwood is one of the fastest growing towns in Dorset. That is so dreadful. As I said before it is some other town that needs to take on the building of more homes. Let some other town take the strain. VERWOOD HAS DONE MORE THAN IT'S FAIR SHARE OF BUILDING. There are NO jobs here for people why bring hundreds more people here?? We are still in a recession businesses are closing down. Ferndown trading estate has lots of EMPTY units as does Ebblake. I agree it would be nice to have an Upper school nearer to Verwood...ideally between 3 legged cross/West Moors/Verwood. That would then suit 3 areas. The position the proposal suggests for the school is totally unacceptable already extremely dangerous for Children. Another school in this position would bring in hundreds more children.....and HUNDR EDS more CARS. I also feel building on Greenbelt land is unacceptable....You can't keep moving the *Goalposts* Greenbelt must remain greenbelt!!!!.			1049
535180	Mrs M Field		CSO19 753	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535196	Mr R Field		CSO19 772	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535206	Mr Calvert		CSO19 820	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support this type of development; it is still trying to catch up, from poor implementation and direction from past developments Buses: lack & frequency of service to neighbouring areas, Lack of Sporting and recreational facilities, Lack of Facilities for teenagers e.g. resulting in the current enforcement of the banning of Alcohol in certain areas Lack of local employment, Current centres of employment being in Bournemouth, Pool, Wimborne Resulting in Poor road / transport support in and out of Verwood along the B3081 and its intersections with other junction e.g.: A31, Alderholt junction, and Cranborne /			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Wimborne, The withdrawal of the Ringwood road improvement and the A338 funding Lack social services with in the area Dentists etc. ∴ How is the new school going to be funded and would this be built before the additional housing , would the funding for such a project be ring fenced in this current financial climate to ensure children do not have to be bussed out of the area . Currently the council cannot find funding or land option for allotments for existing residents, we been waiting for over 3 years for this simple amenity.			
535209	Mr P Webster		CSO19 798	Option VWM 2	Object		Please liaise with NFDC and NPA, as the additional traffic generated by the extra housing and employment zones will increase the traffic problems at the already congested bottleneck at Ringwood and cause yet more problems for the people who live in New Forest hamlets such as Linwood, Brook and Burley as motorists try to find alternative routes. Can the New Forest take any more pressure from additional numbers of visitors? Has Dorset got enough sand and gravel in the landbank to meet the needs of the developers? Can you force Tarmac to start mining gravel by the Spur Road near Hurn? What will happen to the pollution levels close to the trunk roads e.g. at Ringwood, especially particulate pollution? Can Bournemouth Water meet the increased demands for water?			1049
535349	P Thomas		CSO19 831	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
535360	Mrs Phyllis Peach		CSO19 837	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		CSO19 980	Option VWM 2	Object		I think that this whole core strategy consultation needs a full review in light of the proposed changes being brought in under the new government. I particularly object to all the proposed Verwood development as the infrastructure is not in place to support the current population let alone adding even further to it by building a further 400 homes. Any EDDC councillor who has the affront to say that the infrastructure is in place to support this development does not know what they are talking about and obviously do not live in the town.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535376	Mr Michael Reynolds		CSO19 860	Option VWM 2	Object		Insufficient infrastructure to cope with this number of new homes, and will lose the character of Verwood.			1049
535382	Jean Baverstock		CSO19 870	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535384	Mr R Beard		CSO19 877	Option VWM 2	Object		Together VWM 2 and 4 will add 365 new homes. I believe this will place a significant burden on the already stretched services in the 'town'. Assuming 3 persons per home with 2 vehicles that will be an extra 1000+ people and 700 vehicles. There are still far too many unmade roads especially near Emmanuel School. We need another/larger Supermarket and Petrol filling Station as at times both existing ones have customer problems. In both instances there would also be increased pressure on the nearby heathland despite what might be said by appellants.			1049
535387	Mr Brian Cox		CSO19 961	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		CSO20 730	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
489765	Derek KEAREY		CSO19 512	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
535393	Jeremy Berg		CSO19 910	Option VWM 2	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			1049
535395	Clare James		CSO19 885	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535404	Danika Irving		CSO19 900	Option VWM 2	Object		With all current development having seemed enough! There is now the 'threat' of more. Verwood does not have what is required to support further development, our road systems are minimal and already pushed to a level where it is a 'stress' to move through the main roads or move out of			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							various junctions.....further development will require traffic control to be implemented to allow for the increase in population and therefore traffic. As we are aware most households own more than one car and any family or individual living in Verwood would require transport to enable them to exit Verwood to reach amenities as we don't have these that shall fulfil the needs and what we do have is only just coping with these high levels. I.e. Tesco and the congestion caused due to traffic parking on manor road. Morrisons, parking sufficient! Yet the store is always over crowded!! Finally the schools are already having severe issues with regards to traffic, parking etc. when parents doing their daily pick-ups or drop offs, the situation shall only worsen with another school. We already have only a small area surrounding the schools and inadequate parking that deals for the needs of children attending Verwood 1st, Emmanuel and Verwood 1st pre-school Doesn't bear thinking what another school will do to the current state.			
535421	Mr Roland Andrews		CSO19 917	Option VWM 2	Object		The existing infrastructure in Verwood does not support the current level of occupation - Doctors, dentist, schools, shops, car parks and mostly road system. Further building without improving the infrastructure is ridiculous. There is no significant employment in the Verwood area and therefore additional building will only cause increased traffic and congestion. Public transport is extremely limited - why aren't there any proposals to improve this?? I do not understand why land that is already designated as green belt is even being considered for new development, is nothing sacred. Why can't development be further out, why does it all have to be centred on existing towns??			1049
535457	Mr Matthew Newman		CSO19 971	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
535500	David Veevers		CSO20 019	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
535504	Mr Michael		CSO20 086	Option VWM 2	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Beer									
535508	Bill Bowden		CSO20 045	Option VWM 2	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood would not support this amount of housing. It is no good deciding to build a large number of properties without first considering the road system. A large number of people leave the town in the morning to travel to work and this will undoubtedly increase with the introduction of new homes. Can the existing power supply, sewerage system, and water supply cope adequately with this number of houses?. Has a proper in depth survey been carried out?. The tendency to flood from water courses can change dramatically if green field sites are concreted and water run-off is much more rapid during heavy rains. Have the appropriate surveys for protected and endangered species been carried out in areas where new housing is proposed?			1049
535509	Mrs S Durant		CSO20 124	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
535512	J R Page		CSO20 061	Option VWM 2	Object		1. Quite often the Ferret Green car park and the Doctors' Surgery car park at Station Road do not have any car spaces available. 2. To make an appointment with one's own Doctor can result in a two or three week wait. 3. It is nearly impossible to exit my drive on a school morning as there is continuous traffic streaming past my bungalow with double parking in Howe lane. With this and the volume of traffic cars come to a complete stop blocking the road. 4. If 400 houses are built plus an addition school, life will become impossible. Verwood has been overbuilt without the necessary infrastructure being in place.			1049
535517	Roy Rich		CSO20 098	Option VWM 2	Object		We are happy as we are nice and peaceful. THATS WHY WE MOVED TO VERWOOD!! Please just leave a very dense population alone, to sort out all the mistakes already made by previous decisions!! We are full to overflowing, the amenities are VERY stretched. You try to get to a DENTIST for treatment, YOU TRY TO GET A DOCTORS appointment. FULL---FULL ---FULL I WISH YOU LOT LIVED HERE AND FIND THIS OUT. Ok rant over but			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							PLEASE listen to US!!!!!!!!!!!!!!			
535540	Mr Peter Weaver		CSO20 128	Option VWM 2	Object		This group of proposals for Verwood displays a total lack of the 'joined-up thinking' which I trusted the planning system to provide. Verwood is seriously under-provided for in terms of infrastructure. The existing facilities, such as they are, struggle to cope with the mushrooming population that's been shoe-horned in over recent years. Due to the lack of employment opportunities within Verwood the majority of the working population exits the town early in the morning to commute to distant centres of employment, returning in the late evening - a simple observation of Ringwood Road will confirm this. The lack of adequate public transport means that the majority of these journeys are by cars with only one occupant. Apart from the environmental damage of this daily tidal flow, the town is empty during normal business hours resulting in little incentive for shops or businesses to set up, apart from the plethora of estate agencies. All but 20 of the 415 new homes. I believe that all of those issues need to be resolved before any further housing is allowed to commence and I'm disappointed that these proposals are presented without suggestion of any improvements to infrastructure. Developer Contributions are of little use at this scale of development - the town needs to see actual improvements before any development takes place, not just large sums of money being paid as a development tax.			1049
535547	Mr M Folland		CSO20 217	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535550	Mrs D Mogg		CSO20 181	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
535554	Ms Anita Rigler		CSO20 200	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535567	Ms Judy		CSO20 277	Option VWM 2	Object		There are not enough spaces available at the local 1st and middle schools to take in the extra children that would be			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	McMath						living in these new houses. They would have to be bussed to West Moors, Ferndown or Cranborne.			
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		CSO20 257	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
535591	A Walker		CSO20 295	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		CSO20 364	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
535621	Mrs T Brine		CSO20 353	Option VWM 2	Object		Even without additional housing in Verwood, there is clearly already a need for a secondary school here. However a concern with the suggested site in Howe lane, is the access and increased volume of traffic and parking on the school run. This is already considerable, with the two schools currently on the site. Perhaps a better site might be the land west of Trinity school earmarked for housing (VWM1). Similarly, I am against any further housing development in Verwood as the infrastructure needs to be supported. We have the population of a large town, yet lack many of the facilities of towns smaller than us. Also doctors, dentists, Morrison's etc. struggle to cope with the demands of our population as it is!!Please don't spoil our beautiful town with yet more housing, but do improve our existing facilities !!			1049
535659	Fiona Kasey		CSO20 390	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535670	Dave Allen		CSO20 414	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535678	Andrew Bryant		CSO20 442	Option VWM 2	Object		Any further development for Verwood is unsustainable. An increase in the population will result in the SSSI sites attracting more people, despite what is said in the plan about new green space. If you are really bothered about green spaces in Verwood, you should leave the ones that are there. The land to the north of Eastworth Road has a lot of wildlife			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							including deer, badgers, bats, owls as well as several smaller mammals and possibly lizards. The road network in Verwood is poorly laid out and built for much lower volumes of traffic. Do not even think of increasing traffic on the northern approaches. These roads are too small and dangerous as they are. There are no real shops to speak of (four estate agents and several ladies' hairdressers do not count as shops) A bigger Morrisons would be a benefit, but would attract even more traffic onto the inadequate road system as people come in from outlying areas. There is no public transport, save for a poor and expensive bus service - that contrives to charge school children full fare for the trip to Ringwood before 09:00 There is little opportunity for employment in Verwood and the volume of traffic coming into the town indicates that what jobs there are mainly taken by people from outside Verwood. The drainage and sewerage systems were built for a town of 3000 people. This needs addressing before any more houses are built. It really is about time that the various councils of Dorset start to see Verwood as a real town that is trying hard to create a real town environment. I fear the councils see Verwood as a dormitory town and that the attitude shown is that few more housing estates can be squeezed in and around without anyone getting too upset. This is not the case. People don't want or need this extra housing until at least some of the amenities promised over the last 20-years start to materialise.			
535687	Shelley Romans		CSO20454	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood has already experienced substantial housing development over the last 20 years and does not have adequate road links or other infrastructure to cope with further housing development. There are insufficient employment opportunities in Verwood and therefore increasing the population size would increase the pressure on existing roads particularly at commuting times. The green belt should be preserved and future housing development should take place on brown field sites. In the current public sector financial climate I do not believe planning to build new secondary school in Verwood is a realistic aim and I consider that there are adequate school places for Verwood children in nearby locations such as Ferndown.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535688	Susan Hobbs		CSO20 532	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
535695	Robin Peirce		CSO20 466	Option VWM 2	Object		Both VWM1 and 2 both are extremely close to sites of SSI. The number of cars that would be leaving the new developments onto a small country road (Edmondsham Road) would cause major issues to the school . The headmistress as already closed the school car park because of danger to the children. Both sites are green belt . Verwood needs facilities and not more houses and has taken more than it's fair share to date.			1049
535701	Mr Andy Skeats		CSO20 489	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
535714	Joanna Bryant		CSO20 501	Option VWM 2	Object		When I moved to Verwood ten years ago the estate agents promised that there would not be any more building in Verwood. The town is lovely as it is and more houses would lead to traffic congestion and Verwood doesn't have the infrastructure to cope with an increased population - Why can't the village be left as it is.			1049
535718	Richard Green		CSO20 506	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood has undergone the largest expansion of any East Dorset town expanding to 5 times its original population in 20 years. It was the fastest growing town in Europe for 5 years. Facilities and infrastructure have not kept pace with the population and elected councillors are not serving their constituents fairly. PPG17 show that Verwood is below the minimum requirement in active sports space, children and young people space and activities and allotments there are no allotments. The Hub is an ugly building out of character with the town. This is not used to its full capacity as car parking is restricted. The allocated land for further car parking behind the police station has been sold by the council. Flats are now being built on the site adding to the parking problem. PPS 1 and 3 and PPG13 show the need to have shops and leisure activities available without the need to use a car. Morrison's built for 3500 people is now completely overwhelmed. Although plans to extend se feeder will not change the position. Verwood has had more than is fair share			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							of housing development enough is enough.			
535723	Steve Taylor		CSO20 519	Option VWM 2	Object		Dear Sir, I object not only to the principle of developing green belt land in general. As a Verwood resident I also object to the nature of the Verwood options themselves, with the exception of the principle of VWM7 (although this is still on green belt land, which concerns me, although I understand why it here, in close proximity to the other schools). From what I can see the proposal is to build another 400 homes on green belt land in Verwood. There is an acknowledgement that such development will necessitate the upgrade of some roads' infrastructure. Many of Verwood's roads are very busy already, and with one main road in and out, it does not take much to make a short journey to Ringwood quite time-consuming. There is however no commitment for the upgrade or provision of any other much needed facilities. I note VWM7 relates to a secondary school, but this is already required to support Verwood's population. 400 more homes means presumably 400+ new children and the running down St Michaels Road already flood when there is even a small amount of rain. This will presumably worsen as the work progresses, owing to reduced natural drainage opportunities. Furthermore, using St Michaels Road as a vehicular route and 'green linkage', whatever that is, will exacerbate this drainage issue. I am not a typical NIMBY, and I do believe that a properly thought through development strategy encompassing proper facilities for an already stretched community would be a benefit. I also live in the real world and I understand that private development will help generate the funds to pay for such a strategy. All I can really see in these proposals however is bulldozing your way through green belt land for 400+ houses, I'm afraid.			1049
535815	Mrs C M Davies		CSO20 559	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
535836	Peter Parsons		CSO20 586	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
535845	Oliver		CSO20	Option	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Greensmith		598	VWM 2						
535858	Robert Candy		CSO20620	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
535862	Hannah Richards		CSO20631	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535865	Darren Charles Bryson		CSO20650	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
535875	John Kitchenside		CSO20683	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood has too few facilities to support any major new developments. Medical and dental surgeries, middle school, etc. are over-subscribed and there is a lack of large-scale refuse disposal and recycling facilities - compare Dorset's attempt at Wimborne with the excellent and well-run facility provided by Hampshire County Council. There is a desperate need for an upper school (VWM7), which I support, although I doubt the existing residential roads could support the increased traffic this would bring. Travelling to Ferndown Upper or QE Wimborne each day does little for our children's education as they miss out on after-school activities, clubs, etc. Expansion of the village to the east would destroy green-belt land, one of the main things people like living here. Please, please, please if we really have to have more housing can it be built in a style that is more in keeping with the area e.g. not like the recent developments at the top of Crane Drive or at the corner of N Newtown Road and Ringwood Road. Whilst I appreciate the opportunity to air my views, I believe that Verwood is largely ignored by local government due to its location.			1049
360768	Cllr. Mr David Packer	Colehill West Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO21093	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
497471	Mr Robert Wilmott		CSO21424	Option VWM 2	Object	General Comment	According to the Governments New Homes Bonus consultation document from 11/2010 for 1000 new homes the required infrastructure to support those homes costs £20m.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Based on the proposed maximum number of new homes for Verwood of 415 the proportioned infrastructure costs would be £8.3m. How do EDDC propose to fund these costs? I have estimated based on the figures in the document referred to above that if all the 415 homes were built and with 208 being affordable housing the 6 year bonus payment would be circa £4.4m so would not be sufficient to offset these costs. Therefore would you expect the various property developers under their required Section 106 agreements to meet all these costs and use the Bonus payments as suggested by the Government to improve frontline council services and improve the local Verwood community facilities for the benefit of existing residents? Point 11.19 of your Core Strategy document informs readers that Verwood has good road links. As a r ted to accessible and supported housing for this section of the community? It is advised in your strategy document that 90% of commuters use a car as their means of transport this is because of the lack of public transport and the semi-rural location. The 2008 report highlighted the fact that one third of houses in social rented properties had no use of a car. If you locate these families in Verwood in the proposed affordable housing how can this be of benefit if they have no means of transport and a limited public transport system. Finally the erosion of further green belt land should only be considered once the other options such as brown field sites, development of vacant properties have been fully explored.			
518009	Mr D Heather		CSO21044	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		CSO20732	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
535914	Graham Cudmore		CSO20713	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535921	Mrs Charlotte		CSO20736	Option VWM 2	Support					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Miller									
535933	Mr John Lister		CSO20 757	Option VWM 2	Object		I think it is absurd to build any more housing in Verwood without first improving facilities. There is little life to Verwood - for instance there is only one sit-down restaurant to serve the whole population. The leisure centre is too small. There is no swimming pool. The existing schools are already oversubscribed. Improve facilities first BEFORE contemplating increasing the population.			1049
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		CSO20 843	Option VWM 2	Object		The majority of residents in this area relocated because of the permanent despoiling of their places of birth by elected local and national 'representatives' who would not listen or care about the needs of the people that voted for them. Do you want to be remembered as the people who finally ruined this area or the people who saved it? Do not forget that people still visit this area as tourists and we welcome them and accept their contribution to the local economy. They will stop coming if the developments continue. How many tourists visit the outer London sprawl? Can I quote p227 from the Core Strategy Options paper - Para 11.28 The Government's key housing policy is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. This is an impossible dream that can never and will never, be fulfilled. If the developments did go ahead what would be the effect of another 5000 cars on our local roads be ? If Morrison's developments go ahead where are the customers going to park? The parking within Verwood is just about adequate at the moment.			1049
535940	Mrs Linda Medler		CSO20 781	Option VWM 2	Object		Any additional building of houses will need to have a better road structure than exist at the moment to cater for all the extra traffic this will bring. I thought we were trying to bring about a greener environment to Dorset county?			1049
535948	Mr David Hadden		CSO20 789	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
535964	Mr		CSO20	Option	Support		I strongly support the building of additional housing in			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Steven Old		806	VWM 2			Verwood. However my support is only given in order that an Upper School is built OR the council look at changing the current three tier education system to the more sustainable two tier system. The council should also look at providing free transport for high achieving children to go to grammar schools should they wish to do so. The council should also look favourably upon anyone applying for permission to start a business in Verwood.			
535976	Mrs Valerie Stilwell		CSO20824	Option VWM 2	Object		Until the plans show the improvements in road access, car parking, youth and leisure facilities, and above all school places which are needed to meet current demands, let alone increases of this size, there is no possibility of our absorbing 600 extra cars, 600 extra children into the infrastructure and social fabric many of us have worked very hard to engender in our 'new town' which has grown so fast over recent years. the school particularly is an absurd suggestion: a) it is within 400 metres of heathland, where development is forbidden b) we are told there is no budget currently for extra school spaces in this area in the foreseeable future c) the chaotic school traffic situation in Margards Lane is already stretching residents' patience to the limits (with enormous fears about what a leisure centre here would do, let alone a senior school)and d) the local staff of Dorset Police, with whom I work, are dismayed at the proposals : it has taken 5 special constables a und are unsupportable within the current infrastructure. our already struggling 'community' will be drowned with the proposed enormous influx of newcomers - so many of us came to Verwood as it was promised there would be no further development - we escaped from areas where no sense of community was possible, and we have tried to forge such an atmosphere here - we will not just sit by and watch it swept away, for the sake of the millions the government are offering to Councils who do succumb to their demands. Let us know just WHO locally is in such dire need of housing, and we will readily sit down and help plan for them to share in this community!			1049
536014	Mrs Dawn		CSO20884	Option VWM 2	Object		What about the new homes bonus? Why is it not being implemented instead of this core strategy? The upper school			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Tindall						in Verwood will not happen within the life of this document, why is this carrot still being dangled.			
536025	Christopher Trim		CSO20 858	Option VWM 2	Object		We are very concerned about the proposed development particularly around Eastworth Road. The area earmarked for development around Eastworth Road cannot support 200+ homes. We appreciate the proposal to leave the existing play park and surrounding field as a buffer zone - but we are really concerned that this will become a central 'hanging out' point for younger people as it will form the 'centre' of the proposed development and the existing development around Field Place, which we believe will lead to anti-social behaviour problems - has this issue been considered? We understand that there will be 2 new access routes via the Station and Edmondsham Roads but are also concerned that Field Place will also be used as an access road - the road system cannot support the associated additional traffic through what is currently a very peaceful estate. We are also concerned about the loss of what is one of the few remaining unspoilt areas around Verwood as it encroaches onto the existing countryside. On a wider point about the development generally in Verwood : the town does not have the infrastructure to support another 400 homes. In the event that some or all of the proposed developments go ahead, where will children go to school in the short term as the 3 first schools are already oversubscribed? I can't see the logic of the proposals of building a new upper school - what about all the funding that has just gone into building a state of the art school in Wimborne (QE) where children from Verwood currently attend?			1049
536050	Mr Andrew Collin		CSO20 910	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
536077	Caroline Thomas		CSO20 918	Option VWM 2	Object		Moved to Verwood nearly 10 years ago due to the location and rural village feel for a better quality of life away from busy noisy town surroundings, for a better environment for children. This is already changing since more and more housing developments have slowly taken away Verwood's			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							identity.. PLEASE NO MORE.. We were promised that there would be no more housing developments- but this would appear to be a lie if this should go through.. Without stereotyping, housing association or "affordable housing" developments statistically will at best do nothing but make the area a far less desirable place in which to live..... This has to be a concern for all current Verwood residents . Enough is enough.! do not ruin Verwood			
536085	Grahame Thomas		CSO20 926	Option VWM 2	Object		Strongly object to ALL proposals, due to the underlying fact that there have been more than necessary housing developments within Verwood area built in the past 10 years which is going against the rural village location that it once was, and the reason why so many people love Verwood "of old" as opposed to a more populated and busy town the likes of which it is to become....For any resident of 5 or more years it has become clearly evident that crime and unruly behaviour has become more of an issue- which can and will only increase.. Please do not ruin the once loved "Village" of Verwood any more...!!!			1049
536096	Katie Lacey		CSO20 948	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		CSO20 973	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
536152	Mrs Alison OBrien		CSO20 980	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536159	Mr Chris OBrien		CSO20 990	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536165	Margaret Parker		CSO20 995	Option VWM 2	Object		I oppose all large scale development in Verwood as the infrastructure cannot cope with a large increase in population, car drivers etc and such development eradicates much needed green space in the town. As a resident of Eastworth Road I particularly oppose VWM2 - the proposed 200			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							properties on land west of Eastworth Road, especially if access is made via Eastworth Road. This is currently a narrow lane which is predominantly used for leisure purposes - cyclists, horse riders, walkers, parents taking young children to Trinity School etc. It is totally unsuitable for 200+ vehicles having regular access. If the development was to go ahead, surely access should be via the distributor road which was built for large scale vehicular access.			
536169	Mr Tony Treviss-Bell		CSO21 026	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
536175	Mrs Claire Addiscott		CSO21 008	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536178	Mark Addiscott		CSO21 018	Option VWM 2	Object		I feel Verwood is at saturation point at the moment and any increase in the number of people living here would greatly reduce the quality and feel of the town. Increases in population always seem to have adverse effects including loss of community spirit, and increases in crime and anti-social behavior etc. The town doesn't have the type of transport links which I feel would be needed for a greater population either.			1049
536183	Deric Burgess		CSO21 033	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536196	Mr J Spriggs		CSO21 048	Option VWM 2	Object		I feel that Verwood has reached its optimum size and retains a "village" atmosphere, which would be lost if it ended up as a dormitory town of Bournemouth with poor facilities.			1049
536204	Derek Kelly		CSO21 054	Option VWM 2	Object		I believe that too many new houses have already been built in Verwood during the past 10 years, and that the town does not have the infrastructure and amenities to cope with another 430+ families. The roads in and out of the town will be unable to cope (the road to Ringwood is already extremely busy) and there is nothing for young people to do - I would build a new leisure centre and other facilities first, before considering any more houses! As far as the two options affecting me most			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							directly - VWM1 and VWM2 - I understood that the land bordering Eastworth Road is a) good arable land that should remain agricultural land, and b) is green belt and should therefore be protected. I don't see how destroying fields and the wonderful outlook will 'provide valuable green infrastructure' when in my view it is already exactly that! I also believe that building 230+ new homes in this area will adversely affect the local wildlife - the owls, buzzards and other birds, badgers, deer and slow worms etc. Finally, my home backs on to the roundabout at the Champtoceaux Ave/Station Road junction and since the imposition of the one way system in the town centre the level of traffic - and traffic noise - has become intolerable, especially at weekends. Not only will another 200+ houses on Eastworth Road need to be accessed through the existing estate, vastly increasing the traffic in what is currently a quiet area, as well as making it more dangerous for our children, but the traffic from this and the Trinity Road option will all funnel onto the above-mentioned roundabout, making an already intolerable situation far, far worse. Please, please, no more houses in Verwood!!			
536206	Victoria Wiggins		CSO21 055	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536213	L Stevens		CSO21 063	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536220	Mrs J Heather		CSO21 068	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536252	Mrs Pamela Jakes		CSO21 074	Option VWM 2	Object		No more planning permission to erect ugly blocks of flats in Verwood.			1049
536255	Mrs J W Bryant		CSO21 081	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
536257	Mr		CSO21	Option	Object		If further homes were to be built in Verwood, would the			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Graham Jakes		091	VWM 2			utilities be able to cater for the extra demand? Also, there is the matter of increased traffic, more homes = more cars. In Verwood, ugly blocks of flats should be completely ruled out. One can see what has happened to-date on unsympathetic design in Crane Drive.			
536258	Mrs Anne Jones		CSO21102	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536259	Sandy Stockwell		CSO21111	Option VWM 2	Object		Living in Eastworth Road (the Albion Pub end), I am very concerned about the plans for VWM2 - the 200 homes in Eastworth Road. I understand that it is suggested that access be given via both ends of Eastworth Road and fail to see how this would be possible. At the Albion End the road is narrow and single-laned. Increasing its size will either bring the road closer to homes already along this road or will require the destruction of the woodland opposite the properties. If the road size is not increased, additional vehicular traffic will be a danger to those who use the 'lane' - pedestrians including dog walkers and parents walking children to Trinity School, cyclists and horse riders. I am also opposed to the further destruction of green spaces - needed for wildlife and for the well-being of residents. Verwood cannot support the suggested increase in properties and subsequent increase in population and vehicles - quality of life for residents is not considered when plans are discussed, yet this is surely important.			1049
536260	Vicki Palmer		CSO21116	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is big enough already!			1049
536263	Ryan Ward		CSO21120	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536265	Adrian Cox		CSO21128	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood has already been subject to over-development into green field land and infill throughout the village or as it is now known "Town". It has staggered me and many friends in Verwood that developers have been allowed to build huge eyesores in the shape of the blocks of flats around the "Hub" and now on Blackhill. Sadly it is a sign of the economic times			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							when profit over-rides sustainable development and social integration. Flats break down neighbourhoods, discouraging social interaction. Houses support family growth and social development! More needs to be done to make appropriate housing more accessible, e.g. part ownership schemes, possibly making existing housing in towns accessible to first-time buyers and those indeed on lower incomes.. It requires two earners on £25k each per annum to buy a £200k house!! Verwood's biggest problem at present is lack of appropriate facilities not lack of housing, enough is sat empty already!!			
536266	Mr Martin Cobb		CSO21 136	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536267	Trish Wheeler		CSO21 165	Option VWM 2	Object		I feel that Verwood has enough housing at present and it would be criminal to lose greenbelt, disrupt the wildlife and nature. There are not enough facilities for the people of Verwood at the present. There are already groups of young children hanging around the streets bored, how many more do you really want to see around Verwood - personally I don't want to see any. I think a small town like Verwood needs to be left alone. Can't believe that people are thinking of building so many houses when there is a recession on - the cost is going to be huge - can't the money be spent on upgrading the facilities for the people who are already here.			1049
536271	Mrs D Holt		CSO21 207	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
536274	Mrs Annalicaia Cobb		CSO21 157	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536279	Mr Garry Whitham		CSO21 170	Option VWM 2	Object		The local infrastructure struggles to support the present residents of Verwood. An increase in population would be put further pressure on the area			1049
536282	Mrs Doreen		CSO21 198	Option VWM 2	Object		Bad enough traffic on Howe lane without adding to the Burdon. What about sorting Verwood out before adding to its			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Kingaby						problems. Such a lovely little village trying to be a big town, planners mess. Let surrounding areas expand like Verwood has, before any more houses. In 2005 Verwood was declared full, why the change of heart? Please do the right thing for the people of Verwood and say no to building on our last remaining green belt.			
536289	N Waters		CSO21 189	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536300	Mrs Caroline Burgess		CSO21 205	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536311	Shane Ward		CSO21 217	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536313	Mrs J Wilmott		CSO21 231	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>According to the Governments New Homes Bonus consultation document from 11/2010 for 1000 new homes the required infrastructure to support those homes costs £20m. Based on the proposed maximum number of new homes for Verwood of 415 the proportioned infrastructure costs would be £8.3m. How do EDDC propose to fund these costs? I have estimated based on the figures in the document referred to above that if all the 415 homes were built and with 208 being affordable housing the 6 year bonus payment would be circa £4.4m so would not be sufficient to offset these costs. Therefore would you expect the various property developers under their required Section 106 agreements to meet all these costs and use the Bonus payments as suggested by the Government to improve frontline council services and improve the local Verwood community facilities for the benefit of existing residents? Point 11.19 of your core strategy document informs readers that Verwood has good road links. As a r ted to accessible and supported housing for this section of the community? It is advised in your strategy document that 90% of commuters use a car as their means of transport this is because of the lack of public transport and the semi-rural location. The 2008 report highlighted the fact that one third of houses in social rented properties had no use of a car. If you locate these families in Verwood in the</p>			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							proposed affordable housing how can this be of benefit if they have no means of transport and a limited public transport system. Finally the erosion of further green belt land should only be considered once the other options such as brown field sites, development of vacant properties have been fully explored.			
536315	J Ward		CSO21 230	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536323	Anne Crew		CSO21 245	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536324	Paul Sumner		CSO21 292	Option VWM 2	Object		Wimborne has the land and facilities to support more houses. The other areas do not. Especially Verwood, as it has been built upon to the point where it is second only to Dorchester, in terms of population. Verwood should be left alone and other areas play catch up. Verwood has no vibrant town centre no realistic extra employment opportunities. No infrastructure, no buses after 6pm or police for that matter. One NHS dentist with a waiting list as long as your arm. Same with the meagre doctor's services. None of the houses are actually needed, only for the council to get social housing built. Not the attractive affordable homes it seems to like to label them as. Building on green belt land is supposed to be for exceptional circumstances, there are no homeless in Verwood. Do not destroy green belt land just because of a loophole. There is no need for social housing in Verwood, therefore no exceptional circumstances exist. I have looked at the proposed sights and they will all destroy habitat for local wildlife, VWM4 will also see ski sites read beds ancient hedge rows etc severely disrupted. Did you know that there is a flood plane? What about the scientific report on the river crane and fishing lakes down there?. Common sense please.			1049
536329	Mrs C Green		CSO21 254	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is a lovely place to live in. Even though we are now a town, there is still a village atmosphere. People are friendly and know lots of others people. More houses means there will be more people coming in from outside who will want to make our town just like the bigger one they left behind. We have been here since 1986 and have seen Verwood double			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							in size. Enough is enough.			
536332	Emmanuelle Hutton		CSO21 267	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536341	Adrian Bowyer		CSO21 319	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536342	Lily Hutton		CSO21 297	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536346	Mr Ben Richards		CSO21 375	Option VWM 2	Object		Please note my following objections to the East Dorset Core Strategy consultation proposal to build 200 + affordable houses on Greenbelt land at Eastworth / Edmondsham Road. a.) The access (Roads) & infrastructure is inadequate for another 3 house let alone the proposed 200+. In addition there are a number of blind spot's which I understand was a key reason the decision was made to close Eastworth road, to reduce the traffic and potential accidents when accessing Edmondsham road. b.) Additional traffic next to a 1st school would surely add additional safety issues. c.) There is a footpath adjacent to both proposed sites which would add additional pressure onto heath land in direct contradiction to point 11.9 in the "Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 - Chapter 11 Verwood and West Moors Housing and Centre Options" which states: "Verwood lies adjacent to significant areas of protected heathland. The sites that are protected under European legislation, due to their fragility and nature conservation importance, are very sensitive to the impacts of nearby additional residential development. Therefore, housing development is not permitted within 400m of these areas. This has an implication on the areas suitable for residential development, especially within the existing built up area, and the need to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces to reduce the pressure of existing and proposed residential development on these sensitive areas." d.) Effect on rare species and wildlife on current green belt land, such as badgers, which are a protected species.			1049
536349	Mrs		CSO21	Option	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	C Bowyer		388	VWM 2						
536350	Melissa Taylor		CSO21 355	Option VWM 2	Object		Insufficient infrastructure to support additional housing			1049
536351	Mr John Hutton		CSO21 365	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536353	Chris Rowley		CSO21 403	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is already overcrowded with properties and not enough facilities to support this amount of housing growth.			1049
536384	Andy Brookes		CSO21 408	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is full to bursting already. Facilities are required before further housing. The school proposal is only mentioned to bribe people into allowing further housing. The housing will no doubt happen to some extent, the school will not.			1049
536392	Mrs Diana Evans		CSO21 413	Option VWM 2	Object		Already too many houses, the roads into and out of Verwood cannot take any more traffic. Also not enough shops to cater for more homes only one supermarket. PLEASE LEAVE OUR GREEN AREAS ALONE.			1049
536402	Mr P K Evans		CSO21 418	Option VWM 2	Object		Already too many houses with not enough facilities. The roads in and out of Verwood cannot take any more traffic.			1049
536449	Dave Isaacs		CSO21 456	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536467	Kim Rich		CSO21 443	Option VWM 2	Object		There are not enough existing facilities in Verwood for the residents already living here. I.e. Doctors, dentists and a variety of local shops. We do not need additional housing. Social and affordable housing will attract the wrong sort of people. The new flats that have already been allowed to be built are an eyesore and do not fit in with the existing surrounding properties. We moved here years ago to get away from noise pollution and heavy traffic. We do not want our peace and quiet spoiled by your proposals. We want to continue living in a pleasant green environment, quiet and			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							peaceful and unspoilt. That is the reason we chose to live in Verwood and your plans are not in keeping with the area.			
536479	Mr Jeff Maultby		CSO21 460	Option VWM 2	Object		Have you tried getting out of Holly grove or Hayward crescent when schools are open? Inconsiderate parent parking causes dangerously blocked roads, one day a child will be hurt. A secondary school will make it utterly intolerable and impossible. Unless every child is forced to walk or cycle - which is never going to happen! How long will we have to queue on Church Hill if a secondary school is built! It's already ridiculous when the schools are open and will be impossible with a new school. The access roads are just not adequate. We should spend money on all the un-made roads and providing proper cycle lanes before building new houses. Verwood does not have sufficient infrastructure for 415 new homes. We will have even more kids hanging around on corners with nothing to do.			1049
536508	Mrs AJ Hayden		CSO21 489	Option VWM 2	Support		Transportation links should be improved around Verwood, including the 3LX distributor road.			1049
536537	Mrs Susan Isaacs		CSO21 494	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny PEARCE		CSO22 104	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
482494	Mrs Yvette Jones		CSO21 886	Option VWM 2	Object		Large scale developments damage the environment for everyone, and it is for ever. The open green spaces are valued by so many who have paid a premium to live in a semi-rural area. Desecration of this is an assault to the residents' wellbeing; an unwarranted invasion causing a wholesale change of character to what is home to thousands of people who chose a neighbourhood because of its history of modest gradual development. Not convinced there is a housing shortage. Keep 'social' housing in more 'affordable' areas. What is there to aspire to and work towards otherwise? Don't patronise us re. 'housing for local people' -			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							occupants become 'local' by living in a 'location'. Small developments can be assimilated to the character of an area without destroying people's enjoyment of their homes. They can be developed with consideration, gradually and as appropriate. They do not have to cause illness through acute distress of residents just to line the developers' pockets and gratify councillors.			
498402	Mrs T Hughes		CSO22 240	Option VWM 2	Object		Re: Employment Land Options Whilst employment is obviously needed in the area, before building new sites please take a look around the existing industrial estates and see just how many units are empty. For example on Cobham Road on the Ferndown Ind Estate there are currently lots of 'To Let' boards. The traffic problems of the A31 need to be addressed before numerous new homes/businesses are built, throughout the summer routes through Ringwood/Ferndown/Wimborne become totally gridlocked. Whilst we can hope and encourage local people to use buses or cycle to work or for shopping, many of the cars coming into and through the area are driven by holidaymakers. With more people taking their holidays in the UK this problem is likely to get worse.			1049
536543	Mrs Samantha Fysh		CSO21 540	Option VWM 2	Object		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD.. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!			1049
536546	Mrs Sarah Jupp		CSO21 512	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536548	Mr James Robinson		CSO21 515	Option VWM 2	Object		I feel that the building of these additional homes in Verwood is based on the greed of the developers and the landowners. It is not proven that there is a need to rip up more land in Verwood particularly green belt farm land in the case of Eastworth Road. There is the appalling example of the housing units built on the ring road opposite the Hub that have not sold and are a complete eyesore with the developers becoming insolvent and it becoming a protracted farce that should never have been sanctioned. In short a wholly unacceptable set of circumstances that are blight on			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							those who gave permission to construct them. It clearly makes the case that planning has been granted filling the land with inappropriate housing and this has caused me to not trust the judgement of those responsible for making the decisions on development of housing in Verwood. In contrast Verwood has grown over the last three decades and recent efforts to improve the centre, build the Hub and construct the ring road makes the balance between housing and services/facilities better. The planners deserve credit for improving those facilities and that is why the school is a good idea for Verwood, as it is a further step to providing a complete all-encompassing small town. It also has the obvious benefit of not having to bus all those children every day to the schools outside of the area. In conclusion I cannot see any need to increase housing in Verwood. We really do have a responsibility not to concrete and tarmac over for housing any more open space or the surrounding fields of Verwood it is simply an act of gross irresponsibility.			
536553	Ms Michelle Hayter		CSO21530	Option VWM 2	Object		Totally object to the housing developments. Not enough facilities to cater for current population let alone a further 400 homes. Schools and facilities will suffer considerably.			1049
536554	Mr B Tunstall		CSO21533	Option VWM 2	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood will not stand up to this amount of building and people. 400 houses will roughly equate to 800 extra cars, 1200-1600 extra people. The doctors, schools, leisure facilities and shops that are in place at the moment will not be able to cope and the current residents will find that the pleasant small town which it is at the moment, will no longer be just that. Yes I know other facilities will be put in place, but how many years are we going to be over-run with contractors etc, (as is the case with the present building going on at the site which used to be the Fayrewood, and various other sites over the last few years). Please leave Verwood alone and let the money-greedy people who are trying to sell their land to the builders use the land for which it was intended - farming, and preserve the green belt status and England's "Green and pleasant land" Are we to become a wildlife bare area and a traffic black spot about to happen? Does no-one on the planning committee care for the welfare			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							of the present current Verwood residents or is it all being done in the name of "Progress" ?			
536563	Mr David Hayter		CSO21 606	Option VWM 2	Object		Totally object to the housing developments proposed in Verwood. Not enough amenities to cope with the current population and therefore will in no way be able to sustain another 400 homes.			1049
536566	Mr Adrian Blow		CSO21 546	Option VWM 2	Object		1] lack of current facilities e.g. shops & other facilities; public transport poor so would increase car journeys 2] lack of infrastructure e.g. road access etc at Eastworth site			1049
536571	Mr Craig Jerome		CSO21 558	Option VWM 2	Object		I will shortly be moving to Verwood and my partner lives in Pine View Road.			1049
536572	Mr Roger Fysh		CSO21 590	Option VWM 2	Object		I strongly object to the proposal to increase the housing in and around Verwood. Verwood has been extensively developed over the years and there is inadequate services to support the extra cars and people. Also having seen the housing density of the Ebblake housing estate it is clear that agreeing to more housing will only create 'no go' areas in the very near future. I also note that in and around Wimborne there are huge areas of open land, which could easily be developed, especially between Ferndown and Wimborne which also has excellent road networks in place as it could immediately open onto the A31			1049
536576	Mrs Valerie Green		CSO21 609	Option VWM 2	Object		I object to the core strategy. It will mean destruction of the green belt! The land owners will of course be in favour of development as the land will be worth a lot more as building land. There are 1.5m unoccupied homes in the UK plus an unknown number of empty homes in the rented sector. Central Government wants an extra 3M homes to be built. In total this will house 10 to 15M people. The population has increased by only 5M in the last 50 years why do we need these extra homes? Are there so many people who would choose to live in Verwood and have to travel to work? In view of economic uncertainty is it wise to plan a large increase in the number of new homes. You only have to look at the Irish situation to see how easily things can go wrong. Would the			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							council really destroy the green belt and blight the lives of existing residents if it were not for the Government housing bribe.			
536628	Mr C.A Wills		CSO21 663	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
536631	Ms Carole-Ann Young		CSO21 637	Option VWM 2	Object		Totally object to the housing developments proposed in Verwood. The size of the developments are far larger than the current infrastructure can support. There are barely enough amenities for the current residents and these developments will create even more strain on already overstretched and poor facilities.			1049
536634	Mr Andrew Beal		CSO21 649	Option VWM 2	Object		Totally object to all future new housing developments in Verwood. Monies should be invested in infrastructure for existing residents instead. The proposed developments pay little or no attention to existing planning controls and make a mockery of the planning process in East Dorset.			1049
536635	Mr Ronald Helmers		CSO21 656	Option VWM 2	Object		It has been 5 and a half years since I moved to Verwood although I have been familiar with the town for many years prior to that move. Since coming I have been aware of the increase in houses/flats etc over that time. It seems that everywhere I look one house is being demolished and replaced with several residential properties. Now there are these proposals for major residential developments at Eastworth Road and Howe Lane. Combined with the two smaller developments some 415 homes are involved. These, were they in one place could be considered a small town or at the least a very large village. On separate issues where is the infrastructure to support all this development? Has the Council considered the implications of the increased traffic that will be generated not only on the area immediately surrounding the two major schemes but on the town generally? I fear that a modestly sized town is well on its way to becoming a size that many of the residents will find very much not to their liking. I for one object most strongly. I understand that the school proposed is an upper school and that such a school is lacking in the town. If this is the case			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							then I would support its establishment.			
536636	Mr Phil Jones		CSO21 664	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood doesn't have the infrastructure for any further such development			1049
536637	Mrs Geraldine Haigh		CSO21 672	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536642	Ms Clare Taylor		CSO21 677	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536654	Ms Maureen Castell		CSO21 696	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood does not need more houses, it needs a senior school, more shops and another doctor's surgery. Verwood is bursting with house. If Verwood is a Town it needs to be a town.			1049
536656	Charlotte England		CSO21 697	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536659	Mr Andy Longshaw		CSO21 707	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536660	Mr and Mrs N J Close		CSO21 708	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536666	Mr C Thickett		CSO21 719	Option VWM 2	Object		Re: Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Consultation – Verwood I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI's and			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unacceptable strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood’s present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			
536678	Mrs L Thickett		CSO21738	Option VWM 2	Object		I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI’s and contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unacceptable strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood’s present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			
536692	Richard Coulthard		CSO21 744	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood already has too much housing for the infrastructure available. Until schools and other facilities are actually built there should not be any more large developments approved. Permission for additional development should not be granted based on an intention to improve facilities at some point in the future.			1049
536694	Mr T Thickett		CSO21 748	Option VWM 2	Object		Re: Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Consultation – Verwood I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI’s and contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unacceptable strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood`s present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		CSO21 788	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
536702	Mr Mark Hirst		CSO21 768	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
536718	Mrs J Durham		CSO21 801	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536723	P Pembroke		CSO21 813	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood has been developed enough in recent years. It now should be left alone without further intrusion into its green spaces to retain its rural identity and heritage. Further development of 400 homes has the potential for another 800 cars. There is already too much commercial traffic and too many cars coming into and through Verwood with little regard for the speed limit. The roads in Verwood are not large enough to cope with further increases in traffic, not to mention the amount of construction traffic a development of this size would bring. There is insufficient infrastructure in Verwood to accommodate any further development and this would need to be addressed before anything further should be considered.			1049
536766	A Pembroke		CSO21 822	Option VWM 2	Object		Insufficient infrastructure in Verwood. Already far too many cars and commercial traffic coming into and through Verwood with little regard for speed limit. Green belt should be left alone and Verwood retain its rural identity and heritage. Verwood is already an urban dormitory.			1049
536771	B		CSO22	Option	Object		I object to any development that expands Wimborne and			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lusher		081	VWM 2			surrounding villages now and at any time in the future. Why is Wimborne such a beautiful town, could it be the Minster, old buildings, steeped in history? probably all of these and many other attributes. Take a good look at that stunning photograph 'Wimborne Minster and Stour In Winter' by Roger Holman, fields and the town centre, all in one picture. This view of the landscape, identified as a scene of merit by the artistic eye of the photographer, often passes the layman by, until pointed out so graphically. This photograph, like others, is a measure of what we could lose. I wonder if there were other equally stunning scenes in the hills northeast of Wimborne, Colehill, now completely covered in houses. Can you imagine the equivalent photograph of that time, the town, with a backdrop of fields and trees rising above horizon. Too late, that moment has passed. The town, in close proximity to countryside, is ye has realised this and is making an effort to preserve old Singapore. We, on the other hand, seem to be quite happy to knock down our countryside in the name of development. If we really want to preserve Wimborne for generations to come, so they can see the town, be part of its unique character, situated amongst, close at hand countryside, then we must make a conscious decision now to preserve the green belt and green areas in the town forever, before Wimborne eventually becomes a quaint little roundabout that travellers come across on the way from somewhere to somewhere.			
536772	Mr J Stone		CSO21 849	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
536777	Karen Hodgkiss		CSO21 855	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood doesn't need more houses it desperately needs more facilities. We are a town, not a village anymore. We need a bigger supermarket, a public swimming pool and a high school.			1049
536781	Abigail Harris		CSO21 860	Option VWM 2	Object		As a home owner living on the junction of Church Hill and Margards Lane my Primary concerns are the future plans for a secondary school VWM7 and housing at Howe Lane VWM3. This would greatly increase the volume of traffic that			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							already passes by on route to Emmanuel and Verwood First School. I feel this would have a huge impact on the local residents and would have concerns with regards to road safety along this route. I also have concerns about the other possible development sites and the amount of new homes being built in Verwood. The towns Facilities has not grown with the population of Verwood.			
536790	David Steadman		CSO21 902	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
536796	Ann Coleman		CSO21 914	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536798	Peter Coleman		CSO21 919	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536800	Julieanne Sutherland		CSO21 926	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support 400 more homes - there will be increased traffic - the whole point of moving to Verwood is for its rural feel and quietness and safety . Who is going to benefit from these extra houses ?????? Certainly not existing residents , if this a good way to raise extra revenue on the council tax? The rationale behind this proposal to try and build more houses needs to be fully explained			1049
536802	Anida Griffiths		CSO21 952	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536803	Ian Hargreaves		CSO21 942	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536807	Paul Dayson-Smith		CSO21 953	Option VWM 2	Object		I feel Verwood has seen more than enough building in the last 30 years. There are nowhere near enough local jobs or a suitable level of infrastructure to support a higher population. Whoever proposed to build the, admittedly needed, new secondary school on Howe lane clearly hasn't tried to drive down that road at 8:30 on a weekday morning			1049
536808	Ms Yvette		CSO22 018	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood does not need to increase its population is already too big for the local infrastructure.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Allen									
536811	Mr P Carey		CSO21 969	Option VWM 2	Object		I am a resident of Howe Lane, Verwood, and since moving to this location have had nothing but immense problems with traffic due to the Emmanuel/Verwood school campus. I have had a 4 year running battle with motorists parking, not only over my driveway; but also IN my driveway. I have complained to the local police on numerous occasions, only to be told that it is a council problem. I have applied for a 'white line' and complained to my local councillor - all to no avail. There are regular near miss incidents in and around the school campus. And only last week a parked car in Howe Lane was severely damaged. By building the new houses in Howe Lane this will create even more problems. The land to the south of Howe Lane will just compound the problem and then add a new school is just utterly ridiculous. There is no infrastructure within Verwood to accommodate all the proposed developments. If you, the council, wish the residents of Verwood to be amicable, then I suggest h I find highly amusing. There is no money for this new school! There is an on-going situation with damaged vehicles and traffic problems within the school campus and outside. I do not see how this new school can be accessed unless the council is going to build many new roads, or compulsory purchased land. I will fight to my last breath to stop all of this!!!! We do not want this - it will not serve us - it will make our lives intolerable!			1049
536812	R H Barker		CSO21 993	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536816	Mr T C Clark		CSO22 000	Option VWM 2	Object		The village of Verwood has become a dormitory town because of all the most recent building which has taken place Any further builds would cause more of a problem for the residents already living in Verwood. The reasons being: Public Transport is inadequate Roads are inadequate for the amount of traffic which uses them. Shops are inadequate, other than Banks, Estate Agents or Hairdressers. We need more of a variety of shops within a specific area, not spread all over the town. There are no facilities for the younger			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							element of the town,this needs to be addressed urgently.Keep them off the streets and out of mischief. Restaurants are limited i.e. non existant other than cheap pub food or Indian/chinese take aways and the local chippy. As for the new school (which is a requirement).If this is to be situated within the Campus of the current school this would lead to further problems with traffic flow and parking. Already both sides of Margards Lane/Howe Lane and adjoining roads are near to capacity.Which leads me to another point,Emergency vehicles would be unable to attend either house fires or life threatening situations.This means that people living within this area are under great risk.			
536817	Cheryl Evans		CSO22 016	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536819	Cathryn Biggins		CSO22 019	Option VWM 2	Object		I don't think there is enough local work in Verwood to support the proposed number of new homes and if people have to travel out of the area to work there will be increased traffic on roads that are already busy, particularly during school times and in the mornings and early evenings. In addition local services like the doctors, dentists, banks, the supermarket and petrol station are already busy and an increase in population numbers will increase waiting times for appointments and queues. I think a new secondary school would also create huge traffic and parking problems on roads that are already very busy with the first and middle school traffic in the mornings and afternoons. At the moment the students have the choice of several good upper schools and the network of bus stops allows them to walk to a local stop. A new school would result in increased traffic as students travel in from surrounding areas. Verwood is a pleasant place to live at the moment and has beau tiful green areas surrounding it. Many green areas within Verwood have been infilled with housing during the last 15 years and I don't think the town should be expanded any further.			1049
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		CSO22 055	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536840	Mr Clive Evans		CSO22 058	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536841	Mr and Mrs N P Brunning		CSO22 065	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536848	Ola Steadman		CSO22 144	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
536850	Mr Michael Hird		CSO22 159	Option VWM 2	Object		Assertions like "could", "may", "potential", "divert pressures away from heathlands" and "will contribute" are meaningless without guarantees and full explanation. The ratio of affordable homes to (un)affordable is far too high and will result in an unacceptable concentration of ghetto like small dwellings. Developments of more than 30 homes in the current economic climate and without clear plans for improved infrastructure and services is clearly foolhardy and shows a total lack of foresight. The results of the consultation should be published and no further action taken until the full consequences of cuts in Government expenditure are known. This is particularly important with respect to VWM7 - new secondary school.			1049
494436	Mr R D Turvil		CSO22 739	Option VWM 2	Object		We are against the proposals as they over extend Verwood, which has already been extensively developed and now seems taken for granted as the easy option. The town already suffers from limited community facilities and, what there is, is spread out, thus weakening any real sense of community. The Localism Bill currently before Parliament specifically identifies that residents are to be handed powers to approve/block developments .			1049
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		CSO22 677	Option VWM 2	Object		VWM2. West of Eastworth Road. 200 homes. I object to this development at the size indicated. • It erodes green belt • The Alderholt Road is too narrow for the increase in motor and pedestrian traffic. • Eastworth Road was blocked off when the distributor road was built, presumably to stop its use as a 'rat			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							run.' It would seem obvious that re-opening this narrow road would exacerbate the earlier problem. The junction of Eastworth Road with Station Road is difficult to make safe with increased traffic volumes			
499791	Mr & Mrs Ralph and Vivienne Odell		CSO22 911	Option VWM 2	Object		<p>I live in the heart of the beautiful Dorset countryside in Verwood. I am objecting to the proposal by the Christchurch and East Dorset Councils to build circa 450 new houses on what is currently greenbelt land used for agricultural purposes. Whilst there is a 12 week period of consultation ending December 24th, the majority of residents living in Verwood are unaware of the proposal as it has not been widely publicised.</p> <p>The proposed options for Verwood Central sub-area, Eastern sub-area and Western sub-area are areas of outstanding natural beauty and form natural habitat for many wildlife including but not limited to, deer, badgers, foxes, bats, sparrow hawks, green and greater spotted wood peckers, adders, slow worms, grass snakes and newts. These areas are also designated green belt and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. The Green Belt in question is good; rich arable land and for this reason should remain agricultural. Green Belts help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use. They assist in moving towards more sustainable patterns of urban development and the purposes of including land in green belts is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large build-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land • once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. My understanding is that if such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt. Is the Council able to confirm that the Secretary of State is satisfied 			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>and has indeed been consulted?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans or earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally. The core strategy suggests that the Authority plan to move the belt to accommodate any developments. Detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become available. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless the alterations to the structure plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist, which necessitate such revision. <p>As residents, we have good local knowledge and will be most affected by the proposed changes to our environment and we hope that our voice carries considerable weight. As previously stated, the surrounding countryside is a place of outstanding natural beauty and many of the local residents take great pleasure in enjoying the peace and tranquillity it offers. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand. We feel that this development would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. The town's infrastructure and local services are already strained and would need to significantly increase in capacity to cope with the increase in demand.</p> <p>We feel that these developments would have a hugely detrimental effect on the area, both visually and the increase in cars on the road etc. as well as significantly affecting the value of our houses. How will First and Middle schools cope with the influx of a possible extra 800 pupils? There is not enough medical provision, i.e. doctors, community nursing or dentists in the area despite what your report says. I struggle to get an appointment with my Doctor in less than two weeks. The town does not need any more houses.</p>			
507800	Mrs K M Platt		CSO22 899	Option VWM 2	Object		Too much development in Verwood already.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514507	Mr and Mrs C Macy		CSO22 768	Option VWM 2	Support					1049
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22 888	Option VWM 2	Object		Option VWM2 Strongly object to development Please see comments on the Masterplan report. Object to proposals for SANG that include the SNCI woodland, Ironmongers Copse. The additional recreational pressure on this woodland would be very damaging. SANGs are intended to provide an experience of wide open spaces similar to that found on the open heaths. Safe crossing of the C104 to the proposed SANG to the north would be essential if any development were to be considered here			1049
536856	Mr and Mrs Ian Barnes		CSO22 147	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536860	Mrs Sparks		CSO22 191	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
536866	Emma Huns		CSO22 220	Option VWM 2	Object		I feel that Verwood needs more facilities (such as a secondary school, swimming pool, restaurants) before any further expansion			1049
536910	Ms Susan Bradley		CSO22 253	Option VWM 2	Object		I strongly object to the options VWM 1,2,3 and 4 for new houses in Verwood. In particular because they fall within Green Belt land. Green Belt land should be preserved as Green Belt. In the East Dorset SHLAA 2008 Report all of these sites were "considered unacceptable in context of Green Belt Policy". Why are they even being considered? I am horrified at the idea that each time new houses are needed the green belt will simply be redrawn to accommodate them! Please do not build on Green Belt land.			1049
536928	Mr Kevin Fyles		CSO22 279	Option VWM 2	Object		Concern that insufficient developer contributions will be secured in order to underpin the necessary infrastructure improvements that are required in Verwood to support both larger developments and also 'make good' (at least in part) on previous infrastructure shortfalls.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536932	Paul Bason		CSO22 309	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536944	Ian Lucking		CSO22 326	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood cannot take any more traffic because the road system will not cope. The infrastructure will be not be able withstand more population in this small town and will take away its charm.			1049
536966	Rachel Baulch		CSO22 331	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536972	Iris Baulch		CSO22 336	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536990	Steward Gates		CSO22 345	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
536993	Nicola Gates		CSO22 354	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
537012	Carole Lucking		CSO22 369	Option VWM 2	Object		I feel that the traffic in and out of Verwood is already quite considerable. Much more thought must be put in to the vehicular access to all these properties. I also feel we need more facilities in the town to cater for the needs of all the extra population.			1049
537018	Vanessa Scott		CSO22 378	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
537021	John and Susan Lewis		CSO22 384	Option VWM 2	Support		The population is growing in Verwood and I think there is still a need for more affordable family homes. An upper school is required which would eliminate the need for so much school transport to Ferndown and Wimborne. This would also improve our sense of community and be less divisive. The political movers in Verwood all seem to have a NIMBY attitude towards our community and use any excuse to prevent development.			1049
537026	Roy Cronk		CSO22 389	Option VWM 2	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
537030	E Lock		CSO22 394	Option VWM 2	Object		There needs to be a lot more facilities and better infrastructure in the Verwood area before adding any more strain. In particular increasing the bus routes, roads and another petrol station			1049
537050	Diane Fletcher		CSO22 414	Option VWM 2	Object		The infrasture currently in place in Verwood is already sufficient to support the existing population without adding potentially 400+ more families. Public transport is woefully inadequate to service its working and social population, with no quick bus links to major employment and social hubs of Bournemouth, Chrsitchurch, Salisbury and Southampton. The existing services are slow and infrequent, with the evening services stopping ridiculously early and sunday services too infrequent to seriously entertain. There is nothing constructive for the existing youth to do and this is already manifesting itself in anti-social behaviour (openly drinking/smoking and causing a general nuisance late at night). Additional families would only add to this growing issue and the threat of closure of the curent police station is very worrying. An additional 400+ vehicles would significantly add to the risk of accidents, especially around the first and middle schools, all of which are alr eady oversubscribed and could not cope with upto 400 additional children (probably double or more than 400 realistically). The additional stress on the existing drains and sewage systems would put existing housing at risk. The existing shopping centre is more akin to a small village and does not service the existing poulation with a range of goods and service that could be reasonably expected of a town of its existing size, let alone having so many more people to service. All in all, Verwood does not have the infrasture, school capacity, leisure/social facilities or public transport to support its existing population. The proposals to add another 400+ families into these limited facilities and services is ill advised and impractical and will only add to anti-social behaviour problems and pressures on the existing infrastructure that would be disasterous for the existing population.			1049
537075	Mrs Elaine		CSO22 448	Option VWM 2	Object		1. I strongly object to the failure to consult in Verwood regarding our suggestions for building options to fulfil local			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Holt						housing needs when the Regional Spatial Strategy was revoked. I feel we were disenfranchised in this respect, and our current option for expressing our views is inadequate. 2. As most commuter traffic out of Verwood is to Ringwood and Ferndown, more large scale development (400 homes) will overload the already crowded and dangerous roads, (up to 800 more cars). Even traffic problems arising from the Trinity School development have not yet been solved. 3. Paragraph 11.60, 11.62 and 11.71 (Option VWM 1 and VWM 2): I strongly object to the development outlined in VWM1 and VWM2, which I believe compromise the 'Area of Great Landscape Value' rendering it invisible to most, and intruding into the most inspiring view of this landscape from the popular beauty spot and viewpoint at Stephen's Castle SSSI. The raft of houses will be a clearly visible scar in an otherwise rare spread of rolling hills. 4. Paragraph 11.60: When we raised concerns around the development of Trinity School we were informed that the school was a 'special case' for the green belt, and so it should not be an argument used in favour of further housing development. It would not be a properly transparent reason. 5. Transport issues etc: I strongly object to the practice of some developers promising to pay sums to the council for roads etc, or to other bodies such as English Nature, as part of the permission process, as this appears to muddy the basis on which permission is given especially in terms of green belt, or sensitive land.			
537104	J R Bardi		CSO22 460	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
537106	C Hebditch		CSO22 479	Option VWM 2	Object		The more homes we build the more roads we need. The homes and roads get filled up then we're back to square one. When will it ever end. The notion expressed in some of the planning, about trying to get people out of their cars, off the roads, and into public transport, is a joke. For example, building on the Cuthbury allotments in Wimborne means that those who have one of the new allotments will have to get their cars out to drive to them, whereas at present there are many people in Wimborne who can walk to their allotments. Most of the areas designated as fit for development will mean			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							even more chaos on our local roads because public transport is not going to improve to the state where those of us who are fortunate to have a job to go to will all be able to get to work on time using a bus. The size of the proposed developments, in my opinion, is too big and will put undue pressure on local services for which we do not at present have funding to improve. I suppose though that these new homes will bring some new council tax payers to the area and therefore, maybe, help with the budget deficit ... until we have to build the new roads			
537122	Christopher Hill		CSO22 491	Option VWM 2	Object		I strongly object to the two large developments on Green Belt land (VWM1 and VWM2). Verwood has had a massive amount of new housing built in the last 20 years or so and it still does not have the facilities to support the increased population. More housing on this scale would make this problem worse and put great pressure on the local roads. According to the 2008 East Dorset SHLAA report the land which is now included in the VWM1 VWM2 proposals was deemed unsuitable for residential development.			1049
537312	Mr Barry Goldsmith		CSO22 502	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
537314	Mrs Penelope Goldsmith		CSO22 507	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
537318	Daniel Parkin		CSO22 512	Option VWM 2	Object		At present I do not feel any further development is needed in Verwood - the town needs to come to terms with its recent expansion over the last 10-15 years. With no money in the coffers, so to speak, I cannot see where funding for a new school will come from and appears to be a gimmick in return for approval of additional homes. My children go to Verwood First and Emmanuel and traffic is already a problem, without further homes and a potential new school. Money would be better spent expnding the school further so that children can enjoy a wider range of facilities. I attended our child's first xmas fayre this year and the school was so crowded it was uncomfortable, the school does not have the facilities to cater			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							for all the children's wishes, only those drawn out of a hat. If a secondary school is a consideration, then the council really needs to look at how Emmanuel School can be improved first. I agree a secondary school in Verwood would be ideal for the local community growth and dynamics and a further opinion poll taken to see what residents of Verwood would like in 10 years time!!			
537326	Harold Bowskill		CSO22 517	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood continues to lack sufficient amenities and facilities to support its local community now, especially the young with few leisure or entertainment facilities. Verwood has one supermarket serving the entire town with two convenience stores and little else. Adding more homes will simply increase peoples frustrations and anger and due consideration should be given to the existing populous. Increasing the population of Verwood by adding a further 415 homes is clearly a means of increasing council revenue and nothing more, the infrastructure of Verwood simply cannot handle this, the roads, sewers and services will need extensive improvement and in this era of austerity, is it really economically viable.			1049
537362	Peter Constable		CSO22 537	Option VWM 2	Object		The larger residential building proposals are completely out of character for the area and will consume large tracts of green belt. The infrastructure to support development on a large scale is simply not in place. The smaller developments appear to be a better fit e.g Cuthbury, Leigh Park, Stone Lane.			1049
537435	Ms Pauline Burton		CSO22 565	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
537529	Mrs C White		CSO22 592	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
537542	Mrs M Wake		CSO22 603	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
537548	Mr		CSO22	Option	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	C Wake		608	VWM 2						
537557	Batchelor		CSO22 613	Option VWM 2	Object		We feel Verwood have Enough houses/flats/dwellings and schools in this area lack of decent shopping facilities and coffee shops and good cafes in the area - so feel Verwood should concentrate on making itself user friendly love the green belt area and this should not be removed or made s smaller thankyou			1049
537562	Dan Cartmale		CSO22 618	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
537566	Patricia Adlem		CSO22 624	Option VWM 2	Object		We live in Burrows Lane and have to go past the Trinity school,which is nearly impassable at the dropping off and collection time of these school children. The parents park there cars both sides of the road,with out any due care and attention for other drivers.So putting up more housing in this area is just adding to the turmoil of the residents that all ready live there.Why can they not have a drive in and drop off area in the school grounds as there seems to be plenty of space on the school premises?.			1049
537571	Nick and Marion Leatherdale		CSO22 644	Option VWM 2		No Opinion				1049
537580	Ruth Brown		CSO22 656	Option VWM 2	Object					1049
537582	Wendy Stacey		CSO22 662	Option VWM 2	Support		The current infrastructure barely supports the existing development in the Verwood area. My support to any of these proposals is only valid if ALL the utilities are upgraded prior to or in conjunction with any further building schemes. If the infrastructure is not improved I cannot give support top any of these proposals.			1049
537731	Mr Colin Ward		CSO22 667	Option VWM 2	Object					1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
537762	Peggy Marshall		CSO22 672	Option VWM 2	Object		Vewood is a country town with surrounding fields and forest. Therefore there should be no building on green belt 515 homes could mean at least 800 + cars which the roads are unable to cope with. The support services such as drainage was not designed to cope with the proposed rise in number of the population. Existing shops would be inadequate. "Let the people decide"----Cameron's slogan			1049
537806	Mrs P Arnold		CSO22 690	Option VWM 2	Object		We have far too many people in Verwood already and there are not the facilities to cope with the amount at the present time let alone building even more houses. Yes we definately need another school.			1049
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter Griffiths		CSO22 722	Option VWM 2	Support		Approve of provision of affordable housing, however, agreement with Housing Association must be watertight so housing stock for rent remains constant and stock can never be sold. These houses will be near to facilities, schools, shops, transport, work and will alleviate pressure on rural communities with no facilities to provide affordable housing in the Green Belt.			1049
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		CSO22 843	Option VWM 2		General Comment	Again, a point that was made both strongly and clearly at the Public meeting in the Memorial Hall, was that, with all the growth of housing development that has been undertaken in recent years, there needs to be space for 'Verwood to find itself! The general feeling is that too much is happening, too quickly and the community needs more time to 'bed down'. Whilst it is appreciated that the proposed housing developments will probably not take place within the next five years, in the life of a community, that still seems a rather short time frame.			1049
539805	Mr Philpot		CSO22 803	Option VWM 2	Object		Margards Lane is busy and dangerous for the schol children as it is now. Too many houses/flats are ruining Verwood, the landscape and community feeling. In eight years of living here it has grown immensely with ugly flats. The more people living in Verwood the more chance of crime as it no longer has a community feel amd people lose their sense of pride in their area. Verwood still has a village feel - let's keep it that way.			1049

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
583759	Mr A Craddock and Mrs D Goodenough		CSO22 954	Option VWM 2	Object		Verwood is the fastest growing town in Europe with insufficient infrastructure (ie access roads into Verwood) to support these 415 new homes being planned. We already have to wait up to 5 mins to leave Noon Hill Road to access the main Ringwood Road, its very frustrating even now. The traffic along Ringwood Road is already travelling well in excess of the speed limit and it seems no one is interested in doing anything to curb it. With all the proposed extra dwellings and the new school run there will be even more traffic exceeding the speed limit. Therefore it will be even more difficult for the elderly residents to survive this traffic.			1049
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO52 8	11.103	Object		<p>* This site could be considered for housing.</p> <p>This site should not be considered for housing - this is an ideal location to provide the community with some desperately needed facilities - Allotments would be an extremely popular and welcome use for this land.</p> <p>* The site is suitable for low density housing in keeping with surrounding development, possibly replicating the existing street pattern of Summer Fields.</p> <p>Will the social housing provided by this site be large detached premises in keeping with Summer Fields? Really?</p> <p>* Difficult to form satisfactory safe vehicular access from Howe Lane, access may be better from Summer Fields. Access from Howe Lane is blocked by TPO's on trees. Access from Summer Fields would have to be through the gardens of current residents. Planning regulations currently frown upon this practice.</p> <p>* Access would need to respect large existing trees if taken from Howe Lane.</p> <p>This significantly impedes access unless the new residents don't mind walking home.</p> <p>* Land ownership issues would have to be resolved if access was to be taken from Summer Fields.</p> <p>Building on peoples gardens in a road which is very restricted by size.</p> <p>The development of this site is a mistake, there is very poor access. This site could better be used for allotments.</p>			1052
477845	Mr.		CSO24	Option	Object		I must strongly object for the following reasons. The planned			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Robert Pallant			VWM 3			20+ houses in Howe Lane will require vehicle access either from Howe Lane or Summer Fields. I live at number 4 Summer fields. The proposed access would take vehicles across privately owned land. At the moment this land has shared ownership between houses 3 and 4 Summer Fields for the sole use of access to off street parking and garaging for both properties. Therefore as it stands we have zero passing traffic and consequently no traffic noise. The privately owned access road is only one car width wide and to turn this into a public access road would mean widening it encroaching on the off street parking and garden areas of both properties 3 and 4 Summer Fields. We purchased the property knowing it was set in a tranquil setting with no passing traffic. While we understand no one has a right to a particular view we overlook fields with grazing horses and would not want to swap this for the brick wall of a newly built property. We will absolutely refuse any request to purchase our land to allow access to this new housing development. Who ever is making decisions on this planning application should be aware of this. Regards Robert and Susanne Pallant			
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO230	Option VWM 3	Object		Facilities only not houses The 2 doctors surgeries have little room to expand, could we build a medical centre on the North East Section of this site away from the houses. To combine present surgeries to allow for further expansion in the future. This would fall in line with primary health care for local residents with the NHS reform proposals. This would solve some of the rush hour access issues to this site, as the site will be in use all day. This would also create a number of jobs for the local residents. Where the doctors surgery in Lake Road is the Dentist could possibly expand to allow for new NHS and Private patients. Where the doctors surgery is in Station Rd this could be retail space for new business also generating jobs and adding more vibrancy to the town. One or more of the pharmacies may wish to move to the medial centre. Some say 20/30 social and starter homes could be carefully incorporated into the development along the Manor Road for the Elderly for this site provides adequate access to health			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							facilities and bus routes. I would recommend traffic calming on this road prior to any development on this site.			
361055	Mr David OAKLEY		CSO1021	Option VWM 3	Object		I find it very hard to understand how, after unanimous support for no development in the Green Belt this now goes directly against that decision.			1053
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO529	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>This development would require the use of a residents front garden as a public highway, or the destruction of mature trees which are covered by a TPO.</p> <p>Although this document seems to respect TPO's, it fails to respect areas of green fields and green belts.</p> <p>Why is it necessary to purchase Heathy Howe as a SANG? This is not a necessary development.</p> <p>Heathy Howe is currently a back garden, why is it necessary to purchase for great cost an unnecessary plot of land? Typically SANGS in positions like Heathy Howe get developed following their purchase, so is just an advanced purchase of future development land?</p> <p>http://www.dorsetforyou.com/media.jsp?mediaid=129695&filetype=pdf</p> <p>"The SPG advocates the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) which should seek to control surface run-off as close to its origin and attempts to mimic natural drainage processes, thereby reducing flood risk and pollution. Accordingly, a SUDS for a new development should meet the following basic requirements:</p> <p>for 'green-field' sites there should be no greater run-off than exists prior to development</p> <p>downstream watercourses and habitat should not be damaged by run-off generated by the development."</p> <p>As there are significant drainage issues currently with this site and run-off is currently via drainage ditches into the River Crane, will the expectation of the developer include Sustainable Drainage from the site?</p>			1053
490570	Mrs		CSO10	Option	Object		As a resident of Verwood I feel that it already does not have			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Patricia RYAN		36	VWM 3			the facilities to support a town of this size, so an increase in housing seems like madness. The main Ringwood road is already very hard to access at the best of times, without more cars being added.			
490846	Karen COOMBS		CSO1060	Option VWM 3	Object		This development school and houses in Verwood (VWM3 and VWM7) shouldn't be allowed to go ahead unless the access roads are improved. At the moment the majority of traffic goes down Margards Lane causing problems 8 - 9am and 3 - 4pm. Another access route would be essential.			1053
490854	D MUTTON		CSO1068	Option VWM 3	Support		I only support the home development south of Howe Lane and south of Manor Road if Howe Lane and St Michael Road are adopted and improved to provide additional access to the additional homes etc (school). Margards Lane/Church Hill already have more than enough traffic congestion at times. From SNAP: The support of those areas of Verwood marked as 'supported' is dependent on an improved road access - especially in respect of Howe Lane, which needs to be adopted. Margards Lane/Church Hill are already over-loaded with traffic at certain times of the day. This could be relieved by re-opening the northern arm of Church Hill onto Manor Road - with 'left turn only' at this point			1053
495558	Linda Raybould		CSO1498	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
495562	Mr MJ Banting		CSO1518	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
495625	Mr Michael McMath		CSO1545	Option VWM 3	Object		While I support the building of a new upper school in Verwood which I think has been needed for years my main concern is that if 415 new houses are to be built in Verwood where are all the children who will be living in these houses be going to school? I would assume that 415 houses would mean about 700 or more children, the current 1st and middle schools do not have the capacity to take in this number of new pupils so they would have to be bussed to schools outside Verwood.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							My other concerns are the extra traffic that would be generated by another 700 cars. There are times when pedestrians can wait 5 minutes or more to cross Manor Lane to the Monmouth Ash car park for access to Morrisons, this will just get worse. Where are all these residents going to work? I assume they will be commuting in and out of Verwood every day thus adding to the already busy roads.			
496188	Mr RE Vogel		CSO16 25	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
496338	Mr John Clough		CSO16 51	Option VWM 3	Object		Recent roadworks on the B3081 have demonstrated how fragile the routes in and out of Verwood are. More housing will make the situation worse. Recent disastrous developments including the Fairwood site clearly demonstrate the insensitivity of planning within Verwood. I can see no need for supporting further development when it is clear the needs of existing residents are being disregarded and our environment damaged without thought or consideration for the future. I continue to travel to Ringwood and Ferndown for town amenities until such time as these are available in Verwood. I strongly object to further development.			1053
496462	Mr and Mrs Guy Jameson		CSO16 79	Option VWM 3	Support		Before developing hundreds of homes the local infrastructure in Verwood requires enhancements. If a senior school is required in Verwood then a suitable site needs to be found. Land that is protected by green belt status must be respected and adhered to.			1053
496479	Charlotte Dixon		CSO17 20	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
496526	Mr Dennis Barrow		CSO17 37	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
496564	JH Lockwood		CSO17 59	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
360714	Carol		CSO20	Option		No				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Morgan		32	VWM 3		Opinion				
361111	Mr Raymond Brown		CSO2083	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
361170	Mr TR HARVEY		CSO2855	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
484088	Mr David Price		CSO2532	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>If correct guidelines and environmental studies for wildlife etc are conducted along with consultation on all aspects of development then they could proceed with developments but scale in relation to services and infrastructure for these developments is completely out of balance.</p> <p>The relatively short open period for consultation on a document that has clearly been developed over quite sometime is a concern in order to formulate a serious plan of objections. The descriptions of local infrastructure and improvements has been met with much derision along with the continued failure to upgrade the supportive infrastructure required. This is not suprising with the consultants being in Weybridge and clearly have only visited the area briefly. Additionally I note that the environmental impact has been glibbed over as the Bat, Badger, Deer, Slow worm and newt populations have risen considerably. Living on Eastworth itself I cannot see how the council proposes to make the road safe to use as they are narrow and protected by houses, nor is there room for the required pedestrian walkways.</p>	<p>A period of FULL public consultation should be entered into and the council should provide a clearer information pack to local councils and remove the fear that everyone has that this is a done deal and residents will not be listened to,.</p>		1053
491311	Mr Kevin GILLING		CSO2714	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
495971	T A Reith		CSO2248	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
496958	Mrs J Beech		CSO1940	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
497026	Doreen Smith		CSO2002	Option VWM 3	Object		This amount of building will create extra traffic in Ferndown and Parley which already has a lot of road build up in the busy morning and evening travel. Also taking a lot of natural land for our wild life.			1053
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		CSO2111	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
497184	Mr Hilling		CSO2219	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
497223	AJ Marvin		CSO2233	Option VWM 3	Object		My prime objections to Verwood developments are 1 Loss of green belt. What is wrong with the Boundary Lane area? 2 Over 20 years Verwood has expanded out of all proportion, to a level infrastructure is barely able to support. 3 Car parking in the village centre ie Pottery, surgery and limited roadside parking is totally inadequate at present (certainly am) shops have been approved with no parking or at least very limited-how will it cope with 400 new families In favour An upper school will reduce traffic in and out of town save money and environmentally friendly-needs access road improvement from Margarts/Church Hill.			1053
497343	Sharon Sutcliffe		CSO2282	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
497388	Mr Jason Hornsby		CSO2290	Option VWM 3	Object		Access onto Howe Lane. The road gets very congested at school times becoming impassable down to single file and even grinds to a halt as two or more vehicles try to drive down this single file land, making it unsafe for children and emergency vehicles. The mature oak trees, root compaction and wildlife need to be taken into consideration.			1053
497773	R Johnstone		CSO2485	Option VWM 3	Object		Regarding Verwood proposals, I think the town needs more infrastructure before expansion. There is no cinema, swimming pool and a lack of small shops in the centre. Morrisons is not the "be all and end all". The traffic at present (connected with VWM7 proposal) is already clogging our			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							roads twice a day. New facilities (housing and schooling) will increase the street parking problems for residents as there is no sensible drop off points in the schools campus. New roads invariably draw in more traffic. More needs to be done to encourage children to walk to school and for cars to be left in the garage. I have witnessed ladies who arrive early for the pick up to "reserve" their street parking and when I challenged one lady for parking on the pavement, found she lived in Haywards Cres.			
498044	Carolyne BANKS		CSO26 83	Option VWM 3	Support		Use the newer out-of-town developments to extend housing - after all that's what they were created for ie: Verwood, Corfe Mullen, Sturminster Marshall. Don't cram more development into existing residential areas in town.			1053
498047	CD Bradford		CSO26 60	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
498051	Mrs Mary Connor		CSO26 72	Option VWM 3	Object		The proposed developments in the south of Verwood will further exacerbate the problems we currently experience with flooding. Manor Road drains are not able to cope with the present volume of water. Verwood does not have enough public transport to cope with such a sudden rise in population.			1053
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		CSO27 43	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
498078	G Sims		CSO27 30	Option VWM 3	Support		Gives the young a chance of buying affordable homes and a secondary school which is needed.			1053
498084	Mr P HARTLEY		CSO27 65	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
498122	Williams		CSO27 77	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
498125	Mr and Mrs P DASHWOO		CSO28 01	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	D									
498133	Mrs Dowling		CSO28 25	Option VWM 3	Object		The opinions of Verwoodians seem to count for nothing, the unsightly, unwanted, unneeded building at Blackhill being a good example.			1053
360037	Mr Dave BARNES		CSO40 54	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
361041	Mr & Mrs G K HAMPTON		CSO40 26	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
361106	Mr and Mrs Robin and Janet WALL		CSO36 80	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO32 81	Option VWM 3	Support		Verwood already has a population of about 14,000 and doesn't yet benefit from the infrastructure or vibrancy which its residents deserve. Nevertheless, I support a limited amount of development in the town in the hope that it will contribute to improving Verwood's infrastructure, its vibrancy as a town and its green spaces. I also support limited development to provide desperately needed affordable homes as part of a mixed community.			1053
498160	Mrs Gwendoline Martin		CSO28 78	Option VWM 3	Object		No housing development without infrastructure-road in Verwood cannot carry any further traffic Station Road is a death trap we are only waiting for a accident to happen Shop deliveries should be controlled-and not allowed to happen at rush hour. When a satisfactory road scheme is planned-housing could be consdiered. Developer must be made to pay-towards the above.			1053
498169	Mrs D WEAVER		CSO29 04	Option VWM 3	Object					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
498184	Mrs Angela BARKER		CSO2931	Option VWM 3	Object		Not every area needs affordable housing - if a lot of people are retired and/or own their own homes, does it matter?			1053
498268	Mr and Mrs R Cullen		CSO3015	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
498271	Mandy CHEESEM AN		CSO3063	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
498335	Mr and Mrs Lester		CSO3222	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
498385	Ms Sarah Cosgrove		CSO3127	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood is already over populated. There are not enough facilities to accommodate these small or huge developments. The roads in and out of Verwood would not withstand an extra 400+ cars. We have no secondary school and the current primary schools would not cope with such an influx of people. You cannot have a development of this size without additional services and facilities which you have failed to plan for.	No amendments to be made. It is a ridiculous suggestion to develop this many houses in such a small area.		1053
498386	Mr & Mrs DL & MD Thompson		CSO3133	Option VWM 3	Support		The scheme meets government demands for future housing using land which will not cause problems to existing residents - good planning to incorporate ancillary components of the scheme - ie balance cost for housing, transport needs and schooling. Overall a well thought out scheme which hopefully will reduce the need for high density schemes to be built within the town's current planning belt. NB If The Hub had been as well thought out at planning we would not have been facing the current problems.			1053
498518	Mr & Mrs Grieg and Ruth Brown		CSO3286	Option VWM 3	Object		The proposed land is good arable land and should remain of an agricultural usage only. Poor quality land should be used for redevelopment. The proposed land is designated Green Belt. There are no TPO's on many of the trees in the fields. The roads in and out of the proposed development and Verwood cannot cope with another 300+ vehicles per day.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Verwood's infrastructure (education, sports facilities, shops, roads) are already overloaded, especially with regards to secondary education.</p> <p>Devaluation of local properties including affecting some home environments.</p> <p>Verwood already has a glut of affordable housing; new built flats and houses plus existing bungalows suitable for the elderly.</p> <p>The roads in and out of the proposed development (and Verwood) cannot cope with another 300+ vehicles per day.</p> <p>Verwood's infra-structure (education, sports facilities, shops, roads) are already overloaded (esp with regards to secondary education).</p> <p>Devaluation of local properties including affecting some home environments.</p> <p>Verwood already has a glut of affordable housing, new built flats and houses plus existisng bungalows suitable for the elderly.</p>			
498527	Mr John Edgar		CSO3296	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>The sellers of the proposed land and the Council have no consideration of the impact of the proposals on Verwood's infrastructure, existing retail and manufacturing employment facilities or even transport route.</p> <p>The town does not need any more "housing association" style estates with all the problems such areas often bring to areas.</p> <p>Further more, why is Verwood the only East Dorset town to be targeted for such unreasonable numbers of extra profiles (1200 - 1500) a further growth of 10%+, especially as the existing infrastructure hardly copes with today's population.</p> <p>Verwood was given to understand that the town had now received its "quota" of new builds. Most or all of the proposed "sell off" area are farmland or green belt which this area is fast losing to the exasperation of all residents.</p>	Amend the proposals by reducing the new homes plans by no less than 75% and share the proposed houses between other less affected towns such as Ferndown, Wimborne, Blandford etc, all of which have far less populations.		1053
498711	Mr Tam Chant		CSO3405	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
498996	M E CLARKE		CSO3465	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
499044	Mrs Carolyn MASKELL		CSO3490	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>Verwood has expanded rapidly in the last 25 years and needs time to consolidate before any more new houses are built. There is no scope for further increase in traffic and the few facilities we have are overloaded at present. Improvements are desperately needed to the roads, drains and leisure facilities, we have very few shops and public transport is minimal. There is little opportunity for employment and I cannot see the need for the number of houses proposed in this area especially as this is green belt land that should never be released for buildings that do nothing to enhance our Town.</p> <p>At present the schools in Howe Lane do not have the required 2 made up roads for access in an emergency and further delays are now being made to the Springfield Road route that was promised many years ago. Traffic using St Michaels Road has increased to a dangerous level; this is an unadopted, single-track road with no pavements for the many children walking to school.</p> <p>The water level at our end of St Michaels Road is already too high with gardens flooded and water under floorboards, ditches are not maintained and drainage has collapsed in more than one area in Manor Road. More houses in Verwood would just raise the water table even further.</p> <p>Our town character needs defining within the current boundaries; we do not need more urban sprawl with the usual promised improvements by the developers not being fulfilled. The green belt land proposed for this development is adjacent to the triple SSI site of the River Crane and Heathy How Woodland; it can only be detrimental to the many species of wildlife in the area that we understand are protected.</p>			1053
499231	Mrs A Lathbury		CSO3538	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
499236	J PIPE		CSO3552	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
499245	Mr and Mrs		CSO35	Option		No				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	N BUTLER		85	VWM 3		Opinion				
499261	Mrs Norma JACKSON		CSO36 21	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
499271	Mrs P Giles		CSO36 17	Option VWM 3	Object		No new building should take place in Verwood without consideration being given to improving public transport for existing residents. There is no transport after approx 18.30 to enable people to enjoy existing facilities like The Hub and Club 31. A large proportion of the elderly do not have their own cars, taxis are expensive and therefore these venues are not well frequented and are running at a loss. Verwood should be made more 'user friendly'.			1053
499291	R S Welch		CSO36 58	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
360685	Mr M.P HOSE		CSO46 43	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
496396	Mrs Jill Freer		CSO37 52	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood has undergone massive building projects since 1993. I feel that we can't take any more. Hideous flats have been built in a most unsuitable site in Crane Drive; and a worse looking building is going up where the Fayrewood Pub stood. How on earth was permission granted for these buildings? The schools are full, Drs are full, NHS Dentist is full - and the road to Ringwood is dangerous and very busy at times. We just CANNOT take another 400+ houses - which equals 1,000 people at least - and cars and vans etc.			1053
498495	Mr John Williams		CSO37 27	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
499384	Mr A I ROSE		CSO37 24	Option VWM 3	Support		Verwood seems to be adormitory with no town centre (scattered development). All the talk when I moved to the area in 1978 was 'Wessex City'. What happened? Is this the			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							first stage of completing the arc around the Poole/Bournemouth conurbation? If this is so, develop southwards, west of the Moors River, flood plains permitting and there is the planners utopia for the 22nd century.			
499481	Mr John MARTIN		CSO3799	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
499551	Rachel TYLER		CSO3829	Option VWM 3	Support		The main focus of my support is for a new upper school in Verwood. Even without the increase in housing there is a desperate need for this, along with the added community facilities this will bring. For children from outlying villages, they have a longer journey than Verwood children to QE currently. A new upper school would also shorten their travel distances considerably, i.e: Cranborne / Sixpenny Handley etc. As a parent of 2 children aged 8 and 3, I just hope it comes in time for them. I have real concerns about the travel involved for my girls to Wimborne, especially as they currently walk to school.			1053
499873	Mr Graham Holt		CSO3996	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
500060	Mr Stuart PIDDOCK		CSO4082	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
500132	Mrs Margaret Ann Barham		CSO4147	Option VWM 3	Object		Sheer volume of traffic! Already at saturation point on Margards Lane and speed of traffic!!!			1053
500196	Mike & Ruth Smith		CSO4163	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
500222	S Hartley		CSO4441	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
500350	Mr		CSO42	Option	Support					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	P H BARTLETT		27	VWM 3						
500361	Mr and Miss N and A Middleton and Turner		CSO4270	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
500394	Mrs Sandra HOWES		CSO4290	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
500418	Mr and Mrs S H YATES		CSO4298	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood already has too many houses because there is an inadequate infrastructure, especially roads. Howe Lane in particular needs to be improved to provide alternative access to the existing schools. A new school on this site, even with Howe Lane improvements, would create gridlock with only 2 means of access.			1053
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		CSO4317	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
500558	A Baker		CSO4369	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
500697	Mr Thomas SMITH		CSO4497	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
500706	R & J Jeans		CSO4538	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
500720	Mrs VALLIER		CSO4543	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
500748	Mrs Lauren MATTHEWS		CSO4594	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
500802	J Hayward		CSO4719	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
500807	Mr and Mrs K E EYRES		CSO4666	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>Paragraph 11.9 of the Core Strategy options document for Verwood and West Moors states that Verwood has a GOOD ROAD LINK to the A31(T) and the A338. This road, part of the B3081, is TOTALLY INADEQUATE for the volume of traffic it carries in both directions. An unacceptable number of FATAL ACCIDENTS between Verwood and Ringwood have occurred in recent years. This road should be UPGRADED TO DUAL CARRIAGEWAY before any further development is allowed in Verwood.</p> <p>Furthermore, most of the other routes through the town which link to the B3081 - Manor Road, Lake Road, Woodlinken Drive, Burnbake Road, Newtown Road, Newtown Lane - to name but a few, are in a TERRIBLE STATE OF REPAIR, mainly due to adjacent development accessing the underground services, followed by POOR QUALITY, and often TEMPORARY repairs to the road surface. Again these issues need to be addressed before further development is permitted.</p> <p>A new Secondary school is a definite requirement for a Town of Verwood's size, but it must have ADEQUATE VEHICULAR ACCESS. Surely the land to the West of Trinity School, close to the Southern and Western relief roads, would be a better option than the Emmanuel Campus. This would give some relief to the long suffering residents of St. Michaels Road, Howe Lane and Margards Lane.</p>			1053
500836	Mrs Sylvia Hines		CSO4733	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
500903	Mr and Mrs S and R Harris		CSO4787	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
500999	Mrs JD Burton		CSO4805	Option VWM 3	Object		Regarding Verwood. We need more doctors, shops, buses, to cope with extra property			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501012	Louise ARNOLD		CSO4882	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		CSO4913	Option VWM 3	Object		Station Road Verwood and Eastworth Road are presently overloaded with vehicle traffic. Heavy vehicles traffic has increased by 400% in the past ten years and it is now essential that heavy vehicle numbers passing through the centre of Verwood be reduced, diverting to other routes. It is also very necessary to improve Station Road footpath before a serious accident occurs.			1053
501069	Mr and Mrs R Rich		CSO4919	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood does not have enough existing facilities for us who already live here. 1 - Doctors 2 - Dentists 3 - Local shops. We moved here years ago to get away from continuous road noise and heavy traffic and to have a nice green environment which will be spoilt by your plans.			1053
501090	Mr and Mrs Gee		CSO4937	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
501106	Mr John Victor Rogers		CSO4951	Option VWM 3	Support		Verwood needs more housing to ensure that we have a secondary school and an increase in population will help to secure the future of the "Hub". And Morrisons will have to enlarge which will benefit us all and the land in this area is only suitable for housing not "crops".			1053
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		CSO5032	Option VWM 3	Object		The impact of the proposed development in Verwood would be to fundamentally change the feel of the town. There will be no increased employment opportunities for the growing population. We are concerned about the congestion that will occur in Springfield Road if it is adopted and linked to Howe Lane and also have great concerns about the decrease in the value of our property if our front garden decreases in size due to more land being needed for the distributor road. This in turn would lead to large compensation payments being made to residents in a time of economic hardship.			1053
501118	Mr		CSO50	Option		No				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Ron Cook		21	VWM 3		Opinion				
501135	Charlie Wassell		CSO5048	Option VWM 3	Support		Only homeless people should be able to object to the building of new homes. Residents should consider how to improve facilities. Developers should contribute to improving facilities.			1053
501235	Mr and Mrs J Churchward		CSO5134	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood is big enough, the infrastructure just can't take any more homes and people. Our supermarket struggles to cope, the doctors are full and maybe before planning is granted trips should be made in and out of Verwood during the rush hour. Both roads out are like the M25 a constant stream of traffic, and then when an accident occurs and they do it grinds to a halt all the roads are gridlocked. Imagine the extra cars adding to this situation. This is greenbelt land , keeping Verwood the size it is, adding houses and the necessary road system will ruin this rural town.			1053
501261	Mr and Mrs Jeffries		CSO5149	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
501317	Mrs Dawn Paice		CSO5169	Option VWM 3	Object		As a resident home owner in Summer Fields I strongly object to the council's proposal to build 20 houses off of Howe Lane with proposed access through Summer Fields. Not only will this bring extra unwanted traffic to both Howe Lane and Summerfields, but will also completely change the character of our quiet and family friendly cul de sac, which at present provides a safe and happy place for our children to play in. Our houses were purchased because we wished to live in a no through road and I amazed that the council would even consider placing a road which would require the aquisition of two of the existing houses front gardens. As for the comments regarding access from Howe Lane being unsuitable because of the listed cottage again I am amazed this has been given as an objection to road access from Howe Lane as the cottage is clearly being left to fall into "disrepair" by the current owners, with the thatched roof sporting a larger and larger tarpaulin everytime one goes past!! There is also ample access from Howe Lane which is already a through road to avoid the cottage entirely. Why the council wants to build an extra 20 houses on top of			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Verwood's 2 busy schools is beyond me. Bringing even more traffic to a particularly congested part of Verwood. Please take this as the strongest objection to both the buildings and road proposal of Summerfields.			
501351	Mr and Mrs R D'Cruze		CSO5251	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
501485	Mrs J JACKSON		CSO5297	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
501488	Chris LAMB		CSO5331	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
501502	Mr Michael WAREHAM		CSO5377	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
501512	Donald Gray		CSO5408	Option VWM 3	Object		Due to over development Verwood will be unable to support any increase in population and the facilities involved i.e. doctors, shops, traffic will not be able to cope. It would be good to have some green spaces left!! Verwood was once a pretty village - no more! Just a mismatch of 'eyesore' flats etc.			1053
501515	Mrs A Ryan		CSO5410	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
501520	Mrs Z MERRIFIELD		CSO5450	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
501523	Rita Gilbert		CSO5492	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
501525	G Pearson		CSO5475	Option VWM 3	Object		For over 20 years the council planners have rode roughshod over residents wishes, totally ignoring the fact everyone			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							wanted no more housing development in the town. The councils obsession with high density and so called 'affordable housing' was neither wanted or desired by the majority of residents. The monstrosity being built on the former Fairwood Pub site is just one example of council attitude.			
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		CSO5531	Option VWM 3	Support		Please do not accept any community centre / halls or leisure centre as a corporate inducement from developers of housing developments. In my experience they hardly ever work and cost a great deal in subsidy for councils each and every year. ie. Verwood Hub; Lenham, Kent; Ditton, Nr Maidstone, Kent. My ref: 10 years as a Parish Councillor in Ditton, Kent.			1053
501560	Mr Christopher CLARKE		CSO5589	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
359908	Mr F.D.A REVILL		CSO6261	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
359927	Mrs Ann BISSEX		CSO6375	Option VWM 3	Object		The green belt should not be encroached on any further. No building should be allowed on flood plains. Much more serious effort needs to be put into reducing necessity of relying on car travel.			1053
501364	Mr M Devetta		CSO5866	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
501583	Mrs Jean Russell		CSO5689	Option VWM 3	Object		This has been considered before, e.g. when the new houses were built in Howe Lane and beyond St. Michael's Cottage, what happened to that money? Also the developers statement 'will contribute to transport improvements' will they? I rather doubt it considering their previous track record. The holes in Howe Lane and St. Michael's Road bear testimony to this. Try driving along these roads! An accident waiting to happen. No one in this area wants this dreadful plan implemented. It seems to have escaped your notice, that we shall all end up under water. There should not be any more houses / flats in this particular area, there are far too			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>many dreadful flats and developments in gardens and how could all those dreadful developments on the edge of the town ever gained approval? They are a disgrace. Verwood used to be a pleasant place to live when we moved here 39 years ago. Look at it now! Are you proud of the 'improvements'?!! No one else is. I realise that housing is needed. To go ahead with this plan will be a disaster and how did you decide to fall in with the plans / request to sell off this land, just because the owners could sell it at a very good profit? It is possible that they will not be living in the water? I think not.</p> <p>The present infrastructure will not sustain such a large project as this and the drains in Manor Road are at full capacity now. Even more water will accumulate as the leaves fall.</p>			
501616	R J Joyce		CSO6018	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
501626	Mrs J A Russell		CSO5763	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
501694	Mr R BRYAN		CSO5798	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
501699	B THOMAS		CSO5825	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
501720	Dr and Mrs D HARLOW		CSO5923	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
501761	Mr D Curtis		CSO6022	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
501867	Mrs I M Marks		CSO6308	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501873	Mr and Mrs Harold A and D Joan Lilley		CSO62 59	Option VWM 3	Object		All proposals of this nature have a number of basic needs. One of the most important is infrastructure. Subject to finance being available Canford Bottom Roundabout is to be drastically amended for the Olympic Games. The reference to "Improvements to Canford Bottom therefore appear to have been superceded. Since I cannot find any intention to improve the road network all these proposals will only add to our present problems and cannot be supported.			1053
501876	J Long		CSO62 16	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
501881	B W Deverill		CSO62 90	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		CSO62 78	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502022	Mr HWR Stevens		CSO63 95	Option VWM 3	Object		Dorset's villages and small towns should be preserved as such. So called "developers" are only concerned with profits. There'll always be an England? Not when it has been built over and occupied by strangers.			1053
502029	Mr J MacArthur		CSO64 40	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		CSO64 55	Option VWM 3	Object		The whole area is congested, there is no real provision for new TRANSPORT OR services for new homes ie doctors, local shops or community ctrs. There are already MANY EMPTY industrial units. Building more industrial is only viable if a tax loss for developers. Verwood has lost its soul now, and does not need any more ad-hock development. Wimborne will follow if the development of this (at present) lovely Town is carried out in the same way as Verwood has been.			1053
502059	Mr		CSO65	Option		No				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	R Seddon		07	VWM 3		Opinion				
502061	J and M Jeater and Tilley		CSO6495	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
361113	Mr Alan Meade		CSO7206	Option VWM 3	Support		.I like the rate of affordable housing to private homes. We all know that there is a shortage. Jobs will be created, money brought in, good for all in East Dorset, Christchurch			1053
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		CSO6782	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		CSO6976	Option VWM 3	Object	General Comment	The area cannot sustain this quantity of new homes which would also require jobs for the vast majority. This proposal of 2,570 homes would also add another 5,000 cars to an already congested junction at West Parley. This area is already over stretched private and industrial vehicles. Jobs are already at a premium with companies moving out of the area or even closing. Warehouses are laying empty and shops are being converted into living accommodation. The young local people are not able to find homes due to the vast majority going to people moving into the area. This vast development will destroy this rural area. Just look at Bournemouth if you require any proof.			1053
501940	Mr M J Godfrey		CSO7204	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502076	Kay Stead		CSO6564	Option VWM 3	Object		A new secondary school is VITAL for the Verwood area. Verwood has quadrupled in size since we came here 8 years ago. There are enough new homes - many haven't sold. There are not enough facilities in the town to sustain any more residents. The leisure centre is dire, however, the Hub is a triumph.			1053
502077	Douglas Poole		CSO6522	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood is already an overcrowded and congested area. Further developments will contribute to make this town a			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							ghetto like place - what for?			
502078	Mr R Marlow		CSO6542	Option VWM 3	Object		Why waste more tax payers money!!! Too much now!!! These proposals are ridiculous, as any further work prospects in this are are "zero". So why more homes and cars when the road/transport structure is obsolete for modern days need, let alone provision for the future 20/30 years. Just building more houses will not solve the long standing problems in Dorset ie jobs and road structures.			1053
502092	Mr and Mrs A Watkinson		CSO6557	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
502099	Carolyn Lourens		CSO6597	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502114	Mr P Foster		CSO6644	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		CSO6689	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502138	Mrs E Mason		CSO6704	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502253	Mrs Lesley Jane Franklin		CSO6754	Option VWM 3	Support		I support all options for Verwood, Wimborne and Colehill because I feel there is a great need for more affordable housing in these areas, especially for young families and vulnerable elderly people in rural areas.			1053
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		CSO6804	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502317	Cllr Peter Lucas		CSO6838	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502326	Mr and Mrs T Bennett		CSO6888	Option VWM 3	Object		With more homes will need more employment, a vicious circle. Our roads are too busy now. We surely have enough community areas and centres.			1053
502329	Mrs Rosemary Rooke		CSO6894	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502345	Mr and Mrs Ray and Irene Coulson		CSO6952	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502347	Sarah Cobb		CSO7112	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502381	Mr Cyril Josey		CSO7072	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502387	Mr George Kilpatrick		CSO7056	Option VWM 3	Object		I would like to see the justification for increased housing in East Dorset eg, demographics, immigration, increased work opportunities etc. I would also like to understand how transport strategy (and infrastructure) is coordinated with this in such a way to make expansion sustainable.			1053
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		CSO7166	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
502468	Robert Lambert		CSO7388	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502568	sarah morgan		CSO7282	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		CSO7310	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502570	Mr Samways		CSO7338	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502579	Mr & Mrs R L Thorne		CSO7367	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502595	Mr Colin House		CSO7463	Option VWM 3	Object		All these developments will cause an impact on the local heathland and the proposals in all areas will cause road chaos on the A31, Ferndown, Parley and Wimborne. A new road structure is required before any development takes place.			1053
359598	Mr A KETCHLEY		CSO8004	Option VWM 3	Support		Unfortunately whatever is finally decided on the following well known saying will occur: 'You can please some of the people all the time, You can please all of the people some of the time, But you cannot please all of the people all of the time!' I wish you well in whatever is decided. Some will see it as inevitable due to the area's population increases, whereas others will see it as a necessary evil, and some will accept it without question			1053
359873	Mrs M HUGHES		CSO8628	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
359977	Miss M.G. EARP		CSO8060	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		CSO8294	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
361123	Mr Iain STEVENSON		CSO8233	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502610	John		CSO75	Option	Object		The population of Verwood is already larger than that of			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Jackson		12	VWM 3			Ringwood without the civic amenities and the people of Verwood deserve better, a proper leisure centre including a swimming pool and adequate shopping facilities. However good the service from the existing retail businesses; is a tiny post office, one petrol station; a handful of shops, and a small dated supermarket really adequate?			
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		CSO74 64	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502673	Mrs A Powell		CSO75 70	Option VWM 3	Object		The infrastructure in this area needs to be sorted out before anymore building goes ahead. There are times you cannot move on the roads. The area is being ruined with all this building works that are already going on.			1053
502701	Mrs M Williams		CSO75 97	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
502708	Ms Julia Owen		CSO76 50	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502745	Mrs J.M Kenny		CSO76 88	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		CSO79 22	Option VWM 3	Object		There should not be any more large scale house building in the East Dorset area as the roads cannot cope with any more traffic			1053
502921	Mr and Mrs L Forinton		CSO77 99	Option VWM 3	Object		We moved to Verwood a year ago. When considering whether to buy the bungalow we contacted East Dorset District Council (EDDC) future policy planning department. We were told that under the existing policy (incorporating the Regional Spatial Strategy) the council had decided that Verwood had reached its capacity after many years of rapid growth and they would only allow infill housing development in future i.e. no large scale housing development would take place. We realise that the Regional Spatial Strategy has been			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>scrapped however nothing in Verwood has changed therefore we were astonished that the council has done a u-turn and are now considering building up to 415 new houses in the town.</p> <p>We assume these sites have only been included in the core strategy options because landowners have said they would be prepared to sell their land for housing development. We trust therefore that after due consideration the council will conclude that these sites are unsuitable for housing development for the very valid reasons that lead to the previous policy outlined to us in 2009.</p> <p>Our reasons for objecting to further large scale development in Verwood are as follows:</p> <p>Green Belt (South East Dorset). As a general comment building on green belt land should be a last resort, all other options should be considered first. In particular, the site (VWM2) West of Eastworth Road is green belt land and is of particular importance as it is rich arable land (only poor quality land should be used for residential development) and for this reason should remain agricultural land; and has been designated an area of outstanding natural beauty. This part of the green belt is an asset to the town and should be preserved as such, once gone it can never be got back – gone forever. In addition it is understood that there may be rare species of plant and animal inhabitants in this area that need to be protected and preserved which would make the site unsuitable for development. No doubt the council as part of its responsibility will be commissioning a full environmental survey of the site to establish this and I would be pleased to receive a copy once available. Also there are tree preservation orders on many of the trees in these fields, the roots of these trees will be interfered with to get services to these properties.</p> <p>Employment. There are no plans in the core strategy to increase employment opportunities in Verwood; employment presently is very limited indeed, meaning that most people have to travel miles to their place of work. It makes obvious sense to build houses where there are jobs and good public transport. This is particularly important due to the high number of affordable houses being proposed so that low</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>income families would have access to jobs locally with an economical means of getting to work. This is essential in the present climate to ensure people have easy and affordable access to jobs otherwise the council may be creating a problem whereby people end up on benefit through no fault of their own; the ramifications of which do not bear thinking about. On top of this are the obvious environmental benefits of people not travelling long distances to work i.e. pollution, carbon footprint etc.</p> <p>The conclusion being that the housing development should be built in places like Ferndown, West Parley and Three Legged Cross where proposals have been put forward for additional land for employment. Also as the council have a wider environmental responsibility they should not be creating a core strategy which encourages more cars on the roads with the resultant increase in pollution, carbon footprint, congestion etc.</p> <p>Amenities. Verwood population has doubled since 1991 to 15,000 however the amenities have not kept pace with the expansion, in fact facilities, shops etc have actually reduced in recent years. Doctors, NHS dentists, opticians are all hard pressed to cope with present demand as are schools. Those shops we do have are woefully inadequate or consist of Estate Agents, Hairdressers galore. The bottom line is we do not have enough amenities / facilities to cope at present and as these are largely private enterprises we cannot just magic more out of thin air, it has to be viable to attract businesses and clearly from recent experience we are not a viable proposition. The same can be said about doctors, NHS dentists and schools during this period of austerity when public money will be in very short supply severely limiting the possibility of expansion. Contrary to the council's consultants report Verwood does not have a vibrant town centre; you just have to look at Ringwood a town with a similar population to see what we mean.</p> <p>Additionally, facilities for leisure, children and young people are also woefully inadequate and again seem unlikely to improve for years to come during this period of austerity. There isn't enough for the youth of Verwood to do now but with the prospect of 415 houses, possibly 830 more young</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>people, they are going to cause problems roaming the streets. There are no buses after early evening to take them into Bournemouth or Poole they wont have anything to do. The conclusion is that Verwood cannot cope with anymore large scale housing development.</p> <p>Infrastructure and Transport. It's the same old story I'm afraid the population doubles but infrastructure, roads and public transport fail to keep up with the expansion. Its as if the council approve large scale residential housing development, see it built, and then turn their back and walk away from doing anything significant to improve the infrastructure. We were staggered to see the number of unmade roads serving housing development when we moved here, take Springfield Road as an example. We also understand that Verwood has suffered in the past with so called 'bolt on solutions' which don't work. The fear is that EDDC, based on past record, will build the houses and then leave the residents of the outpost which is Verwood to deal with the consequences. This cannot be allowed to happen. The result is that we have two main routes out of Verwood, Station Road and Edmonsham Road which are no more than country lanes which cannot take the extra cars 415 houses would produce. Public transport (buses) doesn't help much as it too is woefully inadequate, too few houses during the daytime and no buses after early evening at all. We also understand that Wessex Water are in the process of producing a report on foul and surface water sewage and drainage which will make interesting reading; again we would appreciate a copy when it is produced.</p> <p>Affordable Housing. We are very concerned about the high percentage of affordable housing per site being proposed; 40-50% is far too high a figure. Not only would it have an adverse effect on the new estate it would also adversely affect the social harmony of Verwood itself. People would be moved into the area for social housing reasons – low income families, there are very few jobs in Verwood they can't afford to travel to work and so end up on benefit. It is an unfortunate fact, learnt in other parts of the country that having such a high proportion of affordable housing (social housing and shared ownership) brings with it many problems. The council should review this aspect in the light of experiences</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>elsewhere, a more sensible figure would be 5-10%. WVM2 Land west of Eastworth Road (200 homes). More specifically we object to housing development on this site for the following reasons:-</p> <p>1) Shouldn't build on Green Belt land – for all the reasons given in our earlier comments Green Belt (South East Dorset).</p> <p>2) There could be up to 400 more cars as a result of this development, on local roads. Station Road and Edmondsham Road are no more than country lanes unable to cope with the increased traffic. As proposed vehicular access along Eastworth Road is preposterous, it is a very narrow lane inadequate for the purpose. In addition, exit and entry onto Station Road and Edmonsham Road from Eastworth Road by this volume of traffic would be inherently dangerous as would exit and entry from the other entrance onto Edmonsham Road. This is a very significant safety aspect.</p> <p>3) Eastworth Road forms a natural boundary to the town, the new housing estate would by its nature be remote and detached.</p> <p>In conclusion, we feel that EDDC as custodians of the built environment have a responsibility to the environment and the people of Verwood to ensure any development is in-keeping with the town and preserves and protects residents way of life and maintains Verwood as a nice place to live. We would also like to quote two extracts from the EDDC Core Strategy Consultation Document relating to Verwood.</p> <p>a) "The specific outcomes that the planning system should deliver are housing developments in suitable locations which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure".</p> <p>b) "The area of great landscape value area should largely be retained comprises open and gently undulating countryside which forms a key strategic structural landscape element".</p> <p>It is with these in mind that we end by saying that the housing proposals for Verwood in the Core Strategy Consultation Document and in particular site VWM2 land west of Eastworth Road will not fulfil the specific outcome that the planning system should deliver as set out in a) nor that set out in b) for the reasons we have given above.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502935	Mr Roger Parker		CSO78 23	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503044	Mr and Mrs R Setchfield		CSO79 32	Option VWM 3	Object		We strongly feel, before any further development in Verwood the infrastructure needs to be vastly improved.			1053
503062	Mr and Mrs D C Hubbard		CSO79 55	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
503085	Mr P.A. Scott		CSO79 79	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503156	Richard and Jackie Blunderfield		CSO80 47	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
503162	Mr Marcus J Huggins		CSO80 29	Option VWM 3	Support		The road from the A31 into Verwood is not good enough to support extra traffic - rough estimate - 1000 more cars using this road (3081) more people and cars would create extra dangers. There have been many deaths on this road in the past. Improve the roads before considering any big developments!			1053
503171	Sally Cooke		CSO80 93	Option VWM 3	Support		Build homes so people have somewhere to live BUT what about Verwood's infrastructure? Where are our facilities? Secondary school must be a priority.			1053
503183	B Chissell		CSO81 66	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503189	Mr David Bulley		CSO81 18	Option VWM 3	Object		VWM 3, 4, 5 - Very dangerous at present with parents parking in morning to drop off and in afternoon to pick up. Sometimes parking both sides of road - making them very narrow for emergency vehicles trying to get through - very difficult.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503193	Julie Richardson		CSO8131	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503197	Mr M Smith		CSO8145	Option VWM 3	Object		Why build more houses, when there are a lack of facilities, ie. shops, nothing for the younger generation to do or use. In my opinion, Verwood is just one big housing estate - all you are encouraging is for gang warfare in the future because the kids have nothing to do. Verwood used to be a village - what do you call it now!!!			1053
503203	Mr and Mrs M Squire		CSO8159	Option VWM 3	Object		Having lived in Verwood for over 30 years we have seen continuous development with poor thought to road systems and town centre shops. Verwood is already a large town in comparison other town populations in Ringwood, Wimborne, Fordingbridge etc, yet has no town centre facilities. Residents are forced to travel at least 7 miles to find a range of shops. Verwood is no longer a village so why pretend that it is? (This is the excuse given for no town centre shops). In fact Verwood offered a wider range of shops 30 years ago when it was a small village than it does now. Please do not allow any further building in Verwood before we have town facilities and fore-thought re - roads to any new properties, especially a school. Margards Lane cannot cope with more traffic.			1053
503218	Mr Chris Beaven		CSO8173	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood already lacks the facilities to support the current number of houses. This is further development for builder profit and little benefit for the community. Health facilities are already fully stretched, poor public transport and road network to support expansion. Limited shopping facilities exist and the sports centre lacks sufficient facilities.			1053
503230	P Andrews		CSO8187	Option VWM 3	Support		I would be shocked if plans were passed to increase housing yet again in Verwood. Provision has not been made to cope with existing traffic and shopping problems. This is a town existing in a village environment. It's time to deal with present problems before creating more.			1053
503233	F Parkes		CSO8260	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503250	Mrs Helen Poole		CSO8276	Option VWM 3	Object		There are far to many new buildings going up in verwood - We cant cope with more cars on the road, and we do not have enough shops or facilities for more residents - please stop !			1053
503303	Mr Anthony Roberts		CSO8315	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		CSO8342	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
359889	Mr and Mrs P CLARK		CSO8496	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
359920	S PARKER		CSO9549	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		CSO9607	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
360288	Mr & Mrs E T SPENCER	E T Spencer (Heating)	CSO9631	Option VWM 3	Object		The area is growing far too fast with inadequate facilities. We need to keep Green Belt land.			1053
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E HACK		CSO8515	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
503024	Valerie Measey		CSO8900	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503347	Ms Hardwick		CSO8371	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
503355	Mr Robert		CSO8399	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Griffiths									
503358	H C Hoare		CSO8428	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503444	R Hobbs		CSO8576	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503463	Mrs Rita Lockyer		CSO8592	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
503477	Mr Edward Fiddler		CSO8640	Option VWM 3	Support		<p>Housing Development in Dorset</p> <p>I am receipt of your publication re the above and other items. During the 1960's certain councils allocated land for development, divided it into plots of about 1/4 acre and sold these plots to individuals. The owners of these plots produced building plans which were submitted for approval. Once approved the owners hired tradesmen to carry out the building work.</p> <p>Most of the owners were relatively new to the housing market. They had limited resources but they were ready to muck in to help with construction. Banks were willing to then to provide stage payments to help cash flow.</p> <p>The end result of all this was a series of beautiful estates with every house different. For some reason this arrangement ceased and I have never found out why.</p> <p>Could I ask you if this facility could be repeated? Such a plan would produce lovely estates and encourage people to act on their own initiative.</p>			1053
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		CSO8677	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503554	Mr D Verguson		CSO8785	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503598	Mr John		CSO8782	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Turner									
503603	Mrs DJ Morley		CSO8805	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503621	A G Haines		CSO8855	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503624	Mr RT Jackson		CSO8850	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503635	Mr J Gough		CSO8911	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		CSO8946	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503640	N J and S A White		CSO9109	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503644	Mr J Riley		CSO8978	Option VWM 3	Object		Re. Housing / xxx Options Reasons for objections is that as proven on many occasions in our area of Verwood no thought has been given on the visual effect / blending in of new with old and existing propoerties ie. flats on main road behind The Hub and the redevelopment of Fayrewood Pub on Blackhill. Also the impact of traffic congestion is always underestimated especially if there is a traffic incident on a main route. More thought needs to be put into providing more facilities for the people/children of our area.			1053
503666	A H J Paul		CSO9008	Option VWM 3	Support		Re. your statement concerning the District car ownership level, I trust, that despite financial restrictions, that road surfaces are maintained at a high level on the grounds of safety, noise and vehicular damage.			1053
503687	Mr		CSO90	Option	Object					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Nick Smith		79	VWM 3						
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		CSO9138	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503695	Mr and Mrs N White		CSO9096	Option VWM 3	Support		If Verwood is to continue to expand, facilities other than a new school are needed. Other towns of a comparable size in Dorset have better/larger more diverse sports and leisure facilities, medical centres, large supermarket, better public transport. Verwood is just becoming one large housing estate with little else. Planning permission should also be considered for new restaurant businesses other than pubs, to enhance the area for residents - Ferndown/Wimborne both have an abundance of these.			1053
503706	Mr David Portnell		CSO9120	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood has very few amenities and this proposed development will just make things worse.			1053
503709	Mr and Mrs A Fairclough		CSO9134	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
503759	Mr D.J. Middleton		CSO9251	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503787	Mrs P A Dent		CSO9274	Option VWM 3	Support		I am totally against the development of large housing estates as they are not popular with the public. Also the cost of providing infrastructure will be phenominal and impact on existing communities detrimental. Far better to use small existing areas of land rubber stamped as Green belt land but of no benefit to the community. These parcels are mainly within residential areas and give immediate access to facilities without overloading them. With a small number of houses built, people can get to know their neighbours better. I, of course, am part owner of such a piece of land.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		CSO10 016	Option VWM 3	Support		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I want to know the projected time scale for these options to start to become active. 2. It is most important that there is adequate employment to accommodate the houses to be built. 3. More attention must be made to supply of affordable housing. 4. The green belt must be respected where possible. 5. The estates around Wimborne must be consulted fully. 			1053
360029	Mr David LANIGAN		CSO10 288	Option VWM 3	Support		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy Document, Managing Growth and Development up to the year 2027. I agree with the preamble stating that we need to meet local housing needs, with the emphasis on growing the main settlements where we have good access to facilities that people require. Some development of smaller communities should continue however, especially the provision of low cost housing. The community as a whole, needs the services of teachers, nurses, firemen, postmen, and policemen who are poorly paid because they commit to a vocation rather than a high salary job. We also need the services of skilled people such as builders, electricians, plumbers, gas fitters, and motor mechanics, the essentially blue collar professionals. They must not be priced out of the market in terms of being able to buy a starter home, in the community that they serve. Having bought my first home in 1963, a two bedroom bungalow for £2,200 I am aware that locally such a property is currently one hundred times as much. This makes things difficult for young couples with the ratio of house prices to wages being the highest in the country. Many struggle with getting mortgages that now require typically a 25% deposit on an already expensive property.</p> <p>I moved to West Moors 15 years ago and appreciate the planning decisions that have taken place affecting this village. We now have a new build shopping centre on Station Road, complete with flats, good pavements, lighting, pelican crossing and trees. I am pleased to have seen built several small, three storey, blocks of retirement and two bed flats close to the village centre. I support the gradual expansion of the</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Village, current population around 7,500 as we have good schools, a large Memorial hall, Churches with halls, two public houses, doctors, dentists and good bus services to both Poole and Bournemouth. We have footpath access to open land such as Holt Heath, as well as being able to use the old railway line route through the village to Ringwood, - the Castleman Trail. Recently St Marys Church has had built a new Church Hall which will serve the community and thanks to the National Lottery grant we now have an excellent Bowling Club. I support the continued slow expansion of the village as currently we have many facilities for people of all ages to enjoy.</p> <p>My current house was built in the mid 70s, and has trebled in value since my wife and I moved here 15 years ago. In the 1970s West Moors doubled in size and acquired new schools and since then other infrastructure improvements. In recent years the Library was refurbished. The facilities for retirees in West Moors, with access to Ferndown and Verwood, are very good, and coupled with excellent hospitals at Poole, Bournemouth and Wimborne, and I have felt no need to move from East Dorset area in the conceivable future.</p> <p>I therefore support the proposals for additional housing as outlined in the Core Strategy Consultation, as well as the proposals for business sites for employment. I also support provisions for new schools particularly a new Secondary School at Verwood, and recreation areas to cater for the population increase. I understand that net immigration into Dorset is running at two thousand people a year so clearly we need to plan for housing, jobs, education, recreation, road improvements especially at busy junctions, and off road car parking in town centres and on new housing estates.</p> <p>There are many reasons why East Dorset and Christchurch, are attractive places for people to live, work and retire to. Long term planning that caters for the needs of a steady population increase is sensible and is to be welcomed.</p>			
360095	Mr & Mrs John & Barbara POLKINGH		CSO98 28	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	ORN									
361105	Mr John GOOCH	Also member of Colehill Parish Council	CSO9916	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
497752	Kelly		CSO10300	Option VWM 3	Object		First build the infrastructure to support any extra housing. Then consider the environment surrounding the proposed developments. It is highly likely that badger and bat colonies are within and/or adjacent to the sites, although I doubt any housing developer will find them before work begins. Where, in Verwood, is the Town centre ?			1053
499748	Ms Soozie Cooper		CSO9745	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
499774	Mr S Weatherill-Podbury		CSO9692	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		CSO9324	Option VWM 3	Object		My objections to the housing are simply the fact that as a Verwood resident, there is already enough houses - far too many for the present infrastructure. Verwood is a joke. It is just a massive, massive, pile of houses in the middle of the forest. Why is it referred to as a 'town'? It has no centre!! New Milton, Christchurch, Ringwood, Ferndown.... they all have healthy centres with lots of amenities. Not enough shops, supermarkets, petrol stations etc. No more houses till this mess is sorted. Soulless.			1053
503861	Mr E Hawkins		CSO9349	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503878	Mr Peter Smith		CSO9406	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
503879	Mr		CSO94	Option	Object		More detailed information required on the Verwood plans as			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	S Smithson		29	VWM 3			the plans I object to will have a largelarge impact on noise and increased congestion.			
503943	Mr & Mrs Rumball		CSO9458	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
504093	Mr & Mrs Vivian		CSO9485	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
504101	Mrs Mary Trewiss-Bell		CSO9512	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
504193	Mrs Shauna Green		CSO9526	Option VWM 3	Object		We have far too many homes in Verwood for the facilities we have. The Ringwood Road is so busy now its hard to get out of The Chase now and far too much traffic.			1053
504203	Kate Pursglove		CSO9539	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood does not have sufficient facilities and infrastructure for its present population (shops, sports facilities, high school etc). It has a growing youth population with nothing for them to do/occupy them. The roads in and out of Verwood are too small to support the current population with frequent accidents, long delays for the slightest disturbance in the traffic and no safe alternative way to get in and out (no dedicated cycle tracks, poor bus service)			1053
504207	L S Dean		CSO9554	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
504216	Mr Mark Rich		CSO9578	Option VWM 3	Object		The facilites which already exist in Verwood are not enough for the community already living here. Doctors, Dentists, Variety of local shops. We moved here to enjoy a peaceful and green environment from a place where there was heavy traffic and continual road noise. I do not want the proposals to go ahead as it will spoil our peace and quiet and your plans are not in keeping with the area.			1053
504232	Rachel and Paul		CSO9608	Option VWM 3	Object		The reason we enjoy living in Verwood is due to it's size and community feel. I do not want to live in another Ferndown.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Higgins						The roads and shops will not support more residents.			
504243	G Haskell		CSO96 26	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
504285	Mr P Miller		CSO96 58	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
504288	Tracey Doherty		CSO96 51	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
504297	C Johnson		CSO96 68	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood does not need more homes but if you have to build then 30 it is!!			1053
504300	Paul Cocker		CSO96 73	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
504307	Lucy Cocker		CSO96 78	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
504311	Mr Victor Steeden		CSO96 83	Option VWM 3	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood is already heavily overstretched and incapable of giving a good service eg poor clearance of debris, road repairs etc and further housing will do nothing but to add to the already paucity of 'service'!			1053
504314	Ms Selina Roper		CSO97 18	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
504318	R V and P Reeks		CSO96 89	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
504344	B Blake-Coleman		CSO96 97	Option VWM 3	Object		Lack of facilities for increased population - no NHS dentists, limited medical care, only one supermarket etc. Facilities and amenities need to match increased demand.			1053
504349	A Hall		CSO97 02	Option VWM 3	Object		Council have made a complete mess of Verwood - once a good place to live. Where are needed facilities, no infrastructure. A so - called town with one shop, village road, unable to cope. We have enough house - leave the Green			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Belt alone. This is Wessex City by the back door. As a life long Verwoodian it saddens me to experience the mess the Council have erected.			
504459	Mr and Mrs Roberts		CSO9754	Option VWM 3	Object		We live in Church Hill and at the present volume of school traffic is a pain, when trying to get out of our drive way. So for a new school to be built without extra roads is a non - starter.			1053
504468	Mrs M Last		CSO9758	Option VWM 3	Object		Too much traffic up and down Margards lane. Some traffic should be diverted via Howe Lane/St Margarets Road. (school) Bus services in Verwood are pathetic. 1 bus an hour to Ringwood/Bournemouth.			1053
504477	Mr Martin Turner		CSO9765	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
504517	Mrs T Otton		CSO9772	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
504530	Christine Phipps		CSO9777	Option VWM 3	Object		The town is over populated now, how will it cope with more families moving here?			1053
504541	Mrs S Newham		CSO9782	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
504572	Carly Bull		CSO9796	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
504641	Elizabeth Gresty		CSO9801	Option VWM 3		General Comment	I was born in Verwood in 1920. We do not want any further development - Verwood has been ruined enough - it was once a beautiful little village - you have ruined and wrecked it - the people and residents and awful buildings are not to be admired at all - we need opportunity for the young people. The new people have done nothing to give to give them that.			1053
505273	Mrs Lorraine Hubbard		CSO9855	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
505288	Mrs S Cramer		CSO9890	Option VWM 3	Support	General Comment	As a married mother of 3 children, 2 girls and 1 boy, living in a 2 bed Council flat (first floor), I welcome more housing to the Wimborne area for young families needing affordable housing / rented housing.			1053
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		CSO9962	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
505369	J Young		CSO9989	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		CSO10065	Option VWM 3	Object	General Comment	Building more houses has NOTHING to do with meeting the needs of (existing) local residents. We do not need or want more houses in our area. Planning to build more houses is driven by the 'need' to meet externally imposed quotas based on false assumptions on the desirability of further population and economic growth. Instead of wasting resources on building more housing which is ecologically unsustainable, we should be using them to make a transition to a low energy sustainable future for our children. Please listen to local residents and reject further development.			1053
505561	Mr. D. Calvert		CSO10115	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
505590	M Spalding		CSO10145	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		CSO10181	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
505742	L. J. Ashplant		CSO10207	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
505802	Mr RGH		CSO10258	Option VWM 3	Support					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Chapman									
360146	Mrs Marilyn A WARBURTON		CSO11 165	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
498775	Mrs P L Buckler		CSO10 765	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		CSO10 332	Option VWM 3	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			1053
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		CSO10 361	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
506754	Mr Derek E Marsh		CSO10 397	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>I have signalled objection to all Verwood development since the town already has significant new build expansion. It is in danger of losing its "village" community ways. Important to planners? – maybe not. The definition of and integration of "affordable homes" is another danger to this.</p> <p>Finally, any development that is made really needs to have: roads and sight-lines etc in place before house building begins; access to schools and shops provided in plenty of time for new residents; low density development would be more in keeping with this town if any!</p> <p>Am I a nimby or am I trying to protect a rare and valuable asset of English life?</p> <p>I have lived through 2 phases of Basingstoke development, and though at poorly run "infill" in Benbridge - a town much like Verwood!</p>			1053
506934	Mrs R Hall		CSO10 401	Option VWM 3	Object		I strongly object to any further building, housing or otherwise, in Verwood as the infrastructure cannot even cope at the moment! The doctors are so busy any appointment within 2 – 3 days is virtually impossible. The bus service is atrocious, nothing after 6pm and during the day it's only hourly. There are no decent shops and not a great deal of evening			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							entertainment for adults without hordes of children running around. Traffic some days is really at a standstill at school times. I have to go to Muscliffe for a dentist as I can't get in here!			
506975	Mrs V Kesler		CSO10 404	Option VWM 3		No Opinion	Verwood RA form-object Verwood RA form- Verwood does not need any more/further developments and in particular NO MORE SCHOOLS. Margards Lane is already a nightmare with the awful school traffic.			1053
506984	Mr T Newnham		CSO10 411	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood needs improvements for existing residents. More dedicated play space for young adults, new provision for youth clubs. There is a 'need' for improved services for food shopping and fuel for cars. Up to a potential of 1000 new residents with and estimate 300+ cars would congest and degrade the road system. Also medical provision and education would be put under strain and degrade present services to existing residents.			1053
506989	Mrs Barbara Harris		CSO10 416	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood needs a bigger super-market and another filling petrol station prior to more housing. Morrisons wants, and needs to be enlarged prior to any more houses being built. Verwood is a large village as it is.			1053
507026	Mr David Craig		CSO10 441	Option VWM 3	Support	General Comment	I would like to see priority given to projects which have a higher concentration of social housing inclusion, and also include a higher green/renewable energy provision. Particular concentration on family areas, playgrounds and social/community facilities should be considered.			1053
507032	Mr David Oliver		CSO10 467	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507033	A R Twaits		CSO10 493	Option VWM 3	Support	General Comment	Despite improvements to public transport, cycling and walking, the reality is that the vast majority of journeys will continue to be made by car. Local roads are already congested and the extent of development proposed is not acceptable without significant increases in the capacity of these roads for cars.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.			
507132	Ms L Joyce		CSO10 538	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507136	Mrs S A Segal		CSO10 544	Option VWM 3	Object		I have lived in Verwood for 26 years. When my husband and I first arrived here there were more small and varied shops and also four banks. I do not think that we could happily and safely sustain the amount of new residents that is being planned for.			1053
507141	Smallman		CSO10 550	Option VWM 3	Object		All you ever want to build in Verwood is more houses. Where are you going to promote and build commercial/ business areas to create local facilities/ employment. Building a school next to 2 existing schools will create massive road jams. This should be built next to Trinity school where the road system is better.			1053
507144	Paul Brewer		CSO10 555	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507152	Mrs A E J Dolan		CSO10 560	Option VWM 3	Object		There are no work opportunities in Verwood therefore roads through Verwood will be further clogged fighting to get to cities south and north for work. We have not the infrastructure for this vas amount of housing. I object most strongly to the whole concept.			1053
507160	Mrs H Walker		CSO10 565	Option VWM 3	Object		I think that Verwood's infrastructure will not be able to cope with any further development. Even if a new upper school is built the amount of cars would be unacceptable as Verwood is so spread out not many children would walk to the school.			1053
507170	Miss A K Jukes		CSO10 584	Option VWM 3		No Opinion	When I moved to Verwood in 2000 I was informed and read for myself that Verwood would not expand any further. As houses have been sold and subsequently demolished, there have been many infill homes built to replace them. I am under the impression that sites VWM 1,2 and 3 are sites of old munitions dumps therefore unsuitable.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507183	Mr G Roberts		CSO10 592	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507207	Paula Edwards		CSO10 601	Option VWM 3		No Opinion	I live in Verwood and I wanted to make comment about the proposed developments. As we are one of the fastest growing towns in Europe I would like to add that its great having all this housing but we do need more facilities to accommodate the needs of each and every family, i.e. a super leisure centre with swimming and great sporting facilities for young people to adults is needed. More improved bus facilities for quicker access to neighbouring towns, and cheaper fare so that people will be encouraged to use the bus rather than the car (the Spanish bus was so cheap and so well used it was great).			1053
507213	Ieuan and Janice Davies		CSO10 607	Option VWM 3	Object		We have lived in Verwood for 32 years. It was a village and now a town which has always lagged behind its growth in terms of amenities and infrastructure. We need a period when we reverse that trend. Lets have more parks/play areas/ proper shopping areas and sports facilities, even a municiple public swimming pool before more houses and hideous blocks of flats.			1053
507218	Mr and Mrs J Smith		CSO10 630	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507219	Mrs Louise Spencer		CSO10 635	Option VWM 3	Object		I object to anymore new homes in Verwood as at the moment all the facilities are overstretched, schools are full and doctors are full. Not enough shops and HSBC bank closed. Buses are only every hour only one petrol station, 3 pubs all for very different tastes. No leisure facilities for teenagers. The parking at Emmanuel middle and Verwood first schools is absolutely dreadful and the roads couldn't cope with more traffic if more places were available. A new secondary school would need a very big car park and new road. Some roads in Verwood are in a dreadful unmade state e.g. Manor Lane, St Michaels Road and Howe Lane (in places).			1053
507220	R		CSO10	Option	Support		The land between Verwood and Three Legged Cross			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Sharples		623	VWM 3			appears appropriate for new housing as it almost represents infill between the two settlements, whereas any significant building to the other (West, North, East) sides of the town encroaches too much on the countryside. VWM Housing leaflet- My approval for VWM 3 and 7 is subject to a major improvement in the road system between Manor Rd, Margards Lane and Howe Lane. The present roads are very congested at school opening and closing times and the additional traffic arising from the opening of a new school in Howe Lane will seriously increase congestion at these times of day unless the access to the site is greatly improved.			
507235	Mrs Margaret Chalk		CSO10 638	Option VWM 3	Object		Don't spoil Verwood any more. The new road was bad enough and the new shops aren't at all inspiring, not enough thought was given to the choice as far different ones were needed as there are not any really decent shops in Verwood. There are three hairdressers also estate agents all within a stones throw of each other. We only really have small village facilities considering the large number of houses that there already are in Verwood.			1053
507253	Joyce Smith		CSO10 644	Option VWM 3	Object		Please no more! Verwood will end up being a place that no one wants to live.			1053
507264	L F J Garratt		CSO10 650	Option VWM 3	Object		The area is overcrowded at present. The majority of the residents (voters) do not want change. Listen to the majority voice.			1053
507269	Michael and Alexandra King		CSO10 660	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507272	A E Cook		CSO10 666	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507274	Miss M Kettless		CSO10 686	Option VWM 3	Object		3 buildings which have ruined Verwood. 1) the flats which look over the Hub, and another 44 which nobody wants, there should have been a green area. 2) the flats with the stupid wavy roofs. 3) the Co-op which is being built onto of the traffic lights this is so dangerous vans park on the bend it is going			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							be an accident plus 3 flights flats people around this building are so angry. We would like to see these buildings pulled down, no-one new there was an appli for the Co-op until it was passed, and people say we did not need another food shop as we already have 3 and why was it passed in Bristol, did anyone bother to come down and look where the building was and to see how dangerous it is going to be, and now 44 flats looking over the Hub, the police, and the fire station said no to it, the people of Verwood don't want any more housing, what builders have done to verwood have ruined it with there designs.			
507275	A Saxby		CSO10 671	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507279	Anne Tubbs		CSO10 677	Option VWM 3	Support		It would be very good to have affordable homes for our young ones.			1053
507286	Mr N P Butler		CSO10 701	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood needs more infrastructure before more homes are contemplated i.e. facilities such as a leisure centre, supermarket etc. incentives for more businesses to set up here to stop it continuing to be simply a dormitory town. I am not surprised that Dorset has the highest level of car ownership in the country. A large percentage of it can be seen leaving Verwood between 7am and 8.30am every morning!			1053
507326	Mr and Mrs M Salter		CSO10 717	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
507330	Mr Malcolm Lay		CSO10 718	Option VWM 3	Object		Transport and infrastructure has to be a priority in Verwood prior to any new homes. To even be thinking about building more homes is irresponsible of the council, unrealistic and will result in the local area being ruined. The council also need to attract new companies, entrepreneurs to the area to stimulate jobs as unemployment will increase substantially otherwise. Comments from Verwood Housing leaflet Until Verwood has a proper infrastructure no new homes			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							should be built. We require urgently a proper, updated, expanded supermarket together with petrol station, new doctor, dentist, a proper bus service and a large leisure centre. Also the roads cannot handle the current level of traffic.			
507336	Mr John Page		CSO10 770	Option VWM 3	Object		I object to use of green belt land. As Margards Lane will be the main route to these new developments please ensure that parking permits are made available to residents of Margards Lane. Parents picking up and dropping off their children block the road at present. It will be much worse if these developments proceed.			1053
507345	Mr B Hodgkins - Wright		CSO10 763	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
507353	Mr and Mrs M Morgan		CSO10 794	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		CSO10 862	Option VWM 3	Object		We strongly object to any housing development in Verwood, there are not enough facilities to cater for this amount of proposed development and we are particularly concerned about the effect it will have on the first schools that are already at full capacity and the middle school which could become over subscribed! It would also have a fundamental effect on our children not having enough spaces at QE School in Wimborne. Verwood is a nice green and safe place to live; we do not need anymore development!			1053
507361	Mr Kenneth Archer		CSO10 819	Option VWM 3	Object		SNAP:A big issue concerns the A31 motorway which would need to be developed into dual carriageway to join up with the A35 motorway. As already stated on all the other survey's Verwood is so lacking in essential facilities to build new housing before sorting out this problem would turn Verwood into one very large housing estate and little else ,especially the figure of 40% being ear-marked as so-called social housing the town would see a massive exodus of it's existing residents who have grown to love being part of Verwood's			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							community.			
507362	Mrs J F Preece		CSO10 812	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		CSO10 896	Option VWM 3	Object	General Comment	The area alongside the A31 between St Leonards Hospital and Tricketts Cross is an area where many houses could be built. Currently this area is an eye-sore and gives a bad impression to visitors as they cross into Dorset from Hampshire. Why are nearly all your proposals on greenbelt land? There are many areas in East Dorset on non greenbelt land which could be built on. Your proposal (FWP 4 and 5) will put more pressure on Parley Common as well as introduce more traffic on an already busy road system.			1053
507366	Dennis A Pattensen		CSO10 826	Option VWM 3	Object		Larger Morrison supermarket to be extended to meet the demands of the current population together with the addition of a petrol outlet.			1053
507372	Andrew Innis		CSO10 839	Option VWM 3	Object		EDDC uses Verwood to fund other areas - the infrastructure needs to be improved before any more houses are built.			1053
507378	Ms Anni Dencher		CSO10 859	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
507386	D Hobbs		CSO10 882	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507388	Mr David Huggins		CSO10 929	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507395	Geoffrey and Valerie Coates		CSO10 901	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507402	Mrs V		CSO10 922	Option VWM 3	Object		Building should not take place on Green Belt land. Church Hill already suffers from too much school traffic. Manor Road is			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Crout						always extremely busy. With more housing it will become even worse.			
507409	John Crout		CSO10 941	Option VWM 3	Object		My concern is that you planners have allowed piece meal development with very little regard to the infrastructure, and the roads in particular. I would suggest that Church Hill and Manor Road already exceed their design capacity.			1053
507418	Mrs J Alexander		CSO10 951	Option VWM 3	Object		Strongly object to building on Green Belt land! Verwood would not be able to accommodate further building of new homes given it's present infrastructure, it would destroy the area!			1053
507425	E M Connick		CSO10 960	Option VWM 3	Object		Having been familiar with 3 Cross and Verwood since the early 60's when my sister and family lived in 3Cross, later my parents in Verwood and now 2 brothers living in the area, I would like to object to this huge development. Verwood was a relatively small village in the 60's that has grown and grown with little improvement to the infrastructure. The Green Belt has been nibbled away and the narrow roads are quite dangerous for the youngsters and the elderly. We ourselves have lived here since 1993 and we feel this development would be a step to far. We lack so much including facilities like a swimming pool.			1053
507435	J Barnacle and S Bennington-Fewsey		CSO10 970	Option VWM 3	Object		We would oppose any further developments in Verwood with the infrastructure that is in place at present, and the alarming amount of affordable housing being proposed, coupled with the erosion of what's left of open fields and land in Verwood.			1053
507451	F Williamson		CSO10 988	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507461	Mr G J Babb		CSO11 006	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507487	Mr W A Linter		CSO11 040	Option VWM 3	Support					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507499	Mr M Ward		CSO11 059	Option VWM 3		No Opinion	These developments do not affect me directly. But. The infrastructure cannot cope. Supermarket not large enough. Doctors have long waiting times for consultation. Chemists cannot cope. Suggest supermarket is rebuilt immediately incorporating leisure centre. Centre to be transferred to land at 'the hub' which is not economically viable.			1053
507524	Mr C G Richardson		CSO11 087	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
507555	Mr and Mrs C Lamond		CSO11 114	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
359890	Mrs G.M. PROWSE		CSO11 348	Option VWM 3	Support		VWM 2- South part very close to flood plain.			1053
361037	Mr P STRATFORD		CSO11 326	Option VWM 3	Object		I expect that my objection to everything is not very practical. However, I have lived in the area for most of the last fifty years. In that time there has been a constant cycle of the council saying we need more housing, followed by we need more industrial areas to provide extra jobs for all the new homes. Then in turn the council says we require extra jobs for the new homes, then in turn the council says we require extra homes for the new workers. This process is never ending. During this time I've witnessed the creation and expansion of the industrial estates at Ferndown, Uddens, Ebblake and Wimborne. A whole new housing estate at Tricketts Cross, Glenmoor Rd Ferndown, the expansion of West Moors, Colehill, Verwood turned from sleepy village into a town. In this time I am not aware of any developed area being returned to its natural state from a developed one. Please let me know if you think differently. I hope you agree that my objection to development is rational and that the never ending cycle of expansion is stopped.			1053
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary		CSO11 742	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Hendy									
503705	B B Morgan		CSO11 965	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507580	Mr and Mrs P & J Gardner		CSO11 149	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507595	Mr D Johnson		CSO11 182	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		CSO11 225	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507668	Mr Gavin Lee		CSO11 237	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507693	Mrs P Carter		CSO11 277	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507699	Mr Robert Rawles		CSO11 256	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood lacks a vibrant town centre but are close to having the population equivalent to Ringwood.			1053
507708	Mr Powell		CSO11 282	Option VWM 3	Object		We object to all the development if there are no plans to improve the infrastructure - 415 houses = potentially 830 more cars. No leisure facilities, no decent bus services, no cinema, swimming pool, bistros.			1053
507716	G R Cridlan		CSO11 295	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507721	Mr M O'Kelly		CSO11 301	Option VWM 3	Object	General Comment	Existing facilities in Verwood are inadequate for the existing population. To increase the population by circa 2,000 will only acxxxxx what is currently a poor situation. You really need to show how you will improve bus routes,			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							roads, centre of town etc etc.			
507723	Oliver Stonehouse		CSO11 306	Option VWM 3	Object		I strongly object to further large developments in Verwood. Verwood is being overdeveloped, without adequate infrastructure of local amenities and services being available. Roads cannot cope with the extra industrial traffic. The town has been spoilt, with ugly buildings and long traffic delays due to poor roadworks. Children have been put at risk of road accidents. Verwood town centre and residential areas are an eyesore with masses of uncollected rubbish. Council cannot cope. Building planning is not thorough enough. Consideration must also be given to the damage caused to wildlife and woodlands, something the Dorset is famous for.			1053
507730	Mr Vince Woolley		CSO11 311	Option VWM 3	Object	General Comment	Verwood has no infrastructure, we have trouble with anti-social behaviour from youths, dangerous level of traffic in front of Emmanuel Middle School. To have a new secondary school so close to Emmanuel Middle School plus 415 houses will only make the situation far worse! By email having just viewed the plans for your redevelopment near Howe Lane Verwood you appear to be making what is a bad situation in Verwood worse at this moment in time there is no infrastructure in Verwood, anti social behaviour by a large youth element who have been avoided in the new "Verwood Hub" so they have nowhere to go. Congested traffic which is extremely dangerous for children going to and from Emmanuelle School. The police are powerless to control the anti social behavior by youths that hang around this area, nobody will do anything about the traffic until a child is injured and yet you want to increase the traffic flow and build a new secondary school. I can sure that having discussed your intentions with local residents you will receive a strong protest from us all. Please stop this insanity before it starts.			1053
507737	Mrs S		CSO11 321	Option VWM 3	Object	General Comment	I believe that crime and vandalism will rise in Verwood if more houses/people come to the area as the community feeling will			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Philpot						be lost. A larger school will also mean that housing near the school will be subject to rubbish, vandalism and graffiti, too many extra cars when there is already a problem at present. Getting in and out of driveways at present is a precision manoeuvre so as not to run anyone over! there is not a problem with the children travelling out of verwood to upper schools, QE has just spent alot of money to accommodate the intake of children and this will be irrelevant if you take away the children from a very good school.			
507744	D Timpron		CSO11 331	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
507752	Mr Glen Bailey		CSO11 341	Option VWM 3	Support		Bring it on more jobs.			1053
507755	Maureen Niblock		CSO11 356	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to accommodate another fifteen hundred people. There is nothing there - particularly for teenagers or adults. The Council ignored the wishes of the inhabitants and built The Hub instead of the swimming pool, which most people wanted, and which would have been great for young and old alike. At present there is little vandalism. This will change with a large influx of teenagers from big towns and cities. Traffic problems will increase. Doctors and dentists will be overwhelmed making it even more difficult than ever to get an appointment.			1053
507760	Mr and Mrs R Gardner		CSO11 369	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507768	John Niblock		CSO11 380	Option VWM 3	Object		We moved here because, like many other people who moved here, we wanted to live somewhere quiet in the countryside. Since we arrived ten years ago there has been almost non-stop building. There are insufficient amenities in Verwood to serve the present community let alone another fifteen hundred people and eight hundred extra vehicles. The road between Verwood and the A31 is already dangerous and with extra traffic will get worse.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507771	Mrs P M Coventry		CSO11 381	Option VWM 3	Object	General Comment	Lack of shops. 70 people waiting for allotments, objection to taking land designated green belt. Why not in-fill between Verwood, 3X, Ashley Heath and West Moors and allow a smaller Castle Point, to serve these areas, thus saving trips to Bournemouth or Salisbury. You assured me some time ago that there was to be no more estates built in Verwood, only in-fill, ie. knock down and put 3 - 4 up.			1053
507780	V R Strickland		CSO11 393	Option VWM 3	Object		I am sorry but I think you have already spoilt our lovely Verwood. PLEASE, PLEASE leave us alone.			1053
507782	Jennifer Baxendale		CSO11 398	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
507786	Ms Helen Scriven		CSO11 408	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		CSO11 455	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
507795	A M Baxendale		CSO11 414	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507800	Mrs K M Platt		CSO11 482	Option VWM 3	Object		Too much development in Verwood already.			1053
507805	Mrs N J Wareham		CSO11 423	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
507808	Mrs J V Atyeo		CSO11 428	Option VWM 3	Object		We need more shops, as people are coming to retire in Verwood they may not be able to travel out of the town to shop. Also the school should have been here years ago.			1053
507812	Mr D Masters		CSO11 435	Option VWM 3	Object					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507817	Mr R Gulliver		CSO11 446	Option VWM 3	Object	General Comment	The new housing does not improve anything in Verwood. We do not need more homes!! We need a Secondary school to build a future for our children. We should not be held to ransom, that if we allow the housing, we will get a Secondary School, because we all fear that you will just walk away and leave us with nothing. Why use Green Belt land, when the council has brown land that it can use. ie. land behind the Police Station for Social Housing. The Nursery's, Pre-schools, Schools, Doctors, Dentist etc can not cope. 400 homes will create another 800+ cars and 1.245 to 1,660 people. NO! NO! NO more!			1053
507833	Mrs Johnson		CSO11 464	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507839	Margaret Williams		CSO11 485	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507869	B O'Kelly		CSO11 497	Option VWM 3	Object		Current facilities are moderate - to add up to 2,000 additional occupants is foolish and unacceptable. It is time our elected representatives began to represent us.			1053
507891	Mr R W Johnson		CSO11 510	Option VWM 3		No Opinion	Further Bus services or more frequent existing routes (36, 36a, 37) or Yellow Buses to extend to Verwood from West Moors? Depending on these being practicable of course.			1053
507899	R J Potts		CSO11 515	Option VWM 3	Object		There should be no more houses built without adequate infrastructure, in particular more shops and a second supermarket in the centre of the town.			1053
507909	G Waterton		CSO11 523	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507915	R Waterton		CSO11 528	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
507931	Mr and Mrs R S W Spicer		CSO11 540	Option VWM 3	Object		We are new to Verwood but feel that Verwood is very much over houses with very little infrastructure. Verwood was and still should be a village.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507941	Mr and Mrs Avril and George Jeavons		CSO11 545	Option VWM 3	Object		We have serious concerns of road access to VWM 3 and 4 via St Michaels Road and Howe Lane, and feel these roads are not suitable for the amount of extra traffic, causing massive disruption to existing residents. We think Verwood is at maximum capacity for housing and what was an attractive country town is being turned into a huge housing estate.			1053
507946	Mr and Mrs K Carter		CSO11 549	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
507957	Mr and Mrs L R Vining		CSO11 557	Option VWM 3	Object		415 x 2 cars per household plus 1 petrol station and only single carriage roads = gridlock! We dont have enough doctor's surgery'y or infrastructure to cope!! with this there is almost zero public transport!			1053
507965	Mr Jack Harvey		CSO11 579	Option VWM 3	Object		We consider Verwood housing has already outgrown the size of the town. There would be insufficient services to support what would be at best another 400 families. There are still many unmade-up roads in Verwood awaiting the promises of 20 years ago. These roads have got progressively worse with all the new building work - Manor Lane in particular as the builders got away with not repairing the damage done during the build of the Spring Close area and new houses on what was an open field. Traffic that should use Margard's Lane persists in using Manor Lane as a short cut and with a new secondary school this would increase. We understand that the Health and Safety rules say that there should be at least two made-up roads to the school to provide IN/OUT access in the event of an emergency - Margards lane or Springfield Road /Close to Howe Lane as was on the ORIGINAL PLAN.			1053
507968	Philip Chivers		CSO11 569	Option VWM 3	Support		email I would like to comment on the new proposed housing developments in Verwood. Although new houses are inevitable, I believe that there are a number of issues which need to be addressed. The infrastructure in and around Verwood is just not in place yet and the town needs time to develop and get things in			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>place before so many houses are built.</p> <p>Schools - there are insufficient places in schools which means either an additional school or extensions will need to be built. Who will pay for this?</p> <p>Medical - The Dr's surgery is already stretched to the limit and will never be able to cope with such an influx. who will pay for new services?</p> <p>Road systems - I believe that the roads will simply not be able to cope and am particularly interested in access for the vwm2 area? I note from the document that you talk about bike lanes, these aren't required as if you live in Verwood you need a car to get anywhere else!</p> <p>Water - The water pressure is already a problem due to the number of new flats built in Verwood. What will another 400 homes mean?</p> <p>Employment - during the recent meeting at the Hub we heard about how half the population of Verwood leave the area to work so lack of jobs wouldn't be an issue - Half leave because there are no jobs in Verwood. Working for a national company I understand about recruitment and profiles of various people. With 50% of people in social housing, I know for a fact that on average they won't travel more than 5 miles and won't be working from home and creating new business. If we therefore intend to move people here from other "council estates/waiting lists" this will simply create a poorer life for all. I grew up in social housing so know better than most the result of this policy! We will certainly need more police and other social resources. Who will pay? Will the residents in social housing be paying full council tax? If not who will make up their shortfall. As it is our council tax is already ridiculously high!</p> <p>So what is the best way forward? Provided access and roads have been considered I think the developments should be smaller in particular VWM2 which is a really large development. Why not build 1/4 of the proposed homes spread across all zones and phase the overall growth over 15 years to allow time?</p> <p>No doubt this is a done deal and council members have hidden interests in this but I think you should be really consider the size and impact of what you are proposing.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507980	Sylvia Allen		CSO11 595	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
508383	Ms Emma Hayter		CSO11 710	Option VWM 3	Support		Think it is important for East Dorset to have affordable housing. At the moment I work in East Dorset and am looking to buy my first home, places in East Dorset are very expensive and am having to look outside the local area. I really don't want to move too far from my job.			1053
508413	Mrs S Best		CSO11 770	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
508529	Jackie Chivers		CSO11 863	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
508532	L C E Lemam		CSO11 870	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
508535	D G Sandy		CSO11 885	Option VWM 3	Object		There is not enough facilities at present for Verwood other than food shopping ie Morrisons you have to travel several miles to the next nearest town for any other goods, Verwood has become a hotch potch of housing developments, with no effort for other facilities and infrastructure. We dont want any more houses.			1053
508545	Dorothy Goodenough & Alan Craddock		CSO11 895	Option VWM 3	Object		There is insufficient infrastructure/facilities etc shops, swimming pool to sustain an increase in the population of Verwood. Until Verwood has better facilities and a more frequent bus service (currently one hour service) increased housing puts a greater strain on our community.			1053
508554	Mr P Mitton		CSO11 904	Option VWM 3	Object		No more houses! We need more facilities - especially a swimming pool.			1053
508560	Mrs Coral Collins		CSO11 913	Option VWM 3	Object		The roads and facilities in Verwood cannot cope with any extra houses, it will spoil what is a very nice place to live.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508577	Mr and Mrs R J Ribbons		CSO11 924	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure, eg buses, shops, leisure facilities, parking etc to support yet morre housing.			1053
508580	Mrs Kirkcaldy		CSO11 935	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
508588	Michelle Hocking		CSO11 949	Option VWM 3	Object		There are already too may empty properties in Verwood. Some remain half built for months and become an eyesore. The planning office don't appear to have any control over the building. The height of the properties is excessive in a small town totally out of propotion.			1053
508596	Whyberd		CSO11 960	Option VWM 3	Object		The area does not have enough facilities to support all the extra people that the new homes would bring.			1053
508609	Patricia Thorley		CSO11 985	Option VWM 3	Object		I Hve lived in Verwood since 1976 and strongly object to any further development. The once rural location has been over-developed - and many other properties have been lost or inappropriate houses have been built in gardens. I would question the need for more housing - it seems to satisfy a buy - to -let market only - our roads are over-burdened with traffic. I believe enough is enough - we need to protect rather than destroy our environment.			1053
508611	Mrs Rosamond Heaven		CSO11 990	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
508628	Martyn Heaven		CSO12 007	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
508635	Mrs I A Jordan		CSO12 014	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
508642	P Williams		CSO12 023	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
508650	Mrs M		CSO12 031	Option VWM 3	Object		I would not like to see any further large developments in Verwood as it would lose its character. Also it would need			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Peters						improved facilities (perhaps a swimming pool in the new school which the pulic could use at times). I am also concerned about the extra traffic.			
508656	Mr and Mrs J Fry		CSO12 045	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
508664	Mrs Sharon Hak		CSO12 059	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
508671	Barry and Carole Bull		CSO12 085	Option VWM 3	Object		The plans for yet more housing is lunacy. Roads in and out of Verwood are few and already totally inadequate at the busy times of day for the amount of traffic, particularly the Ringwood Road. Where are the new inhabitants of these 415 houses going to work? Not in Verwood! So even more cars to clog up the road to Ringwood for hours each day. Any sane person can see that Verwood is already overdeveloped for the infrastructure it can susatin. It's about time we stopped these lunatic planners from using Verwood, only just in Dorset, as the repository for all their county housing requirements, so that they can avoid the difficult issues which challenge them in development of towns and villages in the rest of the County. Now's the time to say enough is enough - they have already wrecked Verwood enough already with overdevelopment and equally lunatic road systems			1053
359931	R E PETERS		CSO12 858	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
477753	Mr Stephen Saville		CSO12 630	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
508690	E and R Wood		CSO12 096	Option VWM 3	Object		No more homes! Sell what is built firts then think of the amenities etc - Council and builders are the only people who will benefit.			1053
508696	Kate and David		CSO12 102	Option VWM 3	Object		Apart for the lack of infrastructure and facilities, indiscriminate (and ghashtly) new buildings and ridiculous alterations to traffic			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Fuller						flow have already resulted in the decline of Verwood. Our car parks have become 'Park and Ride' facilities for people living long distances away and using their free bus passes.			
508709	Mr and Mrs Bennett		CSO12 108	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
508711	Tina Alexander		CSO12 118	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood has already developed too quickly. Facilities have not been reflected. The recent new homes are out of character and shoe horned in. There is overflow of flats already, let these be taken up before considering further new development.			1053
508715	David Drayton		CSO12 129	Option VWM 3	Object		Not enough infrastructure to support more families living in Verwood.			1053
508718	Sienna Drayton		CSO12 134	Option VWM 3	Object		Not enough infrastructure.			1053
508735	Mr Peter Barham		CSO12 144	Option VWM 3	Object		I have lived in VERWOOD for 28 years from the start of the original building boom. Population growth from 3000 to 14000 and a town. A school since constructed at the bottom of my road and the traffic has been increasing substantially to the point where 2 times a day there is gridlock with cars up and down Margards Lane. Before any new houses or school expansion is even considered there must be a solution to the traffic both around the school and in other areas of Verwod. There will be a serious accident / injury waiting to happen with children and pedestrians.			1053
508738	Mankin		CSO12 150	Option VWM 3	Object		We have enough traffic problems as it is.			1053
508826	Mr R.G. Smith		CSO12 161	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood is already over developed, from a pleasant country village into now a sprawling dormitory town without a heart or character. As a villages laced with lanes and sandy tracks, consecutive councils have eroded its natural beauty until we now have vast tracts of housing. Refuse these developers plans and call a halt to these cancerous estates, remember			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							this, once granted, the damage to the countryside is irreversible.			
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		CSO12 195	Option VWM 3	Object		The Council is always after land for housing or business development. Whatever is granted is never enough and a few years later they want more. This process has been going on for over 50 years and it is time it came to a stop. Enough is enough as it is ruining the area.			1053
508842	M G Carlyon		CSO12 209	Option VWM 3	Object		The facilities have not kept pace with present housing situation so approx 400 new homes will only make matters worse. Verwood lacks the infrastructure to support more houses. Traffic is bad at present, more houses will increase this. Comparisons: RINGWOOD - 2 supermarkets, Upper school, Boots, Iceland, Smiths and High Street of shops. WIMBORNE - 2 supermarkets, Upper school, and square of shops with more leading shops in roads leading off The Square. FERNDOWN - 3 supermarkets, Upper school, Boots and numerous shops. VERWOOD - 1 small supermarket, no Upper school, and some very small shops. A Post Office which was here when Verwood was a village. Some people use Three Legged Cross or Cranborne P.O. because of the long queues. This shows that Verwood has a long way to go to catch up with any of the other towns. More houses will make the situation worse.			1053
508848	M Lardner		CSO12 211	Option VWM 3	Object		General comment - I would like the results published so all can see them - ie not in local papers which are not always delivered.			1053
508852	Mrs L.A. Chesshire		CSO12 256	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
508853	Charlotte Rout		CSO12 221	Option VWM 3	Object		Not enough infrastructure.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508857	Mrs and Miss EJ and P D Goode and Smith		CSO12 240	Option VWM 3	Object		There is an insufficient infrastructure of roads and services for a large increase of housing in Verwood. The B3081 (leading to M27 and M3), already under pressure, would see a significant increase of traffic. The Edmondsham road is a country lane completely unsuitable for a large increase of traffic. Large tracts of unspoilt countryside would be built on and nearby wildlife would be threatened. NW7 and 3 already struggle with traffic problems in school term times. Such an increase of residents would inevitably lead to a demand for more shops, services and leisure facilities - and where would they be built?! Verwood really is big enough NOW!			1053
508859	Matilda Rout		CSO12 235	Option VWM 3	Object		Not enough infrastructure			1053
508865	Miss B A Page		CSO12 266	Option VWM 3	Object		A secondary school needs to be around Potterne Park area (if at all: even one of 500 pupils will have a wage bill of £1 million p.a.) (I was a clerk to the Governors of a large secondary school). The Howe Lane one would be impossible for people to drive to - and parents won't use a bus if at all possible. NB. Ferndown Upper is under-subscribed. I am pleased that the area around Doe's Lane (Dewlands Farm and into Horton) has been left undeveloped: it would be the death knell of the nature reserves on Dewlands Common if it were developed, and a problem to fulfil the EU directive on river valley protection (The Crane flows across the end of Doe's Lane.)			1053
508867	Mrs J Martin		CSO12 271	Option VWM 3	Object		I moved to Verwood in 1985 - we have no more amenities now than we did then! The road system is to serve a rural village and cannot cope with the volume of traffic and you want to make the situation worse??? You apparently have orders from 'upstairs' to provide 415 more houses - and you will - so why send these forms - I guess you have to show that you did!			1053
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		CSO12 322	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508890	Mr L Rackham		CSO12 292	Option VWM 3	Object		Would it not be best to just leave well alone.			1053
508898	K Banning		CSO12 306	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
508907	Heather Teasdale		CSO12 316	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
508923	Mrs L Earl		CSO12 388	Option VWM 3		No Opinion	<p>My opinion would only be valid if the proposal was either put into place or dropped. For the Proposal.</p> <p>We know the local government have to abide by government's ruling for more sustainable housing therefore it is inevitable that building will eventually come. More population should create a livelier environment adding to events we already have in place, such as farmers markets, carnivals, rustic fayers, shows at the Hub (which must be badly attended as they are always short of cash), and Memorial Hall, Heritage centre etc. Obviously more rates would help local government which should help create extra amenities for local people.</p> <p>We already have a lack of shops. West Moors which has a smaller population has far far more shops . We also have 1 petrol station which denys us the benefit of competition. 400 more homes would probably increase the population by over 1000 making the area more desirable for business. Extra money from rates could help create more places of leisure or expand those we have for our teenagers who hang around with nothing to do, perhaps a skatepark or club. I would like to see any extra cash put to use making a hard surface cycle lane on one side of the Verwood to Ringwood road. Going south there is a path already for most of the right hand side, but not suitable for cycling.</p> <p>Against the proposal Large areas of council type housing. Nice family houses are always acceptable with intersperced council run at say 5% - 10% this would stop the rough teenage element that most people fear. Roads are not good enough to take the extra</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>traffic that an increase of about 800 - 1000 extra cars would cause. Schools would have to be enlarged as well as the proposed new school. Well in advance of the housing, and has the Council got enough funding for this. Will the extra population cause problems for our car parking, which is often full, making it necessary to enlarge it, making us have to pay for it in the future?</p> <p>If the plans go forward may I suggest that the roads are made up by the developers. Verwood already has far too many roads that are a hazzard if one has to drive down them, it is totally unfair to tradesmen, doctors, ambulances, postmen, etc. who through no fault of their own risk flat tyres and broken suspensions.</p>			
508931	Ina Codrington		CSO12 324	Option VWM 3	Object		There is already considerable volume of traffic on Church Hill particularly at peak (school) times, as this seems to be the only direct access road to Margards Lane / Howe Lane.			1053
508938	Mr Michael Smith		CSO12 371	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
508956	Mr T Webb		CSO12 379	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
508973	Mr Kevin Reynolds		CSO12 399	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
508975	A W J Seaward		CSO12 403	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
508985	Mr N Meyrick		CSO12 438	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
509040	J W Hislop		CSO12 444	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
509043	Mrs		CSO12	Option	Object		Verwood is getting too overcrowded. Lack of facilities is a big			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	P Craven		467	VWM 3			factor. So many people - more cars and reduced to only one petrol station!			
509053	Mrs B Macfarlane		CSO12 459	Option VWM 3	Support		Further traffic on Church Hill during school opening hours and closing will make exit from our drive almost impossible - already very difficult. More population will make Doctor's surgery appointments even longer - already over one week.			1053
509062	Clare Symons		CSO12 477	Option VWM 3	Object		1. Verwood has more than its fair share of modern housing estates. 2. Development southwards is least favourable. Need to retain green space between Verwood and Three Legged Cross. 3. Transport improvements? Few people in Verwood, buses too slow for commuters.. Latter mainly drive via Ringwood or West Moors, much congestion. Would developer fund dual carriageway or new road?			1053
509065	Mrs B Burge		CSO12 503	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
509072	Juliet Garratt		CSO12 487	Option VWM 3	Object		There are too many houses now for the current infrastructure. If more are built it will only lead to increased problems with roads, services ie doctors, lack of garages and shops. Surely it would be more appropriate to build on less congested sites. Perhaps the site of the old hospital at St Leonards which must already be marked as a 'brown site'. If East Dorset District Council persist with this plan the area will be irrevocably destroyed by over development. Despite Verwood being called a 'town' because of the increase in population it is in real terms a village. A town has facilities and shops which we do not. I like the area as it is, that is why I moved here and any attempt to turn the area into a suburban sprawl is resented by yours truly. Verwood will see the movement from a caring population to a transient population. The residents will only live here because of access to work, they will not be the life force of the village. In other words they will not care because Verwood will be like a lot of other villages that have been swallowed and become			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							dormitory towns of other larger conurbations. I have seen it happen, don't let it happen here.			
509099	Mrs L S Timberlake		CSO12 517	Option VWM 3	Object		These plans will instigate the demise of Verwood socially and economically. Current infrastructure is inadequate - Roads/Doctors/Dentists/shops Beggings believe that we were refused permission to relocate the access to the front of our house, but there are now plans to completely reshape and redevelop the whole area.			1053
509116	E I Sams		CSO12 535	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
509128	Susan J Cheese		CSO12 543	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
509251	Frances Hudson		CSO12 596	Option VWM 3	Object		Leave Verwood alone, it's grown too much already - the infrastructure and the facilities cannot cope as it is. Verwood is a beautiful place to live - don't spoil it with more houses, more cars and more kids on the streets with nothing to do. This is just a recipe for disaster.			1053
509421	Mr J Dowling		CSO12 649	Option VWM 3	Object		Unless Ferndown and Wimborne schools are over subscribed, I think the building of a secondary school in Verwood is not a good idea, as it only breeds local gang culture into our youths. It is far better for young people to mix with people from other areas, as it lessens the us and them culture.			1053
509861	Mrs V Aitken		CSO12 879	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
509899	Mr Peter Harfleet		CSO12 894	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
509922	Mr and Mrs V Feltham		CSO12 924	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
361121	Mrs Elizabeth JONES		CSO14 019	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
482795	Mr and Mrs N F Steel		CSO13 876	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
500746	Mrs J Lothian		CSO13 813	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
509952	Tracey Legge		CSO12 952	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
510420	Mr Peter Stevens		CSO13 162	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		CSO13 251	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
510532	W.W. Chant		CSO13 296	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
510623	Mr Douglas Priest		CSO13 395	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
510798	Mr F Sullivan		CSO13 538	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
510844	Mr Michael Guilmany-Cush		CSO13 582	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R.		CSO13 630	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Mayes									
510974	Mr Jim Cullumbine		CSO13 658	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
510993	R.A. Cherrett		CSO13 694	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
511001	Mr Paul Few		CSO13 697	Option VWM 3	Object		A larger population means crime WILL rise, at a time when police cuts are huge. Less officers to deal with road safety issues. With many more children living in the area, Doctors, Schools and other vital services will suffer at a time when all are looking to make cuts. The population of Verwood is BIG ENOUGH!			1053
511015	Mr Christopher White		CSO13 747	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
511020	Mrs E Derbyshire		CSO13 720	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
511030	K Derbyshire		CSO13 737	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
511044	Mr B L Buckman		CSO13 754	Option VWM 3	Support		It's ok to build all these new homes so long as we can have a swimming pool built. Years ago this idea was rejected because of the lack of population in Verwood. Also we need a good shopping centre much like West Moors. Also a B and Q or Homebase save having to travel to Bournemouth to help the DIY man in Verwood. We also need another petrol station (I hear Morrisons may have this soon).			1053
511047	Mr Andrew Bull		CSO13 751	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
511056	K H Saunders		CSO13 777	Option VWM 3	Object					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511058	Mr W Taylor		CSO13 776	Option VWM 3	Object		I feel that 99% of new homes will be for new arrivals, and that all services cannot cope, no matter what the developers promise.			1053
511069	Mr John Cheese		CSO13 799	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
511076	Mr Ian Burden		CSO13 828	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
360097	Mr John DOWLING		CSO14 507	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
511095	Mrs Warburton		CSO13 845	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
511117	Mr and Mrs G McConnell		CSO13 848	Option VWM 3	Object		Our particular objections to the proposed new homes are as follows:- 1) Medical services - We already have difficulty in getting reasonably prompt appointments to see a doctor. An extra 1,000 (?) inhabitants would make matters much worse. 2) Telephones - We live next door to the BT exchange. Within the last year or so, increased overheating of equipment has required the installation of noisy, forced ventilation. Another 400+ phones has the potential for creating really objectionable ventilation noise.			1053
511128	Eileen Housden		CSO13 860	Option VWM 3	Support		The new secondary school should be built before the houses are developed. This has been proposed since I moved into the 'village' in 1979 when the population was a fraction of what it is today. Verwood is now just a dormitory town totally lacking in character and identity. The planning is appalling and hopefully no more blocks of flats will be allowed - the blocks of flats near The Hub are monstrous.			1053
511137	Sarah Barrow		CSO13 868	Option VWM 3	Object					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511175	Webber		CSO13 889	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
511181	Pauline Barrow		CSO13 899	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
511189	Miss Pamela A Stannard		CSO13 921	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>My comments and reasons for objection</p> <p>General comments.</p> <p>Verwood has grown by 500% in the last 20 years. During this time very little has been done to improve the infrastructure to support all this development. Much of the character of this former village (now town) has already been destroyed. We have a duty to protect what remains. The greenbelt, areas of special scientific interest and areas of 'special character' (in the proposed South Verwood Development area) have so far survived. The proposed development on this very special part of South Verwood would be on greenbelt land and runs close to the River Crane (a triple SSI). This must not be allowed. The residents of Verwood and EDDC have in my opinion a duty to protect this very special area and our heritage.</p> <p>Transport issues.</p> <p>Increase in traffic. The current infrastructure/roads in Verwood are already inadequate. The West Moors bypass originally planned to ease traffic problems in Verwood following previous developments was scrapped in favour of new homes. No doubt this would give more revenue to EDDC than any bypass!!!! What I want to know is when are you going to give something back to Verwood???? How do you propose to deal with the increase in traffic and the problems this will cause if these developments go ahead?</p> <p>Potential increased risk of flooding and drainage problems. How would any new development be drained?? I understand the river Crane is a triple SSI so I assume water will not be drained there? I also understand that according to Councillor Flower the drains in Manor Road are 'not fit for purpose' and already 'full to capacity'. I therefore assume water cannot be drained there either? People have shown me photos of flooded fields in the Verwood South area that would serve the Manor Road development. I know the water levels are high in parts of St Michaels Road and peoples gardens</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>are already waterlogged during winter months. Surely further development of land in this area can only make things worse. You only have to look at what happened to the listed cottage in Burnbake Road following land development in that area, The cottage and grounds were so damaged the cottage had to be pulled down!! Do you want this to happen to St Michaels Cottage (also Listed) as well??? Inc rease in development means increase in surface water. Are you prepared to take the risk and increase flooding in the Verwood South area? Are you prepared to be accountable for your actions and responsible for any damage you cause to privately owned property????</p> <p>Encroachment on greenbelt.</p> <p>I have lived in St Michaels Road for 22 years. I understand that land beyond Howe Lane is and always has been greenbelt. This area must be protected for our future heritage. You only have to walk down the farm and beyond to erealise how peaceful and special this area is. St Michaels Road and part of Manor Road are also areas of 'special character'. This is confirmed in the Council Plan (2004). What will happen to wild life that depends on areas like this? This area will be destroyed if this development goes ahead.</p> <p>In the 22 years I have resided in St Michaels Close I have seen much change. This change has not been for the better. I feel privilaged to live where i do and have direct access to the delights of walking up St Michaels Road and beyond the farm on a summers evening or a Sunday afternoon. I am able get away from the hustle ans bustle in the Manor Road area. I witness bats in my graden on a late summer evening despite living toward the developed end of the road. Much wild life depends on this area for its survival. I have seen evidence of badgers in my back garden and have witnessed many rare birds visiting my garden. For example, woodpeckers, chaffinch, green finch, jackdaws to name but a few.</p> <p>Ten years ago Verwood was described as the most rapidly developed town in Europe. We have had enough now. If this council is so concerned with providing affordable housing why did it sell land adjacent to the hub to a developer who I understand will not be providing affordable housing? There is plenty of brown belt land around Verwood that could be used.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							I understand that during a recent Dorset study, the majority of survey respondents said they were against housing construction on the countryside, yet the report's conclusion was in favour of development?! I would ask EDDC what evidence they have that suggests there is a 'need ' for housing in this area? If the evidence for housing need is bogus, as has been suggested to me, and if the wishes of the local community are being ignored, surely there is no justification for building on otherwise protected land in the open countryside?			
511200	Audrey Barrow		CSO13 907	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
511211	Mr Peter Hodges		CSO13 933	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
511236	G Thomas and J R thomas		CSO13 934	Option VWM 3	Object		Church Hill is already blocked with traffic at school times. Enough is enough!			1053
511246	Mr and Mrs Daniels		CSO13 942	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
511252	Ms Mary Harris		CSO13 971	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
511294	Mr Alan Dorey		CSO13 980	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and Diana Froud		CSO14 069	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
511430	A.D. May		CSO14 199	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511489	Mr H G Holden		CSO14 181	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
511571	Colin Alborough		CSO14 236	Option VWM 3	Support		We are in desperate need of more affordable housing in the East Dorset area. There is also a shortage of employment opportunities in the area. The provision of more houses should help to push house prices down to give young people a change of getting on the property ladder.			1053
511618	Mrs V Blunden		CSO14 304	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
511621	Ms Mary A Combe		CSO14 282	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
511711	Coombes		CSO14 443	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
511997	Mr Tom Saville		CSO14 808	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood is big enough; it doesn't need or can cope with any further development. More traffic as a result of more houses will be a disaster for the town; Verwood should not be turned into a dormitory Town.			1053
360809	Mr Brian Skyrme		CSO15 425	Option VWM 3	Object		New secondary school in Howe Lane is the wrong location – support new school on land west of Trinity school. This to be built and opened before housing the middle house building period is finished. Also all roads and parking facilities to be completed at the opening date of the school. House building on the scale suggest in ridiculous without the infrastructure to support it. By this I mean, transport, shops, leisure, doctor surgeries, etc. etc.			1053
476264	Mr David Reddaway		CSO15 687	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
498376	Mrs Helen		CSO15 314	Option VWM 3	Object		We object to the development proposals on the grounds that the proportion of “affordable” housing is too high and on the			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Holman						lack of appropriate plan to improve services within Verwood – including the provision of an appropriately sized supermarket, competition for petrol station, leisure centre. Definition of 'affordable' housing not given in documents.			
499537	C Ayling		CSO15 350	Option VWM 3	Object		We wish to keep Verwood as a small town, council/planning reps. Promised a greater variety of local shops, this will not happen with large supermarkets nearby, we will end up with a never ending urban sprawl or Bournemouth overspill. Existing school will be overloaded. The Ringwood Road will be dangerously overloaded, even greater delays will occur when making doctor/dentist appointments.			1053
500817	Mr L Lothian		CSO15 368	Option VWM 3	Object		1) Re use or develop existing empty houses. 2) Each house has 2 – 3 cars not 1 car. There is too much traffic and congestion in west moors. We do not need a bypass either. 3) There are no jobs here, build the houses were there is work i.e. Bournemouth or Poole, not our green land.			1053
511374	Mr Shane Smith		CSO15 187	Option VWM 3	Object		We have been concerned regarding the volume of traffic along Howe Lane already, and the addition of any additional housing would in our opinion cause too much strain on these old roads. As it is a fire engine could not pass during school runs. The two main roads leading out to the A31 already too busy during peak times and the addition of this number of houses would be a problem we think. Also we are worried about ruin our view – which is why we bought our house in the old area of Verwood as it was quite rural feeling.			1053
511383	Mrs Jean Archer		CSO15 254	Option VWM 3	Object		Existing infrastructure needs greatly improving before any new building could be considered – need senior school but build it next to trinity. Morrisons needs updating and competition, need another petrol station and dentist, doctor can't cope now (waited 9 days for appointment). In fact we need a decent shopping centre and road system. You can't have it all ways. With the amount of houses it's no longer a village more like a town with few amenities. SNAP:A big issue concerns the A31 motorway which would			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							need to be developed into dual carriageway to join up with the A35 motorway. As already stated on all the other survey's Verwood is so lacking in essential facilities to build new housing before sorting out this problem would turn Verwood into one very large housing estate and little else ,especially the figure of 40% being ear-marked as so-called social housing the town would see a massive exodus of it's existing residents who have grown to love being part of Verwood's community.			
511449	Mr K F Armstrong		CSO15 263	Option VWM 3	Support		Option VWM 7 must have new road access developed first along Howe Lane and into Manor Road. Margards Lane is not suitable for construction traffic and is already grid-locked twice per day.			1053
511453	Mr & Mrs Weeks		CSO15 281	Option VWM 3	Object		We object to any further housing in Verwood as there is not sufficient infrastructure to support it. We appreciate that a senior school is needed but are extremely concerned re the access to it and parking. The traffic in Margards Lane is now sometimes grid-locked and a further school would make this an even worse situation. We are amazed that a further school could be built in this vicinity. Safety is also an issue here as is access to emergency vehicles.			1053
511508	Mr & Mrs J E Maiden		CSO15 290	Option VWM 3	Object		Virtually no infrastructure has been provided to Verwood in the last 20 years despite the explosion in population and development. Already the road system towards Bournemouth is at breaking point if ever maintenance is required. I believe Verwood has twice the population of Wimborne but only a small fraction of the facilities, I don't want to move again!			1053
511549	Ms Debby Andrews		CSO15 320	Option VWM 3	Object		There are barely any facilities for current residents and they certainly will not stretch to 400 more homes. Provide infrastructure first and then maybe I wouldn't object.			1053
511564	Ms Emma Prince		CSO15 337	Option VWM 3	Support		I support these proposals providing that any developers are required to provide allotments sites to the north and south of Verwood to meet the current huge level of demand. And also			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							the facilities in Verwood (leisure etc) need to be improved to cope with additional demand.			
511620	Mr Neil Hudson		CSO15 343	Option VWM 3	Object		You simply cannot go ahead with major expansion of Verwood (already grown from 3000 – 13000 approximate residents in 25 years) without addressing the infrastructure of Verwood itself. The roads are a classic example most residents commute out of Verwood to work. Most of this is either towards Ringwood or towards West Moors. There is already traffic build up at junction points. The access to Emmanuel school is currently down Church Hill and Margards Lane. I have recently written to the county council over the current vehicle situation affecting residents of Margards Lane, Haywards Lane, Howe Lane, Keswick Road, Lancaster Drive with drivers on the school run (in an 8 min spell I counted 250 car movements). The noise pollution is currently unbearable. When it rains we are close to gridlock (with the implications of emergency vehicle access) Margards Lane was never designed as the main school access. Any further expansion will make matters worse; you need a school access relief road built now!			1053
511827	Mr J Kennard		CSO15 355	Option VWM 3	Object		I'm sure there are many good reasons why affordable housing could be increased in Verwood; however access and increased traffic issues have been touched on by the community. Public transport is poor for people living in Verwood: Serious investment is needed to improve transport infrastructure between Verwood and neighbouring towns and cities without constantly increasing the size of the town.			1053
511836	Mr J Middleton		CSO15 362	Option VWM 3	Object		Build all amenities first (i.e. more useful shops, sporting facilities, better bus services, more doctors etc. etc. etc.) more exit roads out of village??			1053
511850	Mr & Mrs R C Williamson		CSO15 386	Option VWM 3	Object		I believe the town of Verwood is unprepared for such expansion. Also building on agricultural or woodland is short-sighted, as in long term the country will need land to grow our food. The council should use brown sites as there seems to be quite a few.			1053
511855	Mr		CSO15	Option	Object		It would be crazy to build 400 new homes without major			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Alan Thorn		396	VWM 3			investment in the infrastructure, with only one road in and out of Verwood and not enough doctors and dentists and only one major supermarket for 15,000 people. If the government took responsibility for building affordable housing you would only need to build 180 new homes not the current 400 proposed. This would work out cheaper in the long run as you would not have to make major investment in the infrastructure.			
511868	J Weedon		CSO15 447	Option VWM 3	Object		Any increase in housing in Verwood has an impact on the traffic through West Moors. No consideration has been given to this. Improved infrastructure is needed before housing developments.			1053
511878	Mr Paul Seymour		CSO15 501	Option VWM 3	Object		I support limited development around the Trinity school area as the road system has been 'improved' in that area. I believe a small development would have no further detriment to the area. I do not support any further large scale development in Verwood or infilling of green field in Howe Lane as the area is already 'busy' with existing houses and traffic for the schools.			1053
511980	Mr Stuart Folley		CSO15 615	Option VWM 3	Object		The school is required to meet the requirements of existing population. Additional homes will put increasing strain on an already highly populated town.			1053
512072	Mr W B Chung		CSO14 831	Option VWM 3	Object		Private access in Summerfield, access danger in Howe Lane. Should be open space.			1053
512125	Mrs Julie Long		CSO14 903	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
512145	Mr & Mrs J Dutton		CSO14 929	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
512175	Mr Noel Baugh		CSO15 147	Option VWM 3	Object		The larger concern is one of a village infrastructure (Verwood) through shops and facilities (lack of) supporting a population of 17000 already. Look at Ringwood. Its no greater population but has a better 'high street'. A larger Morrisons			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							will not alter this per se..			
512281	Graham Roberts		CSO15 010	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
512326	Mr Ian Willis		CSO15 067	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
512431	Mr & Mrs Lee		CSO15 162	Option VWM 3	Object		No further development of Verwood should take place until improvements have been made to facilities available to existing residents. Transport links, health facilities, shopping and work places are sadly lacking and its short sighted of council to propose putting pressure on these. Keep Verwood as a small town where it is currently a pleasant place to live. Leave us alone.			1053
512557	Ms Karen French		CSO15 180	Option VWM 3	Support		It is a 'catch 22' situation in that in order to have a new secondary school we need new housing. The main concern is the lack of facilities for an increased population. Although Verwood is a town it has the feel and facilities of a village.			1053
513509	Mr Roy Brodie		CSO15 406	Option VWM 3	Object		As residents of Verwood for the past 16 years we would like to comment on the proposed Core Strategy. We are concerned that during our time here the population of our town has doubled but the infrastructure has stayed the same. Its true we have had a new community centre built and Ferret Green has been made a pleasant area but very little has been done to improve our roads. There are only two roads to connect us with the A31. These are extremely busy during the early hours and evening rush. Often cars entering Ringwood Road from side roads have a long wait. Huge delivery lorries block the traffic at Tesco and Baileys. The prospect of another four hundred plus cars frightens us. Surely we have had our fair share of new houses built in recent years, indeed it was once rumoured that Verwood was the fastest growing town in Europe. Many young families who moved in during that time no have children able to drive. Lets sit back now and improve what we have then think about building more houses.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
513581	Nicola Beesley		CSO15 410	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>In 1987 the population of Verwood was less than 10000 and the figure available for 2009 was 14820, representing an increase of 51%. However the Verwood Town Council has stated, 'that the population is expected to rise to a peak of 15000 and then hopefully stay at that level.' Obviously the figure of 15000 was determined as a result of the Council undertaking full and proper assessments of the facilities that exist in the town to support the citizens and with the due cognizance of the East Dorset District Council Structure Plan. However much the District and Town Councils deserve praise for achieving their own objective, it should be argued that there is currently an inadequacy of proper facilities to serve the needs of the existing population and they must now apply policies to ensure that the needs of the Town inhabitants are properly addressed before additional dwelling places are built.</p> <p>The population of Verwood is already larger than that of Ringwood without the civic amenities and the people of Verwood deserve better, a proper leisure centre including a swimming pool and adequate shopping facilities. However good the service from the existing retail businesses: is a tiny post office, one petrol station; a handful of shops, and a small dated supermarket really adequate?</p> <p>Traffic in Howe Lane is atrocious particularly during rush hours with additional hazards of the school parking - emergency vehicles cannot get through now at key school times. To build adjacent to St Michaels too will mean the unmade section of Howe Lane will become a proper metalled road with the consequences of speeding increased traffic levels.</p> <p>The area between St Michaels Road and Manor Road is currently designated Green Belt land by the existing East Dorset Structure and Local Plans. Environmentally these developments are a potential disaster with the loss of much needed green space for relaxation and the habitat for local flora and fauna in addition to increased traffic and pollution volumes such development will undoubtedly bring!</p> <p>Heavy traffic flow on Manor Road currently causes congestion and safety hazards at busy times without the extra volumes which can be expected from another 165 homes -</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>potentially 330 cars BEFORE the offspring enter the market for vehicles.</p> <p>Under each succeeding structure plan East Dorset District Council has consistently, met and exceeded the housing targets set for it, while protecting the Green Belt and the environment of the District.</p> <p>Approval of these proposals can only lead to the destruction of the Green Belt and the local environment and future development MUST only be allowed to proceed on brown field sites within the jurisdiction of East District Council.</p> <p>The Town Council should continue with the objective of maintaining the population at its own pre-determined level and reject these proposals, restricting any development to that which improves the amenities and lifestyle of that population.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Nicola Beesley</p>			
513617	Valerie J Brown		CSO15 420	Option VWM 3	Support		<p>In moderation.</p> <p>I support moderate increase in housing but the following issues must be addressed first.</p> <p>!) access to verwood via Ringwod Rd- a dangerous rd too narrow for the present traffic in rush hour.</p> <p>2) Access to all the sites should protect present residents</p> <p>3) General services to Verwood suitably increases</p> <p>4) Money for new school (and services) definitely available</p> <p>5) Woodland areas eg st Michaels/Howe Lane corner protected.</p> <p>^ St Michaels Rd left xxxxxx and unlit.</p> <p>No xxxxstreetxxxxxlot of traffic on this narrow side road. No access from Summerfields-quite wrong,xxxxxxxcurrent properties.</p> <p>(This wording unreadable due to water spill prior to receiving the form)</p>			1053
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A Kirby		CSO15 457	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>I live in the beautiful countryside of Verwood and would like it to stay that way. This is why my wife and I decided to move here some 11 years ago.</p> <p>We object to the proposed building of more houses around Verwood and Three Legged Cross.</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							These areas already have an over population of houses without the required facilities. We need better road networks, larger supermarket, another petrol station, more dentists, doctors and all the NHS services are under pressure. We do not have sufficient facilities to support these additional homes. We must have better infrastructure to sustain further development FIRST including secondary school, shops and swimming pool. Also Verwood and West Moors Housing leaflet			
513651	Mrs W Pearsall		CSO15 448	Option VWM 3	Support		1 Increase bus frequency and to Wimborne. More buses on Saturdays and Sundays. 1 per hour is not sufficient. 2 Increase transport to all hospitals, Bournemouth, Poole, St Leonards, Wimborne, Salisbury and Southampton. 3 Verwood needs direct links to all railway stations and airports. 4 Verwood needs allotments. Council land (including County Council) needs to be immediately available at an economic rate. Suggest land parallel to Pottern Way alongside river. land being auctioned on Pottern Way. Part of land VWM 4 in flooding area away from river. 5 VWM4 Access via Manor Rd and St Michaels Lane. Already congested and impeded vision around new gas station. Suggest small roundabout junction these 2 roads. Would slow traffic on this dangerous road and be safer for school children.			1053
513671	Mr and Mrs G Green		CSO15 474	Option VWM 3	Support		Unless we get infrastructure in place first Verwood cannot sustain more homes in such high numbers. Our facilities at present are used by other villages too and what we have here is not nearly enough. Doctors, dentists, shop, a garage, leisure facilities are really inadequate now and would not be able to support more homes. More traffic will be generated, so roads more congested and public transport is high on unavailable at times now.			1053
513719	Mr and Mrs E Roberts		CSO15 496	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood is sadly not the place we moved to 31 years ago. We feel we already have enough new building. If all these houses are built, where are the people going to work? Will they commute out of the town and make the B3081 even			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							more busier than it is now.? Another reason, has adequate thought gone into health, ie doctors surgeries which are already overcrowded, also hospital accommodation. Also where are these extra people going to shop?			
513880	Mr Derek Martin		CSO15 513	Option VWM 3	Object		No development without infrastructure including road improvement. Station road can not carry any further increase in traffic. Developers must pay for this first before any building.			1053
513883	Mr West		CSO15 520	Option VWM 3	Object		The town could not support the extra people (at least 1245) if you say 3 people per house - probably alot more. Doctors surgeries, schools, car parks could not cope. The centre of the town does not have or could not have shops of enough interest to stop people just driving on their way to larger towns.			1053
513891	Mr RA Parsons		CSO15 538	Option VWM 3	Object		Leave Verwood as it is. Give us more sensible shops and better roads and the allotments promised 20 years ago. We cannot keep up with the housing we already have. No more.			1053
513900	Mr P Wall		CSO15 595	Option VWM 3	Support		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed eg. road improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			1053
513915	Mrs PA Parsons		CSO15 572	Option VWM 3	Object		I object to any more houses in Verwood. We have very little in shops less now than 20 years ago. Roads need a lot of attention. No concessions for allotments-if green spaces found for housing why could you not find green space for allotments. Disgrace to you East Dorset Council.			1053
360838	Cllr. Mrs Carol Holmes	Parish Councillor West Moors Parish Council	CSO16 656	Option VWM 3	Object		1) How would you ensure new homes were for local people? 2) Verwood needs competitieve retail outlets like Waitrose etc to offer consumer choice and competition with Morrisons. It is not right to have just one supermarket for a town the size of Verwood. It would cut back on traffic movement too. 3) All the proposed housing developments would put further strain on Station Road, West Moors.		Not changed to processed until clarification of	1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							4) Give serious thought to using St Leonards' Hospital site for major retail eg B and Q to cut down travel to Castle Point.		status of respondent received. L King	
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		CSO16 365	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
361196	Mr J.M BULLIVANT		CSO16 283	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
491252	Margaret Wareham		CSO16 591	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
499533	Mr & Mrs A & C Clein		CSO16 749	Option VWM 3	Object		We strongly object to any further development of Verwood because the local infrastructure can barely cope with the recent growth that Verwood has already seen. Any further growth would have a major impact on it. We moved to Verwood from Woking, Surrey 18 months ago to escape the traffic and overcrowding. Verwood is a great community with a village feel which would dramatically change for the worse if these houses are to be built. The re-development of the town centre and facilities which would be required would have a detrimental impact on our much Verwood. It feels like home here out of all places we have lived – we do not want that to change!			1053
499779	Mr & Mrs J Wilson		CSO15 970	Option VWM 3	Object		I think that unless the infrastructure is in place we cannot support any new building in Verwood.			1053
504241	Mr and Mrs Ansell		CSO16 756	Option VWM 3	Object		Increase volume of traffic along minor roads in the vicinity.			1053
511639	Paul Hockey		CSO16 098	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
513974	Mr		CSO15	Option		No				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	A Moore		825	VWM 3		Opinion				
513988	Mr & Mrs S.G Smith		CSO15 657	Option VWM 3	Object		It is absolutely essential for new road to be forthcoming if new school proceeds. In House Lane, let alone the further housing planned.			1053
514049	Mrs E Hellier		CSO15 752	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
514091	Mr RJ Potts		CSO15 831	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
514092	Ms Natasha Saville		CSO15 806	Option VWM 3	Object		I think that there should be no more building in Verwood without more infrastructure, shops, doctors Etc. Verwood is big enough; the green belt should be saved for future generations.			1053
514099	Mr and Mrs T C Blakeley		CSO15 859	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
514100	Mrs Eileen Gibbs		CSO15 848	Option VWM 3	Object		The infrastructure in Verwood is not sufficient to accommodate all the extra cards and people.			1053
514111	Penelope Webiery		CSO15 931	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
514121	Mr David Dencher		CSO15 905	Option VWM 3	Support		Any development should have improvement in the road network.			1053
514136	Mrs J Crumb		CSO15 964	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
514225	Mr Simon	Secretary West Moors	CSO16 009	Option VWM 3	Support					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Dixon	Traders Association								
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon Chaffey		CSO16 014	Option VWM 3	Object		Our feeling is this is yet another token gesture by the Council. This is clearly obvious by the planning permission that seems to be given for the most grotesque buildings in Verwood. The corner of Ringwood Road and Black Hill Road as a typical example. Also all those other awful flats in the middle of Verwood. If you are going to build then think before giving planning permission. Also speed up the development of Morrisons to keep in line with the increased population to Verwood.			1053
514274	Mr Showell		CSO16 086	Option VWM 3	Support		Instead of new housing there should be a new strategy of providing more public open space. The lessons of the Edwardians/Victorians should be learnt. New public parks like Poole Park, Queens Park and Kings Park save an area from urban crowding. Perhaps all the land proposed for housing could be reallocated to public parks.			1053
514282	Ian Bignell and Sally Hinchliffe		CSO16 042	Option VWM 3	Object		If Verwood gets more houses, it will need more facilities. There are lots of houses on the market at the moment, most of which aren't selling, so this proves we don't need any more houses. I agree with secondary school, as long as the middle school system is maintained.			1053
514287	Mr Brian Walker		CSO16 057	Option VWM 3	Object		Over the last few years Verwood's population has increased above 16,000 due to building expansion, I feel that Verwood has already contributed our duty to the housing problem. Any more house building would put even greater pressure on our limited infrastructure, transport services, roads, parking etc. Also within this proposal for more than 40% of affordable houses, where are these people expected to find employment in the Verwood area? No Green Belt land should be allowed to be built upon. B3081 main road out of Verwood is already over congested in the rush hours.			1053
514344	Ms		CSO16	Option	Object		Don't ruin our green belt. Too many houses in Verwood			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Emily Saville		121	VWM 3			already – not enough facilities to support this!			
514355	Mr T Gee		CSO16 127	Option VWM 3	Object		Living on Station Road we have noticed the massive increase in traffic over the years. An increase of a further 400 homes would probably bring another 800 cars to an already congested town. most people who live in Verwood work elsewhere hence the high number of people travelling at commuting times. There are no employment opportunities in Verwood and no one can guarantee that firms or businesses would open up in Verwood. This is a dormitory town with a high percentage of OAP's. Building on Green Belt land in a semi rural area would directly adversely affect the quality of life of existing residents and the council must do all it can to prevent further building on Green Belt land.			1053
514367	Mr R S Coates		CSO16 156	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
514379	Mrs Denise Bannister		CSO16 140	Option VWM 3	Object		There are already many properties for sale in Verwood and the need to build others is questionable. An increase of 400 homes in this area potentially means 800 more cars. Access to and from Verwood is likely to become more problematical. There are very few jobs in Verwood and to increase housing further is likely to mean that more people will be travelling out of and back to Verwood each day. Whilst building a secondary school does have some merits, access to the existing schools is already difficult and at a time of serious financial constraints it would make sense economically to develop existing secondary school sites and thus minimise the effects upon the local community. Congestion within Verwood does not need to increase and in terms of environmental concerns, any further destruction of the Green Belt land around this area must be strongly and forcefully opposed. There are plenty of brownfield sites within local communities that could be enhanced by developments before encroaching on greenfield sites. Finally facilities such as shopping and community facilities would not support more housing.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514392	Alison Frost		CSO16 151	Option VWM 3		No Opinion	Please can you leave land to provide allotments for the residents of Verwood? They are a vital part of health and well being for residents with little or no garden and are much needed in the town.			1053
514429	Joan and Ann Humphries		CSO16 173	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
514455	Mrs Christine Groves		CSO16 165	Option VWM 3	Object		There are enough homes and people in Verwood and enough traffic on our roads.			1053
514467	Mrs Lesley Cripps		CSO16 208	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
514482	C E T Gilbert		CSO16 244	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
514499	Mrs S H Chung		CSO16 228	Option VWM 3	Object		Land south of Howe Lane Private access in Summerfield, access danger in Howe Lane – also the road busy already. Should be open space in land south of Howe Lane.			1053
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		CSO16 320	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
514703	Mr S Harvey		CSO16 390	Option VWM 3	Object		The village has enough housing stock already and is too densely populated with a need for a better public transport network that operates beyond the hours of 6pm! We need to build a secondary school and more shops offering local goods and not just estate agents!			1053
514752	Claire Richardson & Jamie Shirley		CSO16 396	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
514812	Mr C		CSO16 432	Option VWM 3	Object					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Sawyer									
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		CSO16 489	Option VWM 3	Support		Seeking the opinion of the general public on planning issues is all very commendable - but setting aside all political persuasion my feeling is that this is no more than a Public Relations exercise because in the end the final decisions are always to the advantage of the developers whoever they may be because of money, greed and looks good on paper. My general view is that density levels for new homes should be kept down, East Dorset has become so over developed that is its now just one big urban sprawl. Infact it has lost so much of all the natural character and charm that it used to enjoy it is hard to know where the so called green belt begins and ends.			1053
514913	Mr and Mrs M Clark		CSO16 468	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
514939	D Porter		CSO16 513	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		CSO16 541	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
360167	Mrs Pippa WHEATLEY		CSO17 449	Option VWM 3	Object		As Options comments are requested on separate sheets, I will make points which are general to the four Verwood Options (VWM1 to VWM4) first, and then make comments relating to this particular site. Comments general to the 4 Verwood Housing Options Opportunistic This does not appear to be a 'strategy'. It appears to be a Phew! Someone's offering us land for housing. Let's try and make the facts fit. Complete reversal of intentions in RSS Under RSS there was no intention to roll back Green Belt and subject Verwood to yet more large areas of housing. There was indeed the sentiment that Verwood had far more than its share over the past few decades. In your Vision para 3.10 you tell us that PPS 12 advises that the Vision should be in	Delete Option VWM 3		1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>general conformity with the RSS and closely relate to any Sustainable Community Strategy for the area. As far as Verwood is concerned there has been a complete turn around on both these issues</p> <p>Sustainability All sites have rich biodiversity. Sites generally appear to be unimproved grassland, probably not ploughed for many decades, good hedgerows and mature trees. These are increasingly being recognised for their role in carbon capture.</p> <p>Verwood is noted for high car ownership and high usage to get to work which is largely out of Verwood. No increased employment sites are put forward for Verwood so any newcomers will inevitably add to the traffic going out and returning home to Verwood on a daily basis. Increased traffic will be generated by the needs of these developments for supplies to local shops, home deliveries and people having to shop for many items in outlying towns.</p> <p>The road system in and around Verwood is incapable of coping with increased traffic and there is no plan to improve the main access route B3081 or to make it safer. The roads will be continually jammed up with traffic queues, burning up oil and puffing out carbon.</p> <p>Climate change means likelihood of more impact from flooding. All these sites are going to affect the Moors river system where there is already concern.</p> <p>Green Belt I have commented on Option KS2. The Green Belt is being treated far too casually. Three of the four Verwood sites require movement of the Green Belt. I do not think sufficient attention is being given to national guidance. Have the following in PPG2 been properly considered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposes of the Green Belt, in particular to check unrestricted sprawl and to safeguard our countryside • Sustainability – to consider consequences for sustainability including effects of car travel if channelling development toward areas of Green Belt • Permanence – the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence <p>In 06 Green Belt Key Issue paper para 2.14 you tell us the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Core Strategy will only propose alteration to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate recognised local needs in sustainable locations. Most Verwood people I have talked to do not agree we need these houses and it is difficult to argue these are sustainable locations.</p> <p>I notice the Masterplan document in its appraisal on Green Belt seems to find very little justification for moving it. The only thing that is mentioned is maintaining key gaps and key edges.</p> <p>Overdevelopment Verwood has too much housing. Your figures show Verwood has five times more houses than in the early 1960s, resulting in a population of nearly 15,000. It was known as the fastest growing town in Europe. The facilities are only still that of a village. It is not viable as a fully functioning town while there is the daily exodus of the majority of the workforce.</p> <p>It is a distortion to mention in para 11.3 that 300 houses were unable to be built without saying 'However, a large number of houses and flats have been, and are still being, built on Bakers Farm land which was to have been reserved for Community facilities / supermarket in a previous plan. Also part of the land at Ebblake Industrial Estate has been used for houses when it was previously reserved for employment.'</p> <p>Further comments relating to VWM 3 Landscape and nature conservation Although this proposal does not involve moving Green Belt boundary, it is in an environmentally sensitive area lying so close to SNCI. The area is attractive grassland with trees and of nature conservation value in its own right.</p> <p>Congestion This area suffers serious traffic congestion morning and afternoon because of the schools. Understandably, it was not envisaged that first school pupils now need to be collected from inside the school premises. By car, a quick pick up is now not possible and if walking or cycling someone has to go to the premises to collect the child. Also the schools have been expanding because of increased numbers of pupils and adding pressure on these roads.</p> <p>Roads and safety The road system is notoriously inadequate and road safety is</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							a major problem with so many children about, so much congestion and a certain amount of impatience generated.			
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		CSO16 892	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
508562	K Clayson		CSO16 948	Option VWM 3	Object		More houses will create more congestion on the roads.			1053
511936	Mrs G Anstey		CSO16 992	Option VWM 3	Object		I am in agreement with a new secondary school as Verwood needs one badly. I am NOT in agreement with more homes being built in Verwood. The roads are crowded enough as it is one of these days a terrible accident is going to occur. There is NO INFRASTRUCTURE here, and for children and young families a dead loss. I came here more than 20 years ago when Verwood was a village and it has been spoilt by over-building, ugly flats and stupid bureaucracy! All the open spaces are going, the fields with houses and our wildlife.WHEN IS IT GOING TO END???			1053
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		CSO16 575	Option VWM 3	Object		The area is already over-developed and congested - further development on the scales proposed would lead to deterioration of the environment and a reduction in the quality of life. I am particularly dismayed by continued threats to the Green Belt, especially as this Government pledged to protect it. I do not believe that such massive development is necessary or beneficial to the vast majority of inhabitants. Pressure on our area should be reduced by Government tackling such issues as population growth through immigration control and regeneration of brownfield sites in Midlands and North. There is a need for limited affordable and social housing locally, but not more executive homes. It is wrong to build new homes while second homes and investment properties continue to exist.			1053
515033	Mr T Crump		CSO16 613	Option VWM 3	Support					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
515086	Mrs Elaine Pugh		CSO16 624	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood is lacking facilities to accommodate more homes and pressure on services is too much. Services must deteriorate. The main roads are already overwhelmed and can only get worse with yet more traffic. Most of the land is what is green belt and should stay green belt. Verwood has doubled in the last 10 years (approx) enough is enough!			1053
515114	M J Porter		CSO16 639	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
515148	Mr E G Howarth		CSO16 644	Option VWM 3	Object		Until it is clear how the infrastructure to support additional housing is to be provided it is not possible to support any of these proposals. Will the type of housing result in increased anti-social behaviour?			1053
515255	Mr and Mrs C Beck		CSO16 650	Option VWM 3		No Opinion	No problem with extra homes being built if facilities are increased – i.e. 1) Medical facilities – another surgery, more doctors, (we already have to wait for appointments!) nurses, dentists, opticians, chiropodists 2) Transport improvements 3) Extra police 4) Extra shops, larger post office and library 5) Leisure facilities – especially swimming pool 6) Elderly retirement homes			1053
515287	Mr L Jackson		CSO16 687	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
515354	Mr Walker		CSO16 714	Option VWM 3	Object		I object very strongly to any further development in Verwood, especially of the size that has been proposed. Green belt land in this overcrowded island of ours is precious and should not be encroached upon by yet more homes. Verwood has more than played its part over the past 20 years in providing extra housing. I do not think the infrastructure will take the strain.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
515367	Mr & Mrs J Pottinger		CSO16 811	Option VWM 3	Object		Please save the Green Belt			1053
515786	Mrs A M Bright		CSO16 828	Option VWM 3	Support		As a recent inhabitant of Verwood I am happy to support plans which will enable others to move to a town I have grown to love. It would be selfish to try to keep the town just for those of us already here. However I do not support the large development as I see the influx of over 2000 people creating a number of problems. Large developments seldom encourage community spirit and many house buyers are reluctant to purchase on an estate with large proportion of social housing. We do not need more empty properties. I am also concerned that without improvement to our infrastructure (more schools, shops, etc) Verwood may become ever more of a dormitory town.			1053
516343	Mrs J Stebbings		CSO16 954	Option VWM 3		General Comment	My concern is that a full infrastructure be in place to cope with the extra pressure on amenities, in particular doctors/dentists surgery Transport Employment opportunities Facilities for young people Taking into consideration population growth in the whole areas in the scheme extra pressure on hospitals-already under strain.			1053
517572	Mr D Alexander		CSO17 001	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
517717	Mr Frederick Thorne		CSO17 123	Option VWM 3	Object		General Comments Verwood has grown by 500% in the last 20 years. During this time very little has been done to improve the infrastructure to support all this development. Much of the character of this former village (now town) has already been destroyed. We have a duty to protect what remains. The green belt, areas of special scientific interest and areas of 'special character' (in the proposed South Verwood Development area) have so far survived. The proposed development in this very special part of South Verwood would be on greenbelt land and run close			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>to the river Crane (a triple SSSI). this must not be allowed. The residents of Verwood and EDDC have in my opinion a duty to protect this area and our heritage.</p> <p>Transport Issues Increase in traffic. The current infrastructure/roads in Verwood are already inadequate. The West Moors bypass originally planned to ease traffic problems in Verwood following previous developments was scrapped in favour of new homes. No doubt this would give more revenue to EDDC than any bypass!!!! What I want to know is when are you going to give something back to Verwood???? how do you propose to deal with the increase in traffic and the problems this will cause if these developments do go ahead? Potential increased risk of flooding and drainage problems. How would any new developments be drained?? I understand the river Crane is a triple SSI so I assume water will not be drained there? I also understand that according to Councillor Flower the drains in Manor Road are 'not fit for purpose' and already 'full to capacity'. I therefore assume water can not be drained there either? People have shown me photos of flooded fields in the Verwood South Area that would serve the Manor Road development. I know the water levels are high in parts of St Michaels Road and peoples gardens are already waterlogged during winter months. Surely further development of land in this area can only make things worse. You only have to look at what happened to the listed cottage in Burnbake Road following land development in the area. the cottage and grounds were so damaged the cottage had to be pulled down!! Do you want this to happen to St Michaels Cottage (also listed) as well??? Increase in development means increase in surface water. Are you prepared to take the risk and increase flooding in the Verwood South Area? Are you prepared to be accountable for your actions and responsible for any damage you cause to privately owned property????</p> <p>Encroachment on Green Belt I have lived in St Michaels Road for 56 years. I understand that land beyond Howe Lane is and always has been green belt. This area must be protected for our future heritage. St Michaels Road and part of Manor Road are areas of 'special</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>character'. This is confirmed in the Council Plan (2004). What will happen to wild life that depends on areas like this? This area will be destroyed if this development goes ahead.</p> <p>In the 56 years I have resided in St Michaels Road I have seen much change. This change has not been for the better. I feel privileged to have lived where I do. I witness and watch wildlife that depends on this area for its survival. I have badgers who frequent my back garden and I spend hours there watching the nuthatch and long tailed tits feeding in the bushes. We have woodpeckers, chaffinch, green finch and robins are always present. Then there are the butterflies in the summer and the hedgehogs hibernating in the winter. This area is so special.</p> <p>I am now 86 years old now so your proposed development, if approved may not be witnessed by me. I do however feel the need to strongly verbalise my concern about what in my opinion would be total destruction of this peaceful, quiet and very special part of Verwood. The area is a haven for wildlife. What will happen to them?</p> <p>Ten years ago Verwood was described as the most rapidly developed town in Europe. We have had enough now. If this council is so concerned with providing affordable housing why did it sell land adjacent to the hub to a developer who I understand will not be providing affordable housing? There is plenty of brown belt land around Verwood that could be used. I understand that during a recent Dorset study, the majority of survey respondents said they were against housing construction in the countryside, yet the report's conclusion was in favour of development?! I would ask EDDC what evidence they have that suggests there is a 'need' for housing in this area? If the evidence for housing need is bogus, as has been suggested to me, and if the wishes of the local community are being ignored, surely there is no justification for building on otherwise protected land in the open countryside?</p>			
517818	LT. CDR R Bennett RNR RETD.		CSO17233	Option VWM 3	Support		<p>The ratio of affordable homes is a major concern 400 extra dwellings will put further overload onto public services including sewage and drain systems.</p> <p>This number of dwellings will introduce at least an extra 1000</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							people + around 600 cars to the area. All this when we have virtually lost our fire service and police station Edmondsham Road still has no lighting, no footpath and no drains, how's that for progress.			
517935	J H Stacey		CSO17 264	Option VWM 3	Object		As an extension to the schooling area - in effect - and on condition that a new secondary school is built so as to integrate the education of Verwood's children, I support it. Comment: before any further housing is added to the Verwood area at all, major attention must be given to all the services - ie it must be ensures that the main utilities, namely electricity, gas, water and telephone have sufficient capacity to serve the extra number of dwellings. The roadways which will serve the new residential areas will have to be upgraded for the increase in traffic. The sewage and stormwater systems will also have to be upgraded to cope with the extra volume that will be created by the new dwellings. It is well-known that the system can only just handle the current volume now, and tends to be blocked from time to time by thoughtless and/or uncaring householders and businesses discharging inappropriate materials into the system. Unless the above infrastructure improvements are implemented I cannot support any of the above options, notwithstanding support given in the first two paragraphs. I have lived in Verwood since 1982 as a householder and thus a ratpayer/council-tax payer, and therefore trust that the views expressed in this document will be respected. I should also add that my wife is in agreement with the above views.			1053
518009	Mr D Heather		CSO17 280	Option VWM 3	Object		We wish to express our concerns about the proposed developments in Verwood. Change of Character to road and area. In the East Dorset Local Plan (2004) Manor Road and St Michaels Road are designated 'Special Character Areas'/ The plan points out that existing development should not be disrupted by new building and that new development will often result in the loss of mature trees, hedges, and other vegetation, as well as damaging the look and character of the area. In addition the woodland at Heathy How has been			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>designated by EDDC as an area of 'Great landscape Value'. this would be destroyed by new housing development.</p> <p>Increased traffic</p> <p>The 2010 Consultative Document shows potential new housing development on both sides of St Michaels Road, a single width bridleway, which could not be widened due to existing houses, one a listed building. Should these new houses be built it could bring potentially 300 additional cars to the vicinity, adding to the existing traffic in the area.</p> <p>The junctions with Howe Lane and Manor Road are extremely dangerous, both having restricted views for drivers turning into St Michaels Road. There have been many 'near misses' and the potential for further accidents would be greatly increased.</p> <p>Drainage and flooding problems</p> <p>The area has a propensity to flood and residents have reported that gardens are boggy or under water a good part of the year. We understand that several times in the last few winters St Michaels Road has flooded right across to a depth of at least 40cm just south of the river Crane. St Michaels Road, at the Manor Road end, has substantial pools of water for most of the year. Existing ditches are necessary to take the surplus water from the road, but are at many times full to capacity and overflowing. Persistent problems with flooding and drainage have been reported to EDDC and Wessex Water on numerous occasions. In addition, it should be noted that Manor Road floods regularly throughout the winter, with water running off the fields on which it is proposed to build 165 houses. Development on this site would likely lead to further flooding problems in the area.</p> <p>Infrastructure</p> <p>We are concerned about the lack of infrastructure, which would be compounded by further housing development on this site. The additional traffic from the new development along St Michaels Road would greatly change the whole character of the area.</p> <p>Green Belt</p> <p>The proposed development between St Michaels Road and Manor Road would be built on existing Green Belt land. This would potentially bring disruption of the headgerows and the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							SSSI at the River Crane, together with the adjacent Heathy How woodland, areas noted as important sites for a wide range of plants and animals. A proposed benefit given to residents in the Strategy Document cites access to circular walks through Heathy How, which would not be achievable as it is privately owned. We strongly object to the proposals under VWM3 and VWM4 as we believe it to be an entirely inappropriate housing development in an environmentally important part of an existing green belt.			
518035	Mr Peter Pugh		CSO17 285	Option VWM 3	Object		In my opinion Verwood is lacking the facilities to accommodate more homes and the pressure on services is too much the service must deteriorate!! The main roads are being overwhelmed now without more cars being added. Most of the land is low lying or subject to flooding which is why it should stay greenbelt. This town/village has doubled in the last ten years (approx) enough is enough!			1053
518041	D Bury		CSO17 283	Option VWM 3	Object		The reasons for my objections are: 1. No clearly defined access to the sites. 2. These sites are situated in a flood zone and further building work would make an existing problem worse. 3. Intrusion of the countryside and wildlife. 4. We are in a 'Special Character Area' and it should be preserved. 5. Large increase in traffic. 6. Excessive noise from school in a primarily retirement area. Reference is made to the East Dorset Local Plan, Chapter 13, adopted 11 Jan 2002, page 213, 13.00, Policy V26. Manor Lane and St. Michaels Road will be CLOSED at their junctions with the B3072 Manor Road, turning facilities will be provided. In each case the road will remain open to pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists. We moved into our property on the 28th June 2004 our rear access backs onto St. Michaels Road, we are still waiting for this road to be CLOSED and would expect the Council to honour their existing commitments before other badly thought			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							out schemes.			
518058	Mr and Mrs Glendinning		CSO17 297	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>This is just to express a letter of concern and objection to the proposed options for the Verwood area. As you can see from my address this concern is justified.</p> <p>My main issues are the lack of facilities to support such over concentrated proposals, there is already a two week waiting list to get an appointment with the only doctors surgery nearby to Eastworth Road. I doubt if local schools could cope with such an influx and as for local shops and amenities this is just a joke.</p> <p>If you want a hairdo or buy a house or tv - fine! Try to buy anything to wear, no chance, not even a pair of knickers. Even the two small supermarkets run out of essentials, especially at weekends.</p> <p>What are younger people going to do here? As far as I am aware there isn't even a table-tennis table they could use. This would mean parents having to transport them everywhere by car by putting more traffic and pollution on the roads.</p> <p>On the subject of environmental issues, what about the desecration of such a lovely part of the Green Belt land, not to mention all the indigneous wildlife it supports. As for building on arable land this is surely unacceptable , when we are trying to decrease the amount of imported food into this country.</p> <p>The other worrying fact is what is 'affordable' housing? Whilst I agree with the admirable sentiment that we should help local people who are working and providing a service and contributing to the economy of the town, how is this going to be controlled, monitored and decided?</p> <p>Please register our concerns and objections.</p>			1053
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 501	Option VWM 3		General Comment	This site lies adjacent to a tributary of the Crane, which would require buffering and provision of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems as for VWM 1.			1053
359477	Ms Natasha	Clerk Ellingham,	CSO17 711	Option VWM 3	Object	General Comment	In reality, however, the 2001 Census advised a working population of 5000 in Verwood, of which 1/3rd worked locally			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Mackenzie	Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council					<p>and 2/3rd commuted out. The working population is estimated to have increased to 6.500 today. There is a significant disconnect in looking to alleviate an already over stretched road network identifying further housing provision in the town, but nearest additional employment opportunity in St Leonards and Ferndown. Until a new secondary school is built in Verwood any new housing will also mean even more journeys to Ferndown and Wimborne.</p> <p>The proposed additional housing and employment areas will therefore only increase the traffic problems at Ringwood and thus on the roads in our Parish, especially on the B3081, A338 and Linwood Road if the A31 is blocked. The junction at Bakers Hanging will also become even more saturated. The Parish Council agree that these developments should only go ahead if road improvements at Bakers Hanging and the junction of the A338 and A31 are carried out.</p>			
359478	Mr Rohan TORKILDS EN	West Territory Planner English Heritage	CSO18 553	Option VWM 3	Support		<p>We acknowledge an appreciation of the importance of ensuring any development within proximity of Oak Tree Cottage (a grade II listed building) conserves its historic significance. The principle of development must be predicated on the basis that this is achievable.</p>			1053
359547	Mrs V BRIGHT	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17 950	Option VWM 3	Support	General Comment	<p>We realise that there has been a rapid growth of population locally in recent years but that with it we have seen a reduced number of young adults in the 20-40 age group compared to the number of older working residents, retired elderly and children. There was also little forethought put in place by EDDC to improve infrastructure and amenities when the new developments were built over the last 10 years, resulting in a rapid expansion of footfall, traffic and pollution and bolt-on solutions to try and remedy problems that ensued later. The rise in house prices has outstripped wage levels, due to high demand coupled with the development of 3-4 bedroomed houses, which local people, on local salaries, could not afford. In fact, there are virtually no starter homes, and only a small amount of 2 bedroomed houses have been built over the last decade. If this trend is allowed to continue the District Council is faced with the difficult task of providing a range of</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>houses to include affordable homes, both to retain the workforce and to reduce the existing long waiting lists. It is important that any affordable homes built should be for local people, and not made available for people living outside East Dorset.</p> <p>The proposed sites immediately adjoining the existing urban area are not prime agricultural land and in planning terms can be construed as suitable for development. Whilst we understand and could support the proposals, we must stress that any development would require improvements in the infrastructure which should be in place before any houses are built, or at least alongside with the construction and before occupation. Therefore, when the statutory core strategy is prepared we feel it is important that timescales are included within the document which sets out not only the timings of the programme of works, but should include details and timings of the infrastructure proposed, which should complement the works programme.</p> <p>If we are to support the individual sites, both on housing need and the provision of open space not currently available, we would require more infrastructure and environmental improvements. All sites need to be surveyed for archaeological deposits and all require new access roads.</p> <p>Tree lines should be respected and two sites to the south of Verwood are close to the flood plain or watercourse. We would like EDDC to confirm that, due to the ecology and rich biodiversity of both sites, that at least a one year cyclical survey is conducted by EDDC to cover the 4 seasons, these surveys to be conducted under the statutory requirements of Natural England, the Environment Agency, and other relevant bodies, both UK and EU, the results of these surveys to be made available for inspection.</p>			
359552	Ms J WEEDON	Clerk West Moors Parish Council	CSO17911	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
359891	Mrs Susanne Parkin		CSO18353	Option VWM 3	Support					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359894	Mr D.S Medlycott		CSO17 553	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>Parking problems - Public car park surgery Station Road When planning permission was granted for the Hub it was stated the overflow car park was the public car park adjacent to Verwood Surgery. Likewise the same was said again when planning permission was granted for The Herons when only 1 space per flat was allowed. Again when approval was granted for the proposed 29 flats (rear of the Police Station) with only 1 parking space per flat allocated it was stated that any additional vehicle overflow could use the above public car park.</p> <p>These planning applications were all dealt with individually without any thought to the combined collective consequences of the pressures it would place on the above car park. At the present moment there are constantly days when patients of the Verwood Surgery (including disabled) are unable to find a parking space and in addition staff at the surgery have also been unable to find a space in the staff car park</p> <p>The Practice Manager at the Surgery will confirm this as they have received many complaints from patients.</p> <p>The problem will be acute during the building of the 29 flats and will be exacerbated if the proposed 230 homes at the land west of Trinity School and land west of Eastworth Road went ahead.</p> <p>The reality is that the majority of people will not walk into town from these sites and in fact the elderly or disabled will be unable to do so.</p> <p>The idea that people will be discouraged from using their cars if no parking provision is made whilst laudable is totally unrealistic.</p> <p>Recently the paved footway area outside the surgery has had to be re-laid and bollards have been erected to prevent vehicles driving up to the surgery door and also to prevent parking on the paved footway by those vehicles unable to find a parking space.</p> <p>In addition to all the problems outlined above people do park their vehicles there all day and catch the bus to Bournemouth or Poole using their free bus passes.</p> <p>Traffic B3081 Dorset County Council Traffic Counts undertaken in 1989,</p>	<p>I suggest</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Adequate parking provision is provided at new developments for both residents and visitors as often minimum requirements are insufficient. 2) Use of the Hub car park during daylight hours for additional public parking. 3) Notice in the Public Car Park to be erected saying "parking limited to two hours 7am - 7pm. Alternative parking available at Potters Wheel Car Park". No parking charges to be applied. <p>Transport</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) An east-west bypass be included in the Core Strategy (this was on the agenda 20 years ago when traffic flow was significantly lower) 2) The town centre to be pedestrianised vehicular traffic only for access, parking and deliveries. 3) consideration of one way system for through traffic. 4) alternative bypass routes using existing road infrastructure. On the 14th November 2010 during the remembrance service at Ferret Green all through traffic was diverted away from the town centre for some 30 minutes. This shows that other than building a new east-west bypass traffic could be diverted using Home Farm Road/Manor 		1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>1997, 2004 and 2007 show that there has been a hugely significant increase in traffic flow of 101% on 12 hour flow and 97% on 24 hour flow 7 day average. (Traffic is substantially lower on Sunday and therefore weekday figures will be in excess of the percentages stated above). Year Increase 12 hours 24 hours Increase 1989 3938 4670 1997 5368 6309 2004 40% 5505 6529 40% 2007 101% 7915 9181 97% 2007 8567 9895 5 day average Up to 2004 there was a 40% increase in traffic flow which at that time Mr Paul Willis (DCC Group Policy Planning Manager) considered to be highly significant. As shown above that percentage increase has now risen from 40% to 97% and 101% in the space of three years from 2004 to 2007. I would regard this as hugely significant. There are no figures available for 2010 but I would suggest that since 2007 there has been a further substantial increase in traffic flow, one of the factors being the use of Sat Nav's which has increased both HGV and cars using the B3081 through Verwood to get to places further afield. This increase in traffic has a detrimental effect on the town centre by way of Noise, Pollution, Vibration, Road Safety and Environmental Concerns. Traffic will increase further in the coming years and could even double by 2027 particularly if there is further housing development in Verwood and this increased traffic flow will have serious consequences for the town centre. In looking forward to 2027 and a Town Centre 'Fit for the Future' with an increasing elderly population it is essential that other options are considered.</p> <p>Housing I consider there is a need for more affordable housing for the Verwood Area, with a mix of 2/3 bed semi detached and terraced houses with adequate provision for off road parking and/or garages. However, unless the infrastructure is put in place in the first instance and the problems I have outlined earlier relating to the Town Centre and parking are resolved I cannot support</p>	<p>Road/Burnbake Road/Blackhill Road or Vicarage Road/Home Farm Road. 5) Traffic calming measures or reduced carriageway or speed humps should be avoided due to emergence services in Station Road (eg Police, Fire Ambulances re Verwood Surgery) and the environmental impact on the town centre. The slower the traffic the greater the pollution and congestion. It is also well documented that speed humps damage vehicles (types, wheel joints etc thus creating road safety concerns), adversely affect disabled drivers/passengers and created vibration damage to the immediate surrounding area. 6) A large retail store such as Wilkinson's should be encouraged to come to Verwood and also a traditional restaurant for midday and evening meals.</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							the present proposals.			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 753	Option VWM 3	Support		As in the case of the other potential urban extensions, the Agency supports the development of the evidence base to inform any strategic growth retained in the Verwood and West Moors area, notably the use of SEDMMTS. Given the very high level of car dependency evident at Verwood and the direct link between the town and the A31 east of Ashley, the area of search south of Verwood (Options VWM3 and VWM4) is likely to be of greater concern to the Agency compared to areas north of the town (Options VWM1 and VWM2).			1053
478398	Mrs Diana Saville		CSO17 688	Option VWM 3	Object		I strongly object to building houses on green belt. The green belt is there for a reason, to protect the countryside. Verwood does not have the infrastructure to cope with more development. In particular the roads cannot cope with more traffic. Most people work and do shopping outside Verwood. More houses would just create a bigger dormitory town.			1053
515763	Mr V S Harris		CSO17 795	Option VWM 3	Object		The growth of Verwood is beyond sensible limits and there is a strong need for all facilities to catch up with the current population. The development of green belt is totally unacceptable, brown field sites abound in the area and any new development must be restricted to these whatever the additional costs.	Scrub it!!		1053
518073	Mrs S Williams		CSO17 310	Option VWM 3	Object		Several of the areas are on green belt. It is against the planning guidance to build on green belt and so I think these options should be declined. The land affected is beautiful and the building will totally spoil these areas. It will also create a precedence that will be used in the future. This affects VWM1, VWM2, VWM4 I think. The building is too near protected heathland and woodland. VWM1 and VWM2 are too near Ringwood Forset. VWM3 and VWM4 are too near Heathy How which is a beautiful wood and I think has an SSI order on it. Even if areas for sport are provided as part of the developments you will not be able to stop people using the heathland/woodland areas and people's pets will damage/kill the wildlife. This building would be against the national guidelines on building near protected areas.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>There are currently not enough facilities to support the present population of Verwood. We do not have things that people living in much smaller settlements take for granted, eg allotments. In the 10 year plan produced shortly after we moved to Verwood in 1989 there was a leisure centre with a swimming pool and that has still not been built - in fact its not even in the plans now. You are now talking about building on the land put aside for this - VWM3. For this reason I'm against VWM3, but also I think you need to sort the facilities out for the current population and not add to the problems by building more houses - so I'm against all the other options on this basis.</p> <p>Like many people we moved to Verwood as it was a village, with plans to increase to a small town. Further large scale building work is going to harm that feel and make it into a large conurbation. This will detract from the quality of life in Verwood. Over the last 20 years there has been a massive amount of building work here and lots of new houses. Verwood has done its bit to provide extra houses for East Dorset and I think its someone else's turn now. The people need some time to settle and grow into a community without the dsirruption of having further large-scale additions to the population.</p>			
518095	Mrs M R Owen		CSO17 315	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>I am objecting to the listed developments because of my concerns over land and mains drainage. Also there is no information on access to the proposed new school and also the proposed closure of Verwood police station as reported in the daily echo. There are not enough facilities for heath care i.e. doctors, dentists for existing population as things are now never mind another 400+ houses.</p>			1053
518105	John Maskell		CSO17 321	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>I have read the Core Strategy Options document issued for voluntary consultations and object to the construction of a further 415 homes in Verwood as described in VWM 1 - 4 inclusive.</p> <p>Verwood has suffered from massive and uncontrolled expansion for many years and we are left with a 'messy' town with no single centre and a series of other problems relating to infrastructure, highways, shopping facilities, folding, drainage</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>systems and lack of acceptable recreational facilities. Most residents have to use cars just for the basic essentials such as food, employment, recreational facilities with round trips being at least 10 and in most cases more like 20 or more miles. The Verwood 'carbon footprint' is enormous and these proposals will only make it worse.</p> <p>We really do need substantial improvements to correct the existing problems that exist in Verwood today before we should even think about more housing. For example we need to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Improve the highways including the B3081 through the town, Manor Road from Vicarage Road junction to Newtown Road junction, construct the Springfield Distributor Road and provide adequate crossing facilities in sufficient quantities on these roads to allow safe crossing locations. -The Sewage systems are running at full capacity and need substantial improvements. -We need more adequate leisure centre facilities. - We need more retail outlets to reduce the need to car travel. -As the second largest town in Dorset we do not have a senior school (the proposal to build one on the site adjacent to Emanuel School is not feasible). -We need time to consolidate before more homes are built. <p>I understand that previous plans/strategies stated that Verwood could stand more housing developments when the West Moors bypass was constructed. Since this major road improvement scheme has now been abandoned perhaps it would be a good idea to abandon additional homes.</p> <p>A major concern is the erosion of further green belt land on the outskirts of the town and the resultant loss of amenity, wildlife and natural habitat.</p> <p>We have reduced the green areas within the existing town boundaries to a couple of reasonable size areas in the Recreation Ground and Bugdens Copse and now you want to re-align the protected green belt areas so we can build more homes and lose more green space. This is totally unacceptable; the green belt has been protected all these years to prevent urban crawl which is what you are now proposing to do. OK if the District Council does implement these proposals and we lose the areas of green belt what is</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>to stop the next landowner from offering his land for development, are we to expect houses all over what is now Verwood Manor Farm. Before long Verwood will join Three Legged Cross, which will join West Moors, Which will join Ferndown and so on until we in Verwood become part of the Bournemouth/Poole Urban Conurbation.</p> <p>All of the proposed future development is very close to the protected Dorset heathland and to the established Sites of Special Scientific Interest, including the River Crane Valley. I strongly urge the District Council not to proceed with the proposals under VWM 1 - 4.</p> <p>To conclude I think it is time for Verwood to be left to consolidate as we are managing improvements as we can as money becomes available.</p> <p>Improvements provided they are the right improvements, generated by the Morrison's expansion are welcome and should be encouraged.</p> <p>The other towns in East Dorset may think too much investment has been made in Verwood but Ferndown, Wimborne, Christchurch and the like have not expanded at the same rate as Verwood and have not been left in such a mess either.</p> <p>I have been a resident in Verwood since 1986 and have seen most of the rapid expansion and along with a large number of others have sat back and done nothing about it. The Verwood apathy is no more, please listen to what we have to say. I appreciate some of it will be highly emotive, probably vitriolic and some downright rude but amongst all of it there will be a great deal of sense and constructive comments. Please Listen!</p>			
518195	Mr M Willcocks		CSO17 337	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>I wish to make the following comments regarding the proposals set out for Verwood:</p> <p>1. Verwood has already experienced a period of very rapid housing growth and development in recent years. I understand that Verwood now has a population of around 14,000 people and like myself, many residents believe that the town developed on a piecemeal basis such that we now suffer from many problems through lack of careful planning and development in recent times. My wife and I moved to</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Verwood in 2002 by which time the majority of rapid housing growth had already taken place. However, since 2002, housing expansion has still continued at a pace with two significant flat developments on Home Farm Road, a new Care Home on Station Road, a new block of flats at the junction of Station Road/Black Hill, a pocket of new houses close to the Cemetery, and recently there has been planning approval for 26 Flats behind the Police Station.</p> <p>2. TRANSPORTATION Links to Verwood are already up to capacity especially the main roads to Ringwood (B3081) and Three Legged Cross/West Moors (B3072). Verwood is very much a commuter town and a lot of the population works outside Verwood in places like Southampton, Bournemouth and Poole. So the main roads to and from Verwood already carry a high volume of traffic on a daily basis. There is a particular 'bottleneck' along the Ringwood Road at the 'Tesco Express' where parking of cars along the main road has led to a situation where cars cannot travel in opposite directions at the same time, thereby causing tailbacks on both sides of the road. The B3081 already suffers from the heavy lorry use to and from Bluehaze landfill site, as well as the significant car traffic to the Somerlees domestic waste site. Because of these waste sites, the number of heavy lorries travelling through the centre into Verwood (coming from the West Moors and Cranborne directions) has also increased in recent times adding to the heavy road usage.</p> <p>3. SCHOOL/HEALTHCARE/EMERGENCY SERVICES The already rapid population expansion has led to our Verwood infant/junior schools being at risk of running at beyond their current capacity. I understand there is very little, if any, spare capacity to cope with significant population growth. I am aware that the emergency services, especially the ambulance service are already struggling to deal with the level of emergency calls they already have to deal with. We already have a considerable number of residents who are elderly and this adds pressure to the problem. Then of course there is the question as to whether the current medical practices could handle a greater number of patients.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>The Medical Practice that I belong to already seems to be extremely busy.</p> <p>4. SHOPS Complaints about the lack of shops in Verwood has been an issue for several years now, and further population growth will only serve to exacerbate this ongoing problem.</p> <p>5. In summary, it is highly questionable whether Verwood is able to absorb the high level of new housing proposed, firstly because after such a rapid expansion in recent years, it now needs time to mature as a town. Secondly, there are strong questions about whether the transport links, schools, emergency and medical services could cope with such expansion. And finally, I believe a strategy based upon such a high proportion of affordable housing in a town where plentiful employment opportunities are not available or even within a short travel distance will ultimately fail the constituents of Verwood.</p> <p>I should be grateful if you could give consideration to these comments.</p>			
518281	Adrian Palmer	Clerk to Governors Emmanuel Middle School	CSO17 349	Option VWM 3		General Comment	<p>I have been asked to send you the following extract from the minutes of our Full Governing Body Meeting on Tuesday 11th January 2011.</p> <p>"JW (Headteacher) explained the potential implications for EMS should additional housing be approved. Already the school hall is too small for our purposes. Also we do not have any spare classrooms, so any additional pupils would mean additional buildings for new classrooms."</p>			1053
518303	Mr P R Owen		CSO17 355	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>Nothing in the plan about access to the school. Also concerns about land surface water drainage with ref to Howe Lane site (V3) also main drainage.</p> <p>With reference to Burnbake Road. Some years ago when a development behind Elmtree cottage caused surface water to engulf the site and the cottage had to be demolished. As I am sure you can remember this would be a problem for VWM 3 and 4 sites.</p>			1053
518433	Chris Holmes		CSO17 364	Option VWM 3	Support		<p>Thank you for the chance to comment. I feel that your plans include too many social houses, your plans have much detail</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							but why the disproportionate number of low cost houses. In all cases you are looking for 50%, which is just too many. Because of this I object to your plan. Additionally the link between the new school and the new houses is not wholly clear, but you are trying to make that link, perhaps to gain extra support for this biased proposal.			
518812	Mrs L Munn		CSO17 387	Option VWM 3	Object		With a population already larger than the county town, I feel Verwood has reached its optimum number of inhabitants. We are in danger of creating a dormitory living space with an increasing lack of community input: evidence the apathy with which the vastly ever expensive hub has been received. Stop now before we reach the point where Verwood is a soul-less place to live.			1053
518882	Mrs Doreen Knowlden		CSO17 401	Option VWM 3	Object		VWM 3 and 4 will both create traffic problems for Howe Lane and area especially if school located in VWM 7, better location would be VWM 4. We also have a very ill though out road system already in place!			1053
518895	Mr Mark Gifford		CSO17 410	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
518905	Mrs Burbidge		CSO17 418	Option VWM 3	Object		Over the last 30 years Verwood has expanded hugely, facilities have not increased, with intention to provide more affordable homes, hence families, surely have a plan to incorporate a indoor recreational facility aimed at the youth, with a refreshment area, affordable for youths, the hub is only ok for older people which is why hundreds of kids congregate at the park opposite Tesco express Verwood in winter + summer. Come on council think again wisely!			1053
519265	Mrs Pat Morrow		CSO17 430	Option VWM 3	Support		I am in favour, in principal, of the proposed developments provided that: 1) The infrastructure needed is in place before building. 2) That the transport situation is improved. 3) That parking in the town centre is reversed and all day parking is prohibited. The development of a park and ride system could be available for those wishing to use free bus passes – A Blake a possibility.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							4) That facilities – doctors, dentists, shops (not estate agents) land uses – are affordable.			
519368	Mr Frederick Iley		CSO17 436	Option VWM 3	Object		Road Structure will not take any more traffic. Single lane roads at school time will only take a car width and then with difficulty.			1053
519400	Mrs Bailey		CSO17 527	Option VWM 3	Object		I moved to Verwood 23 years ago. Now everywhere is packed solid with shoppers at the only supermarket, upto 5 years ago you could get a doctor's appointment within a day, now because of the already great volume of people it's a week or more. The roads are full opposite my house, the evenings and weekends "Close" is like a parking lot only one garage for petrol unless you can get in Ringwood or Wimborne. No Verwood cannot cope now, so no more buildings please.			1053
519890	Mrs Christine Iley		CSO17 614	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 580	Option VWM 3		General Comment	<p>Chapter 11 - Verwood and West Moors</p> <p>Our main concern regarding development area is foul drainage and the capacity of Palmerford Sewage Treatment Works (STW). This is discussed below.</p> <p>All options</p> <p>Foul Drainage</p> <p>The effluent capacity at Palmersford STW is currently unknown. This is particularly relevant because development in Verwood is believed to connect to this STW, and this settlement is part of the Core Strategy. The capacity of Palmersford STW and associated infrastructure must be established as part of the Core Strategy evidence.</p> <p>Overall issues for consideration are: surface water drainage; SUDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
520657	Miss Claire Gibbins		CSO17 632	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
520671	P Hancy		CSO17 655	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
520737	S New		CSO17 669	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
520927	Ms I Jenson		CSO17 680	Option VWM 3	Object		I like most residents in Verwood object because we have not got the doc, dentist, schools, shops, bus service, roads for all the cars ext ext. The old people have to go out of Verwood to get cloths ext. We already have a building going up, on the Ringwood road site, no one wanted, did anyone do anything to stop it for Verwood nd Bristol went ahead. Would they like to live by it I don't think so.			1053
520965	Mrs J Lake		CSO17 693	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul Timberlake		CSO18 028	Option VWM 3		No Opinion	SUMMARY: VWM3 SOUTH OF HOWE LANE (30) This site is a 'least worst option' providing it achieves a 40% target of affordable housing. Any less and we would object to this site. However, as we were unable to access or even see the site we are unable to either support or object to it. It should have little visible impact, though it will impact on the environment as to the south of this site is the River Crane SSSI. It could also cause traffic congestion. This would not just be on local traffic but on the wider East Dorset traffic problems. If car journeys were not reduced it would have the potential to add 45 cars on the road. This is a conservative estimate of 1 ½ cars per household. Only 'B' and 'C' roads link Verwood to the main industrial and service centres. There is no access in the evenings to entertainment centres for Verwood's youth. This has the potential to lead to anti-social behaviour unless informal facilities are provided in Verwood.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>PURPOSES OF THE GREENBELT PPG2 (as applicable to this site) None of the purposes of the Green belt apply to this site. It is hidden from view by houses on two sides of it, a school on the other, and no access from Heathy How.</p> <p>VISUAL IMPACT ON BOTH THE NATURAL AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPE It was impossible to see into this site so there was no way of judging any impact it may have. Access was via Summerfields, a small estate of large detached houses. We felt this access was unsuitable both for cars and in particular for the emergency services. The GI access was from Howe Lane, but this was unsuitable for vehicular access due to some lovely mature oak trees. Therefore, although there could be little visual impact from some more housing, there were problems with the site.</p> <p>SUSTAINABLE LOCATION PPS1 Location Primary Schools Middle and Upper Daily shopping Post Office Doctors South of Howe Lane adjacent Adjacent – M Upper - FD 1.2km to Morr 1.7km to town 1.7km ???</p> <p>The school system in Verwood is very complex. There is a mixture of both the 2-tier and 3-tier system which has led to a great number of different schools. For this reason the stats are unsound. Some children go to school in Cranborne and these generally move onto Wimborne as an upper school (not Ferndown). Others go to Ringwood to senior school as it has a 2 tier system. Until this system has been resolved, it is likely that this will lead to more car journeys making the potential housing sites less sustainable.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>EMPLOYMENT 3.3km to Ebblake Industrial Estate. It would be necessary to use a car for all other employment centres in East Dorset. Commuting Figures for Verwood. Source: 2001 Census Internal Commuters ... 1648 In Commuters1558 Out Commuters3331 Total commuters (in and out)....4889 90% of commuting is by car or as a passenger (Core Strategy)</p> <p>PUBLIC TRANSPORT The number 36, Verwood to Bournemouth bus. Hourly during the middle of the day, 3 buses before 9am on school days. These do not run when the school is closed. Last bus from Bournemouth leaves at 18.20 hours. Journey times: 45 mins to Bournemouth (from Manor Rd) The number 37, Verwood to Poole, runs hourly, it takes 1 ¼ hours to get to Poole. Last bus from Poole is at 17.50 hours. Journey times: 40 mins to FD and 1 hour 5 mins to Poole (from Manor Rd) No trains There is no access to Bournemouth or Poole in the evenings by public transport, therefor this restricts the recreational activities of the younger population</p> <p>NEAREST CENTRE WITH FULL RANGE OF SERVICES Ringwood, Ferndown or Wimborne. There is an hourly service to Ringwood and Ferndown. It is more likely the private car would be the chosen form of transport.</p> <p>PROVISION OF MULTI-FUNCTIONAL GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND OPEN SPACES: (Natural England's Green Infrastructure Guidance NE176 & PPG17 Planning for Open Spaces GI would need to be provided to open spaces as the site is too small to provide it's own. It is next to Heathy Howe so access to this would be a favourite option. It is also fairly close to the Crane and a lovely lake, though this area seems to be controlled by an angling club that restricts access. The Crane SSSI will have to be protected, but access to Heathy Howe that then led onto a path/track by the Crane and around the lake, possible access to Potterne Park and on into</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Moors Valley/Ringwood Forest would be ideal. Access would, of course, be restricted to normal weather conditions as the Crane would flood in prolonged periods of rain. The site would not need GI for urban cooling or drainage as it would be too small.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS: Our comments on environmental aspects of the Core Strategy Options document are included in the Response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Community Partnership, which we fully endorse.</p> <p>ECOSYSTEM DAMAGE: disturbance to flora and fauna This is a small open area which is built on three sides (as best as we could see), so it is bound to act as a safe haven for wild life. This would be lost.</p> <p>TRANQUILLITY: a sense of place The site is too small given its location to have a great deal of tranquillity. However, it would have acted as a buffer between the houses and Heathy How so there would be an effect.</p> <p>LIGHT POLLUTION Please see the ETAG Response and comments by Bob Mizon.</p> <p>DRAINAGE PPS25 (causing increase in river flooding or surface water problems) There should not be a problem as Heathy How is between this potential site and the Crane.</p> <p>PROXIMITY TO HEATHLAND AND AVAILABILITY OF SANGS FOR MITIGATION Mitigation will be required as it is close to heathlands. The proposed SANGS is close to an SSSI of the Crane, the site must avoid it.</p> <p>PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE (schools etc) In view of the size of Verwood, nearly 15,000 people, it seems there really is a need for a new Upper School to be built. A school here would relieve Ferndown who could then provide spare capacity to relieve the Wimborne Upper school. The Hub provides an excellent Community Centre and there is a Leisure Centre by Morrisons. The main criticism of Verwood is that it is so spread out with too many services and not enough retail. Another doctor's surgery would be required</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>if much development took place. Facilities would also be required for Verwood's youth as they have no access to Ringwood, Wimborne, Poole or Bournemouth in the evenings to visit places of entertainment.</p> <p>Parking in Verwood is an issue that needs resolving by providing more spaces. There are not enough car parks, the settlement sprawls over a large area, people are struggling to park at the shops and are being forced to go elsewhere. A survey needs to be done to check on the situation. There is also a suggestion that people are using the central parking to leave their cars, catch a bus using their bus passes, and so blocking shoppers spaces. Delivery vans also cause problems due to lack of space.</p> <p>IMPACT ON TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>There are very few jobs in Verwood so any potential development will put more cars on already overcrowded roads. The bus service is poor, there is very little employment accessible by alternate means of travel. The Edmondsham Road is a 'C' road without a speed limit so traffic calming would be required due to its proximity to Trinity School. Manor Road also winds and is busy with some very bad bends, the junction at Three Legged Cross would get more difficult. The road to Ringwood is a little better in size but we understand during wet weather it tends to suffer from surface water. There is no where in East Dorset you can build and not add to the congestion around the main employment centres. One of the problems with Verwood workers driving in the direction of Wimborne is that they use the Holt Road as a 'rat run'.</p> <p>East Dorset District Council has a target in the Transport Plan to introduce buses to take workers directly to industrial estates. This is an excellent idea. However, one such bus already exists, the number 29 from Bournemouth to Ferndown Industrial site. There are two early morning buses from Bournemouth, one leaving the estate at lunch time and two leaving in the evening. This service started in April 2010, without subsidies. The Yellow bus company confirmed that they do carry some regular passengers to and from the Industrial Estate. We suspect the buses are not that well used, one major problem influencing their use is the vast</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							areas of free parking available on Ferndown Industrial Estate. It may be that the 'stick and carrot' needs to be introduced to get people out of their cars and into a bus. If less parking existed there would be more room for new business. We noticed a large new factory down Brook Road had a vast new car park, when parking is free and easy no-one will catch a bus. Perhaps spaces should only be allocated if there are no other means of reasonable travel.			
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 719	Option VWM 3	Object		We agree with the findings of the HRA in connection with the proposed housing sites within these areas. Consequently, until such time as assessment of the potential impacts of the options on European sites is determined we object to the following policies:			1053
521457	Mr and Mrs M Daymond		CSO17 835	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>VWM 1-4 4 different sites of development means 4 different groups of residents affected by the development on Green Belt; hence the outcry locally. Small Sites (VWM 1 & VWM3) : Affordable Homes – does this mean Social Housing? We do not agree with having social housing on the small sites. Social housing downgrades the value of private property and makes them less desirable. With the other development sites being much larger, the proposed affordable homes for the small sites, should be transferred to the larger sites; if there are starter homes on the same site, it will be easy for social housing tenants to upgrade to 1st time buyer status on the same estate. (recent Government initiative) Density We note that the number of houses is given as “approx.”. This can only mean that the total number is likely to exceed that stated. Otherwise it would say “up to” x number of houses. THE CORE STRATEGY LITERATURE Each development is described as benefitting residents with “additional valuable green infrastructure and divert pressures away from heathlands”. This is nonsense!! The majority of residents who walk or ride bikes off road go to Moors Valley</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Country Park. Walkers have the vast Ringwood Forest and it is only ramblers and horse owners who use the heathland and it is the horses that churn up heathland. Any green infrastructure within a development just improves the local environment but also needs maintenance.			
522203	Mr Nigel Reeves		CSO18078	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>As a Verwood resident, please see below my response and comments relating to the Verwood Options in the Core Strategy Consultation document.</p> <p>I object to any further substantial housing increases in Verwood, specifically VWM 2 and VWM 4 in the document, for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - why is suddenly okay to build on green belt land? - as noted, there are significant Verwood public transport issues, and I see no information as to how this will be dramatically improved to encourage residents out of private transports (cars) - as reported, most residents use their cars to commute, so this will just increase this usage - I see all the surrounding traffic problem areas noted (Ashley Heath, Spur Road, A31 etc) but see nothing of how these significant problems will be resolved. <p>Why increase the population in a town already noted as being small for its population and in a location with no decent transportation infrastructure in place (as above), no shopping centre, and, despite what it states in the report, inadequate facilities in terms of what a town of this population should have. Yes, there is a supermarket, but there is no real shopping centre, few shops other than hairdressers and estate agents, only one restaurant, and inadequate facilities for young people as the report states (I know as I have 4 children).</p> <p>In summary, before any further increase in housing, properly address the transportation and facilities issues raised, not to mention comments from others on your "dorsetforyou" website and other websites, and then maybe consider more housing.</p> <p>Finally, inviting comments on your paper copy form from everyone on all of the options for each of the areas being considered simply turns it into a competition between each of</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>them to no real benefit, and with Verwood the obvious loser. By that I mean why should a resident of Wimborne or Corfe Mullen, for example, object to new housing in Verwood, especially if they think that it may obviate the need for housing in their own town. A Verwood resident is far more likely to be aware of increased traffic problems connected to any potential new housing in Wimborne, Corfe Mullen or Ferndown as they have to leave Verwood and possibly drive through these areas to reach a hospital or a shopping centre etc, whereas mostly residents of other towns would infrequently travel through or to Verwood.</p> <p>For the most part therefore, I don't think it is fair to comment on the potential options for the other towns except that the current transport infrastructure problems common to all of our areas must be resolved until any further substantial house building. No one seems to also bear in mind that this is a major tourist area and the traffic is hugely increased by visitors and holidaymakers for much of the year, and at certain times many of the roads almost grind to a halt, and in the case of a serious accident on any one of a number of routes, they do come to a halt. Personally I regularly drive to and through Wimborne and Corfe Mullen, and occasionally through Ferndown, and dread to think how the options of high numbers of new houses will worsen these often already slow and painful journeys.</p> <p>Please, therefore, first try to address the issues raised before major increases in house building.</p>			
522240	Association Verwood Residents	Chairman Association Verwood Residents	CSO18 098	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>5. THE PROPOSALS VWM 1 – 30 Homes – 12-15 affordable VWM 2 – 200 Homes – 80-100 affordable VWM – 20 Homes – 8-10 affordable VWM 4 – 165 Homes – 66-83 affordable Total – 415 Homes – 166-208 affordable These proposals are in essence simply going to exacerbate the problems and shortcomings outlined above in Paragraph 3.</p> <p>The Secretary of State for the Environment set out in the vision for the area to: "develop the region in a sustainable way,....., where the quality of life for residents,, the</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>business community and visitors will be maintained and enhanced". The Regional Planning Guidance for the region states: ".....minimise the need to develop on Greenfield sites and to travel" with the aims of protecting the environment and providing prosperity for communities.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how the proposed developments will support the above aims.</p> <p>Quality of life for residents would be decimated with loss of recreational land, increased traffic and associated pollution. This is in addition to the severe adverse impact on wildlife and SSSIs. The associated infrastructure within Verwood cannot sustain more housing development as there are limited employment opportunities within the town, particularly for executive roles. Therefore more housing will simply lead to a further loss of community identity and increased isolation for those living in Verwood.</p> <p>The fear is that the distinct and unique quality of Verwood and its environment would be further eroded by these developments. The EDDC plan states that "development in future should be based on the principles of sustainable development". How is it proposed this will be achieved? Developer and or the new "Homes Bonus" contributions will be totally insufficient to correct the existing shortcomings that have been endemic over the last 25 years.</p> <p>Previous strategies and plans indicated Verwood could accept more housing development only if the West Moors Bypass was completed. This major road improvement scheme has now been abandoned completely removing a main motivator for future housing development in Verwood.</p> <p>In short these proposals will further: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erode more protected GREEN BELT LAND • Cause more traffic congestion • Cause more flooding • Cause more light pollution • Cause the loss of wildlife habitat • Cause the loss of protected ancient hedgerows • Increase demand on drainage systems beyond their capabilities • Increase demand on overstretched Medical facilities • Compound the lack of adequate recreational and leisure 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the danger to school children when arriving and leaving the school campus site at the junction of Howe Lane and Margards Lane <p>6.2 South Verwood VWM 3</p> <p>1. The Site</p> <p>This is currently used for recreational purposes and provides grazing and stabling for various horses. The site is situated next to and surrounding a listed cob and thatch cottage. When Oak Tree cottage was listed what was the curtilage granted?</p> <p>The area to the east of the cottage has had 3 large Executive houses developed. Further development would take away the visual impact of the listed building and impose on its curtilage. Please note previous statements regarding the wildlife activity and use of this site as a feeding and roosting ground. We would welcome the site to remain as recreational. If the owner still wishes to sell could the Council purchase it and turn it into allotments for local residents as with the proposed Upper School site?</p> <p>2. Nature</p> <p>The area to the south of Verwood lays on sands and clays, to the west a heathland SSSI, Dewlands Common, which is extremely important in supporting several protected species. The limits of the town are set by the existing Green Belt which includes the Crane Valley and floodplain to the south and west of the town. The proposed development off Manor Road eats into this Green Belt.</p> <p>The Dorset Heathlands are of international important for wildlife where a number of protected species including sand lizards, smooth snakes, adders and night jars reside. Further urban development will impose very severe pressure on this precious and internationally important environment.</p> <p>The East Dorset Local plan, adopted in January 2002, proposed the protection of Sites of Special Scientific Interest and other sites of Nature Conservation Interest and floodplains. These housing developments would not perpetuate this aim.</p> <p>The site at Howe Lane is slightly more than 400 metres from an SSSI. However, the proposed development would still</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>adversely impact the visitor pressures on Dewlands Common. This would be increased by the additional development off Manor Road. Research findings from English Nature indicate that the adverse impacts would be: increasing disturbance to nest sites from visitors, increasing frequency of fire damage and a decline in the breeding success of night jays.</p> <p>There are other protected species utilising the wildlife corridors and spaces in and adjoining the Manor Road and Howe Lane sites. Development of these sites would adversely impact the feeding grounds of Badgers, Owls and Bats resident in Heathy How and the adjacent land. It is known there are bats roosting in Howe Lane utilising the land adjoining Heathy How for feeding. There are stag beetles, badgers, deer, smooth snakes, adders, sand lizards, and newts in local gardens and in Heathy How.</p> <p>The River Crane (and Moors) is also an SSSI with a unique chemical balance in the waters. Otters now live there. There are reed beds to deal naturally with pollution. The increase in housing and consequent hard landscaping will increase the flow rate through these reed beds potentially overwhelming their capacity to continue their vital function.</p> <p>There would need to be a full flora and fauna species count as it is anticipated that significant plants would be adversely impacted by these developments. These could include: Caluna Vulgaris, Bladderwort, Narthecium Ossifragum, Ulex Minor, Sundew, Drosera Rotondiflor and Intermedia.</p> <p>To protect this landscape requires the EU Habitats Regulations to be fully complied with.</p> <p>3. Geology</p> <p>The Howe Lane site has a stream running along its western boundary (the River Crane). Ground water run off would need to be forced this way. How would the developers ensure the SSSI nature of the River Crane is protected? How would the developers deal with the existing underground streams, bearing in mind the local geology of clay and sand?</p> <p>Recently the Environment Select Committee published a report about the future adequacy of funding for flood defences. The report stated that over the next 20 years the number of homes likely to be classified by insurers as facing</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>“significant” flood risk will rise from 500,000 to 850,000. These risks are covered under an agreement with the insurance industry which runs only until 2013. The Comprehensive Spending Review represented a cut in flooding budgets when funding had already been judged to be “inadequate”.</p> <p>How could the Council propose to mitigate flooding issues with these developments?</p> <p>4. Access from Summer Fields The Council have confirmed that there will be no compulsory purchases to facilitate these developments. The alleged “ransom strip” adjacent to Nos. 3 and 4 Summer Fields is owned by No 3. We understand No. 3 wish to retain their ownership of this “ransom strip” therefore no entrance can be facilitated into the land. Summer Fields is a cul de sac. Any planning consultant would note there is insufficient parking at, and around, the first junction within the road. The proposed entrance to the new development would mean additional traffic taking a right hand turn, at a blind corner, where cars are parked and children play. It is also a turning point for the weekly refuse collection. Therefore there can be no access from Summer Fields</p> <p>5. Access from Howe Lane The only access point could be through a paddock and through an established line of English Oak trees, unless existing buildings were demolished including a listed building. Any access road would require construction near to, and impacting the roots of, these established oak trees. It would also impact on the loss of visual amenity and wildlife habitats. Howe Lane is used by horse riders to link up with the local bridleways. Opening the road up to increase traffic will stop a valuable rural and recreational activity. Howe Lane suffers from double parking 4 times per day during school term time. Any proposed cut through to this land would result in further traffic. Local residents already suffer as delivery vans cannot get through during these times. Also emergency vehicles are stopped from travelling along Howe Lane during these parking periods. Opening up the Springfield Road distributor would simply adversely impact</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>this, not assist.</p> <p>The only option would be to create one large one way system including Margards Lane, thereby adversely impacting local residents even further. A full traffic survey is required covering Margards lane, Howe Lane (including the unmade up section) and St Michael's Road.</p> <p>6.4 STATISTICAL EVIDENCE</p> <p>1. Introduction</p> <p>All figures and statistics within this section have been obtained from one of the references. When extrapolations have been made the basis for that is clarified in the text. Whilst many of the statistics are taken from reports applying to East Dorset there is nothing in the reports to indicate that they do not apply proportionately to Verwood. Indeed since the reports have been commissioned to decide on future housing strategy and this has determined that Verwood is one of five locations where future building is appropriate it can be argued that they are either relevant statistics or the reports are irrelevant. In most of the reports EDDC report a maximum margin of error District wide of 1.6% at the 95% confidence interval.</p> <p>We believe all statistical evidence used for the basis of the Core strategy needs further analysis and independent verification because of its importance in developing what happens to Verwood in the future. The following paragraphs demonstrate where the figures used for the Core Strategy may well be incorrect and or inappropriate.</p> <p>2. Population and Housing</p> <p>The East Dorset Housing Need and Demand Report June 2008 estimated that there are around 37,600 households in the District, of these around 85% are currently owner-occupiers with 8% living in the social rented sector and around 7% in the private rented sector.</p> <p>Out migrant households tend to be employed, whereas in migrant households have a higher proportion of retired households. Although the differences are not very large, the results would suggest that the in-migrants into Dorset are often wealthy households, retired or looking to retire.</p> <p>This is important on two fronts: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly retired populations are much more likely to want that 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order															
							<p>sense of community that ironically this development plan will help to reduce. Consultation meetings run by the Council have shown very clearly that there is very strong support for conserving the sense of Community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondly an ageing population places greater demands on infrastructure such as Doctors and Dentists. <p>3. Economic status in Verwood</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Working</td> <td>Unemployed</td> <td>Retired</td> <td>Other</td> <td>Total</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2611</td> <td>50.6%</td> <td>38</td> <td>0.7%</td> <td>2213</td> </tr> <tr> <td>42.9%</td> <td>294</td> <td>5.7%</td> <td>5156</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>In 1991 nine out of ten employed people found their employment in Verwood, by 2008 there were 730 firms in Verwood, but 88% of them only employed 1 – 10 people. Since 65.5% (1710) of employed people in Verwood are classed as Wealthy Achievers it is evident that they must be finding employment outside of Verwood. In addition 90.7% of the population of Verwood are classed as comfortably off or better.</p> <p>It is estimated that at the time of the survey there was a current stock of affordable housing of around 325 which could be used to meet this need (including dwellings becoming available as households in the social rented sector move to different dwellings). Hence it was estimated that the net backlog of need for affordable housing is around 386 units (711- 325). Annualised over 5 years (as recommended in the Practice Guidance) this becomes 77 households (386/5). The total future need for affordable housing is therefore estimated to be 525 units per annum.</p> <p>Reports show that overall there is expected to be a greater demand for housing than the current stock of housing can meet. Overall, across all tenures there is an apparent shortfall of 375 dwellings per annum (excess demand over supply) of which 48% is for affordable housing. However the Audit Commission report criticises for consistently allowing over 900 dwellings to lie empty for more than one year and having a record of only getting three such dwellings back into use per annum.</p>	Working	Unemployed	Retired	Other	Total	2611	50.6%	38	0.7%	2213	42.9%	294	5.7%	5156				
Working	Unemployed	Retired	Other	Total																					
2611	50.6%	38	0.7%	2213																					
42.9%	294	5.7%	5156																						

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>In total the plan shows an intention to develop 2570 houses over a fifteen year period, 35% of this could be provided by getting existing stock back into use leaving Green Field sites unaffected. Since the references indicate that there is an anticipated annual need of 179 units and the plan would deliver 171 units, it is clear that the Council has no intention of addressing the Audit Commissions criticism of failing to bring long term empty stock back into use. This is a pity since as a strategy this has to be a much more sustainable and environmentally option.</p> <p>EDDC assume that any household with more than one spare bedroom is under-occupying their dwelling and nearly 50% of houses are in this category. An alternative strategy to new buildings could be to investigate incentive schemes to get existing stock more fully occupied.</p> <p>Since only a total of 65 households and an anticipated 43 households of inward migration have been identified as in need of housing in Verwood, the need for 415 units is questionable.</p> <p>Finally all of the data on housing need has been gathered prior to 2009 when the overall economic climate was very different. In view of the current economic climate it has to be worth reconsidering the demand for housing.</p> <p>A report run using the official Estate Agents and Land Registry Database shows that of the 100 properties marketed in the BH31 area in the quarter ending 9/1/11 only seven have been sold subject to contract with an additional nine under offer. Since this sample includes several new builds it calls into question the demand for such a high level of building in Verwood, and would be likely to result in even larger numbers of empty properties.</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that EDDC check officially with local Estate Agents the current state of the housing market before proceeding with this plan. In addition we have asked District Councillors to provide information on local waiting lists which are being used to justify the large percentage of affordable housing in the Core Strategy proposals. To date this has not been made available.</p> <p>4. Roads and Vehicles Car ownership data suggests that there is an average of 1.49</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>cars per household in the District. There are however large differences by tenure with owner-occupiers (with mortgage) having an average of 1.88 cars per household.</p> <p>In Verwood the Core Strategy as it stands will exacerbate the number of people living in the town but commuting to work, since all the employment opportunities exist outside Verwood. Of the existing 730 firms in Verwood 88% only employ between one and ten people. Assuming the proportion of economically active people remains broadly the same at 69% and that car ownership figures remain static, then the proposed 415 houses will place an additional 780 vehicles on the roads out of Verwood.</p> <p>Since the plan requires new housing to blend with the existing and surrounding housing it is inevitable that a high percentage will attract Executives who certainly will not be able to find suitable employment without commuting. The net effect will be to reduce further the sense of Community, directly in contravention of the Central Governments concept of the Big Community, and to further enhance the feeling of a Dormitory Town.</p> <p>Current car ownership in Verwood is stated to be: - None One Two Three or more Total 437 8.4% 2209 42.9% 1924 37.3% 582 11.3% 5152</p> <p>There is an intention to close off to vehicular traffic Manor Lane St Michaels Lane at the Manor Road end. If the intended Springfield Close relief road is put in place then there will be increased vehicular traffic in Howe Lane above the potential increase due to the proposed housing development. Since the eastern end of Howe Lane is part of the bridle and cycle path network increasing vehicular traffic in this area will significantly adversely affect this valuable leisure provision.</p> <p>Currently Howe Lane and Margards Lane are almost impassable at school run time with vehicles parked on both sides of the road. It is just possible to get an ordinary car down the centre in these conditions, but an Emergency</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Vehicle would find it impossible. This situation would be made even worse with the introduction of probably over 1000 people in the additional 415 homes. Certainly any addition of a Secondary School would make a bad situation intolerable. The Howe Lane development has only two choices of access, one off Howe Lane which almost certainly would have an impact on established and protected trees as well as potential adverse impact on the curtilage provisions of the Listed Building.</p> <p>As mentioned above there are also significant traffic congestion problems around school run times, making this access at best problematic. The other access option is via Summer Fields, this option requires purchasing a substantial proportion of the front gardens of two dwellings. There are already parking problems for houses in the area resulting in existing homeowners parking their vehicles on the street. In addition, established hedging on front gardens hinders sightlines making the turn in or out of the Close blind and therefore extremely hazardous. The twenty proposed properties would add an additional nearly 40 vehicles to this narrow access.</p> <p>Although not contained within the plan it is understood that there is an intention to put a relief road through Springfields linking Manor Road with the Eastern end of Howe Lane. This road would reduce further the ability of the land to allow natural run off of surface water in an area already prone to flooding. It will also add vehicular congestion to an area that is already dangerously congested for much of the day.</p> <p>Since most of the new occupants will have employment outside of Verwood they will be forced to commute out of the own via either the Ringwood Road or through Three Legged Cross. Both of these routes are already crowded in rush hour and neither permit widening of the road. The Ringwood Road in particular has recently had its speed limit reduced in order to try to reduce the number of fatal accidents.</p> <p>5. General</p> <p>The plan states that Verwood amongst other towns has been identified as an area suitable for development as it is a location where important facilities, services and employment are most accessible and readily improved. This is misleading</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							as employment in Verwood is already inadequate for the existing population. With the exception of the Hub there are no entertainment facilities such as Restaurants, a permanent cinema or theatre and Youth activities are generally agreed to be inadequate. Even the Hub is plainly failing to meet the entertainment desires of the population as it is loss making and yet there is significant outward migration of people in the evening. Finally the town is served by a retained fire station, in the current climate this is unlikely to change, the latest figures from show that the engine was unavailable due to manning constraints for over 10% of the time, the seventh worst station in Dorset.			
522257	Mr Richard Beaman		CSO18 103	Option VWM 3	Support		My support for the additional housing proposed in Verwood and Wimborne is conditional, based on building the proposed secondary school in Verwood. The new school should start to be built prior to or at the same time as any of the proposed larger housing developments.			1053
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	CSO18 120	Option VWM 3	Support		The residential development of land south of Howe Lane, Verwood, is supported; as set out in the text of the third bullet point under Paragraph 11.103 of the Core Strategy Options for Consideration. It is submitted that access from Summer Fields is preferable for a number of reasons. First, the site contains a number of mature trees, and these are the subject of separate preservation orders. Many of the trees are mature oaks, with some situated towards the Howe Lane frontage of the site. These may preclude the construction of a suitable vehicular access in this area. Despite the existence of an area TPO, a vehicular access from Summer Fields would have no such constraint. The carriage way of Summer Fields could be extended into the site without adverse impact; please refer to the photograph reproduced within Appendix 1. Second, the construction of an access from Howe Lane would adversely impact on the setting of Oak Tree Cottage, which is a grade II listed building. Its description on the Heritage Gateway records, describes the building as post medieval. It would not be appropriate to construct a vehicular	“Development will take place on land on the south western edge of the existing town involving land to the south Howe Lane, with vehicular access from Summer Fields. This will involve: • The provision of about 20 homes.		1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>access, potentially with street lighting, in such close proximity to this heritage asset.</p> <p>Third, Howe Lane provides access to two schools; Verwood C of E First School and Emmanuel Middle C of E Voluntary Aided School. At the start and the end of the school day there is substantial on street parking at the western end of Howe Lane. There is potential for vehicular / pedestrian conflict in this area.</p> <p>Appendix 2 to these representations demonstrates the context within which the Core Strategy can be developed through the Preferred Options stage. The proposed access from Summer Fields can be constructed into the large southern field. This is a relatively unconstrained open area, with trees to the boundaries. The construction of houses here, extending towards Howe Lane from within the site, can deliver the unit numbers required in the Core Strategy.</p>			
522404	Mr David Puckeridge		CSO18 137	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
522671	Mrs K Thompson		CSO18 169	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
523262	Mr & Mrs Jones		CSO18 262	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		CSO18 303	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
523326	Mrs H Clark		CSO18 325	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>I think the infra structure of Verwood would not be able to cope with this many new homes. We live off Margards lane which leads to Emmanuel School and the potential new secondary school. The road is already like a race track at school run times, with the increased housing and new school it would be impossible to get out of our road in the mornings, and even more problems pulling out onto Manor Road. Building on these plots will spoil the lovely aspect for the schools and also the people in Summerfields will loose their</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							lovely quiet environment. I think Verwood is big enough and a housing project of this size is going to ruin a lovely place.			
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 179	Option VWM 3	Object		The Moors River system, including the River Crane, Ebblake Stream and Uddens Water has already been subject to excessive development within its catchment including the establishment of a number of very ill advised employment/industrial estates. It has suffered severely from all the above impacts resulting in temporary or permanent losses to biodiversity. Continued development within the catchment, especially in close proximity to its water courses, and particularly of employment/industrial development, is wholly inappropriate. Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously impinging on the Moors River system and its corridor include KS3/ PC7 (St Leonards Hospital), KS4 (Woodland Walk), VM 1,2,3 and 4 (Verwood), PC4 (Blunts Farm), and PC 5 (Woolsbridge).			1053
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 300	Option VWM 3	Object		The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and prepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options.</p> <p>However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported.</p> <p>Options VWM1,2,3 and 4 Continued development in Verwood will progressively increase the demand for a by-pass for West Moors which will inevitably have very damaging repercussions for biodiversity. Whilst such a scheme may not be possible in the present financial climate, the time will undoubtedly come when controversial road schemes will be back on the agenda and changes which have taken place in the interim will be weighed in the balance.</p> <p>All these sites in Verwood will drain into the River Crane and thence the Moors River.</p> <p>In summary all the sites are problematic in terms of pressure for a West Moors By-pass and drainage to the River Crane, while VWM2, and 4 have additional problems or currently improperly assessed issues which require at least reduction in extent, and potentially rejection.</p>			
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO18 992	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>Verwood has taken on more than its fair share of new homes. The town cannot expand any further - there are limited facilities and employment opportunities. People have to travel further afield, invariably by car as public transport provision is pathetic. I can see absolutely no justification for building houses on designated Green Belt land. As far as I can see, the only reason the sites proposed for new homes in Verwood have been put forward is that the land owners are offering it up for sale (and want to make profit out of it). What is the point in designating land as Green Belt if that designation can be changed, apparently, at will? It is being suggested that the disused railway line to the west of Eastworth Road makes a natural town boundary. I would argue that Eastworth Road makes a natural town boundary given that it is already the town boundary and the Green Belt boundary. After these developments go ahead (God forbid) what will be identified as the next natural boundary? And the next.... Enough is enough!</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
527501	Eve Thompson		CSO18 783	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood has expanded too much and hasn't enough facilities i.e. dentist, shops etc to service the present population. The number of extra cars will impact on the narrow roads.			1053
527512	Eric Thompson		CSO18 797	Option VWM 3	Object		More houses mean more cars. 400 houses maybe 600 to 800 more vehicles, we are bursting at the seams. The roads in our town are generally in poor condition. More cars mean more pollution, more noise more traffic jams. You should be thinking more of the people who already live in the town I have not found anyone who supports these proposals. We don't have the infrastructure to support hundreds of extra people. Statistically crime and anti social behaviour will rise. In these times of cut backs are we to get more police and more fire fighters to cope with the extra load?			1053
527740	Anne Parsons		CSO18 893	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood 1. Why should our children wait until a further 400+ homes are built before they get their long awaited Secondary School - one can only presume that the planning gain will pay for this. 2. Verwood needs more infrastructure before consideration is given to more homes. 3. What guarantee is there that affordable housing - IF built would not be sold on at the market rate in future years? If homes have to be built why not put a stipulation regarding affordable housing. Other areas of the country do this such as the Lake and Peak District. 4. TA1 how could developers contribute to transport improvements other than roads - its up to Wilts and Dorset Buses to put on extra public transport. 5. It was not a surprise that no Councillors either Town or District were at the Hub between 2-3pm today 11 Nov 2010 - I wonder why? I doubt that the views of the local residents will be listened to as they've not been in the past.			1053
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		CSO18 925	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
527818	Mr Nigel Lester	Synergy Housing Association	CSO18 971	Option VWM 3	Support		Having looked at the proposals for each of the geographical areas and the proposed sites within those areas we can see no reason to disagree with the Local Authorities assessment and findings in each case, and would be very keen to become involved in the provision of affordable housing on any of			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							these sites.			
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO19 059	Option VWM 3		General Comment	This site would have little impact on the need to provide the Springfield distributor road as it is only for 20 units.			1053
533834	Mr Tim Harris		CSO19 211	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
533862	Mr Paul Holman		CSO19 219	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
533905	Mr & Mrs A Kell		CSO19 250	Option VWM 3	Object		We cannot support a small development as we are concerned about road access for cars, as there is only one made up road into this area to service the school and parents collecting. There would also be a problem for the emergency services in case of a fire or other. Leave that area free because of the school access being limited.			1053
534820	Paul Batten		CSO19 441	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
534837	Mrs P Martin		CSO19 502	Option VWM 3		No Opinion	Horses need grazing land. No infrastructure in place for the total number of homes planned. I do not go out between 8.00 and 9.30 am and 3.00pm and 6.30pm because of the traffic on the roads now.			1053
534875	Brian Lane		CSO19 547	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
534904	Mr Martin Aldridge		CSO19 580	Option VWM 3	Object		I strongly object to any more development in Verwood it's time to pick on somewhere else. The road from Verwood to Ringwood is at capacity in the morning and evening rush-hours. My local road to the schools is at capacity and suffers from intense school traffic and no attempt has been made over the years to make up the unmade roads to provide alternative routes to the schools. If I have to leave a car in the			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							road overnight it causes chaos with the school run. Please build more houses in much much more central loactions where they are needed not in a saturated place out in the sticks. I know your destruction of Verwood as a place to live is almost complete but please please build eslewhere it'a only common sense. If you cannot drive Verwood is an expensive place of isolation. Ringwood has the advantage of a coach link. Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch have train links. As a minimum Verwood should have both a free bus service to Ringwood and a safe separate from the road tarmacd cycle path to Ringwood so that the fit and able can quickly get to Ringwood for free instead of a £6 return bus service that takes hours and goes around the houses. Planners - get real.			
534914	Mrs P Froud		CSO19 679	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
535026	Mr Andy Thompson		CSO19 589	Option VWM 3	Object		Talk of green infrastructure is fine and accept that travel to distant schools is not as good an option as learning in your own community but Verwood will become a ghetto without effective urban infrastructure to support it - swimming pool/adequate health facilities, space for what local people want such as a couple of restaurants, shops selling more than groceries and nick nacks etc. A pub in a carpark at Morrisons is charmless and this area perfectly describes the hollow feel that will eb generated accross all verwood as more people are brought in without building community facilities trouble is brewing and developers/retailers etc need to be pressured to deliver for the community as well as thier share holders. If the council systems can not negotiate this effectively then sinmply ask for help from those in the community who can add value and demand more of these developers I lived in Milton keyenes as a boty when it was growing and it was a disaster for many childr en			1053
535040	Mr Tom Garnham		CSO19 594	Option VWM 3	Object		I have lived in Dorset for 15 years, the last 8 of which have been in Verwood. Verwood is unique in that in terms of population it can be considered a town but in all other respects it bears no resemblance to what most of us			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							commonly think of as a town. Sandwiched by open countryside and Ringwood Forest, it is a wonderful location in which to live but in just the last 8 years I have seen changes. With the building of additional housing and the disappointing emergence of blocks of flats wholly out of keeping with the surrounding area, increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic has been noticeable. I would strongly urge you not to approve any further housing developments for Verwood. The process of development is irreversible. If any of the options under consideration are approved the beautiful landscape those developments would replace will be lost forever with incalculable consequences for the diverse wildlife they sustain. In addition, the increase in population we again amend the Green Belt boundary. Now is the time to take a long-term view and put conservation ahead of the seemingly inexorable tide of development. Despite many years of development, Verwood has somehow managed to retain its rural character. For the benefit of its residents, the wildlife it sustains, the people of Dorset, and for future generations please do what you can to keep it that way.			
535049	Mr Ian Parsons		CSO19 599	Option VWM 3	Object		I object to the developments within Verwood. The main reason is that the infrastructure with the present population of Verwood cannot cope. Reasons as follows why we do not want more Developments: Our First Schools are over subscribed now, our only Middle School Emmanuel has had to have extra classes yearly to accommodate the increasing number of children that feed in from the three first schools. We have NO HIGH SCHOOL, which we need NOW. This would save the Council Tax Payers the costs of Transporting all the High School age children to either QE at Wimborne or Ferndown High School. There would need to be more Doctors surgeries and dental surgeries as the present number would not be able to cope. We are aware that there is NO MONEY available for a High School now. Also that no additional infrastructure will be built until such proposed developments are built - which means to us the council tax payers - that no extra infrastructure will be built even after new houses are occupied. Who is LOW COST housing for - this should only be limited to local people ie People of			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Verwood and there are many who need low cost/social housing. We do not want Verwood to become a SINK TOWN by the local authorities to DUMP unwanted Tenants in Verwood. Development will not contribute to Transport Costs UNLESS you are GOING to GIVE Planning Gain Monies to Wilts and Dorset for more Buses day and evening times.			
535055	R Knox		CSO19 603	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
535070	Mr Alan Reade		CSO19 633	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
535096	Mrs S M West		CSO19 660	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535103	Neil Clarke		CSO19 673	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535112	Mr Jack Tindall		CSO19 718	Option VWM 3	Object		The upper school will not be built within the life of this document, and will not be able to go ahead on the land proposed due to lack of access to the site and the close proximity to the heathland. If this issue were to be sorted out before the building of more houses then I would support the proposals but not until.			1053
535167	Lynda Lake		CSO19 765	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
535169	Mrs A Jarvis		CSO19 734	Option VWM 3	Object		I am totally against any further building in Verwood.			1053
535176	Mrs Krithia Blaker		CSO19 745	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood is over populated...over built and under facilitated....We have had more than our fair share of houses built in Verwood. Let somewhere else have more housing built. People state Verwood is one of the fastest growing towns in Dorset.That is so dreadful. As I said before it is			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							some other town that needs to take on the building of more homes. Let some other town take the strain. VERWOOD HAS DONE MORE THAN IT'S FAIR SHARE OF BUILDING. There are NO jobs here for people why bring hundreds more people here?? We are still in a recession businesses are closing down. Ferndown trading estate has lots of EMPTY units as does Ebblake. I agree it would be nice to have an Upper school nearer to Verwood...ideally between 3 legged cross/West Moors/Verwood. That would then suit 3 areas. The position the proposal suggests for the school is totally unacceptable already extremely dangerous for Children. Another school in this position would bring in hundreds more children.....and HUNDR EDS more CARS. I also feel building on Greenbelt land is unacceptable....You can't keep moving the *Goalposts* Greenbelt must remain greenbelt!!!!!!.			
535180	Mrs M Field		CSO19 756	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535196	Mr R Field		CSO19 774	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535206	Mr Calvert		CSO19 823	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support this type of development; it is still trying to catch up, from poor implementation and direction from past developments Buses: lack & frequency of service to neighbouring areas, Lack of Sporting and recreational facilities, Lack of Facilities for teenagers eg resulting in the current enforcement of the banning of Alcohol in certain areas Lack of local employment, Current centres of employment being in Bournemouth, Pool, Wimborne Resulting in Poor road / transport support in and out of Verwood along the B3081 and its intersections with other junction eg: A31, Alderholt junction, and Cranborne / Wimborne, The withdrawal of the Ringwood road improvement and the A338 funding Lack social services with in the area Dentists etc .: How is the new school going to be funded and would this be built before the additional housing ,			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							would the funding for such a project be ring fenced in this current financial climate to ensure children do not have to be bussed out of the area . Currently the council can not find funding or land option for allotments for existing residents, we been waiting for over 3 years for this simple amenity.			
535209	Mr P Webster		CSO19 799	Option VWM 3	Object		Please liaise with NFDC and NPA,as the additional traffic generated by the extra housing and employment zones will increase the traffic problems at the already congested bottleneck at Ringwood and cause yet more problems for the people who live in New Forest hamlets such as Linwood,Brook and Burley as motorists try to find alternative routes. Can the New Forest take any more pressure from additional numbers of visitors? Has Dorset got enough sand and gravel in the landbank to meet the needs of the developers? Can you force Tarmac to start mining gravel by the Spur Road near Hurn? What will happen to the pollution levels close to the trunk roads eg at Ringwood,especially particulate pollution? Can Bournemouth Water meet the increased demands for water?			1053
535349	P Thomas		CSO19 832	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
535360	Mrs Phyllis Peach		CSO19 838	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535361	Mr Jonathan Ewing		CSO19 840	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		CSO19 982	Option VWM 3	Object		I think that this whole core strategy consultation needs a full review in light of the proposed changes being brought in under the new government. I particularly object to all the proposed Verwood development as the infrastructure is not in place to support the current population let alone adding even further to it by building a further 400 homes. Any EDDC councilor who has the affront to say that the infrastructure is in place to support this development does not know what they are talking about and obviously do not live in the town.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535372	Mrs Carol Weaver		CSO19 853	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535382	Jean Baverstock		CSO19 873	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535384	Mr R Beard		CSO19 875	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
535387	Mr Brian Cox		CSO19 962	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		CSO20 733	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
489765	Derek KEAREY		CSO19 515	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
535393	Jeremy Berg		CSO19 911	Option VWM 3	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			1053
535395	Clare James		CSO19 890	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535404	Danika Irving		CSO19 903	Option VWM 3	Object		With all current development having seemed enough! There is now the 'threat' of more. Verwood does not have what is required to support further development, our road systems are minimal and already pushed to a level where it is a 'stress' to move through the main roads or move out of various junctions.....further development will require traffic control to be implemented to allow for the increase in population and therefore traffic. As we are aware most households own more than one car and any family or individual living in verwood would require transport to enable them to exit verwood to reach amenities as we don't have these that shall fulfill the needs and what we do have is is			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							only just coping with these high levels. I.e tesco and the congestion caused due to traffic parking on manor road. Morrisons, parking sufficient! Yet the store is always over crowded!! Finally the schools are already having severe issues with regards to traffic, parking etc when parents do ing their daily pick ups or drop offs, the situation shall only worsen with another school. We already have only a small area surrounding the schools and inadequate parking that deals for the needs of children attending verwood 1st, Emmanuel and verwood 1st pre-school Doesn't bear thinking what another school will do to the current state.			
535421	Mr Roland Andrews		CSO19 919	Option VWM 3	Object		The existing infrastructure in Verwood does not support the current level of occupation - Doctors, dentist, schools, shops, car parks and mostly road system. Further building without improving the infrastrucure is ridiculous. There is no significant employment in the Verwood area and therefore additional building will only cause increased traffic and congestion. Public transport is extremely limited - why aren't there any proposals to improve this?? I do not understand why land that is already designated as green belt is even being considered for new development, is nothing sacred. Why can't development be further out, why does it all have to be centred on existing towns??			1053
535457	Mr Matthew Newman		CSO19 973	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
535500	David Veevers		CSO20 022	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
535504	Mr Michael Beer		CSO20 090	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535508	Bill Bowden		CSO20 046	Option VWM 3	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood would not support this amount of housing. It is no good deciding to build a large number of properties without first considering the road system. A large number of people leave the town in the morning to travel to work and this will undoubtedly increase with the introduction			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							of new homes. Can the existing power supply, sewerage system, and water supply cope adequately with this number of houses?. Has a proper in depth survey been carried out?. The tendency to flood from water courses can change dramatically if green field sites are concreted and water run off is much more rapid during heavy rains. Have the appropriate surveys for protected and endangered species been carried out in areas where new housing is proposed?			
535509	Mrs S Durant		CSO20 126	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
535512	J R Page		CSO20 065	Option VWM 3	Object		1. Quite often the Ferret Green carpark and the Doctors' Surgery carpark at Station Road do not have any car spaces available. 2. To make an appointment with one's own Doctor can result in a two or three week wait. 3. It is nearly impossible to exit my drive on a school morning as there is continuous traffic streaming past my bungalow with double parking in Howe lane. With this and the volume of traffic cars come to a complete stop blocking the road. 4. If 400 houses are built plus an addition school, life will become impossible. Verwood has been overbuilt without the necessary infrastructure being in place.			1053
535517	Roy Rich		CSO20 099	Option VWM 3	Object		We are happy as we are nice and peacefull. THATS WHY WE MOVED TO VERWOOD!! Please just leave a very dense population alone,to sort out all the mistakes already made by previous decisions!! We are full to overflowing,the amenities are VERY stretched. You try to get to a DENTIST for treatment, YOU TRY TO GET A DOCTORS appointment.FULL---FULL ---FULL I WISH YOU LOT LIVED HERE AND FIND THIS OUT. Ok rant over but PLEASEisten to US!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!			1053
535540	Mr Peter Weaver		CSO20 132	Option VWM 3	Object		This group of proposals for Verwood displays a total lack of the 'joined-up thinking' which I trusted the planning system to provide. Verwood is seriously under-provided for in terms of infrastructure. The existing facilities, such as they are, struggle to cope with the mushrooming population that's been			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							shoe-horned in over recent years. Due to the lack of employment opportunities within Verwood the majority of the working population exits the town early in the morning to commute to distant centres of employment, returning in the late evening - a simple observation of Ringwood Road will confirm this. The lack of adequate public transport means that the majority of these journeys are by cars with only one occupant. Apart from the environmental damage of this daily tidal flow, the town is empty during normal business hours resulting in little incentive for shops or businesses to set up, apart from the plethora of estate agencies. All but 20 of the 415 new homes are es. I believe that all of those issues need to be resolved before any further housing is allowed to commence and I'm disappointed that these proposals are presented without suggestion of any improvements to infrastructure. Developer Contributions are of little use at this scale of development - the town needs to see actual improvements before any development takes place, not just large sums of money being paid as a development tax.			
535547	Mr M Folland		CSO20 220	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535550	Mrs D Mogg		CSO20 183	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
535554	Ms Anita Rigler		CSO20 203	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535567	Ms Judy McMath		CSO20 280	Option VWM 3	Object		There are not enough spaces available at the local 1st and middle schools to take in the extra children that would be living in these new houses. They would have to be bussed to West Moors, Ferndown or Cranborne.			1053
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		CSO20 258	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535591	A Walker		CSO20 296	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		CSO20 366	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
535621	Mrs T Brine		CSO20 354	Option VWM 3	Object		Even without additional housing in Verwood, there is clearly already a need for a secondary school here. However a concern with the suggested site in Howe lane, is the access and increased volume of traffic and parking on the school run. This is already considerable, with the two schools currently on the site. Perhaps a better site might be the land west of Trinity school earmarked for housing (VWM1). Similarly, I am against any further housing development in Verwood as the infrastructure needs to be supported. We have the population of a large town, yet lack many of the facilities of towns smaller than us. Also doctors, dentists, Morrisons etc struggle to cope with the demands of our population as it is!!Please don't spoil our beautiful town with yet more housing, but do improve our existing facilities !!			1053
535659	Fiona Kasey		CSO20 391	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535670	Dave Allen		CSO20 416	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535678	Andrew Bryant		CSO20 443	Option VWM 3	Object		Any further development for Verwood is unsustainable. An increase in the population will result in the SSSI sites attracting more people, despite what is said in the plan about new green space. If you are really bothered about green spaces in Verwood, you should leave the ones that are there. The land to the north of Eastworth Road has a lot of wildlife including deer, badgers, bats, owls as well as several smaller mammals and possibly lizards. The road network in Verwood is poorly laid out and built for much lower volumes of traffic. Do not even think of increasing traffic on the northern approaches. These roads are too small and dangerous as they are. There are no real shops to speak of (four estate agents and several ladies' hairdressers do not count as			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							shops) A bigger Morrisons would be a benefit, but would attract even more traffic onto the inadequate road system as people come in from outlying areas. There is no public transport, save for a poor and expensive bus service - that contrives to charge school children full fare for the trip to Ringwood before 09:00 There is little opportunity for employment in Verwood and the volume of traffic coming into the town indicates that what jobs there are are mainly taken by people from outside Verwood. The drainage and sewerage systems were built for a town of 3000 people. This needs addressing before any more houses are built. It really is about time that the various councils of Dorset start to see Verwood as a real town that is trying hard to create a real town environment. I fear the councils see Verwood as a dormitory town and that the attitude shown is that few more housing estates can be squeezed in and around without anyone getting too upset. This is not the case. People don't want or need this extra housing until at least some of the amenities promised over the last 20-years start to materialise.			
535687	Shelley Romans		CSO20 455	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood has already experienced substantial housing development over the last 20 years and does not have adequate road links or other infrastructure to cope with further housing development. There are insufficient employment opportunities in Verwood and therefore increasing the population size would increase the pressure on existing roads particularly at commuting times. The green belt should be preserved and future housing development should take place on brown field sites. In the current public sector financial climate I do not believe planning to build new secondary school in Verwood is a realistic aim and I consider that there are adequate school places for Verwood children in nearby locations such as Ferndown.			1053
535688	Susan Hobbs		CSO20 533	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
535695	Robin Peirce		CSO20 467	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
535701	Mr		CSO20	Option		No				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Andy Skeats		490	VWM 3		Opinion				
535714	Joanna Bryant		CSO20502	Option VWM 3	Object		When I moved to Verwood ten years ago the estate agents promised that there would not be any more building in Verwood. The town is lovely as it is and more houses would lead to traffic congestion and Verwood doesn't have the infrastructure to cope with an increased population - Why can't the village be left as it is.			1053
535718	Richard Green		CSO20507	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood has undergone the largest expansion of any East Dorset town expanding to 5 times its original population in 20 years. It was the fastest growing town in Europe for 5 years. Facilities and infrastructure have not kept pace with the population and elected councillors are not serving their constituents fairly. PPG17 show that Verwood is below the minimum requirement in active sports space, children and young people space and activities and allotments there are no allotments. The Hub is an ugly building out of character with the town. This is not used to its full capacity as car parking is restricted. The allocated land for further car parking behind the police station has been sold by the council. Flats are now being built on the site adding to the parking problem. PPS 1 and 3 and PPG13 show the need to have shops and leisure activities available without the need to use a car. Morrison's built for 3500 people is now completely overwhelmed. Although plans to extend the feeder will not change the position. Verwood has had more than its fair share of housing development enough is enough.			1053
535723	Steve Taylor		CSO20520	Option VWM 3	Object		Dear Sir, I object not only to the principle of developing green belt land in general. As a Verwood resident I also object to the nature of the Verwood options themselves, with the exception of the principle of VWM7 (although this is still on green belt land, which concerns me, although I understand why it here, in close proximity to the other schools). From what I can see the proposal is to build another 400 homes on green belt land in Verwood. There is an acknowledgement that such development will necessitate the upgrade of some roads' infrastructure. Many of Verwood's roads are very busy			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							already, and with one main road in and out, it does not take much to make a short journey to Ringwood quite time-consuming. There is however no commitment for the upgrade or provision of any other much needed facilities. I note VWM7 relates to a secondary school, but this is already required to support Verwood's population. 400 more homes means presumably 400+ new children and the running down St Michaels Road already flood when there is even a small amount of rain. This will presumably worsen as the work progresses, owing to reduced natural drainage opportunities. Furthermore, using St Michaels Road as a vehicular route and 'green linkage', whatever that is, will exacerbate this drainage issue. I am not a typical NIMBY, and I do believe that a properly thought through development strategy encompassing proper facilities for an already stretched community would be a benefit. I also live in the real world and I understand that private development will help generate the funds to pay for such a strategy. All I can really see in these proposals however is bulldozing your way through green belt land for 400+ houses, I'm afraid.			
535815	Mrs C M Davies		CSO20 560	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
535836	Peter Parsons		CSO20 587	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
535845	Oliver Greensmith		CSO20 599	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
535858	Robert Candy		CSO20 622	Option VWM 3	Object		The traffic situation in Howe Lane and St. Michaels road is already at bursting point with traffic delays of up to 10 minutes during peak hours. Further planned developments would exacerbate the existing problem and cause further misery not only to residents but those attending the proposed facilities. Verwood is a large town and does require an upper school however, howe lane is not the place for it, three schools in one road is plenty the road simply does not have the capacity to host another establishment!			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535865	Darren Charles Bryson		CSO20652	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
535875	John Kitchenside		CSO20685	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
360768	Cllr. Mr David Packer	Colehill West Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO21095	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
497471	Mr Robert Wilmott		CSO21425	Option VWM 3	Object	General Comment	<p>According to the Governments New Homes Bonus consultation document from 11/2010 for 1000 new homes the required infrastructure to support those homes costs £20m. Based on the proposed maximum number of new homes for Verwood of 415 the proportioned infrastructure costs would be £8.3m. How do EDDC propose to fund these costs? I have estimated based on the figures in the document referred to above that if all the 415 homes were built and with 208 being affordable housing the 6 year bonus payment would be circa £4.4m so would not be sufficient to offset these costs. Therefore would you expect the various property developers under their required Section 106 agreements to meet all these costs and use the Bonus payments as suggested by the Government to improve frontline council services and improve the local Verwood community facilities for the benefit of existing residents? Point 11.19 of your core strategy document informs readers that Verwood has good road links. As a r ted to accessible and supported housing for this section of the community? It is advised in your strategy document that 90% of commuters use a car as their means of transport this is because of the lack of public transport and the semi-rural location. The 2008 report highlighted the fact that one third of houses in social rented properties had no use of a car. If you locate these families in Verwood in the proposed affordable housing how can this be of benefit if they have no means of transport and a limited public transport system. Finally the erosion of further green belt land should only be considered once the other options such as brown</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							field sites, development of vacant properties have been fully explored.			
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		CSO20 738	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
535914	Graham Cudmore		CSO20 715	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535921	Mrs Charlotte Miller		CSO20 737	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
535933	Mr John Lister		CSO20 758	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		CSO20 844	Option VWM 3	Object		The majority of residents in this area relocated because of the permanent despoiling of their places of birth by elected local and national 'representatives' who would not listen or care about the needs of the people that voted for them. Do you want to be remembered as the people who finally ruined this area or the people who saved it. Do not forget that people still visit this area as tourists and we welcome them and accept their contribution to the local economy. They will stop coming if the developments continue. How many tourists visit the outer London sprawl? Can I quote p227 from the Core Strategy Options paper - para 11.28 The Government's key housing policy is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. This is an impossible dream that can never and will never, be fulfilled. If the developments did go ahead what would be the effect of another 5000 cars on our local roads be ? If Morrisons developments go ahead where are the customers going to park? The parking within Verwood is just about adequate at the moment.			1053
535940	Mrs Linda		CSO20 782	Option VWM 3	Object		Any additional building of houses will need to have a better road structure than exist at the moment to cater for all the			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Medler						extra traffic this will bring. I thought we were trying to bring about a greener enviroment to Dorset county?			
535948	Mr David Hadden		CSO20790	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
535964	Mr Steven Old		CSO20808	Option VWM 3	Support		I strongly support the building of additional housing in Verwood. However my support is only given in order that an Upper School is built OR the council look at changing the current three tier education system to the more sustainable two tier system. The council should also look at providing free transport for high acheiving children to go to grammar schools should they wish to do so. The council should also look favourably upon anyone applying for permission to start a business in Verwood.			1053
535976	Mrs Valerie Stilwell		CSO20826	Option VWM 3	Object		Until the plans show the improvements in road access, car parking, youth and leisure facilities, and above all school places which are needed to meet current demands, let alone increases of this size, there is no possiblity of our absorbing 600 extra cars, 600 extra children into the infrastructure and social fabric many of us have worked very hard to engender in our 'new town' which has grown so fast over recent years. the school particularly is an absurd suggestion: a) it is within 400 metres of heathland, where development is forbidden b) we are told there is no budget currently for extra school spaces in this area in the foreseeable future c) the chaotic school traffic situation in Margards Lane is already stretching residents' patience to the limits (with enormous fears about what a leisure centre here would do, let alone a senior school)and d) the local staff of Dorset Police, with whom I work, are dismayed at the proposals : it has taken 5 special constables a und are unsupportable within the current infrastructure. our already struggling 'community' will be drowned with the proposed enormous influx of newcomers - so many of us came to Verwood as it was promised there would be no further development - we escaped from areas where no sense of community was possible, and we have tried to forge such an atmosphere here - we will not just sit by			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							and watch it swept away, for the sake of the millions the government are offering to Councils who do succumb to their demands. let us know just WHO locally is in such dire need of housing, and we will readily sit down and help plan for them to share in this community!			
536014	Mrs Dawn Tindall		CSO20 888	Option VWM 3	Object		What about the new homes bonus? Why is it not being implimented instead of this core strategy? The upper school in verwood will not happen within the life of this document, why is this carrot still being dangled.			1053
536025	Christopher Trim		CSO20 860	Option VWM 3		No Opinion	We are very concerned about the proposed development particularly around Eastworth Road. The area earmarked for development around Eastworth Road cannot support 200+ homes. We appreciate the proposal to leave the existing playpark and surrounding field as a buffer zone - but we are really concerned that this will become a central 'hanging out' point for younger people as it will form the 'centre' of the proposed development and the existing development around Field Place, which we believe will lead to anti social behaviour problems - has this issue been considered? We understand that there will be 2 new access routes via the Station and Edmondsham Roads but are also concerned that Field Place will also be used as an access road - the road system cannot support the associated additional traffic through what is currently a very peaceful estate. We are also concerned about the loss of what is one of the few remaining unspoilt areas around Verwood as it encroaches onto the existing countryside. On a wider point about the development generally in Verwood : the town does not have the infrastructure to support another 400 homes. In the event that some or all of the proposed developments go ahead, where will children go to school in the short term as the 3 first schools are already over subscribed? I can't see the logic of the proposals of building a new upper school - what about all the funding that has just gone into building a state of the art school in Wimborne (QE) where children from Verwood currently attend?			1053
536046	L		CSO20	Option	Support					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Appleton		900	VWM 3						
536050	Mr Andrew Collin		CSO20 912	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536077	Caroline Thomas		CSO20 919	Option VWM 3	Object		Moved to Verwood nearly 10 years ago due to the location and rural village feel for a better quality of life away from busy noisy town surroundings, for a better environment for children..This is already changing since more and more housing developments have slowly taken away Verwoods identity.. PLEASE NO MORE.. We were promised that there would be no more housing developments- but this would appear to be a lie if this should go through.. Without stereotyping, housing association or "affordable housing" developments statistically will at best do nothing but make the area a far less desirable place in which to live..... This has to be a concern for all current Verwood residents . enough is enough.! do not ruin Verwood			1053
536085	Grahame Thomas		CSO20 927	Option VWM 3	Object		Strongly object to ALL proposals, due to the underlying fact that there have been more than necessary housing developments within Verwood area built in the past 10 years which is going against the rural village location that it once was, and the reason why so many people love Verwood "of old" as opposed to a more populated and busy town the likes of which it is to become....For any resident of 5 or more years it has become clearly evident that crime and unruly behaviour has become more of an issue- which can and will only increase.. Please do not ruin the once loved "Village"of Verwood any more...!!!			1053
536096	Katie Lacey		CSO20 949	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		CSO20 974	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536152	Mrs Alison		CSO20 981	Option VWM 3	Object					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	OBrien									
536159	Mr Chris OBrien		CSO20 991	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536165	Margaret Parker		CSO20 997	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536169	Mr Tony Trewiss-Bell		CSO21 027	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536175	Mrs Claire Addiscott		CSO21 010	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536178	Mark Addiscott		CSO21 020	Option VWM 3	Object		I feel Verwood is at saturation point at the moment and any increase in the number of people living here would greatly reduce the quality and feel of the town. Increases in population always seem to have adverse effects including loss of community spirit, and increases in crime and anti social behavior etc. The town doesn't have the type of transport links which I feel would be needed for a greater population either.			1053
536183	Deric Burgess		CSO21 035	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536196	Mr J Spriggs		CSO21 049	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536204	Derek Kelly		CSO21 056	Option VWM 3	Object		I believe that too many new houses have already been built in Verwood during the past 10 years, and that the town does not have the infrastructure and amenities to cope with another 430+ families. The roads in and out of the town will be unable to cope (the road to Ringwood is already extremely busy) and there is nothing for young people to do - I would build a new leisure centre and other facilities first, before considering any more houses! As far as the two options affecting me most			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							directly - VWM1 and VWM2 - I understood that the land bordering Eastworth Road is a) good arable land that should remain agricultural land, and b) is green belt and should therefore be protected. I don't see how destroying fields and the wonderful outlook will 'provide valuable green infrastructure' when in my view it is already exactly that! I also believe that building 230+ new homes in this area will adversely affect the local wildlife - the owls, buzzards and other birds, badgers, deer and slow worms etc. Finally, my home backs on to the roundabout at the Champtoceux Ave/Station Road junction and since the imposition of the one way system in the town centre the level of traffic - and traffic noise - has become intolerable, especially at weekends. Not only will another 200+ houses on Eastworth Road need to be accessed through the existing estate, vastly increasing the traffic in what is currently a quiet area, as well as making it more dangerous for our children, but the traffic from this and the Trinity Road option will all funnel onto the above-mentioned roundabout, making an already intolerable situation far, far worse. Please, please, no more houses in Verwood!!			
536206	Victoria Wiggins		CSO21 057	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536213	L Stevens		CSO21 064	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536220	Mrs J Heather		CSO21 069	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536252	Mrs Pamela Jakes		CSO21 075	Option VWM 3	Object		No more planning permission to erect ugly blocks of flats in Verwood.			1053
536255	Mrs J W Bryant		CSO21 083	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536257	Mr		CSO21	Option	Object		If further homes were to be built in Verwood, would the			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Graham Jakes		092	VWM 3			utilities be able to cater for the extra demand? Also, there is the matter of increased traffic, more homes = more cars. In Verwood, ugly blocks of flats should be completely ruled out. One can see what has happened to-date on unsympathetic design in Crane Drive.			
536258	Mrs Anne Jones		CSO21 104	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536259	Sandy Stockwell		CSO21 106	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
536260	Vicki Palmer		CSO21 117	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood is big enough already!			1053
536263	Ryan Ward		CSO21 122	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536265	Adrian Cox		CSO21 129	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood has already been subject to over-development into green field land and infill throughout the village or as it is now known "Town". It has staggered me and many friends in Verwood that developers have been allowed to build huge eyesores in the shape of the blocks of flats around the "Hub" and now on Blackhill. Sadly it is a sign of the economic times when profit over-rides sustainable development and social integration. flats break down neighbourhoods, discouraging social interaction. Houses support family growth and social development! More needs to be done to make appropriate housing more accessible, e.g. part ownership schemes, possibly making existing housing in towns accessible to first-time buyers and those indeed on lower incomes.. it requires two earners on £25k each per annum to buy a £200k house!! Verwood's biggest problem at present is lack of appropriate facilities not lack of housing, enough is sat empty already!!			1053
536266	Mr Martin Cobb		CSO21 137	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536267	Trish		CSO21	Option	Object		I feel that Verwood has enough housing at present and it			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Wheeler		166	VWM 3			would be criminal to lose greenbelt, disrupt the wildlife and nature. There are not enough facilities for the people of Verwood at the present. There are already groups of young children hanging around the streets bored, how many more do you really want to see around Verwood - personally I don't want to see any. I think a small town like Verwood needs to be left alone. Can't believe that people are thinking of building so many houses when there is a recession on - the cost is going to be huge - can't the money be spent on upgrading the facilities for the people who are already here.			
536271	Mrs D Holt		CSO21 208	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536274	Mrs Annalicaia Cobb		CSO21 158	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536279	Mr Garry Whitham		CSO21 172	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536282	Mrs Doreen Kingaby		CSO21 199	Option VWM 3	Object		Bad enough traffic on Howe lane without adding to the burdon.What about sorting Verwood out before adding to its problems.Such a lovely little village trying to be a big town,planners mess.Let surrounding areas expand like Verwood has, before any more houses.In 2005 Verwood was declared full,why the change of heart? Please do the right thing for the people of Verwood and say no to building on our last remaining green belt.			1053
536289	N Waters		CSO21 192	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536300	Mrs Caroline Burgess		CSO21 206	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536311	Shane Ward		CSO21 219	Option VWM 3	Object					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536313	Mrs J Wilmott		CSO21 236	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>According to the Governments New Homes Bonus consultation document from 11/2010 for 1000 new homes the required infrastructure to support those homes costs £20m. Based on the proposed maximum number of new homes for Verwood of 415 the proportioned infrastructure costs would be £8.3m. How do EDDC propose to fund these costs? I have estimated based on the figures in the document referred to above that if all the 415 homes were built and with 208 being affordable housing the 6 year bonus payment would be circa £4.4m so would not be sufficient to offset these costs. Therefore would you expect the various property developers under their required Section 106 agreements to meet all these costs and use the Bonus payments as suggested by the Government to improve frontline council services and improve the local Verwood community facilities for the benefit of existing residents? Point 11.19 of your core strategy document informs readers that Verwood has good road links. As a r ted to accessible and supported housing for this section of the community? It is advised in your strategy document that 90% of commuters use a car as their means of transport this is because of the lack of public transport and the semi-rural location. The 2008 report highlighted the fact that one third of houses in social rented properties had no use of a car. If you locate these families in Verwood in the proposed affordable housing how can this be of benefit if they have no means of transport and a limited public transport system. Finally the erosion of further green belt land should only be considered once the other options such as brown field sites, development of vacant properties have been fully explored.</p>			1053
536315	J Ward		CSO21 233	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536323	Anne Crew		CSO21 246	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536324	Paul Sumner		CSO21 294	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>Wimborne has the land and facilities to support more houses.The other areas do not.Especially Verwood,as it has been built upon to the point where it is second only to</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Dorchester, in terms of population. Verwood should be left alone and other areas play catch up. Verwood has no vibrant town centre no realistic extra employment opportunities. No infrastructure, no buses after 6pm or police for that matter. One NHS dentist with a waiting list as long as your arm. Same with the meager doctors services. None of the houses are actually needed, only for the council to get social housing built. Not the attractive affordable homes it seems to like to label them as. Building on green belt land is supposed to be for exceptional circumstances, there are no homeless in Verwood. Do not destroy green belt land just because of a loophole. There is no need for social housing in Verwood, therefore no exceptional circumstances exist. I have looked at the proposed sights and they will all destroy habitat for local wildlife, VWM4 will also see SSI sites, red beds, ancient hedge rows etc severely disrupted. Did you know that there is a flood plane? What about the scientific report on the river crane and fishing lakes down there?. commonsense please.			
536329	Mrs C Green		CSO21 256	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood is a lovely place to live in. Even though we are now a town, there is still a village atmosphere. People are friendly and know lots of other people. More houses means there will be more people coming in from outside who will want to make our town just like the bigger one they left behind. We have been here since 1986 and have seen Verwood double in size. Enough is enough.			1053
536332	Emmanuelle Hutton		CSO21 268	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536341	Adrian Bowyer		CSO21 321	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
536342	Lily Hutton		CSO21 301	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536346	Mr Ben Richards		CSO21 379	Option VWM 3	Support					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536349	Mrs C Bowyer		CSO21 390	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536350	Melissa Taylor		CSO21 359	Option VWM 3	Object		Insufficient infrastructure to support additional housing			1053
536351	Mr John Hutton		CSO21 368	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536353	Chris Rowley		CSO21 404	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood is already overcrowded with properties and not enough facilities to support this amount of housing growth.			1053
536384	Andy Brookes		CSO21 409	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood is full to bursting already. Facilities are required before further housing. The school proposal is only mentioned to bribe people into allowing further housing. The housing will no doubt happen to some extent, the school will not.			1053
536392	Mrs Diana Evans		CSO21 414	Option VWM 3	Object		Already too many houses,the roads into and out of Verwood cannot take anymore traffic.also not menough shops to cater for more homes only one supermarket. PLEASE LEAVE OUR GREEN AREAS ALONE.			1053
536402	Mr P K Evans		CSO21 419	Option VWM 3	Object		Already too many houses with not enough facilities.the roads in and out of verwood can not take any more traffic.			1053
536449	Dave Isaacs		CSO21 457	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536467	Kim Rich		CSO21 445	Option VWM 3	Object		There are not enough existing facilities in Verwood for the residents already living here. i.e Doctors,dentists and a variety of local shops. We do not need additional housing. Social and affordable housing will attract the wrong sort of people. The new flats that have already been allowed to be built are an eyesore and do not fit in with the existing surrounding properties. We moved here years ago to get away from noise pollution and heavy traffic. We do not want our peace and quiet spoiled by your proposals. We want to			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							continue living in a pleasant green environment, quiet and peaceful and unspoilt. That is the reason we chose to live in Verwood and your plans are not in keeping with the area.			
536479	Mr Jeff Maultby		CSO21 462	Option VWM 3	Object		Have you tried getting out of Holly grove or Hayward crescent when schools are open? inconsiderate parent parking causes dangerously blocked roads, one day a child will be hurt. A secondary school will make it utterly intolerable and impossible. Unless every child is forced to walk or cycle - which is never going to happen! How long will we have to queue on Church Hill if a secondary school is built! Its already ridiculous when the schools are open and will be impossible with a new school. The access roads are just not adequate. We should spend money on all the un-made roads and providing proper cycle lanes before building new houses. Verwood does not have sufficient infrastructure for 415 new homes. We will have even more kids hanging around on corners with nothing to do.			1053
536508	Mrs AJ Hayden		CSO21 490	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny PEARCE		CSO22 106	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
482494	Mrs Yvette Jones		CSO21 889	Option VWM 3	Object		Large scale developments damage the environment for everyone, and it is for ever. The open green spaces are valued by so many who have paid a premium to live in a semi-rural area. Desecration of this is an assault to the residents' wellbeing; an unwarranted invasion causing a wholesale change of character to what is home to thousands of people who chose a neighbourhood because of its history of modest gradual development. Not convinced there is a housing shortage. Keep 'social' housing in more 'affordable' areas. What is there to aspire to and work towards otherwise? Don't patronise us re. 'housing for local people' - occupants become 'local' by living in a 'location'. Small developments can be assimilated to the character of an area without destroying people's enjoyment of their homes. They			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							can be developed with consideration, gradually and as appropriate. They do not have to cause illness through accute distress of residents just to line the developers' poc kets and gratify councillors.			
498402	Mrs T Hughes		CSO22 241	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536537	Mrs Susan Isaacs		CSO21 495	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536543	Mrs Samantha Fysh		CSO21 541	Option VWM 3	Object		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD.. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!			1053
536546	Mrs Sarah Jupp		CSO21 514	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536548	Mr James Robinson		CSO21 519	Option VWM 3	Object		I feel that the building of these additional homes in Verwood is based on the greed of the developers and the landowners. It is not proven that there is a need to rip up more land in Verwood particularly green belt farm land in the case of Eastworth Road. There is the appalling example of the housing units built on the ring road opposite the Hub that have not sold and are a complete eyesore with the developers becoming insolvent and it becoming a protacted farce that should never have been sanctioned. In short a wholly unacceptable set of circumstances that is a blight on those who gave permission to construct them. It clearly makes the case that planning has been granted filling the land with inappropriate housing and this has caused me to not trust the judgement of those responsible for making the decisions on development of housing in Verwood. In contrast Verwood has grown over the last three decades and recent efforts to; improve the centre, build the Hub and co nstruct the ring road makes the balance between housing and services/facilities better. The planners deserve credit for improving those facilities and that is why the school is a good			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							idea for Verwood, as it is a further step to providing a complete all encompassing small town. It also has the obvious benefit of not having to bus all those children every day to the schools outside of the area. In conclusio I cannot see any need to increase housing in Verwood. We really do have a responsibility not to concrete and tarmac over for housing any more open space or the surrounding fields of Verwood it is simply an act of gross irresponsibility.			
536553	Ms Michelle Hayter		CSO21 531	Option VWM 3	Object		Totally object to the housing developments. Not enough facilities to cater for current population let alone a further 400 homes. Schools and facilities will suffer considerably.			1053
536554	Mr B Tunstall		CSO21 535	Option VWM 3	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood will not stand up to this amount of building and people. 400 houses will roughly equate to 800 extra cars, 1200-1600 extra people. The doctors, schools, leisure facilities and shops that are in place at the moment will not be able to cope and the current residents will find that the pleasant small town which it is at the moment, will no longer be just that. Yes I know other facilities will be put in place, but how many years are we going to be over-run with contractors etc, (as is the case with the present building going on at the site which used to be the Fairwood, and various other sites over the last few years). Please leave Verwood alone and let the money-greedy people who are trying to sell their land to the builders use the land for which it was intended - farming, and preserve the green belt status and Englands "Green and pleasant land" Are we to become a wildlife bare area and a traffic blackspot about to happen? Does no-one on the plaanning committee care for the welfare of the present current Verwood residents or is it all being done in the name of "Progress" ?			1053
536563	Mr David Hayter		CSO21 607	Option VWM 3	Object		Totally object to the housing developments proposed in Verwood. Not enough amenities to cope with the current population and therefore will in no way be able to sustain another 400 homes.			1053
536566	Mr Adrian Blow		CSO21 548	Option VWM 3	Object		1] lack of current facilities eg shops & other facilities; public transport poor so would increase car journeys 2] lack of infrastructure eg road access etc at Eastworth site			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536571	Mr Craig Jerome		CSO21 559	Option VWM 3	Object		I will shortly be moving to Verwood and my partner lives in Pine View Road.			1053
536572	Mr Roger Fysh		CSO21 592	Option VWM 3	Object		I strongly object to the proposal to increase the housing in and around Verwood. Verwood has been extensively developed over the years and there is inadequate services to support the extra cars and people. Also having seen the housing density of the Ebblake housing estate it is clear that agreeing to more housing will only create 'no go' areas in the very near future. I also note that in and around Wimborne there are huge areas of open land, which could easily be developed, especially between Ferndown and Wimborne which also has excellent road networks in place as it could immediately open onto the A31			1053
536576	Mrs Valerie Green		CSO21 613	Option VWM 3	Object		I object to the core strategy. It will mean destruction of the green belt! The land owners will of course be in favour of development as the land will be worth a lot more as building land. There are 1.5m unoccupied homes in the UK plus an unknown number of empty homes in the rented sector. Central Government wants an extra 3M homes to be built. In total this will house 10 to 15M people. The population has increased by only 5M in the last 50 years why do we need these extra homes? Are there so many people who would choose to live in Verwood and have to travel to work? In view of economic uncertainty is it wise to plan a large increase in the number of new homes. You only have to look at the Irish situation to see how easily things can go wrong. Would the council really destroy the green belt and blight the lives of existing residents if it were not for the Government housing bribe.			1053
536628	Mr C.A Wills		CSO21 666	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536631	Ms Carole-Ann Young		CSO21 638	Option VWM 3	Object		Totally object to the housing developments proposed in Verwood. The size of the developments are far larger than the current infrastructure can support. There are barely enough amenities for the current residents and these			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							developments will create even more strain on already overstretched and poor facilities.			
536634	Mr Andrew Beal		CSO21 650	Option VWM 3	Object		Totally object to all future new housing developments in Verwood. Monies should be invested in infrastructure for existing residents instead. The proposed developments pay little or no attention to existing planning controls and make a mockery of the planning process in East Dorset.			1053
536635	Mr Ronald Helmers		CSO21 658	Option VWM 3	Object		It has been 5 and a half years since I moved to Verwood although I have been familiar with the town for many years prior to that move. Since coming I have been aware of the increase in houses/flats etc over that time. It seems that everywhere I look one house is being demolished and replaced with several residential properties. Now there are these proposals for major residential developments at Eastworth Road and Howe Lane. Combined with the two smaller developments some 415 homes are involved. These, were they in one place could be considered a small town or at the least a very large village. On a seperate issues where is the infrastructure to support all this development? Has the Council considered the implications of the increased traffic that will be generated not only on the area immediately surrounding the two major scehemes but on the town generally? I fear that a modestly sized town is well on its way to becoming a size that many of the residents will find very much not to their liking. I for one object most strongly. I understand that the school proposed is an upper school and that such a school is lacking in the town. If this is the case then I would support its establishment.			1053
536636	Mr Phil Jones		CSO21 667	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood doesn't have the infrastructure for any further such development			1053
536637	Mrs Geraldine Haigh		CSO21 674	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536642	Ms Clare		CSO21 678	Option VWM 3	Object					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Taylor									
536654	Ms Maureen Castell		CSO21 698	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood does not need more houses, it needs a senior school, more shops and another doctors surgery. Verwood is bursting with house. If Verwood is a Town it needs to be a town.			1053
536656	Charlotte England		CSO21 704	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536659	Mr Andy Longshaw		CSO21 709	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536660	Mr and Mrs N J Close		CSO21 711	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536666	Mr C Thickett		CSO21 720	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>Re: Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Consultation – Verwood I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI's and contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unaccepta ble strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses 			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood`s present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			
536678	Mrs L Thickett		CSO21740	Option VWM 3	Object		I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI`s and contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unaccepta ble strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood`s present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			1053
536692	Richard Coulthard		CSO21746	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood already has too much housing for the infrastructure available. Until schools and other facilities are actually built			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							there should not be any more large developments approved. Permission for additional development should not be granted based on an intention to improve facilities at some point in the future.			
536694	Mr T Thickett		CSO21 750	Option VWM 3	Object		Re: Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Consultation – Verwood I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI's and contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unaccepta ble strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood`s present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			1053
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		CSO21 789	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536702	Mr Mark Hirst		CSO21770	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
536718	Mrs J Durham		CSO21802	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536723	P Pembroke		CSO21814	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood has been developed enough in recent years.It now should be left alone without further intrusion into its green spaces to retain it's rural identity and heritage.Further development of 400 homes has the potential for another 800 cars.There is already too much commercial traffic and too many cars coming into and through Verwood with little regard for the speed limit.The roads in Verwood are not large enough to cope with further increases in traffic,not to mention the amount of construction traffic a development of this size would bring.There is insufficient infrastructure in Verwood to accomodate any further development and this would need to be addressed before anything further should be considered.			1053
536766	A Pembroke		CSO21823	Option VWM 3	Object		Insufficient infrastructure in Verwood.Already far too many cars and commercial traffic coming into and through Verwood with little regard for speed limit.Green belt should be left alone and Verwood retain it's rural identity and heritage.Verwood is already an urban dormitory.			1053
536771	B Lusher		CSO22085	Option VWM 3	Object		I object to any development that expands Wimborne and surrounding villages now and at any time in the future. Why is Wimborne such a beautiful town, could it be the Minster, old buildings, steeped in history? probably all of these and many other attributes. Take a good look at that stunning photograph 'Wimborne Minster and Stour In Winter' by Roger Holman, fields and the town centre, all in one picture. This view of the landscape, identified as a scene of merit by the artistic eye of the photographer, often passes the layman by, until pointed out so graphically. This photograph, like others, is a measure of what we could lose. I wonder if there were other equally stunning scenes in the hills northeast of Wimborne, Colehill, now completely covered in houses. Can you imagine the equivalent photograph of that time, the town, with a backdrop			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							of fields and trees rising above horizon. Too late, that moment has passed. The town, in close proximity to countryside, is ye has realised this and is making an effort to preserve old Singapore. We, on the other hand, seem to be quite happy to knock down our countryside in the name of development. If we really want to preserve Wimborne for generations to come, so they can see the town, be part of it's unique character, situated amongst, close at hand countryside, then we must make a conscious decision now to preserve the green belt and green areas in the town forever, before Wimborne eventually becomes a quaint little roundabout that travellers come across on the way from somewhere to somewhere.			
536772	Mr J Stone		CSO21 850	Option VWM 3	Object		Current schools already at Howe Lane, Verwood are now causing congestion twice daily by random parking, bad driving and unless sufficient parking is allowed for future development someone, child or adult, will be killed. Also access away from this area is very poor.			1053
536777	Karen Hodgkiss		CSO21 856	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood doesn't need more houses it desperately needs more facilities. We are a town, not a village anymore. We need a bigger supermarket, a public swimming pool and a high school.			1053
536781	Abigail Harris		CSO21 861	Option VWM 3	Object		As a home owner living on the junction of Church Hill and Margards Lane my Primary concerns are the future plans for a secondary school VWM7 and housing at Howe Lane VWM3. This would greatly increase the volume of traffic that already passes by on route to Emmanuel and Verwood First School.I feel this would have a huge impact on the local residents and would have concerns with regards to road safety along this route. I also have concerns about the other possible development sites and the amount of new homes being built in Verwood. The towns Facilities has not grown with the the population of Verwood.			1053
536790	David Steadman		CSO21 903	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536796	Ann		CSO21	Option	Object					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Coleman		915	VWM 3						
536798	Peter Coleman		CSO21920	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536800	Julieanne Sutherland		CSO21927	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support 400 more homes - there will be increased traffic - the whole point of moving to Verwood is for it's rural feel and quietness and safety . Who is going to benefit from these extra houses ?????? Certainly not existing residents , if this a good way to raise extra revenue on the council tax? The rationale behind this proposal to try and build more houses needs to be fully explained			1053
536802	Anida Griffiths		CSO21955	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536803	Ian Hargreaves		CSO21944	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536807	Paul Dayson-Smith		CSO21954	Option VWM 3	Object		I feel Verwood has seen more than enough building in the last 30 years. There are nowhere near enough local jobs or a suitable level of infrastructure to support a higher population. Whoever proposed to build the, admittedly needed, new secondary school on Howe lane clearly hasn't tried to drive down that road at 8:30 on a weekday morning			1053
536808	Ms Yvette Allen		CSO22025	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood does not need to increase its population is is already too big for the local infrastructure.			1053
536811	Mr P Carey		CSO21972	Option VWM 3	Object		I am a resident of Howe Lane, Verwood,and since moving to this location have had nothing but immense problems with traffic due to the Emmanuel/Verwood school campus. I have had a 4 year running battle with motorists parking, not only over my driveway; but also IN my driveway. I have complained to the local police on numerous occasions, only to be told that it is a council problem. I have applied for a 'white line' and complained to my local councillor - all to no avail. There are regular near miss incidents in and around the school campus. And only last week a parked car in Howe			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Lane was severely damaged. By building the new houses in Howe Lane this will create even more problems. The land to the south of Howe Lane will just compound the problem and then add a new school is just utterly ridiculous. There is no infrastructure within Verwood to accomodate all the proposed developments. If you, the council, wish the residents of Verwood to be amicable, then I suggest I find highly amusing. There is no money for this new school! There is an ongoing situation with damaged vehicles and traffic problems within the school campus and outside. I do not see how this new school can be accessed unless the council is going to build many new roads, or compulsory purchased land. I will fight to my last breath to stop all of this!!!! We do not want this - it will not serve us - it will make our lives intollerable!			
536812	R H Barker		CSO21 994	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536816	Mr T C Clark		CSO22 002	Option VWM 3	Object		The village of Verwood has become a dormitory town because of all the most recent building which has taken place Any further builds would cause more of a problem for the residents already living in Verwood.The reasons being: Public Transport is inadequate Roads are inadequate for the amount of traffic which uses them. Shops are inadequate,other than Banks,Estate Agents or Hairdressers.We need more of a variety of shops within a specific area,not spread all over the town. There are no facilities for the younger element of the town,this needs to be addressed urgently.Keep them off the streets and out of mischief. Restaurants are limited i.e. non existant other than cheap pub food or Indian/chinese take aways and the local chippy. As for the new school (which is a requirement).If this is to be situated within the Campus of the current school this would lead to further problems with traffic flow and parking. Already both sides of Margards Lane/Howe Lane and adjoining roads are near to capacity.Which leads me to another point,Emergency vehicles would be unable to attend either house fires or life threatening situations.This means that people living within this area are under great risk.			1053
536817	Cheryl		CSO22	Option	Object					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Evans		017	VWM 3						
536819	Cathryn Biggins		CSO22 021	Option VWM 3	Object		I don't think there is enough local work in Verwood to support the proposed number of new homes and if people have to travel out of the area to work there will be increased traffic on roads that are already busy, particularly during school times and in the mornings and early evenings. In addition local services like the doctors, dentists, banks, the supermarket and petrol station are already busy and an increase in population numbers will increase waiting times for appointments and queues. I think a new secondary school would also create huge traffic and parking problems on roads that are already very busy with the first and middle school traffic in the mornings and afternoons. At the moment the students have the choice of several good upper schools and the network of bus stops allows them to walk to a local stop. A new school would result in increased traffic as students travel in from surrounding areas. Verwood is a pleasant place to live at the moment and has beautiful green areas surrounding it. Many green areas within Verwood have been infilled with housing during the last 15 years and I don't think the town should be expanded any further.			1053
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		CSO22 069	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536840	Mr Clive Evans		CSO22 059	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536841	Mr and Mrs N P Brunning		CSO22 066	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536848	Ola Steadman		CSO22 146	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536850	Mr Michael Hird		CSO22 160	Option VWM 3	Support		Assertions like "could", "may", "potential", "divert pressures away from heathlands" and "will contribute" are meaningless without guarantees and full explanation. The ratio of			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							affordable homes to (un)affordable is far too high and will result in an unacceptable concentration of ghetto like small dwellings. Developments of more than 30 homes in the current economic climate and without clear plans for improved infrastructure and services is clearly foolhardy and shows a total lack of foresight. The results of the consultation should be published and no further action taken until the full consequences of cuts in Government expenditure are known. This is particularly important with respect to VWM7 - new secondary school.			
494436	Mr R D Turvil		CSO22 740	Option VWM 3	Object		We are against the proposals as they over extend Verwood, which has already been extensively developed and now seems taken for granted as the easy option. The town already suffers from limited community facilities and, what there is, is spread out, thus weakening any real sense of community. The Localism Bill currently before Parliament specifically identifies that residents are to be handed powers to approve/block developments .			1053
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		CSO22 678	Option VWM 3	Support		VWM 3. Howe Lane. 20 homes. No objection.			1053
514507	Mr and Mrs C Macy		CSO22 769	Option VWM 3	Support		We suggest that an access would be better from Summerfields despite 5 NIMBY objectors. The reasons being: 1) Far safer as Howe Lane serves Emmanuel campus 2) Summerfields will soon link up with the road soon to be built by connecting the Morrisons roundabout to the Summerfield roundabout. 3) It will be a continuation of Summerfield style/type houses. Unfortunately, the % of low cost will not mix in with Summerfield.			1053
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22 889	Option VWM 3	Object		Option VWM3 Object to proposal Comment It is recognised that this is within the urban area. However, no ecological surveys have been undertaken and in their absence it would be premature to support this proposal.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							In any event it could only be supported if problems of access, protection of mature trees (including root protection zones) and new supporting SANG could be addressed satisfactorily. It is understood that the owners of Heathy Howe have not and will not support access across their land. The potential drainage issues which could impact on both the land and the River Crane to the south would require mitigation.			
536856	Mr and Mrs Ian Barnes		CSO22 149	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536860	Mrs Sparks		CSO22 192	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
536866	Emma Huns		CSO22 221	Option VWM 3	Object		I feel that Verwood needs more facilities (such as a secondary school, swimming pool, restaurants) before any further expansion			1053
536910	Ms Susan Bradley		CSO22 254	Option VWM 3	Object		I strongly object to the options VWM 1,2,3 and 4 for new houses in Verwood. In particular because they fall within Green Belt land. Green Belt land should be preserved as Green Belt. In the East Dorset SHLAA 2008 Report all of these sites were "considered unacceptable in context of Green Belt Policy". Why are they even being considered? I am horrified at the idea that each time new houses are needed the green belt will simply be redrawn to accommodate them! Please do not build on Green Belt land.			1053
536928	Mr Kevin Fyles		CSO22 280	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
536932	Paul Bason		CSO22 310	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536944	Ian Lucking		CSO22 327	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood cannot take any more traffic because the road system will not cope. The infrastructure will be not be able withstand more population in this small town and will take away its charm.			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536966	Rachel Baulch		CSO22 332	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536972	Iris Baulch		CSO22 337	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536990	Steward Gates		CSO22 347	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
536993	Nicola Gates		CSO22 355	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
537012	Carole Lucking		CSO22 370	Option VWM 3	Object		I feel that the traffic in and out of Verwood is already quite considerable. Much more thought must be put in to the vehicular access to all these properties. I also feel we need more facilities in the town to cater for the needs of all the extra population.			1053
537018	Vanessa Scott		CSO22 380	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
537021	John and Susan Lewis		CSO22 385	Option VWM 3	Support		The population is growing in Verwood and I think there is still a need for more affordable family homes. An upper school is required which would eliminate the need for so much school transport to Ferndown and Wimborne. This would also improve our sense of community and be less divisive. The political movers in Verwood all seem to have a NIMBY attitude towards our community and use any excuse to prevent development.			1053
537026	Roy Cronk		CSO22 390	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
537030	E Lock		CSO22 395	Option VWM 3	Object		There needs to be a lot more facilities and better infrastructure in the Verwood area before adding any more strain. In particular increasing the bus routes, roads and another petrol station			1053
537050	Diane Fletcher		CSO22 415	Option VWM 3	Object		The infrasture currently in place in Verwood is already sufficient to support the existing population without adding potentially 400+ more families. Public transport is woefully			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							inadequate to service its working and social population, with no quick bus links to major employment and social hubs of Bournemouth, Chrsitchurch, Salisbury and Southampton. The existing services are slow and infrequent, with the evening services stopping ridiculously early and sunday services too infrequent to seriously entertain. There is nothing constructive for the existing youth to do and this is already manifesting itself in anti-social behaviour (openly drinking/smoking and causing a general nuisance late at night). Additional families would only add to this growing issue and the threat of closure of the curent police station is very worrying. An additional 400+ vehicles would significantly add to the risk of accidents, especially around the first and middle schools, all of which are alr eady oversubscribed and could not cope with upto 400 additional children (probably double or more than 400 realistically). The additional stress on the existing drains and sewage systems would put existing housing at risk. The existing shopping centre is more akin to a small village and does not service the existing poulation with a range of goods and service that could be reasonably expected of a town of its existing size, let alone having so many more people to service. All in all, Verwood does not have the infrasture, school capacity, leisure/social facilities or public transport to support its existing population. The proposals to add another 400+ families into these limited facilities and services is ill advised and impractical and will only add to anti-social behaviour problems and pressures on the existing infrastructure that would be disasterous for the existing population.			
537075	Mrs Elaine Holt		CSO22 449	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
537104	J R Bardi		CSO22 461	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
537106	C Hebditch		CSO22 480	Option VWM 3	Object		The more homes we build the more roads we need. The homes and roads get filled up then we're back to square one. When will it ever end. The notion expressed in some of the			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>planning, about trying to get people out of their cars, off the roads, and into public transport, is a joke. For example, building on the Cuthbury allotments in Wimborne means that those who have one of the new allotments will have to get their cars out to drive to them, whereas at present there are many people in Wimborne who can walk to their allotments. Most of the areas designated as fit for development will mean even more chaos on our local roads because public transport is not going to improve to the state where those of us who are fortunate to have a job to go to will all be able to get to work on time using a bus. The size of the proposed developments, in my opinion, is too big and will put undue pressure on local services for which we do not at present have funding to improve. I suppose though that these new homes will bring some new council tax payers to the area and therefore, maybe, help with the budget deficit ... until we have to build the new roads</p>			
537122	Christopher Hill		CSO22 492	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
537312	Mr Barry Goldsmith		CSO22 503	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
537314	Mrs Penelope Goldsmith		CSO22 508	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
537318	Daniel Parkin		CSO22 513	Option VWM 3	Object		<p>At present I do not feel any further development is needed in Verwood - the town needs to come to terms with its recent expansion over the last 10-15 years. With no money in the coffers, so to speak, I cannot see where funding for a new school will come from and appears to be a gimmick in return for approval of additional homes. My children go to Verwood First and Emmanuel and traffic is already a problem, without further homes and a potential new school. Money would be better spent expnding the school further so that children can enjoy a wider range of facilities. I attended our child's first xmas fayre this year and the school was so crowded it was uncomfortable, the school does not have the facilities to cater</p>			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							for all the children's wishes, only those drawn out of a hat. If a secondary school is a consideration, then the council really needs to look at how Emmanuel School can be improved first. I agree a secondary school in Verwood would be ideal for the local community growth and dynamics and a further opinion poll taken to see what residents of Verwood would like in 10 years time!!			
537326	Harold Bowskill		CSO22 518	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood continues to lack sufficient amenities and facilities to support its local community now, especially the young with few leisure or entertainment facilities. Verwood has one supermarket serving the entire town with two convenience stores and little else. Adding more homes will simply increase peoples frustrations and anger and due consideration should be given to the existing populous. Increasing the population of Verwood by adding a further 415 homes is clearly a means of increasing council revenue and nothing more, the infrastructure of Verwood simply cannot handle this, the roads, sewers and services will need extensive improvement and in this era of austerity, is it really economically viable.			1053
537362	Peter Constable		CSO22 539	Option VWM 3	Support		The larger residential building proposals are completely out of character for the area and will consume large tracts of green belt. The infrastructure to support development on a large scale is simply not in place. The smaller developments appear to be a better fit e.g Cuthbury, Leigh Park, Stone Lane.			1053
537435	Ms Pauline Burton		CSO22 566	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
537529	Mrs C White		CSO22 593	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
537542	Mrs M Wake		CSO22 604	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
537548	Mr		CSO22	Option	Object					1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	C Wake		609	VWM 3						
537557	Batchelor		CSO22 614	Option VWM 3	Object		We feel Verwood have Enough houses/flats/dwellings and schools in this area lack of decent shopping facilities and coffee shops and good cafes in the area - so feel Verwood should concentrate on making itself user friendly love the green belt area and this should not be removed or made s smaller thankyou			1053
537562	Dan Cartmale		CSO22 619	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
537566	Patricia Adlem		CSO22 625	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
537571	Nick and Marion Leatherdale		CSO22 645	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053
537580	Ruth Brown		CSO22 657	Option VWM 3	Support					1053
537582	Wendy Stacey		CSO22 663	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
537731	Mr Colin Ward		CSO22 668	Option VWM 3	Object					1053
537762	Peggy Marshall		CSO22 673	Option VWM 3	Object		Vewood is a country town with surrounding fields and forest. Therefore there should be no building on green belt 515 homes could mean at least 800 + cars which the roads are unable to cope with. The support services such as drainage was not designed to cope with the proposed rise in number of the population. Existing shops would be inadequate. "Let the people decide"----Cameron's slogan			1053
537806	Mrs P Arnold		CSO22 691	Option VWM 3		No Opinion				1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter Griffiths		CSO22 723	Option VWM 3	Support		Approve of provision of affordable housing, however, agreement with Housing Association must be watertight so housing stock for rent remains constant and stock can never be sold. These houses will be near to facilities, schools, shops, transport, work and will alleviate pressure on rural communities with no facilities to provide affordable housing in the Green Belt.			1053
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		CSO22 844	Option VWM 3		General Comment	Again, a point that was made both strongly and clearly at the Public meeting in the Memorial Hall, was that, with all the growth of housing development that has been undertaken in recent years, there needs to be space for 'Verwood to find itself! The general feeling is that too much is happening, too quickly and the community needs more time to 'bed down'. Whilst it is appreciated that the proposed housing developments will probably not take place within the next five years, in the life of a community, that still seems a rather short time frame.			1053
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		CSO22 850	Option VWM 3	Support		11.91 Western Sub-area: Area 1 - land south of Howe Lane: no specific objection provided that a) good proportion of housing is starter-homes and b) no direct access to Howe Lane too close to roundabout and on rising ground, with limitations for sight lines eastwards;			1053
539805	Mr Philpot		CSO22 804	Option VWM 3	Object		Margards Lane is busy and dangerous for the school children as it is now. Too many houses/flats are ruining Verwood, the landscape and community feeling. In eight years of living here it has grown immensely with ugly flats. The more people living in Verwood the more chance of crime as it no longer has a community feel and people lose their sense of pride in their area. Verwood still has a village feel - let's keep it that way.			1053
583759	Mr A Craddock and Mrs D Goodenough		CSO22 955	Option VWM 3	Object		Verwood is the fastest growing town in Europe with insufficient infrastructure (ie access roads into Verwood) to support these 415 new homes being planned. We already have to wait up to 5 mins to leave Noon Hill Road to access the main Ringwood Road, its very frustrating even now. The traffic along Ringwood Road is already travelling well in			1053

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							excess of the speed limit and it seems no one is interested in doing anything to curb it. With all the proposed extra dwellings and the new school run there will be even more traffic exceeding the speed limit. Therefore it will be even more difficult for the elderly residents to survive this traffic.			
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO530	11.104	Object		<p># This site should be considered for housing. As it is easier to build on rather than investigate brown field sites?</p> <p># The site has a number of sensitive boundaries, including a Site of Nature Conservation Interest to the west and wooded heath to the east, requiring careful consideration. It does, it has a SSSI within 400m which makes it un-usable for development.</p> <p># Significant tree lines run through the site which would need to be retained and enhanced. More trees is always a good plan.</p> <p># Several Tree Preservation Orders are present across the site and should be retained. Although trees are currently being felled in this area by landowners. TPO fines are typically a few hundred pounds, on land worth millions.</p> <p># Potential for area to the south to deliver semi-natural circular walks (River Crane). Why do houses need to be developed for this to happen?</p> <p># Environmental Agency flood maps indicate that the flood outlines are constrained to the area around the watercourse, however, further investigation would be required to confirm this at a later date.</p> <p>The area is currently under water, as it is typically every winter. The environment agency maps are not up to date. There are sink holes in this area as the soil is typically very sandy.</p>			1056
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO231	Option VWM 4	Support		<p>Very dangerous road, increase in traffic would make life hell for bikes, horse riders etc. Access on dangerous bends, access at St Micheals ridiculous. Greenbelt?? I have been told..</p> <p>The 2 doctors surgeries have little room to expand, could we build a medical centre on the North East Section of this site</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>away from the houses. To combine present surgeries to allow for further expansion in the future. This would fall in line with primary health care for local residents with the NHS reform proposals. This would solve some of the rush hour access issues to this site, as the site will be in use all day. This would also create a number of jobs for the local residents.</p> <p>Where the doctors surgery in Lake Road is the Dentist could possibly expand to allow for new NHS and Private patients. Where the doctors surgery is in Station Rd this could be retail space for new business also generating jobs and adding more vibrancy to the town. One or more of the pharmacies may wish to move to the medial centre.</p> <p>Some say 20/30 social and starter homes could be carefully incorporated into the development along the Manor Road for the Elderly for this site provides adequate access to health facilities and bus routes.</p> <p>I would recommend traffic calming on this road prior to any development on this site.</p> <p>From my understanding there is a protected Oak Tree in the way which would make it impossible to do the Springfield Close Road access, unless this tree is felled.</p>			
361055	Mr David OAKLEY		CSO1022	Option VWM 4	Object		I find it very hard to understand how, after unanimous support for no development in the Green Belt this now goes directly against that decision.			1057
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO590	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>http://www.dorsetforyou.com/media.jsp?mediaid=129695&filetype=pdf</p> <p>"The SPG advocates the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) which should seek to control surface run-off as close to its origin and attempts to mimic natural drainage processes, thereby reducing flood risk and pollution. Accordingly, a SUDS for a new development should meet the following basic requirements: for 'green-field' sites there should be no greater run-off than exists prior to development downstream watercourses and habitat should not be damaged by run-off generated by the development."</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							As there are significant drainage issues currently with this site, will the expectation of the developer include Sustainable Drainage from the site?			
490570	Mrs Patricia RYAN		CSO10 37	Option VWM 4	Object		As a resident of Verwood I feel that it already does not have the facilities to support a town of this size, so an increase in housing seems like madness. The main Ringwood road is already very hard to access at the best of times, without more cars being added.			1057
490846	Karen COOMBS		CSO10 61	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
490854	D MUTTON		CSO10 69	Option VWM 4	Support		I only support the home development south of Howe Lane and south of Manor Road if Howe Lane and St Michael Road are adopted and improved to provide additional access to the additional homes etc (school). Margards Lane/Church Hill already have more than enough traffic congestion at times. From SNAP: The support of those areas of Verwood marked as 'supported' is dependent on an improved road access - especially in respect of Howe Lane, which needs to be adopted. Margards Lane/Church Hill are already over-loaded with traffic at certain times of the day. This could be relieved by re-opening the northern arm of Church Hill onto Manor Road - with 'left turn only' at this point			1057
495558	Linda Raybould		CSO14 99	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
495562	Mr MJ Banting		CSO15 19	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
495625	Mr Michael McMath		CSO15 46	Option VWM 4	Object		While I support the building of a new upper school in Verwood which I think has been needed for years my main concern is that if 415 new houses are to be built in Verwood where are all the children who will be living in these houses be going to school? I would assume that 415 houses would mean about 700 or more children, the current 1st and middle schools do not have the capacity to take in this number of			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							new pupils so they would have to be bussed to schools outside Verwood. My other concerns are the extra traffic that would be generated by another 700 cars. There are times when pedestrians can wait 5 minutes or more to cross Manor Lane to the Monmouth Ash car park for access to Morrisons, this will just get worse. Where are all these residents going to work? I assume they will be commuting in and out of Verwood every day thus adding to the already busy roads.			
496188	Mr RE Vogel		CSO16 26	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
496338	Mr John Clough		CSO16 52	Option VWM 4	Object		Recent roadworks on the B3081 have demonstrated how fragile the routes in and out of Verwood are. More housing will make the situation worse. Recent disastrous developments including the Fairwood site clearly demonstrate the insensitivity of planning within Verwood. I can see no need for supporting further development when it is clear the needs of existing residents are being disregarded and our environment damaged without thought or consideration for the future. I continue to travel to Ringwood and Ferndown for town amenities until such time as these are available in Verwood. I strongly object to further development.			1057
496462	Mr and Mrs Guy Jameson		CSO16 80	Option VWM 4	Object		Before developing hundreds of homes the local infrastructure in Verwood requires enhancements. If a senior school is required in Verwood then a suitable site needs to be found. Land that is protected by green belt status must be respected and adhered to.			1057
496479	Charlotte Dixon		CSO17 21	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
496526	Mr Dennis Barrow		CSO17 38	Option VWM 4	Object		I object strongly to the Manor Road development on ecological grounds. I regularly walk my dog around this area and see deer, foxes, buzzard, woodpeckers and a variety of snakes and in the late evening badgers. This land is prone to flooding in the winter and the building of another 165 homes would put a strain on the Manor Rd drainage system which I	My suggested amendment to the option of Manor Road development VM4 would be to use this land for much needed allotments. I know some of this land is very fertile as the		1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							understand is not fit for purpose. I object to the Manor Road development on ecological grounds.	previous owners used to grow vegetables and fruit on this land and sell the produce for good profit.		
496564	JH Lockwood		CSO1760	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
496588	Mr and Mrs Richardson		CSO1787	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
496612	Mr and Mrs JP Lovell		CSO1816	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
360714	Carol Morgan		CSO2034	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
361111	Mr Raymond Brown		CSO2084	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
361170	Mr TR HARVEY		CSO2856	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
484088	Mr David Price		CSO2533	Option VWM 4	Object		If correct guidelines and environmental studies for wildlife etc are conducted along with consultation on all aspects of development then they could proceed with developments but scale in relation to services and infrastructure for these developments is completely out of balance. The relatively short open period for consultation on a document that has clearly been developed over quite sometime is a concern in order to formulate a serious plan of objections. The descriptions of local infrastructure and improvements has been met with much derision along with the continued failure to upgrade the supportive infrastructure required. This is not surprising with the consultants being in Weybridge and clearly have only visited the area briefly. Additionally I note that the environmental impact has been glibbed over as the Bat, Badger, Deer, Slow worm and newt	A period of FULL public consultation should be entered into and the council should provide a clearer information pack to local councils and remove the fear that everyone has that this is a done deal and residents will not be listened to,.		1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							populations have rised considerably. Living on Eastworth itself I cannot see how the council proposes to make the road safe to use as they are narrow and protected by houses, nor is there room for the required pedestrian walkways.			
491311	Mr Kevin GILLING		CSO2716	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
495971	T A Reith		CSO2249	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
496958	Mrs J Beech		CSO1941	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
497026	Doreen Smith		CSO2004	Option VWM 4	Object		This amount of building will create extra traffic in Ferndown and Parley which already has a lot of road build up in the busy morning and evening travel. Also taking a lot of natural land for our wild life.			1057
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		CSO2112	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
497184	Mr Hilling		CSO2220	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
497223	AJ Marvin		CSO2234	Option VWM 4	Object		My prime objections to Verwood developments are 1 Loss of green belt. What is wrong with the Boundary Lane area? 2 Over 20 years Verwood has expanded out of all proportion, to a level infrastructure is barely able to support. 3 Car parking in the village centre ie Pottery, surgery and limited roadside parking is totally inadequate at present (certainly am) shops have been approved with no parking or at least very limited-how will it cope with 400 new families In favour An upper school will reduce traffic in and out of town save money and environmentally friendly-needs access road improvement from Margarts/Church Hill.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
497343	Sharon Sutcliffe		CSO2283	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
497773	R Johnstone		CSO2486	Option VWM 4	Object		Regarding Verwood proposals, I think the town needs more infrastructure before expansion. There is no cinema, swimming pool and a lack of small shops in the centre. Morrisons is not the "be all and end all". The traffic at present (connected with VWM7 proposal) is already clogging our roads twice a day. New facilities (housing and schooling) will increase the street parking problems for residents as there is no sensible drop off points in the schools campus. New roads invariably draw in more traffic. More needs to be done to encourage children to walk to school and for cars to be left in the garage. I have witnessed ladies who arrive early for the pick up to "reserve" their street parking and when I challenged one lady for parking on the pavement, found she lived in Haywards Cres.			1057
498044	Carolyne BANKS		CSO2684	Option VWM 4	Support		Use the newer out-of-town developments to extend housing - after all that's what they were created for ie: Verwood, Corfe Mullen, Sturminster Marshall. Don't cram more development into existing residential areas in town.			1057
498047	CD Bradford		CSO2661	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
498051	Mrs Mary Connor		CSO2678	Option VWM 4	Object		The proposed developments in the south of Verwood will further exacerbate the problems we currently experience with flooding. Manor Road drains are not able to cope with the present volume of water. Verwood does not have enough public transport to cope with such a sudden rise in population.			1057
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		CSO2745	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
498078	G Sims		CSO2732	Option VWM 4	Support		Gives the young a chance of buying affordable homes and a secondary school which is needed.			1057
498084	Mr P		CSO2766	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	HARTLEY									
498122	Williams		CSO2779	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is full!! Infrastructure does not cope with existing poulace. limited supermarket facilities, garage (fuel) etc. High rise flats are not conducive to a country town. However they seem to be springing up all over - more than a blot on the landscape!			1057
498125	Mr and Mrs P DASHWOOD		CSO2802	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
498133	Mrs Dowling		CSO2829	Option VWM 4	Object		The opinions of Verwoodians seem to count for nothing, the unsightly, unwanted, unneeded building at Blackhill being a good example.			1057
360037	Mr Dave BARNES		CSO4055	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
361041	Mr & Mrs G K HAMPTON		CSO4027	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
361106	Mr and Mrs Robin and Janet WALL		CSO3681	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO3282	Option VWM 4	Support		Verwood already has a population of about 14,000 and doesn't yet benefit from the infrastructure or vibrancy which its residents deserve. Nevertheless, I support a limited amount of development in the town in the hope that it will contribute to improving Verwood's infrastructure, its vibrancy as a town and its green spaces. I also support limited development to provide desperately needed affordable homes as part of a mixed community.			1057
497947	Mr Guy		CSO2579	Option VWM 4	Object		I see this as a far better site for an Upper School than the one listed in VWM7; it avoids most of the traffic issues that are the	Include the option of an upper school on the Manor Road site.		1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Brooker						main thrust of objections to a new school next to Emmanuel. If the area is sufficient, perhaps there could be a mixed development of school with houses? VWM4. Manor Road. 165 homes. I object e Strategy are likely to proceed quickly and thereby overload existing shopping, commercial and transport facilities. I would also expect that the pace of privately funded housing development will greatly outstrip any affordable housing where part public funding is required, thereby failing to meet a core strategy target. I must presume also that these development proposals under current consideration will run alongside such plans as are already identified in the plan expiring in 2012, although we are not asked to comment about the impact of this combination. Neither has it been indicated by EDDC the expected level of infill development that can be expected over the plan period. EDDC faces an uphill struggle to persuade the residents that they can be responsive to public opinion and effective at delivering acceptable development. Recent history demonstrates poor performance in these areas.			
498160	Mrs Gwendoline Martin		CSO2880	Option VWM 4	Object		No housing development without infrastructure-road in Verwood cannot carry any further traffic Station Road is a death trap we are only waiting for a accident to happen Shop deliveries should be controlled-and not allowed to happen at rush hour. When a satisfactory road scheme is planned-housing could be considered. Developer must be made to pay-towards the above.			1057
498169	Mrs D WEAVER		CSO2905	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
498184	Mrs Angela BARKER		CSO2932	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
498211	Mrs J AUCKLAND		CSO2941	Option VWM 4	Object		1. The area historically has a problem with surface water flooding. If 200 houses are built on this site - this will obviously exacerbate this problem. The area is surrounded by			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>natural ponds and lakes, and the River Crane.</p> <p>2. My home is one of the few Cob buildings left in Verwood. If the houses cause a problem with flooding, the Cob just washes away. This has already happened in Verwood to a very beautiful Cob house in Burnbake Road, which suffered the same fate after new builds were erected around it and the Cob had to be demolished.</p> <p>3. The River Crane is an area of special scientific interest, and as such would certainly be affected by a housing estate being built next to it.</p> <p>4. The area's wildlife would suffer, there are Badgers, Foxes, Bats, snakes etc.... I appreciate none of these are protected species, the lack of light pollution from street lights helps encourage wildlife.</p> <p>5. Most of the residents moved to this location because of its semi rural outlook, we appreciate the character of the roads and the fact that there is no light pollution from street lights.</p> <p>6. The 'road' (this is a 6' wide lane) from the junction of Howe Lane up to Manor Farm is a Green Lane. I would like to know how you aim to stop traffic from the proposed development using this as vehicle access to the school. I am aware of the councils intention to close off the end of St Michael's onto Manor Road, but if there are 165+ houses, all potentially with cars, do you also intend to close off St Michael's from the proposed development at the end of St Michael's - or maybe where Howe Lane joins St Michael's?</p> <p>I would appreciate some information on your proposals regarding this point,</p>			
498268	Mr and Mrs R Cullen		CSO3016	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
498271	Mandy CHEESEM AN		CSO3064	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
498335	Mr and Mrs Lester		CSO3223	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
498385	Ms		CSO31	Option	Object		Verwood is already over populated. There are not enough	No amendments to be made. It		1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Sarah Cosgrove		28	VWM 4			facilities to accommodate these small or huge developments. The roads in and out of Verwood would not withstand an extra 400+ cars. We have no secondary school and the current primary schools would not cope with such an influx of people. You cannot have a development of this size without additional services and facilities which you have failed to plan for.	is a ridiculous suggestion to develop this many houses in such a small area.		
498386	Mr & Mrs DL & MD Thompson		CSO31 34	Option VWM 4	Support		The scheme meets government demands for future housing using land which will not cause problems to existing residents - good planning to incorporate ancillary components of the scheme - ie balance cost for housing, transport needs and schooling. Overall a well thought out scheme which hopefully will reduce the need for high density schemes to be built within the town's current planning belt. NB If The Hub had been as well thought out at planning we would not have been facing the current problems.			1057
498428	Ms Helen Puttock		CSO31 98	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood has expanded enough. There are blocks of flats that keep appearing already. The infrastructure of the village is not enough as it is. The roads will be clogged up more than they are at the moment without the minimum of an extra 300 plus cars to cope with. Verwood does not need any more housing. Are we aiming for city status?			1057
498477	Mr Terry Puttock		CSO32 49	Option VWM 4	Object		Clogged roads. Infrastructure is insufficient. Lose small town / village atmosphere.			1057
498518	Mr & Mrs Grieg and Ruth Brown		CSO32 87	Option VWM 4	Support		Support building new accommodation to the South of Verwood			1057
498527	Mr John Edgar		CSO32 98	Option VWM 4	Object		The sellers of the proposed land and the Council have no consideration of the impact of the proposals on Verwood's infrastructure, existing retail and manufacturing employment facilities or even transport route. The town does not need any more "housing association" style estates with all the problems such areas often bring to areas. Further more, why is Verwood the only East Dorset town to	Amend the proposals by reducing the new homes plans by no less than 75% and share the proposed houses between other less affected towns such as Ferndown, Wimborne, Blandford etc, all of which have		1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							be targeted for such unreasonable numbers of extra profiles (1200 - 1500) a further growth of 10%+, especially as the existing infrastructure hardly copes with today's population. Verwood was given to understand that the town had now received its "quota" of new builds. Most or all of the proposed "sell off" area are farmland or green belt which this area is fast losing to the exasperation of all residents.	far less populations.		
498711	Mr Tam Chant		CSO34 06	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
498996	M E CLARKE		CSO34 67	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
499044	Mrs Carolyn MASKELL		CSO34 93	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>Verwood has expanded rapidly in the last 25 years and needs time to consolidate before any more new houses are built. There is no scope for further increase in traffic and the few facilities we have are overloaded at present. Improvements are desperately needed to the roads, drains and leisure facilities, we have very few shops and public transport is minimal. There is little opportunity for employment and I cannot see the need for the number of houses proposed in this area especially as this is green belt land that should never be released for buildings that do nothing to enhance our Town.</p> <p>At present the schools in Howe Lane do not have the required 2 made up roads for access in an emergency and further delays are now being made to the Springfield Road route that was promised many years ago. Traffic using St Michaels Road has increased to a dangerous level; this is an unadopted, single-track road with no pavements for the many children walking to school.</p> <p>The water level at our end of St Michaels Road is already too high with gardens flooded and water under floorboards, ditches are not maintained and drainage has collapsed in more than one area in Manor Road. More houses in Verwood would just raise the water table even further.</p> <p>Our town character needs defining within the current boundaries; we do not need more urban sprawl with the usual</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							promised improvements by the developers not being fulfilled. The green belt land proposed for this development is adjacent to the triple SSI site of the River Crane and Heathy How Woodland; it can only be detrimental to the many species of wildlife in the area that we understand are protected.			
499231	Mrs A Lathbury		CSO35 39	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
499236	J PIPE		CSO35 54	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
499245	Mr and Mrs N BUTLER		CSO35 86	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
499261	Mrs Norma JACKSON		CSO36 22	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
499271	Mrs P Giles		CSO36 20	Option VWM 4	Object		No new building should take place in Verwood without consideration being given to improving public transport for existing residents. There is no transport after approx 18.30 to enable people to enjoy existing facilities like The Hub and Club 31. A large proportion of the elderly do not have their own cars, taxis are expensive and therefore these venues are not well frequented and are running at a loss. Verwood should be made more 'user friendly'.			1057
499290	Mrs Lisa TURNBULL		CSO36 53	Option VWM 4	Object		This development on green belt land rich in wildlife should not be allowed to proceed for the following reasons: 1. Detrimental effect on rural character of local area. 2. Increased traffic both car and foot, in currently tranquil area. 3. Increased risk of flooding on boggy area. 4. Loss of wildlife. 5. Loss of ancient hedgerows and trees. This is not a sensible or sustainable development for Verwood.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							SNAP:The land south of Manor Road in particular is a wildlife rich area of Green Belt. Road infrastructure, risk of flooding/drainage concerns and an area of natural beauty suggests to me that this area is wholly unsuitable for any development. The impact on the already congested southern entrance to Verwood along Manor Road would become an issue as well as protecting residence of St Michaels Road including the listed St Michaels Cottage. Any proposed development here will have an adverse effect on the whole area and the key issues of "sustainable development" and "impact on the environment" MUST be looked at carefully to show that this area should not be developed.			
499291	R S Welch		CSO3682	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
360685	Mr M.P HOSE		CSO4645	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
496396	Mrs Jill Freer		CSO3754	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood has undergone massive building projects since 1993. I feel that we can't take any more. Hideous flats have been built in a most unsuitable site in Crane Drive; and a worse looking building is going up where the Fayrewood Pub stood. How on earth was permission granted for these buildings? The schools are full, Drs are full, NHS Dentist is full - and the road to Ringwood is dangerous and very busy at times. We just CANNOT take another 400+ houses - which equals 1,000 people at least - and cars and vans etc.			1057
498495	Mr John Williams		CSO3728	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
499384	Mr A I ROSE		CSO3729	Option VWM 4	Support		Verwood seems to be adormitory with no town centre (scattered development). All the talk when I moved to the area in 1978 was 'Wessex City'. What happened? Is this the first stage of completing the arc around the Poole/Bournemouth conurbation? If this is so, develop southwards, west of the Moors River, flood plains permitting			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							and there is the planners utopia for the 22nd century.			
499481	Mr John MARTIN		CSO3800	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
499551	Rachel TYLER		CSO3831	Option VWM 4	Support		The main focus of my support is for a new upper school in Verwood. Even without the increase in housing there is a desperate need for this, along with the added community facilities this will bring. For children from outlying villages, they have a longer journey than Verwood children to QE currently. A new upper school would also shorten their travel distances considerably, i.e: Cranborne / Sixpenny Handley etc. As a parent of 2 children aged 8 and 3, I just hope it comes in time for them. I have real concerns about the travel involved for my girls to Wimborne, especially as they currently walk to school.			1057
499873	Mr Graham Holt		CSO3999	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
500060	Mr Stuart PIDDOCK		CSO4083	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
500132	Mrs Margaret Ann Barham		CSO4145	Option VWM 4	Object		Sheer volume of traffic! Already at saturation point on Margards Lane and speed of traffic!!!	Already congested traffic in area. Adopt Springfield Road, Manor Lane and Hove Lane to divert traffic and ease congestion.		1057
500196	Mike & Ruth Smith		CSO4164	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
500222	S Hartley		CSO4442	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
500350	Mr P H BARTLETT		CSO4228	Option VWM 4	Support					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
500361	Mr and Miss N and A Middleton and Turner		CSO4271	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
500394	Mrs Sandra HOWES		CSO4291	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
500418	Mr and Mrs S H YATES		CSO4299	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood already has too many houses because there is an inadequate infrastructure, especially roads. Howe Lane in particular needs to be improved to provide alternative access to the existing schools. A new school on this site, even with Howe Lane improvements, would create gridlock with only 2 means of access.			1057
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		CSO4318	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
500558	A Baker		CSO4370	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
500697	Mr Thomas SMITH		CSO4498	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
500706	R & J Jeans		CSO4541	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
500720	Mrs VALLIER		CSO4545	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
500748	Mrs Lauren MATTHEWS		CSO4595	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
500802	J Hayward		CSO4720	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
500807	Mr and Mrs K E EYRES		CSO46 67	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>Paragraph 11.9 of the Core Strategy options document for Verwood and West Moors states that Verwood has a GOOD ROAD LINK to the A31(T) and the A338. This road, part of the B3081, is TOTALLY INADEQUATE for the volume of traffic it carries in both directions. An unacceptable number of FATAL ACCIDENTS between Verwood and Ringwood have occurred in recent years. This road should be UPGRADED TO DUAL CARRIAGEWAY before any further development is allowed in Verwood.</p> <p>Furthermore, most of the other routes through the town which link to the B3081 - Manor Road, Lake Road, Woodlinken Drive, Burnbake Road, Newtown Road, Newtown Lane - to name but a few, are in a TERRIBLE STATE OF REPAIR, mainly due to adjacent development accessing the underground services, followed by POOR QUALITY, and often TEMPORARY repairs to the road surface. Again these issues need to be addressed before further development is permitted.</p> <p>A new Secondary school is a definite requirement for a Town of Verwood's size, but it must have ADEQUATE VEHICULAR ACCESS. Surely the land to the West of Trinity School, close to the Southern and Western relief roads, would be a better option than the Emmanuel Campus. This would give some relief to the long suffering residents of St. Michaels Road, Howe Lane and Margards Lane.</p>			1057
500836	Mrs Sylvia Hines		CSO47 35	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
500903	Mr and Mrs S and R Harris		CSO47 88	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
500999	Mrs JD Burton		CSO48 07	Option VWM 4	Object		Regarding Verwood. We need more doctors, shops, buses, to cope with extra property			1057
501012	Louise ARNOLD		CSO48 83	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		CSO49 14	Option VWM 4	Object		Station Road Verwood and Eastworth Road are presently overloaded with vehicle traffic. Heavy vehicles traffic has increased by 400% in the past ten years and it is now essential that heavy vehicle numbers passing through the centre of Verwood be reduced, diverting to other routes. It is also very necessary to improve Station Road footpath before a serious accident occurs.			1057
501069	Mr and Mrs R Rich		CSO49 22	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood does not have enough existing facilities for us who already live here. 1 - Doctors 2 - Dentists 3 - Local shops. We moved here years ago to get away from continuous road noise and heavy traffic and to have a nice green environment which will be spoilt by your plans.			1057
501090	Mr and Mrs Gee		CSO49 38	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
501106	Mr John Victor Rogers		CSO49 52	Option VWM 4	Support		Verwood needs more housing to ensure that we have a secondary school and an increase in population will help to secure the future of the "Hub". And Morrisons will have to enlarge which will benefit us all and the land in this area is only suitable for housing not "crops".			1057
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		CSO50 34	Option VWM 4	Object		The impact of the proposed development in Verwood would be to fundamentally change the feel of the town. There will be no increased employment opportunities for the growing population. We are concerned about the congestion that will occur in Springfield Road if it is adopted and linked to Howe Lane and also have great concerns about the decrease in the value of our property if our front garden decreases in size due to more land being needed for the distributor road. This in turn would lead to large compensation payments being made to residents in a time of economic hardship.			1057
501118	Mr Ron Cook		CSO50 23	Option VWM 4	Support					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501135	Charlie Wassell		CSO5051	Option VWM 4	Support		Only homeless people should be able to object to the building of new homes. Residents should consider how to improve facilities. Developers should contribute to improving facilities.			1057
501235	Mr and Mrs J Churchward		CSO5136	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is big enough, the infrastructure just can't take any more homes and people. Our supermarket struggles to cope, the doctors are full and maybe before planning is granted trips should be made in and out of Verwood during the rush hour. Both roads out are like the M25 a constant stream of traffic, and then when an accident occurs and they do it grinds to a halt all the roads are gridlocked. Imagine the extra cars adding to this situation. This is greenbelt land , keeping Verwood the size it is, adding houses and the necessary road system will ruin this rural town.			1057
501261	Mr and Mrs Jeffries		CSO5166	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
501351	Mr and Mrs R D'Cruze		CSO5252	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
501485	Mrs J JACKSON		CSO5298	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
501488	Chris LAMB		CSO5332	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
501502	Mr Michael WAREHAM		CSO5379	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
501512	Donald Gray		CSO5412	Option VWM 4	Object		Due to over development Verwood will be unable to support any increase in popultaion and the facilities involved i.e. doctors, shops, traffic will not be able to cope. It would be good to have some green spaces left!! Verwood was once a pretty village - no more! Just a miss match of 'eyesore' flats etc.			1057
501515	Mrs		CSO54	Option	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	A Ryan		16	VWM 4						
501520	Mrs Z MERRIFIELD		CSO5451	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
501523	Rita Gilbert		CSO5496	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
501525	G Pearson		CSO5479	Option VWM 4	Object		For over 20 years the council planners have rode roughshod over residents wishes, totally ignoring the fact everyone wanted no more housing development in the town. The councils obsession with high density and so called 'affordable housing' was neither wanted or desired by the majority of residents. The monstrosity being built on the former Fairwood Pub site is just one example of council attitude.			1057
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		CSO5532	Option VWM 4	Support		Please do not accept any community centre / halls or leisure centre as a corporate inducement from developers of housing developments. In my experience they hardly ever work and cost a great deal in subsidy for councils each and every year. ie. Verwood Hub; Lenham, Kent; Ditton, Nr Maidstone, Kent. My ref: 10 years as a Parish Councillor in Ditton, Kent.			1057
501560	Mr Christopher CLARKE		CSO5590	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
359908	Mr F.D.A REVILL		CSO6263	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
359927	Mrs Ann BISSEX		CSO6380	Option VWM 4	Object		The green belt should not be encroached on any further. No building should be allowed on flood plains. Much more serious effort needs to be put into reducing necessity of relying on car travel.			1057
501364	Mr M		CSO5867	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Devetta									
501583	Mrs Jean Russell		CSO5691	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>This has been considered before, e.g. when the new houses were built in Howe Lane and beyond St. Michael's Cottage, what happened to that money? Also the developers statement 'will contribute to transport improvements' will they? I rather doubt it considering their previous track record. The holes in Howe Lane and St. Michael's Road bear testimony to this. Try driving along these roads! An accident waiting to happen. No one in this area wants this dreadful plan implemented. It seems to have escaped your notice, that we shall all end up under water. There should not be any more houses / flats in this particular area, there are far too many dreadful flats and developments in gardens and how could all those dreadful developments on the edge of the town ever gained approval? They are a disgrace. Verwood used to be a pleasant place to live when we moved here 39 years ago. Look at it now! Are you proud of the 'improvements'?!! No one else is. I realise that housing is needed. To go ahead with this plan will be a disaster and how did you decide to fall in with the plans / request to sell off this land, just because the owners could sell it at a very good profit? It is possible that they will not be living in the water? I think not.</p> <p>The present infrastructure will not sustain such a large project as this and the drains in Manor Road are at full capacity now. Even more water will accumulate as the leaves fall.</p>			1057
501616	R J Joyce		CSO6021	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
501626	Mrs J A Russell		CSO5766	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
501694	Mr R BRYAN		CSO5799	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
501699	B THOMAS		CSO5826	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501720	Dr and Mrs D HARLOW		CSO5924	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
501761	Mr D Curtis		CSO6023	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
501867	Mrs I M Marks		CSO6310	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
501873	Mr and Mrs Harold A and D Joan Lilley		CSO6315	Option VWM 4	Object		All proposals of this nature have a number of basic needs. One of the most important is infrastructure. Subject to finance being available Canford Bottom Roundabout is to be drastically amended for the Olympic Games. The reference to "Improvements to Canford Bottom therefore appear to have been superceded. Since I cannot find any intention to improve the road network all these proposals will only add to our present problems and cannot be supported.			1057
501876	J Long		CSO6217	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
501881	B W Deverill		CSO6291	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		CSO6281	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502022	Mr HWR Stevens		CSO6396	Option VWM 4	Object		Dorset's villages and small towns should be preserved as such. So called "developers" are only concerned with profits. There'll always be an England? Not when it has been built over and occupied by strangers.			1057
502029	Mr J MacArthur		CSO6442	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		CSO6456	Option VWM 4	Object		The whole area is congested, there is no real provision for new TRANSPORT OR services for new homes ie doctors, local shops or community ctrs. There are already MANY EMPTY industrial units. Building more industrial is only viable if a tax loss for developers. Verwood has lost its soul now, and does not need any more ad-hock development. Wimborne will follow if the development of this (at present) lovely Town is carried out in the same way as Verwood has been.			1057
502059	Mr R Seddon		CSO6508	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502061	J and M Jeater and Tilley		CSO6500	Option VWM 4	Object		The current infrastructure is insufficient as it is. Priority should be given to improving this before enlarging Verwood to the extent suggested. Verwood has become a dormitory town by design. All this has happened in 20 years or less. Has not Verwood developed enough? Several more shops and another filling station is the very minimum expected.			1057
361113	Mr Alan Meade		CSO7207	Option VWM 4	Support		.I like the rate of affordable housing to private homes. We all know that there is a shortage. Jobs will be created, money brought in, good for all in East Dorset, Christchurch			1057
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		CSO6783	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		CSO6977	Option VWM 4	Object	General Comment	The area cannot sustain this quantity of new homes which would also require jobs for the vast majority. This proposal of 2,570 homes would also add another 5,000 cars to an already congested junction at West Parley. This area is already over stretched private and industrial vehicles. Jobs are already at a premium with companies moving out of the area or even closing. Warehouses are laying empty and shops are being converted into living accommodation. The young local people are not able to find homes due to the vast majority going to people moving into the area. This vast development will destroy this rural area. Just look at Bournemouth if you require any proof.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501940	Mr M J Godfrey		CSO7208	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502076	Kay Stead		CSO6565	Option VWM 4	Object		A new secondary school is VITAL for the Verwood area. Verwood has quadrupled in size since we came here 8 years ago. There are enough new homes - many haven't sold. There are not enough facilities in the town to sustain any more residents. The leisure centre is dire, however, the Hub is a triumph.			1057
502077	Douglas Poole		CSO6533	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is already an overcrowded and congested area. Further developments will contribute to make this town a ghetto like place - what for?			1057
502078	Mr R Marlow		CSO6543	Option VWM 4	Object		Why waste more tax payers money!!! Too much now!!! These proposals are ridiculous, as any further work prospects in this area are "zero". So why more homes and cars when the road/transport structure is obsolete for modern days need, let alone provision for the future 20/30 years. Just building more houses will not solve the long standing problems in Dorset ie jobs and road structures.			1057
502092	Mr and Mrs A Watkinson		CSO6561	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
502099	Carolyn Lourens		CSO6598	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502114	Mr P Foster		CSO6646	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
502117	Mr P A Beard		CSO6628	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		CSO6691	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502138	Mrs E Mason		CSO6706	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502253	Mrs Lesley Jane Franklin		CSO6755	Option VWM 4	Support		I support all options for Verwood, Wimborne and Colehill because I feel there is a great need for more affordable housing in these areas, especially for young families and vulnerable elderly people in rural areas.			1057
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		CSO6806	Option VWM 4	Object	General Comment	No new building should be anywhere near a floodplain with sea levels rising. Transport issues on and around the A31 are already over capacity - no development should proceed without that being sorted - including knock on effects of A31 issues. Has it actually been established that there is a need for all the homes and industrial development? Are we at risk of creating a need in order to service developers rather than establishing if there will be a real need in the the first place?			1057
502317	Cllr Peter Lucas		CSO6841	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
502326	Mr and Mrs T Bennett		CSO6892	Option VWM 4	Object		With more homes will need more employment, a vicious circle. Our roads are too busy now. We surely have enough community areas and centres.			1057
502329	Mrs Rosemary Rooke		CSO6897	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
502345	Mr and Mrs Ray and Irene Coulson		CSO6953	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502347	Sarah Cobb		CSO7115	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502381	Mr Cyril		CSO7076	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Josey									
502387	Mr George Kilpatrick		CSO7057	Option VWM 4	Object		I would like to see the justification for increased housing in East Dorset eg, demographics, immigration, increased work opportunities etc. I would also like to understand how transport strategy (and infrastructure) is coordinated with this in such a way to make expansion sustainable.			1057
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		CSO7167	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
502468	Robert Lambert		CSO7389	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502568	sarah morgan		CSO7283	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		CSO7311	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502570	Mr Samways		CSO7339	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502579	Mr & Mrs R L Thorne		CSO7368	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502595	Mr Colin House		CSO7466	Option VWM 4	Object		All these developments will cause an impact on the local heathland and the proposals in all areas will cause road chaos on the A31, Ferndown, Parley and Wimborne. A new road structure is required before any development takes place.			1057
359598	Mr A KETCHLEY		CSO8005	Option VWM 4	Support		Unfortunately whatever is finally decided on the following well known saying will occur: 'You can please some of the people all the time, You can please all of the people some of the time,			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							But you cannot please all of the people all of the time! I wish you well in whatever is decided. Some will see it as inevitable due to the area's population increases, whereas others will see it as a necessary evil, and some will accept it without question			
359873	Mrs M HUGHES		CSO8629	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
359977	Miss M.G. EARP		CSO8077	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		CSO8295	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
361123	Mr Iain STEVENSON		CSO8235	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502610	John Jackson		CSO7515	Option VWM 4	Object		The area between St Michaels Road and Manor Road is currently designated Green Belt land by the existing East Dorset Structure and Local Plans. Environmentally these developments are a potential disaster with the loss of much needed green space for relaxation and the habitat for local flora and fauna in addition to increased traffic and pollution volumes such development will undoubtedly bring! The listed key feature and benefit is "the potential to deliver semi-circular walks (River Crane) and a valuable green infrastructure that would benefit both residents and divert pressures away from heathlands". Perhaps someone has failed to see that there is an adequate circular route by using existing paths and bridleways, giving views of farmland and woods, which would otherwise be destroyed by the proposed developments. Heavy traffic flow on Manor Road currently causes congestion and safety hazards at busy times without the extra volumes which can be expected from another 165 houses –			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>potentially 330 cars before the offspring enter the market for motor vehicles.</p> <p>Most importantly although it is listed that “The Environment Agency maps indicate a risk of flooding around the water course only” local residents have previously made council officers aware of the flood risk from rising water levels as a result of earlier developments to the north of St Michaels Road.</p> <p>The surface water from these later developments drains to an underground stream, which currently causes problems for residents, and further development will only increase this nuisance. It is a glib observation to tell us that it will be the responsibility of the developer to ensure compliance with current regulation but it takes little imagination or thought to understand that the whole drainage system in the region needs to be updated. Whilst it is possible to ensure compliance with the latest regulation on new developments, it clearly is not possible to upgrade existing 4” drains that have existed since the first properties were built.</p> <p>The aging population means that some minor development may be required over the course of the next Structure Plan but the proposed development go far beyond what is either necessary or acceptable and way beyond what the existing public amenities can sustain.</p> <p>Approval of these proposals can only lead to the destruction of the Green Belt and the local environment. Future minimal development must only be allowed to proceed on brown field sites within the jurisdiction of East District Council, whilst putting in place proper planning to deliver the amenities that will improve the lifestyle of the population!!</p>			
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		CSO7467	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502673	Mrs A Powell		CSO7571	Option VWM 4	Object		The infrastructure in this area needs to be sorted out before anymore building goes ahead. There are times you cannot move on the roads. The area is being ruined with all this building works that are already going on.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502701	Mrs M Williams		CSO75 98	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
502708	Ms Julia Owen		CSO76 51	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502745	Mrs J.M Kenny		CSO76 89	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		CSO79 23	Option VWM 4	Object		There should not be any more large scale house building in the East Dorset area as the roads cannot cope with any more traffic			1057
502921	Mr and Mrs L Forinton		CSO78 02	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>We moved to Verwood a year ago. When considering whether to buy the bungalow we contacted East Dorset District Council (EDDC) future policy planning department. We were told that under the existing policy (incorporating the Regional Spatial Strategy) the council had decided that Verwood had reached its capacity after many years of rapid growth and they would only allow infill housing development in future i.e. no large scale housing development would take place. We realise that the Regional Spatial Strategy has been scrapped however nothing in Verwood has changed therefore we were astonished that the council has done a u-turn and are now considering building up to 415 new houses in the town.</p> <p>We assume these sites have only been included in the core strategy options because landowners have said they would be prepared to sell their land for housing development. We trust therefore that after due consideration the council will conclude that these sites are unsuitable for housing development for the very valid reasons that lead to the previous policy outlined to us in 2009.</p> <p>Our reasons for objecting to further large scale development in Verwood are as follows:</p> <p>Green Belt (South East Dorset). As a general comment building on green belt land should be a last resort, all other options should be considered first. In particular, the site</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>(VWM2) West of Eastworth Road is green belt land and is of particular importance as it is rich arable land (only poor quality land should be used for residential development) and for this reason should remain agricultural land; and has been designated an area of outstanding natural beauty. This part of the green belt is an asset to the town and should be preserved as such, once gone it can never be got back – gone forever. In addition it is understood that there may be rare species of plant and animal inhabitants in this area that need to be protected and preserved which would make the site unsuitable for development. No doubt the council as part of its responsibility will be commissioning a full environmental survey of the site to establish this and I would be pleased to receive a copy once available. Also there are tree preservation orders on many of the trees in these fields, the roots of these trees will be interfered with to get services to these properties.</p> <p>Employment. There are no plans in the core strategy to increase employment opportunities in Verwood; employment presently is very limited indeed, meaning that most people have to travel miles to their place of work. It makes obvious sense to build houses where there are jobs and good public transport. This is particularly important due to the high number of affordable houses being proposed so that low income families would have access to jobs locally with an economical means of getting to work. This is essential in the present climate to ensure people have easy and affordable access to jobs otherwise the council may be creating a problem whereby people end up on benefit through no fault of their own; the ramifications of which do not bear thinking about. On top of this are the obvious environmental benefits of people not travelling long distances to work i.e. pollution, carbon footprint etc.</p> <p>The conclusion being that the housing development should be built in places like Ferndown, West Parley and Three Legged Cross where proposals have been put forward for additional land for employment. Also as the council have a wider environmental responsibility they should not be creating a core strategy which encourages more cars on the roads with the resultant increase in pollution, carbon footprint,</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>congestion etc.</p> <p>Amenities. Verwood population has doubled since 1991 to 15,000 however the amenities have not kept pace with the expansion, in fact facilities, shops etc have actually reduced in recent years. Doctors, NHS dentists, opticians are all hard pressed to cope with present demand as are schools. Those shops we do have are woefully inadequate or consist of Estate Agents, Hairdressers galore. The bottom line is we do not have enough amenities / facilities to cope at present and as these are largely private enterprises we cannot just magic more out of thin air, it has to be viable to attract businesses and clearly from recent experience we are not a viable proposition. The same can be said about doctors, NHS dentists and schools during this period of austerity when public money will be in very short supply severely limiting the possibility of expansion. Contrary to the council's consultants report Verwood does not have a vibrant town centre; you just have to look at Ringwood a town with a similar population to see what we mean.</p> <p>Additionally, facilities for leisure, children and young people are also woefully inadequate and again seem unlikely to improve for years to come during this period of austerity. There isn't enough for the youth of Verwood to do now but with the prospect of 415 houses, possibly 830 more young people, they are going to cause problems roaming the streets. There are no buses after early evening to take them into Bournemouth or Poole they won't have anything to do. The conclusion is that Verwood cannot cope with anymore large scale housing development.</p> <p>Infrastructure and Transport. It's the same old story I'm afraid the population doubles but infrastructure, roads and public transport fail to keep up with the expansion. Its as if the council approve large scale residential housing development, see it built, and then turn their back and walk away from doing anything significant to improve the infrastructure. We were staggered to see the number of unmade roads serving housing development when we moved here, take Springfield Road as an example. We also understand that Verwood has suffered in the past with so called 'bolt on solutions' which don't work. The fear is that EDDC, based on past record, will</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>build the houses and then leave the residents of the outpost which is Verwood to deal with the consequences. This cannot be allowed to happen. The result is that we have two main routes out of Verwood, Station Road and Edmonsham Road which are no more than country lanes which cannot take the extra cars 415 houses would produce. Public transport (buses) doesn't help much as it too is woefully inadequate, too few houses during the daytime and no buses after early evening at all. We also understand that Wessex Water are in the process of producing a report on foul and surface water sewage and drainage which will make interesting reading; again we would appreciate a copy when it is produced.</p> <p>Affordable Housing. We are very concerned about the high percentage of affordable housing per site being proposed; 40-50% is far too high a figure. Not only would it have an adverse effect on the new estate it would also adversely affect the social harmony of Verwood itself. People would be moved into the area for social housing reasons – low income families, there are very few jobs in Verwood they can't afford to travel to work and so end up on benefit. It is an unfortunate fact, learnt in other parts of the country that having such a high proportion of affordable housing (social housing and shared ownership) brings with it many problems. The council should review this aspect in the light of experiences elsewhere, a more sensible figure would be 5-10%.</p> <p>WVM2 Land west of Eastworth Road (200 homes). More specifically we object to housing development on this site for the following reasons:-</p> <p>1) Shouldn't build on Green Belt land – for all the reasons given in our earlier comments Green Belt (South East Dorset).</p> <p>2) There could be up to 400 more cars as a result of this development, on local roads. Station Road and Edmondsham Road are no more than country lanes unable to cope with the increased traffic. As proposed vehicular access along Eastworth Road is preposterous, it is a very narrow lane inadequate for the purpose. In addition, exit and entry onto Station Road and Edmonsham Road from Eastworth Road by this volume of traffic would be inherently dangerous as would exit and entry from the other entrance onto Edmonsham</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Road. This is a very significant safety aspect.</p> <p>3) Eastworth Road forms a natural boundary to the town, the new housing estate would by its nature be remote and detached.</p> <p>In conclusion, we feel that EDDC as custodians of the built environment have a responsibility to the environment and the people of Verwood to ensure any development is in-keeping with the town and preserves and protects residents way of life and maintains Verwood as a nice place to live. We would also like to quote two extracts from the EDDC Core Strategy Consultation Document relating to Verwood.</p> <p>a) "The specific outcomes that the planning system should deliver are housing developments in suitable locations which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure".</p> <p>b) "The area of great landscape value area should largely be retained comprises open and gently undulating countryside which forms a key strategic structural landscape element".</p> <p>It is with these in mind that we end by saying that the housing proposals for Verwood in the Core Strategy Consultation Document and in particular site VWM2 land west of Eastworth Road will not fulfil the specific outcome that the planning system should deliver as set out in a) nor that set out in b) for the reasons we have given above.</p>			
502935	Mr Roger Parker		CSO78 24	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503044	Mr and Mrs R Setchfield		CSO79 33	Option VWM 4	Object		We strongly feel, before any further development in Verwood the infrastructure needs to be vastly improved.			1057
503062	Mr and Mrs D C Hubbard		CSO79 56	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
503085	Mr P.A. Scott		CSO79 80	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503156	Richard and Jackie Blunderfield		CSO8048	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
503162	Mr Marcus J Huggins		CSO8031	Option VWM 4	Object		The road from the A31 into Verwood is not good enough to support extra traffic - rough estimate - 1000 more cars using this road (3081) more people and cars would create extra dangers. There have been many deaths on this road in the past. Improve the roads before considering any big developments!			1057
503171	Sally Cooke		CSO8095	Option VWM 4	Support		Build homes so people have somewhere to live BUT what about Verwood's infrastructure? Where are our facilities? Secondary school must be a priority.			1057
503183	B Chissell		CSO8167	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503189	Mr David Bulley		CSO8121	Option VWM 4	Object		VWM 3, 4, 5 - Very dangerous at present with parents parking in morning to drop off and in afternoon to pick up. Sometimes parking both sides of road - making them very narrow for emergency vehicles trying to get through - very difficult.			1057
503193	Julie Richardson		CSO8132	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503197	Mr M Smith		CSO8147	Option VWM 4	Object		Why build more houses, when there are a lack of facilities, ie. shops, nothing for the younger generation to do or use. In my opinion, Verwood is just one big housing estate - all you are encouraging is for gang warfare in the future because the kids have nothing to do. Verwood used to be a village - what do you call it now!!!			1057
503203	Mr and Mrs M Squire		CSO8160	Option VWM 4	Object		Having lived in Verwood for over 30 years we have seen continuous development with poor thought to road systems and town centre shops. Verwood is already a large town in comparison other town populations in Ringwood, Wimborne, Fordingbridge etc, yet has no town centre facilities. Residents are forced to travel at least 7 miles to find a range of shops.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Verwood is no longer a village so why pretend that it is? (This is the excuse given for no town centre shops). In fact Verwood offered a wider range of shops 30 years ago when it was a small village than it does now. Please do not allow any further building in Verwood before we have town facilities and fore-thought re - roads to any new properties, especially a school. Margards Lane cannot cope with more traffic.			
503218	Mr Chris Beaven		CSO8174	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood already lacks the facilities to support the current number of houses. This is further development for builder profit and little benefit for the community. Health facilities are already fully stretched, poor public transport and road network to support expansion. Limited shopping facilities exist and the sports centre lacks sufficient facilities.			1057
503230	P Andrews		CSO8188	Option VWM 4	Object		I would be shocked if plans were passed to increase housing yet again in Verwood. Provision has not been made to cope with existing traffic and shopping problems. This is a town existing in a village environment. It's time to deal with present problems before creating more.			1057
503233	F Parkes		CSO8262	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503250	Mrs Helen Poole		CSO8277	Option VWM 4	Object		Too many new homes in Verwood, not enough resources for those of us who already live here. Stop filling up our green space!			1057
503303	Mr Anthony Roberts		CSO8316	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		CSO8343	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
359889	Mr and Mrs P CLARK		CSO8497	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359920	S PARKER		CSO9551	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		CSO9609	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
360288	Mr & Mrs E T SPENCER	E T Spencer (Heating)	CSO9632	Option VWM 4	Object		The area is growing far too fast with inadequate facilities. We need to keep Green Belt land.			1057
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E HACK		CSO8516	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
503024	Valerie Measey		CSO8902	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503347	Ms Hardwick		CSO8372	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
503355	Mr Robert Griffiths		CSO8400	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503358	H C Hoare		CSO8429	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503444	R Hobbs		CSO8578	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503463	Mrs Rita Lockyer		CSO8593	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
503477	Mr Edward Fiddler		CSO8642	Option VWM 4	Support		Housing Development in Dorset I am receipt of your publication re the above and other items. During the 1960's certain councils allocated land for development, divided it into plots of about 1/4 acre and sold these plots to individuals. The owners of these plots produced			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>building plans which were submitted for approval. Once approved the owners hired tradesmen to carry out the building work.</p> <p>Most of the owners were relatively new to the housing market. They had limited resources but they were ready to muck in to help with construction. Banks were willing to then to provide stage payments to help cash flow.</p> <p>The end result of all this was a series of beautiful estates with every house different. For some reason this arrangement ceased and I have never found out why.</p> <p>Could I ask you if this facility could be repeated? Such a plan would produce lovely estates and encourage people to act on their own initiative.</p>			
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		CSO8678	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503554	Mr D Verguson		CSO8793	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503598	Mr John Turner		CSO8784	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503603	Mrs DJ Morley		CSO8806	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503621	A G Haines		CSO8856	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503624	Mr RT Jackson		CSO8852	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503635	Mr J Gough		CSO8914	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		CSO8947	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503640	N J and S A White		CSO9126	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503644	Mr J Riley		CSO8979	Option VWM 4	Object		Re. Housing / xxx Options Reasons for objections is that as proven on many occasions in our area of Verwood no thought has been given on the visual effect / blending in of new with old and existing properties ie. flats on main road behind The Hub and the redevelopment of Fayrewood Pub on Blackhill. Also the impact of traffic congestion is always underestimated especially if there is a traffic incident on a main route. More thought needs to be put into providing more facilities for the people/children of our area.			1057
503666	A H J Paul		CSO9009	Option VWM 4	Support		Re. your statement concerning the District car ownership level, I trust, that despite financial restrictions, that road surfaces are maintained at a high level on the grounds of safety, noise and vehicular damage.			1057
503687	Mr Nick Smith		CSO9080	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		CSO9150	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503695	Mr and Mrs N White		CSO9097	Option VWM 4	Object		If Verwood is to continue to expand, facilities other than a new school are needed. Other towns of a comparable size in Dorset have better/larger more diverse sports and leisure facilities, medical centres, large supermarket, better public transport. Verwood is just becoming one large housing estate with little else. Planning permission should also be considered for new restaurant businesses other than pubs, to enhance the area for residents - Ferndown/Wimborne both have an abundance of these.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503706	Mr David Portnell		CSO9122	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood has very few amenities and this proposed development will just make things worse.			1057
503709	Mr and Mrs A Fairclough		CSO9135	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
503759	Mr D.J. Middleton		CSO9252	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503787	Mrs P A Dent		CSO9271	Option VWM 4	Object		I am totally against the development of large housing estates as they are not popular with the public. Also the cost of providing infrastructure will be phenomenal and impact on existing communities detrimental. Far better to use small existing areas of land rubber stamped as Green belt land but of no benefit to the community. These parcels are mainly within residential areas and give immediate access to facilities without overloading them. With a small number of houses built, people can get to know their neighbours better. I, of course, am part owner of such a piece of land.			1057
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		CSO10017	Option VWM 4	Support		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I want to know the projected time scale for these options to start to become active. 2. It is most important that there is adequate employment to accommodate the houses to be built. 3. More attention must be made to supply of affordable housing. 4. The green belt must be respected where possible. 5. The estates around Wimborne must be consulted fully. 			1057
360029	Mr David LANIGAN		CSO10289	Option VWM 4	Support		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy Document, Managing Growth and Development up to the year 2027. I agree with the preamble stating that we need to meet local housing needs, with the emphasis on growing the main settlements where we have good access to facilities that people require. Some development of smaller communities should continue however, especially the provision of low cost housing. The community as a whole, needs the services of			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>teachers, nurses, firemen, postmen, and policemen who are poorly paid because they commit to a vocation rather than a high salary job. We also need the services of skilled people such as builders, electricians, plumbers, gas fitters, and motor mechanics, the essentially blue collar professionals. They must not be priced out of the market in terms of being able to buy a starter home, in the community that they serve. Having bought my first home in 1963, a two bedroom bungalow for £2,200 I am aware that locally such a property is currently one hundred times as much. This makes things difficult for young couples with the ratio of house prices to wages being the highest in the country. Many struggle with getting mortgages that now require typically a 25% deposit on an already expensive property.</p> <p>I moved to West Moors 15 years ago and appreciate the planning decisions that have taken place affecting this village. We now have a new build shopping centre on Station Road, complete with flats, good pavements, lighting, pelican crossing and trees. I am pleased to have seen built several small, three storey, blocks of retirement and two bed flats close to the village centre. I support the gradual expansion of the</p> <p>Village, current population around 7,500 as we have good schools, a large Memorial hall, Churches with halls, two public houses, doctors, dentists and good bus services to both Poole and Bournemouth. We have footpath access to open land such as Holt Heath, as well as being able to use the old railway line route through the village to Ringwood, - the Castleman Trail. Recently St Marys Church has had built a new Church Hall which will serve the community and thanks to the National Lottery grant we now have an excellent Bowling Club. I support the continued slow expansion of the village as currently we have many facilities for people of all ages to enjoy.</p> <p>My current house was built in the mid 70s, and has trebled in value since my wife and I moved here 15 years ago. In the 1970s West Moors doubled in size and acquired new schools and since then other infrastructure improvements. In recent years the Library was refurbished. The facilities for retirees in West Moors, with access to Ferndown and Verwood, are very</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							good, and coupled with excellent hospitals at Poole, Bournemouth and Wimborne, and I have felt no need to move from East Dorset area in the conceivable future. I therefore support the proposals for additional housing as outlined in the Core Strategy Consultation, as well as the proposals for business sites for employment. I also support provisions for new schools particularly a new Secondary School at Verwood, and recreation areas to cater for the population increase. I understand that net immigration into Dorset is running at two thousand people a year so clearly we need to plan for housing, jobs, education, recreation, road improvements especially at busy junctions, and off road car parking in town centres and on new housing estates. There are many reasons why East Dorset and Christchurch, are attractive places for people to live, work and retire to. Long term planning that caters for the needs of a steady population increase is sensible and is to be welcomed.			
360095	Mr & Mrs John & Barbara POLKINGHORN		CSO9829	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
361105	Mr John GOOCH	Also member of Colehill Parish Concil	CSO9917	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
497752	Kelly		CSO10301	Option VWM 4	Object		First build the infrastructure to support any extra housing. Then consider the environment surrounding the proposed developments. It is highly likely that badger and bat colonies are within and/or adjacent to the sites, although I doubt any housing developer will find them before work begins. Where, in Verwood, is the Town centre ?			1057
499748	Ms Soozie Cooper		CSO9749	Option VWM 4	Object		People have moved to live in Verwood as it is such a beautiful area. It does not support more homes as we have little facilities now with the residents here. It makes more sense to develop areas such as Ferndown as they offer more facilities for families and jobs. Leave Verwood Green.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
499774	Mr S Weatherill-Podbury		CSO9693	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		CSO9326	Option VWM 4	Object		My objections to the housing are simply the fact that as a Verwood resident, there is already enough houses - far too many for the present infrastructure. Verwood is a joke. It is just a massive, massive, pile of houses in the middle of the forest. Why is it referred to as a 'town'? It has no centre!! New Milton, Christchurch, Ringwood, Ferndown.... they all have healthy centres with lots of amenities. Not enough shops, supermarkets, petrol stations etc. No more houses till this mess is sorted. Soulless.			1057
503861	Mr E Hawkins		CSO9350	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503878	Mr Peter Smith		CSO9407	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503879	Mr S Smithson		CSO9430	Option VWM 4	Object		More detailed information required on the Verwood plans as the plans I object to will have a largelarge impact on noise and increased congestion.			1057
503943	Mr & Mrs Rumball		CSO9459	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
504093	Mr & Mrs Vivian		CSO9486	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
504101	Mrs Mary Treviss-Bell		CSO9513	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
504193	Mrs Shauna Green		CSO9527	Option VWM 4	Object		We have far too many homes in Verwood for the facilities we have. The Ringwood Road is so busy now its hard to get out of The Chase now and far too much traffic.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
504203	Kate Pursglove		CSO95 41	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood does not have sufficient facilities and infrastructure for its present population (shops, sports facilities, high school etc). It has a growing youth population with nothing for them to do/occupy them. The roads in and out of Verwood are too small to support the current population with frequent accidents, long delays for the slightest disturbance in the traffic and no safe alternative way to get in and out (no dedicated cycle tracks, poor bus service)			1057
504207	L S Dean		CSO95 55	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
504216	Mr Mark Rich		CSO95 79	Option VWM 4	Object		The facilities which already exist in Verwood are not enough for the community already living here. Doctors, Dentists, Variety of local shops. We moved here to enjoy a peaceful and green environment from a place where there was heavy traffic and continual road noise. I do not want the proposals to go ahead as it will spoil our peace and quiet and your plans are not in keeping with the area.			1057
504232	Rachel and Paul Higgins		CSO96 10	Option VWM 4	Object		The reason we enjoy living in Verwood is due to it's size and community feel. I do not want to live in another Ferndown. The roads and shops will not support more residents.			1057
504241	Mr and Mrs Ansell		CSO96 18	Option VWM 4	Object		Will generate more traffic in Station Road area. Will also generate more traffic, and in Howe Lane, people there cannot get in and out of their own properties there now!! Comments from Verwood Housing leaflet Increase volume of traffic along minor roads in the vicinity.			1057
504243	G Haskell		CSO96 27	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
504285	Mr P Miller		CSO96 59	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
504288	Tracey Doherty		CSO96 52	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
504297	C Johnson		CSO96 69	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood does not need more homes but if you have to build then 30 it is!!			1057
504300	Paul Cocker		CSO96 74	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
504307	Lucy Cocker		CSO96 79	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
504311	Mr Victor Steeden		CSO96 85	Option VWM 4	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood is already heavily overstretched and incapable of giving a good service eg poor clearance of debris, road repairs etc and further housing will do nothing but to add to the already paucity of 'service'!			1057
504314	Ms Selina Roper		CSO97 19	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
504318	R V and P Reeks		CSO96 90	Option VWM 4	Object		Parking outside schools horrendous. Cycle tacks in the town needed to encourage use of bicycles. Traffic congestion on town centre frequently caused by loading and unloading at retail stores. Pavements already too narrow for push chairs/buggies.			1057
504344	B Blake-Coleman		CSO96 98	Option VWM 4	Object		Lack of facilities for increased population - no NHS dentists, limited medical care, only one supermarket etc. Facilities and amenities need to match increased demand.			1057
504349	A Hall		CSO97 03	Option VWM 4	Object		Council have made a complete mess of Verwood - once a good place to live. Where are needed facilities, no infrastructure. A so - called town with one shop, village road, unable to cope. We have enough house - leave the Green Belt alone. This is Wessex City by the back door. As a life long Verwoodian it saddens me to experience the mess the Council have erected.			1057
504459	Mr and Mrs Roberts		CSO97 55	Option VWM 4	Object		We live in Church Hill and at the present volume of school traffic is a pain, when trying to get out of our drive way. So for a new school to be built without extra roads is a non - starter.			1057
504468	Mrs		CSO97	Option	Object		Too much traffic up and down Margards lane. Some traffic			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	M Last		59	VWM 4			should be diverted via Howe Lane/St Margarets Road. (school) Bus services in Verwood are pathetic. 1 bus an hour to Ringwood/Bournemouth.			
504477	Mr Martin Turner		CSO9766	Option VWM 4	Object		I believe there is enough housing in the Verwood area, small developments are ok up to say 20 homes. It is the amenities that need improvement say an upper school for example. The infrastructure ie roads are already clogged at rush hour times. The development around Albion Way has produced a lot more traffic that end of town another large development would cause untold misery. We are an old Verwood family and have seen many changes but this is one too far.			1057
504512	Mr E and Mrs B Appleby		CSO9769	Option VWM 4	Object		Population of Verwood already too big for the facilities ie doctors surgeries, public transport too infrequent considering the number of elderly people.			1057
504517	Mrs T Otton		CSO9773	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
504530	Christine Phipps		CSO9778	Option VWM 4	Object		The town is over populated now, how will it cope with more families moving here?			1057
504541	Mrs S Newham		CSO9783	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
504572	Carly Bull		CSO9797	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
504641	Elizabeth Gresty		CSO9802	Option VWM 4		General Comment	I was born in Verwood in 1920. We do not want any further development - Verwood has been ruined enough - it was once a beautiful little village - you have ruined and wrecked it - the people and residents and awful buildings are not to be admired at all - we need opportunity for the young people. The new people have done nothing to give to give them that.			1057
505273	Mrs Lorraine Hubbard		CSO9856	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
505288	Mrs S Cramer		CSO9891	Option VWM 4	Support	General Comment	As a married mother of 3 children, 2 girls and 1 boy, living in a 2 bed Council flat (first floor), I welcome more housing to the Wimborne area for young families needing affordable housing / rented housing.			1057
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		CSO9963	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
505369	J Young		CSO9990	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		CSO10066	Option VWM 4	Object	General Comment	Building more houses has NOTHING to do with meeting the needs of (existing) local residents. We do not need or want more houses in our area. Planning to build more houses is driven by the 'need' to meet externally imposed quotas based on false assumptions on the desirability of further population and economic growth. Instead of wasting resources on building more housing which is ecologically unsustainable, we should be using them to make a transition to a low energy sustainable future for our children. Please listen to local residents and reject further development.			1057
505561	Mr. D. Calvert		CSO10116	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
505590	M Spalding		CSO10146	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		CSO10182	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
505742	L. J. Ashplant		CSO10208	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
505802	Mr RGH		CSO10259	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Chapman									
360146	Mrs Marilyn A WARBURTON		CSO11 167	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
498775	Mrs P L Buckler		CSO10 769	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		CSO10 333	Option VWM 4	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			1057
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		CSO10 362	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
506754	Mr Derek E Marsh		CSO10 396	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>I have signalled objection to all Verwood development since the town already has significant new build expansion. It is in danger of losing its "village" community ways. Important to planners? – maybe not. The definition of and integration of "affordable homes" is another danger to this.</p> <p>Finally, any development that is made really needs to have: roads and sight-lines etc in place before house building begins; access to schools and shops provided in plenty of time for new residents; low density development would be more in keeping with this town if any!</p> <p>Am I a nimby or am I trying to protect a rare and valuable asset of English life?</p> <p>I have lived through 2 phases of Basingstoke development, and though at poorly run "infill" in Benbridge - a town much like Verwood!</p> <p>The idea of build on VWM4 must go against so many guidelines. It is adjacent to a river; it is, at best, around only two metres above the river level. It is on adjacent to wild water meadows. In other words it is a flood plain. You can be almost certain that it will get flooded in the future. Look at the department of environment flood maps and then at the actual terrain!</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
506934	Mrs R Hall		CSO10 402	Option VWM 4	Object		I strongly object to any further building, housing or otherwise, in Verwood as the infrastructure cannot even cope at the moment! The doctors are so busy any appointment within 2 – 3 days is virtually impossible. The bus service is atrocious, nothing after 6pm and during the day it's only hourly. There are no decent shops and not a great deal of evening entertainment for adults without hordes of children running around. Traffic some days is really at a standstill at school times. I have to go to Muscliffe for a dentist as I can't get in here!			1057
506975	Mrs V Kesler		CSO10 406	Option VWM 4	Object		There is already horrendous traffic down Margards Lane with school traffic; more traffic (school) will make matters much worse for us residents. There are no humps to slow the traffic which does speed down at well over 30mph. There is no speed camera to slow traffic, Margards Lane has become rather a "rat run" speed is awful, several cats have been killed, and the noise and shouting of school children and parents – leaves a lot to be desired! Verwood RA form- Verwood does not need any more/further developments and in particular NO MORE SCHOOLS. Margards Lane is already a nightmare with the awful school traffic.			1057
506984	Mr T Newnham		CSO10 412	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood needs improvements for existing residents. More dedicated play space for young adults, new provision for youth clubs. There is a 'need' for improved services for food shopping and fuel for cars. Up to a potential of 1000 new residents with and estimate 300+ cars would congest and degrade the road system. Also medical provision and education would be put under strain and degrade present services to existing residents.			1057
506989	Mrs Barbara Harris		CSO10 418	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood needs a bigger super-market and another filling petrol station prior to more housing. Morrisons wants, and needs to be enlarged prior to any more houses being built. Verwood is a large village as it is.			1057
507026	Mr David		CSO10 442	Option VWM 4	Support	General Comment	I would like to see priority given to projects which have a higher concentration of social housing inclusion, and also			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Craig						include a higher green/renewable energy provision. Particular concentration on family areas, playgrounds and social/community facilities should be considered.			
507032	Mr David Oliver		CSO10 468	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
507033	A R Twaits		CSO10 494	Option VWM 4	Support	General Comment	Despite improvements to public transport, cycling and walking, the reality is that the vast majority of journeys will continue to be made by car. Local roads are already congested and the extent of development proposed is not acceptable without significant increases in the capacity of these roads for cars. In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.			1057
507132	Ms L Joyce		CSO10 536	Option VWM 4	Support		Plans for Verwood: In supporting options VWM 2,4 and 7 it is essential that consideration should also be given within these plans for a new large food store as currently the Morrisons store is far too small and does not meet the needs of the current community let alone the development of new homes as well. Also we desperately need a new secondary school but within that! I would like to see plans for a new leisure centre and swimming pool for Verwood. Otherwise I would be very reluctant to support any new developments and would urge the council to re-consider the current options with a view to inclusion of: extensive food store; new leisure centre, that developers could contribute to these two things alone would alleviate traffic pressures, pressure on QE and Ringwood plus wider area.			1057
507136	Mrs S A Segal		CSO10 545	Option VWM 4	Object		I have lived in Verwood for 26 years. When my husband and I first arrived here there were more small and varied shops and also four banks. I do not think that we could happily and safely sustain the amount of new residents that is being planned for.			1057
507141	Smallman		CSO10 552	Option VWM 4	Object		All you ever want to build in Verwood is more houses. Where are you going to promote and build commercial/ business areas to create local facilities/ employment.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Building a school next to 2 existing schools will create massive road jams. This should be built next to Trinity school where the road system is better.			
507144	Paul Brewer		CSO10 556	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507152	Mrs A E J Dolan		CSO10 561	Option VWM 4	Object		There are no work opportunities in Verwood therefore roads through Verwood will be further clogged fighting to get to cities south and north for work. We have not the infrastructure for this vas amount of housing. I object most strongly to the whole concept.			1057
507160	Mrs H Walker		CSO10 566	Option VWM 4	Object		I think that Verwood's infrastructure will not be able to cope with any further development. Even if a new upper school is built the amount of cars would be unacceptable as Verwood is so spread out not many children would walk to the school.			1057
507178	Mr Paul Banning		CSO10 597	Option VWM 4	Object		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is disingenuous to show the proposals without showing existing planned development – please publish these plans. • In the past 20 years Verwood has experienced exponential expansion of residential property and now need a period of time to mature and create an identity and community. • These proposals will lead to the increase of motor vehicles (c.500) and daily vehicles journeys measured in excess of 1000. This increases atmospheric and noise pollution and leads to a reduction in quality of life for existing residents. Because Verwood s a dormitory town it already experiences high levels of road usage as it is essential to use a car for most activity. • EDDC will fail in its promises (especially 1+3) if these plans proceed. • The parking on the public highway at Trinity school is already a danger to pupils and local residents (no access for emergency services) and this will greatly exacerbate the problem. <p>In our view it would be inappropriate to expand the town of Verwood, as it has already experienced almost exponential population growth since the beginning of the nineties and now needs time to mature and establish a sense of identity. For a town the size and population of Verwood the facilities and</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>shopping areas are only adequate, and they need more time to develop before making a significant increase in new houses. For this reason, and the more detailed points that we make below, we are against the proposals.</p> <p>The main concern is the proposed use of greenbelt for further encroachment of suburban sprawl into the countryside. A main attraction of Verwood is that it still retains a rural feel, especially at its northern edges and its boundary with Ringwood Forest. We believe this should be maintained, and not jeopardised for the future by a further sprawl of relatively high density housing. You do not publicise the capacity for additional houses within the existing non-greenbelt boundaries of Verwood, and this is a serious omission to the integrity and transparency of the planning process. This should be addressed in the next round of the planning process.</p> <p>There is also a lot of detail on the proposals to build houses, but very little on facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>An example of this, are the proposals for VWM 1 and 2, totalling 230 homes many of which will have young children. My understanding is that the existing Trinity School is already full, and so First School capacity would need to be increased, or provided elsewhere in Verwood. An increase in capacity at Trinity School would lead to an increase in volume in traffic at the start and end of the school day. The parking and delivery of children is already chaotic, often making the roads impassable if emergency vehicles need access to the houses accessed through Edmondsham Road and Coopers Lane.</p> <p>This in itself reflects poorly on the organisational abilities of the school and local authorities to provide a suitable solution. The attitude appears to be move the problem outside of the school premises (for reasons associated with litigation) onto the surrounding roads, without concern for general public and pupil safety. The proposals for mitigation of traffic volumes (walking trains etc) fell away very quickly. It would be interesting to understand how Trinity now compares with best practice in this regard.</p> <p>As an example of town planning, this is a microcosm of poor implementation and follow through that must be a concern for any changes proposed by a planning function at local</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>authority level. My household experience of EDDC planning since moving to Verwood is very poor. In my previous 30+ of home ownership I have experienced reasonable responses in my interactions with the local authority. With EDDC I have had to make a letter of complaint, also escalated another issue to the LGO. This does not give any confidence that EDDC can manage the changes proposed in the Town Plan to a successful conclusion.</p> <p>We are concerned that the Consultation document makes no attempt to set out a financial plan for the strategy. I have to say that in my years of working in large business the idea of strategic planning without an indication of the financial implications would have been anathema. In the 8 years that we have lived in Verwood we have experienced above inflation levels of Council Tax increases without any obvious changes in services. Having compared the Council Tax payable in Verwood with a number of houses in the same band in Dorset and Devon, I have been surprised that Verwood is more expensive than most. This is particularly surprising since the value of our house in Verwood is usually substantially less than the houses in these other areas.</p> <p>So the Plan makes no commitment to the existing Council Tax payers that any proposals will be at least financially neutral to them. Indeed the majority of the proposals will not bring benefit to the existing Tax payers, but the contrary.</p> <p>While Verwood retains a rural feel, it is essentially a commuter town. Most people whose to live here but work elsewhere – as shown in the planning documentation. We see little scope to change this, so any increase in housing brings with it increased traffic noise and atmospheric pollution. An increase of more than 400 houses will, we estimate, bring 1 – 2000 additional car journeys per day, mostly during peak hours for work commuting and school runs by runs by parents. This will again further tip the balance from Verwood retaining a rural character, to just becoming a noisy, crowded suburban sprawl.</p> <p>So, in summary our views are that the plan should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preserve the greenbelt wherever possible. 2. Retain as much rural character in Verwood as possible. 3. Address existing noise pollution and not exacerbate this. 			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							4. Focus on meeting the needs of existing Council Tax payers, as prime stakeholders in the community. 5. Promote organic growth in the provision of both housing and facilities.			
507183	Mr G Roberts		CSO10 593	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507207	Paula Edwards		CSO10 602	Option VWM 4		No Opinion	I live in Verwood and I wanted to make comment about the proposed developments. As we are one of the fastest growing towns in Europe I would like to add that its great having all this housing but we do need more facilities to accommodate the needs of each and every family, i.e. a super leisure centre with swimming and great sporting facilities for young people to adults is needed. More improved bus facilities for quicker access to neighbouring towns, and cheaper fare so that people will be encouraged to use the bus rather than the car (the Spanish bus was so cheap and so well used it was great).			1057
507213	Ieuan and Janice Davies		CSO10 608	Option VWM 4	Object		We have lived in Verwood for 32 years. It was a village and now a town which has always lagged behind its growth in terms of amenities and infrastructure. We need a period when we reverse that trend. Lets have more parks/play areas/ proper shopping areas and sports facilities, even a municiple public swimming pool before more houses and hideous blocks of flats.			1057
507219	Mrs Louise Spencer		CSO10 636	Option VWM 4	Object		I object to anymore new homes in Verwood as at the moment all the facilities are overstretched, schools are full and doctors are full. Not enough shops and HSBC bank closed. Buses are only every hour only one petrol station, 3 pubs all for very different tastes. No leisure facilities for teenagers. The parking at Emmanuel middle and Verwood first schools is absolutely dreadful and the roads couldn't cope with more traffic if more places were available. A new secondary school would need a very big car park and new road. Some roads in Verwood are in a dreadful unmade state e.g. Manor Lane, St Michaels Road and Howe Lane (in places).			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507220	R Sharples		CSO10 624	Option VWM 4	Support		The land between Verwood and Three Legged Cross appears appropriate for new housing as it almost represents infill between the two settlements, whereas any significant building to the other (West, North, East) sides of the town encroaches too much on the countryside. VWM Housing leaflet Object			1057
507235	Mrs Margaret Chalk		CSO10 640	Option VWM 4	Object		Don't spoil Verwood any more. The new road was bad enough and the new shops aren't at all inspiring, not enough thought was given to the choice as far different ones were needed as there are not any really decent shops in Verwood. There are three hairdressers also estate agents all within a stones throw of each other. We only really have small village facilities considering the large number of houses that there already are in Verwood.			1057
507253	Joyce Smith		CSO10 645	Option VWM 4	Object		Please no more! Verwood will end up being a place that no one wants to live.			1057
507264	L F J Garratt		CSO10 652	Option VWM 4	Object		The area is overcrowded at present. The majority of the residents (voters) do not want change. Listen to the majority voice.			1057
507269	Michael and Alexandra King		CSO10 661	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507272	A E Cook		CSO10 667	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507274	Miss M Kettless		CSO10 688	Option VWM 4	Object		3 buildings which have ruined Verwood. 1) the flats which look over the Hub, and another 44 which nobody wants, there should have been a green area. 2) the flats with the stupid wavy roofs. 3) the Co-op which is being built onto of the traffic lights this is so dangerous vans park on the bend it is going to be an accident plus 3 flights flats people around this building are so angry. We would like to see these buildings pulled down, no-one new there was an appli for the Co-op until it was passed, and people say we did not need another food shop as we already have 3 and why was it passed in Bristol, did anyone bother to come down and look where the building			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							was and to see how dangerous it is going to be, and now 44 flats looking over the Hub, the police, and the fire station said no to it, the people of Verwood don't want any more housing, what builders have done to verwood have ruined it with there designs.			
507275	A Saxby		CSO10 674	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood has had more than its share of development during past 10 years. Housing development will put undue pressure on roads and facilities in town.			1057
507279	Anne Tubbs		CSO10 678	Option VWM 4	Support		It would be very good to have affordable homes for our young ones.			1057
507286	Mr N P Butler		CSO10 702	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood needs more infrastructure before more homes are contemplated i.e. facilities such as a leisure centre, supermarket etc, incentives for more businesses to set up here to stop it continuing to be simply a dormitory town. I am not surprised that Dorset has the highest level of car ownership in the country. A large percentage of it can be seen leaving Verwood between 7am and 8.30am every morning!			1057
507326	Mr and Mrs M Salter		CSO10 722	Option VWM 4	Object		There should be no further 'major' housing developments in Verwood. Verwood is becoming over crowded, the roads are very busy, doctors' surgeries and the schools are overcrowded. Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support more people! It does however need a secondary school, swimming pool / leisure centre and decent shops. Access in and out of Verwood is very poor given the amount of people who already live here!			1057
507330	Mr Malcolm Lay		CSO10 720	Option VWM 4	Object		Transport and infrastructure has to be a priority in Verwood prior to any new homes. To even be thinking about building more homes is irresponsible of the council, unrealistic and will result in the local area being ruined. The council also need to attract new companies, entrepreneurs to the area to stimulate jobs as unemployment will increase substantially otherwise. Comments from Verwood Housing leaflet Until Verwood has a proper infrastructure no new homes			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							should be built. We require urgently a proper, updated, expanded supermarket together with petrol station, new doctor, dentist, a proper bus service and a large leisure centre. Also the roads cannot handle the current level of traffic.			
507336	Mr John Page		CSO10 772	Option VWM 4	Object		I object to use of green belt land. As Margards Lane will be the main route to these new developments please ensure that parking permits are made available to residents of Margards Lane. Parents picking up and dropping off their children block the road at present. It will be much worse if these developments proceed.			1057
507345	Mr B Hodgkins - Wright		CSO10 768	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507353	Mr and Mrs M Morgan		CSO10 797	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		CSO10 865	Option VWM 4	Object		We strongly object to any housing development in Verwood, there are not enough facilities to cater for this amount of proposed development and we are particularly concerned about the effect it will have on the first schools that are already at full capacity and the middle school which could become over subscribed! It would also have a fundamental effect on our children not having enough spaces at QE School in Wimborne. Verwood is a nice green and safe place to live; we do not need anymore development!			1057
507361	Mr Kenneth Archer		CSO10 821	Option VWM 4	Object		SNAP:A big issue concerns the A31 motorway which would need to be developed into dual carriageway to join up with the A35 motorway. As already stated on all the other survey's Verwood is so lacking in essential facilities to build new housing before sorting out this problem would turn Verwood into one very large housing estate and little else ,especially the figure of 40% being ear-marked as so-called social housing the town would see a massive exodus of it's existing residents who have grown to love being part of Verwood's			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							community.			
507362	Mrs J F Preece		CSO10 813	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		CSO10 900	Option VWM 4	Object	General Comment	The area alongside the A31 between St Leonards Hospital and Tricketts Cross is an area where many houses could be built. Currently this area is an eye-sore and gives a bad impression to visitors as they cross into Dorset from Hampshire. Why are nearly all your proposals on greenbelt land? There are many areas in East Dorset on non greenbelt land which could be built on. Your proposal (FWP 4 and 5) will put more pressure on Parley Common as well as introduce more traffic on an already busy road system.			1057
507366	Dennis A Pattensen		CSO10 829	Option VWM 4	Object		Larger Morrison supermarket to be extended to meet the demands of the current population together with the addition of a petrol outlet.			1057
507372	Andrew Innis		CSO10 840	Option VWM 4	Object		EDDC uses Verwood to fund other areas - the infrastructure needs to be improved before any more houses are built.			1057
507378	Ms Anni Dencher		CSO10 861	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
507379	Mr J M Leno		CSO10 863	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood do not have infrastructure for total number of houses proposed and object to green belt development of houses, or commercial use.			1057
507386	D Hobbs		CSO10 884	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507388	Mr David Huggins		CSO10 930	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507395	Geoffrey and Valerie		CSO10 904	Option VWM 4	Object		No more houses until bigger supermarket and better roads out of town - another school, and doctors surgeries can't cope			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Coates						already with numbers.			
507402	Mrs V Crout		CSO10 923	Option VWM 4	Object		Building should not take place on Green Belt land. Church Hill already suffers from too much school traffic. Manor Road is always extremely busy. With more housing it will become even worse.			1057
507409	John Crout		CSO10 943	Option VWM 4	Object		My concern is that you planners have allowed piece meal development with very little regard to the infrastructure, and the roads in particular. I would suggest that Church Hill and Manor Road already exceed their design capacity.			1057
507418	Mrs J Alexander		CSO10 952	Option VWM 4	Object		Strongly object to building on Green Belt land! Verwood would not be able to accommodate further building of new homes given it's present infrastructure, it would destroy the area!			1057
507425	E M Connick		CSO10 961	Option VWM 4	Object		Having been familiar with 3 Cross and Verwood since the early 60's when my sister and family lived in 3Cross, later my parents in Verwood and now 2 brothers living in the area, I would like to object to this huge development. Verwood was a relatively small village in the 60's that has grown and grown with little improvement to the infrastructure. The Green Belt has been nibbled away and the narrow roads are quite dangerous for the youngsters and the elderly. We ourselves have lived here since 1993 and we feel this development would be a step to far. We lack so much including facilities like a swimming pool.			1057
507435	J Barnacle and S Bennington-Fewsey		CSO10 972	Option VWM 4	Object		We would oppose any further developments in Verwood with the infrastructure that is in place at present, and the alarming amount of affordable housing being proposed, coupled with the erosion of what's left of open fields and land in Verwood.			1057
507451	F Williamson		CSO10 989	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507461	Mr G J Babb		CSO11 009	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507487	Mr W A Linter		CSO11 041	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
507499	Mr M Ward		CSO11 060	Option VWM 4		No Opinion	These developments do not affect me directly. But. The infrastructure cannot cope. Supermarket not large enough. Doctors have long waiting times for consultation. Chemists cannot cope. Suggest supermarket is rebuilt immediately incorporating leisure centre. Centre to be transferred to land at 'the hub' which is not economically viable.			1057
507524	Mr C G Richardson		CSO11 088	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507555	Mr and Mrs C Lamond		CSO11 115	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
359890	Mrs G.M. PROWSE		CSO11 351	Option VWM 4	Support		VWM 4 South part close to flood plain.			1057
361037	Mr P STRATFORD		CSO11 328	Option VWM 4	Object		I expect that my objection to everything is not very practical. However, I have lived in the area for most of the last fifty years. In that time there has been a constant cycle of the council saying we need more housing, followed by we need more industrial areas to provide extra jobs for all the new homes. Then in turn the council says we require extra jobs for the new homes, then in turn the council says we require extra homes for the new workers. This process is never ending. During this time I've witnessed the creation and expansion of the industrial estates at Ferndown, Uddens, Ebblake and Wimborne. A whole new housing estate at Tricketts Cross, Glenmoor Rd Ferndown, the expansion of West Moors, Colehill, Verwood turned from sleepy village into a town. In this time I am not aware of any developed area being returned to its natural state from a developed one. Please let me know if you think differently. I hope you agree that my objection to development is rational and that the never ending cycle of expansion is stopped.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary Hendy		CSO11 743	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
503705	B B Morgan		CSO11 966	Option VWM 4	Object		I am aware of the need for new homes, but not in large concentrated areas. We have insufficient shops, and traffic will pour out onto already too crowded roads. The school is also needed but not next to 2 other schools and these areas are in the Green Belt.			1057
507580	Mr and Mrs P & J Gardner		CSO11 150	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507595	Mr D Johnson		CSO11 183	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		CSO11 226	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
507668	Mr Gavin Lee		CSO11 238	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507693	Mrs P Carter		CSO11 278	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
507699	Mr Robert Rawles		CSO11 259	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood lacks a vibrant town centre but are close to having the population equivalent to Ringwood.			1057
507708	Mr Powell		CSO11 283	Option VWM 4	Object		We object to all the development if there are no plans to improve the infrastructure - 415 houses = potentially 830 more cars. No leisure facilities, no decent bus services, no cinema, swimming pool, bistros.			1057
507716	G R		CSO11	Option	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Cridlan		296	VWM 4						
507721	Mr M O'Kelly		CSO11 302	Option VWM 4	Object	General Comment	Existing facilities in Verwood are inadequate for the existing population. To increase the population by circa 2,000 will only acxxxxx what is currently a poor situation. You really need to show how you will improve bus routes, roads, centre of town etc etc.			1057
507723	Oliver Stonehouse		CSO11 307	Option VWM 4	Object		I strongly object to further large developments in Verwood. Verwood is being overdeveloped, without adequate infrastructure of local amenities and services being available. Roads cannot cope with the extra industrial traffic. The town has been spoilt, with ugly buildings and long traffic delays due to poor roadworks. Children have been put at risk of road accidents. Verwood town centre and residential areas are an eyesore with masses of uncollected rubbish. Council cannot cope. Building planning is not thorough enough. Consideration must also be given to the damage caused to wildlife and woodlands, something the Dorset is famous for.			1057
507730	Mr Vince Woolley		CSO11 313	Option VWM 4	Object	General Comment	Verwood has no infrastructure, we have trouble with anti-social behaviour from youths, dangerous level of traffic in front of Emmanuel Middle School. To have a new secondary school so close to Emmanuel Middle School plus 415 houses will only make the situation far worse! By email having just viewed the plans for your redevelopment near Howe Lane Verwood you appear to be making what is a bad situation in Verwood worse at this moment in time there is no infrastructure in Verwood, anti social behaviour by a large youth element who have been avoided in the new "Verwood Hub" so they have nowhere to go. Congested traffic which is extremely dangerous for children going to and from Emmanuelle School. The police are powerless to control the anti social behaviour by youths that hang around this area, nobody will do anything about the traffic untill a child is injured and yet you want to increase the traffic flow and build a new secondary school. i			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							can sure that having discussed your intentions with local residents you will receive a strong protest from us all. Please stop this insanity before it starts.			
507737	Mrs S Philpot		CSO11 322	Option VWM 4	Object	General Comment	I believe that crime and vandalism will rise in Verwood if more houses/people come to the area as the community feeling will be lost. A larger school will also mean that housing near the school will be subject to rubbish, vandalism and graffiti, too many extra cars when there is already a problem at present. Getting in and out of driveways at present is a precision manoeuvre so as not to run anyone over! there is not a problem with the children travelling out of verwood to upper schools, QE has just spent alot of money to accommodate the intake of children and this will be irrelevant if you take away the children from a very good school.			1057
507744	D Timpron		CSO11 332	Option VWM 4	Object		The large new developments proposed will seriously reduce the (apparently) rural aspect of the town by being visilbe when approaching Verwood. The VWM1 development would also be visible on approach but at laest it is a relatively small development.			1057
507752	Mr Glen Bailey		CSO11 343	Option VWM 4	Support		Bring it on more jobs.			1057
507755	Maureen Niblock		CSO11 357	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to accommodate another fifteen hundred people. There is nothing there - particularly for teenagers or adults. The Council ignored the wishes of the inhabitants and built The Hub instead of the swimming pool, which most people wanted, and which would have been great for young and old alike. At present there is little vanadalism. This will change with a large influx of teenageres from big towns and cities. Traffic problems will increase. Doctors and dentists will be overwhelmed making it even more difficult than ever to get an appointment.			1057
507760	Mr and Mrs R Gardner		CSO11 371	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507768	John Niblock		CSO11 383	Option VWM 4	Object		We moved here because, like many other people who moved here, we wanted to live somewhere quiet in the countryside. Since we arrived ten years ago there has been almost non-stop building. There are insufficient amenities in Verwood to serve the present community let alone another fifteen hundred people and eight hundred extra vehicles. The road between Verwood and the A31 is already dangerous and with extra traffic will get worse.			1057
507771	Mrs P M Coventry		CSO11 384	Option VWM 4	Object	General Comment	Lack of shops. 70 people waiting for allotments, objection to taking land designated green belt. Why not in-fill between Verwood, 3X, Ashley Heath and West Moors and allow a smaller Castle Point, to serve these areas, thus saving trips to Bournemouth or Salisbury. You assured me some time ago that there was to be no more estates built in Verwood, only in-fill, ie. knock down and put 3 - 4 up.			1057
507780	V R Strickland		CSO11 394	Option VWM 4	Object		I am sorry but I think you have already spoilt our lovely Verwood. PLEASE, PLEASE leave us alone.			1057
507782	Jennifer Baxendale		CSO11 400	Option VWM 4	Object		Too many.			1057
507786	Ms Helen Scriven		CSO11 409	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		CSO11 456	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
507795	A M Baxendale		CSO11 415	Option VWM 4	Object		Unless there is a feeder road from a direction other than Margards Lane a new secondary school and large numbers of houses should not be considered.			1057
507800	Mrs K M Platt		CSO11 483	Option VWM 4	Object		Too much development in Verwood already.			1057
507805	Mrs		CSO11	Option	Support					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	N J Wareham		424	VWM 4						
507808	Mrs J V Atyeo		CSO11 429	Option VWM 4	Object		We need more shops, as people are coming to retire in Verwood they may not be able to travel out of the town to shop. Also the school should have been here years ago.			1057
507812	Mr D Masters		CSO11 436	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507817	Mr R Gulliver		CSO11 448	Option VWM 4	Object	General Comment	The new housing does not improve anything in Verwood. We do not need more homes!! We need a Secondary school to build a future for our children. We should not be held to ransom, that if we allow the housing, we will get a Secondary School, because we all fear that you will just walk away and leave us with nothing. Why use Green Belt land, when the council has brown land that it can use. ie. land behind the Police Station for Social Housing. The Nursery's, Pre-schools, Schools, Doctors, Dentist etc can not cope. 400 homes will create another 800+ cars and 1.245 to 1,660 people. NO! NO! NO more!			1057
507833	Mrs Johnson		CSO11 466	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507839	Margaret Williams		CSO11 488	Option VWM 4	Object		When my husband and I came to Verwood nearly 12 years ago, it was a delight to walk into the village centre along Ringwood Road. Not any more. The amount of traffic has increased dramatically in proportion to the growth of what was then a small town. The growth of Verwood has been noted as the fastest growing town in the country. I suggest it is big enough.			1057
507869	B O'Kelly		CSO11 498	Option VWM 4	Object		Current facilities are moderate - to add up to 2,000 additional occupants is foolish and unacceptable. It is time our elected representatives began to represent us.			1057
507891	Mr		CSO11	Option		No	Further Bus services or more frequent existing routes (36,			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	R W Johnson		512	VWM 4		Opinion	36a, 37) or Yellow Buses to extend to Verwood from West Moors? Depending on these being practicable of course.			
507899	R J Potts		CSO11 517	Option VWM 4	Object		There should be no more houses built without adequate infrastructure, in particular more shops and a second supermarket in the centre of the town.			1057
507909	G Waterton		CSO11 524	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507915	R Waterton		CSO11 530	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507931	Mr and Mrs R S W Spicer		CSO11 541	Option VWM 4	Object		We are new to Verwood but feel that Verwood is very much over houses with very little infrastructure. Verwood was and still should be a village.			1057
507941	Mr and Mrs Avril and George Jeavons		CSO11 552	Option VWM 4	Object		We have serious concerns of road access to VWM 3 and 4 via St Michaels Road and Howe Lane, and feel these roads are not suitable for the amount of extra traffic, causing massive disruption to existing residents. We think Verwood is at maximum capacity for housing and what was an attractive country town is being turned into a huge housing estate.			1057
507946	Mr and Mrs K Carter		CSO11 550	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
507957	Mr and Mrs L R Vining		CSO11 558	Option VWM 4	Object		415 x 2 cars per household plus 1 petrol station and only single carriage roads = gridlock! We dont have enough doctor's surgery'y or infrastructure to cope!! with this there is almost zero public transport!			1057
507965	Mr Jack Harvey		CSO11 581	Option VWM 4	Object		We consider Verwood housing has already outgrown the size of the town. There would be insufficient services to support what would be at best another 400 families. There are still many unmade-up roads in Verwood awaiting the promises of 20 years ago. These roads have got progressively worse with all the new building work - Manor Lane in particular as the builders got away with not repairing the damage done during the build of the Spring Close area			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>and new houses on what was an open field. Traffic that should use Margard's Lane persists in using Manor Lane as a short cut and with a new secondary school this would increase. We understand that the Health and Safety rules say that there should be at least two made-up roads to the school to provide IN/OUT access in the event of an emergency - Margards lane or Springfield Road /Close to Howe Lane as was on the ORIGINAL PLAN.</p>			
507968	Philip Chivers		CSO11 570	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>The larger developments are too big. large amounts of social housing will be detrimental to the area - crime will rise, unemployment will lead to anti-social behaviour. Council tax already ridiculously high so how can we fund extra facilities, police etc required. Email I would like to comment on the new proposed housing developments in Verwood. Although new houses are inevitable, I believe that there are a number of issues which need to be addressed. The infrastructure in and around Verwood is just not in place yet and the town needs time to develop and get things in place before so many houses are built. Schools - there are insufficient places in schools which means either an additional school or extensions will need to be built. Who will pay for this? Medical - The Dr's surgery is already stretched to the limit and will never be able to cope with such an influx. who will pay for new services? Road systems - I believe that the roads will simply not be able to cope and am particularly interested in access for the vwm2 area?I note from the document tthat you talk about bike lanes, these aren't required as f you live in Verwood you need a car to get anywhere else! Water - The water pressure is already a problem due to the number of new flats built in Verwood. What will another 400 homes mean? Employment - during the recent meeting at the Hub we heard about how half th epopulation of Verwood leave the area to work so lack of jobs wouldn't be an issue - Half leave</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>because there are no jobs in Verwood. Working for a national company I understand about recruitment and profiles of various people. With 50% of people in social housing, i know for a fact that on average they won't travel more than 5 miles and won't be working from home and creating new business. If we therefore intend to move people here from other \"council estates/waiting lists\" this will simply create a poorer life for all. I grew up in social housing so know better than most the result of this policy! We will certainly need more police and other social resources. Who will pay? Will the residents in social housing be paying full council tax? If not who will make up their shortfall. As it is our council tax is already ridiculously high!</p> <p>So what is the best way forward? Provided access and roads have been considered i think the developments should be smaller in particular VWM2 which is a really large development. Why not build 1/4 of the proposed homes spread across all zones and phase the overall growth over 15 years to allow time?</p> <p>No doubt this is a done deal and council members have hidden interests in this but I think you should be really consider the size and impact of what you are proposing.</p>			
507980	Sylvia Allen		CSO11 596	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
508383	Ms Emma Hayter		CSO11 711	Option VWM 4	Support		<p>Think it is important for East Dorset to have affordable housing.</p> <p>At the moment I work in East Dorset and am looking to buy my first home, places in East Dorset are very expensive and am having to look outside the local area.</p> <p>I really don't want to move too far from my job.</p>			1057
508413	Mrs S Best		CSO11 773	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
508529	Jackie Chivers		CSO11 864	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
508532	L C E		CSO11	Option	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Leman		871	VWM 4						
508535	D G Sandy		CSO11 886	Option VWM 4	Object		There is not enough facilities at present for Verwood other than food shopping ie Morrisons you have to travel several miles to the next nearest town for any other goods, Verwood has become a hotch potch of housing developments, with no effort for other facilities and infrastructure. We dont want any more houses.			1057
508545	Dorothy Goodenough & Alan Craddock		CSO11 897	Option VWM 4	Object		There is insufficient infrastructure/facilities etc shops, swimming pool to sustain an increase in the population of Verwood. Until Verwood has better facilities and a more frequent bus service (currently one hour service) increased housing puts a greater strain on our community.			1057
508554	Mr P Mitton		CSO11 906	Option VWM 4	Object		No more houses! We need more facilities - especially a swimming pool.			1057
508560	Mrs Coral Collins		CSO11 914	Option VWM 4	Object		The roads and facilities in Verwood cannot cope with any extra houses, it will spoil what is a very nice place to live.			1057
508577	Mr and Mrs R J Ribbons		CSO11 925	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure, eg buses, shops, leisure facilities, parking etc to support yet morre housing.			1057
508580	Mrs Kirkcaldy		CSO11 937	Option VWM 4	Object		I appreciate houses have to be built somewhere but traffic congestion will be a problem in many places especially Margards Lane/Howe lane. It would not cope with the additional traffic another school would bring. It only just copes now with the two schools. There are long queues on Margards Lane and Church Hill exit to Manor Road at school times.			1057
508588	Michelle Hocking		CSO11 950	Option VWM 4	Object		There are already too may empty properties in Verwood. Some remain half built for months and become an eyesore. The planning office don't appear to have any control over the building. The height of the properties is excessive in a small town totally out of proportion.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508596	Whyberd		CSO11 961	Option VWM 4	Object		The area does not have enough facilities to support all the extra people that the new homes would bring.			1057
508609	Patricia Thorley		CSO11 986	Option VWM 4	Object		I Hve lived in Verwood since 1976 and strongly object to any further development. The once rural location has been over-developed - and many other properties have been lost or inappropriate houses have been built in gardens. I would question the need for more housing - it seems to satisfy a buy - to -let market only - our roads are over-burdened with traffic. I believe enough is enough - we need to protect rather than destroy our environment.			1057
508611	Mrs Rosamond Heaven		CSO11 991	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
508628	Martyn Heaven		CSO12 008	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
508635	Mrs I A Jordan		CSO12 016	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
508642	P Williams		CSO12 024	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
508650	Mrs M Peters		CSO12 032	Option VWM 4	Object		I would not like to see any further large developments in Verwood as it would lose its character. Also it would need improved facilities (perhaps a swimming pool in the new school which the pulic could use at times). I am also concerned about the extra traffic.			1057
508656	Mr and Mrs J Fry		CSO12 047	Option VWM 4	Object		Although we are all for improving Verwood and it's facilities, we feel that the above future plans will only cause problems within the town. If land is registered as Green Belt then it should not be built on for a reason. We don't have enough facilities for the residents of Verwood as it is, what it would be like with another 415 houses would be a complete nightmare! No No No!!!			1057
508664	Mrs		CSO12	Option	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Sharon Hak		061	VWM 4						
508671	Barry and Carole Bull		CSO12 088	Option VWM 4	Object		The plans for yet more housing is lunacy. Roads in and out of Verwood are few and already totally inadequate at the busy times of day for the amount of traffic, particularly the Ringwood Road. Where are the new inhabitants of these 415 houses going to work? Not in Verwood! So even more cars to clog up the road to Ringwood for hours each day. Any sane person can see that Verwood is already overdeveloped for the infrastructure it can susatin. It's about time we stopped these lunatic planners from using Verwood, only just in Dorset, as the repository for all their county housing requirements, so that they can avoid the difficult issues which challenge them in development of towns and villages in the rest of the County. Now's the time to say enough is enough - they have already wrecked Verwood enough already with overdevelopment and equally lunatic road systems			1057
359931	R E PETERS		CSO12 860	Option VWM 4	Object		VWM 4 - Verwood is desperately short of RETAIL space and I would like to see this area developed accordingly, with a new road to the school developer funded. Alternatively if this is not possible, any area towards Crab Orchard Way on the same basis.			1057
477753	Mr Stephen Saville		CSO12 632	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood's infrastructure cannot handle this level of house building. There are insufficient jobs and poor public transport. Each new family adds approx 2 cars and the roads cannot cope. VWM 4 in particular is completely unsuitable for any additional traffic. Crime will inevitably rise with the additiion of social housing. (comments from Main Response Form) A significant part of this area floods every year, in particular the strip behind 'Little Cranebrook'. A photo is included, taken from the rear of said property. Also, any development would inevitably have access to parts of St Michaels Road which is single track and totally unsiutable for anything other than very light traffic. Development would severely impact wildlife in the VWM4	This area VWM4 should be completely discounted.		1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							section including bats, owls, deer, badgers and slow worms all of which have been observed in the woodland and area boundary.			
508690	E and R Wood		CSO12 097	Option VWM 4	Object		No more homes! Sell what is built first then think of the amenities etc - Council and builders are the only people who will benefit.			1057
508696	Kate and David Fuller		CSO12 103	Option VWM 4	Object		Apart for the lack of infrastructure and facilities, indiscriminate (and ghastly) new buildings and ridiculous alterations to traffic flow have already resulted in the decline of Verwood. Our car parks have become 'Park and Ride' facilities for people living long distances away and using their free bus passes.			1057
508709	Mr and Mrs Bennett		CSO12 109	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
508711	Tina Alexander		CSO12 120	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood has already developed too quickly. Facilities have not been reflected. The recent new homes are out of character and shoe horned in. There is overflow of flats already, let these be taken up before considering further new development.			1057
508715	David Drayton		CSO12 130	Option VWM 4	Object		Not enough infrastructure to support more families living in Verwood.			1057
508718	Sienna Drayton		CSO12 135	Option VWM 4	Object		Not enough infrastructure.			1057
508735	Mr Peter Barham		CSO12 145	Option VWM 4	Object		I have lived in VERWOOD for 28 years from the start of the original building boom. Population growth from 3000 to 14000 and a town. A school since constructed at the bottom of my road and the traffic has been increasing substantially to the point where 2 times a day there is gridlock with cars up and down Margards Lane. Before any new houses or school expansion is even considered there must be a solution to the traffic both around the school and in other areas of Verwood. There will be a serious accident / injury waiting to happen with children and pedestrians.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508738	Mankin		CSO12 151	Option VWM 4	Object		We have enough traffic problems as it is.			1057
508826	Mr R.G. Smith		CSO12 162	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is already over developed, from a pleasant country village into now a sprawling dormitory town without a heart or character. As a villages laced with lanes and sandy tracks, consecutive councils have eroded its natural beauty until we now have vast tracts of housing. Refuse these developers plans and call a halt to these cancerous estates, remember this, once granted, the damage to the countryside is irreversible.			1057
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		CSO12 196	Option VWM 4	Object		The Council is always after land for housing or business development. Whatever is granted is never enough and a few years later they want more. This process has been going on for over 50 years and it is time it came to a stop. Enough is enough as it is ruining the area.			1057
508842	M G Carlyon		CSO12 213	Option VWM 4	Object		The facilities have not kept pace with present housing situation so approx 400 new homes will only make matters worse. Verwood lacks the infrastructure to support more houses. Traffic is bad at present, more houses will increase this. Comparisons: RINGWOOD - 2 supermarkets, Upper school, Boots, Iceland, Smiths and High Street of shops. WIMBORNE - 2 supermarkets, Upper school, and square of shops with more leading shops in roads leading off The Square. FERNDOWN - 3 supermarkets, Upper school, Boots and numerous shops. VERWOOD - 1 small supermarket, no Upper school, and some very small shops. A Post Office which was here when Verwood was a village. Some people use Three Legged Cross or Cranborne P.O. because of the long queues. This shows that Verwood has a long way to go to catch up with any of the other towns. More houses will make the situation worse.			1057
508848	M Lardner		CSO12 212	Option VWM 4	Object		General comment - I would like the results published so all can see them - ie not in local papers which are not always			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							delivered.			
508852	Mrs L.A. Chesshire		CSO12 257	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
508853	Charlotte Rout		CSO12 223	Option VWM 4	Object		Not enough infrastructure.			1057
508857	Mrs and Miss EJ and P D Goode and Smith		CSO12 242	Option VWM 4	Object		There is an insufficient infrastructure of roads and services for a large increase of housing in Verwood. The B3081 (leading to M27 and M3), already under pressure, would see a significant increase of traffic. The Edmondsham road is a country lane completely unsuitable for a large increase of traffic. Large tracts of unspoilt countryside would be built on and nearby wildlife would be threatened. NW7 and 3 already struggle with traffic problems in school term times. Such an increase of residents would inevitably lead to a demand for more shops, services and leisure facilities - and where would they be built?! Verwood really is big enough NOW!			1057
508859	Matilda Rout		CSO12 236	Option VWM 4	Object		Not enough infrastructure			1057
508865	Miss B A Page		CSO12 268	Option VWM 4	Object		A secondary school needs to be around Potterne Park area (if at all: even one of 500 pupils will have a wage bill of £1 million p.a.) (I was a clerk to the Governors of a large secondary school). The Howe Lane one would be impossible for people to drive to - and parents won't use a bus if at all possible. NB. Ferndown Upper is under-subscribed. I am pleased that the area around Doe's Lane (Dewlands Farm and into Horton) has been left undeveloped: it would be the death knell of the nature reserves on Dewlands Common if it were developed, and a problem to fulfil the EU directive on river valley protection (The Crane flows across the end of Doe's Lane.)			1057
508867	Mrs J		CSO12 272	Option VWM 4	Object		I moved to Verwood in 1985 - we have no more amenities now than we did then! The road system is to serve a rural			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Martin						village and cannot cope with the volume of traffic and you want to make the situation worse??? You apparently have orders from 'upstairs' to provide 415 more houses - and you will - so why send these forms - I guess you have to show that you did!			
508874	Mr Orkney		CSO12 278	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		CSO12 323	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
508890	Mr L Rackham		CSO12 293	Option VWM 4	Object		Would it not be best to just leave well alone.			1057
508898	K Banning		CSO12 307	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
508907	Heather Teasdale		CSO12 317	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
508923	Mrs L Earl		CSO12 390	Option VWM 4		No Opinion	<p>My opinion would only be valid if the proposal was either put into place or dropped. For the Proposal. We know the local government have to abide by government's ruling for more sustainable housing therefore it is inevitable that building will eventually come. More population should create a livelier environment adding to events we already have in place, such as farmers markets, carnivals, rustic fayers, shows at the Hub (which must be badly attended as they are always short of cash), and Memorial Hall, Heritage centre etc. Obviously more rates would help local government which should help create extra amenities for local people. We already have a lack of shops. West Moors which has a smaller population has far far more shops . We also have 1 petrol station which denys us the benefit of competition. 400 more homes would probably increase the population by over 1000 making the area more desirable for business. Extra</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>money from rates could help create more places of leisure or expand those we have for our teenagers who hang around with nothing to do, perhaps a skatepark or club. I would like to see any extra cash put to use making a hard surface cycle lane on one side of the Verwood to Ringwood road. Going south there is a path already for most of the right hand side, but not suitable for cycling.</p> <p>Against the proposal</p> <p>Large areas of council type housing. Nice family houses are always acceptable with intersperced council run at say 5% - 10% this would stop the rough teenage element that most people fear. Roads are not good enough to take the extra traffic that an increase of about 800 - 1000 extra cars would cause. Schools would have to be enlarged as well as the proposed new school. Well in advance of the housing, and has the Council got enough funding for this. Will the extra population cause problems for our car parking, which is often full, making it necessary to enlarge it, making us have to pay for it in the future?</p> <p>If the plans go forward may I suggest that the roads are made up by the developers. Verwood already has far too many roads that are a hazzard if one has to drive down them, it is totally unfair to tradesmen, doctors, ambulances, postmen, etc. who through no fault of their own risk flat tyres and broken suspensions.</p>			
508938	Mr Michael Smith		CSO12 373	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
508956	Mr T Webb		CSO12 383	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
508973	Mr Kevin Reynolds		CSO12 400	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
508975	A W J Seaward		CSO12 405	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508985	Mr N Meyrick		CSO12 439	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
509040	J W Hislop		CSO12 445	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
509043	Mrs P Craven		CSO12 470	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is getting too overcrowded. Lack of facilities is a big factor. So many people - more cars and reduced to only one petrol station!			1057
509053	Mrs B Macfarlane		CSO12 462	Option VWM 4	Support		Further traffic on Church Hill during school opening hours and closing will make exit from our drive almost impossible - already very difficult. More population will make Doctor's surgery appointments even longer - already over one week.			1057
509062	Clare Symons		CSO12 478	Option VWM 4	Object		1. Verwood has more than its fair share of modern housing estates. 2. Development southwards is least favourable. Need to retain green space between Verwood and Three Legged Cross. 3. Transport improvements? Few people in Verwood, buses too slow for commuters.. Latter mainly drive via Ringwood or West Moors, much congestion. Would developer fund dual carriageway or new road?			1057
509065	Mrs B Burge		CSO12 504	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
509072	Juliet Garratt		CSO12 489	Option VWM 4	Object		There are too many houses now for the current infrastructure. If more are built it will only lead to increased problems with roads, services ie doctors, lack of garages and shops. Surely it would be more appropriate to build on less congested sites. Perhaps the site of the old hospital at St Leonards which must already be marked as a 'brown site'. If East Dorset District Council persist with this plan the area will be irrevocably destroyed by over development. Despite Verwood being called a 'town' because of the increase in population it is in real terms a village. A town has facilities			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							and shops which we do not. I like the area as it is, that is why I moved here and any attempt to turn the area into a suburban sprawl is resented by yours truly. Verwood will see the movement from a caring population to a transient population. The residents will only live here because of access to work, they will not be the life force of the village. In other words they will not care because Verwood will be like a lot of other villages that have been swallowed and become dormitory towns of other larger conurbations. I have seen it happen, don't let it happen here.			
509099	Mrs L S Timberlake		CSO12 519	Option VWM 4	Object		These plans will instigate the demise of Verwood socially and economically. Current infrastructure is inadequate - Roads/Doctors/Dentists/shops Begg's belief that we were refused permission to relocate the access to the front of our house, but there are now plans to completely reshape and redevelop the whole area.			1057
509116	E I Sams		CSO12 536	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
509128	Susan J Cheese		CSO12 544	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
509251	Frances Hudson		CSO12 597	Option VWM 4	Object		Leave Verwood alone, it's grown too much already - the infrastructure and the facilities cannot cope as it is. Verwood is a beautiful place to live - don't spoil it with more houses, more cars and more kids on the streets with nothing to do. This is just a recipe for disaster.			1057
509421	Mr J Dowling		CSO12 651	Option VWM 4	Object		Unless Ferndown and Wimborne schools are over subscribed, I think the building of a secondary school in Verwood is not a good idea, as it only breeds local gang culture into our youths. It is far better for young people to mix with people from other areas, as it lessens the us and them culture.			1057
509861	Mrs V Aitken		CSO12 881	Option VWM 4	Object		The objection to the bigger sites is that facilities and amenities in Verwood have not kept up with the building of new homes in the last 30 years!			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Fine to encourage young people with affordable houses but they will bring in even more cars because Public Transport is not there! Can Verwood road structure stand all the extra traffic? Verwood needs the Secondary School but how about all the extra traffic. It is bad enough with the First and Middle Schools.			
509899	Mr Peter Harfleet		CSO12 896	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
509922	Mr and Mrs V Feltham		CSO12 926	Option VWM 4	Object		Very serious consideration should be given to the following: 1. Verwood has no proper infrastructure - Doctors surgeries are already at bursting point and there are no available places on NHS Dentists waiting lists. 2. There's nowhere in Verwood (other than the charity shops) to purchase clothes, shoes, bedding and other household essentials. 3. Would it not be better to build the school at VWM 4 where sporting facilities and open spaces are already available at nearby Potterne Park? This in turn would relieve traffic congestion which would arise at VWM 7 if the school was sited there. 4. To erect the number of homes outlined in the document would mean a tremendous increase in traffic. Verwood is already a commuter town with people already having to travel to work, and with no proper facilities for shopping have to go to Ringwood, Bournemouth and Poole. To increase the volume of traffic would seriously affect safety and the environment.			1057
361121	Mrs Elizabeth JONES		CSO14 020	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
482795	Mr and Mrs N F Steel		CSO13 878	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
500746	Mrs		CSO13	Option	Object		Where are the jobs for all these households? A part from the			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	J Lothian		815	VWM 4			fact that 415 houses means 600 - 800 cars extra (Not allowing for teenagers on future) people will have to travel to work daily. In recent years the traffic through West Moors has doubled. Traffic from Verwood every hour of the day. The 'sleeping policemen' road hump at the end of Pinehurst Road/Moorside Road junction/Station Road is useless as the cars drive straight across the hump, in fact 1 in every dozen cars drives to the right hand side of the 'hump', into the oncoming traffic from the A31 and flyover from Ferndown! There should be a stop sign to pull out onto this roundabout before we have hundreds more vans and lorries to cope with.			
509952	Tracey Legge		CSO12 953	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
510420	Mr Peter Stevens		CSO13 163	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		CSO13 252	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
510532	W.W. Chant		CSO13 297	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
510623	Mr Douglas Priest		CSO13 406	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
510798	Mr F Sullivan		CSO13 539	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
510844	Mr Michael Guilmany-Cush		CSO13 583	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R.		CSO13 631	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Mayes									
510974	Mr Jim Cullumbine		CSO13 661	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
510993	R.A. Cherrett		CSO13 695	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
511001	Mr Paul Few		CSO13 698	Option VWM 4	Object		A larger population means crime WILL rise, at a time when police cuts are huge. Less officers to deal with road safety issues. With many more children living in the area, Doctors, Schools and other vital services will suffer at a time when all are looking to make cuts. The population of Verwood is BIG ENOUGH!			1057
511015	Mr Christopher White		CSO13 748	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
511020	Mrs E Derbyshire		CSO13 721	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
511030	K Derbyshire		CSO13 738	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
511044	Mr B L Buckman		CSO13 757	Option VWM 4	Support		It's ok to build all these new homes so long as we can have a swimming pool built. Years ago this idea was rejected because of the lack of population in Verwood. Also we need a good shopping centre much like West Moors. Also a B and Q or Homebase save having to travel to Bournemouth to help the DIY man in Verwood. We also need another petrol station (I hear Morrisons may have this soon).			1057
511047	Mr Andrew Bull		CSO13 756	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
511056	K H Saunders		CSO13 780	Option VWM 4	Support					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511058	Mr W Taylor		CSO13 779	Option VWM 4	Object		I feel that 99% of new homes will be for new arrivals, and that all services cannot cope, no matter what the developers promise.			1057
511069	Mr John Cheese		CSO13 800	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
511076	Mr Ian Burden		CSO13 833	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
360097	Mr John DOWLING		CSO14 509	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
511095	Mrs Warburton		CSO13 847	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
511117	Mr and Mrs G McConnell		CSO13 850	Option VWM 4	Object		Our particular objections to the proposed new homes are as follows:- 1) Medical services - We already have difficulty in getting reasonably prompt appointments to see a doctor. An extra 1,000 (?) inhabitants would make matters much worse. 2) Telephones - We live next door to the BT exchange. Within the last year or so, increased overheating of equipment has required the installation of noisy, forced ventilation. Another 400+ phones has the potential for creating really objectionable ventilation noise.			1057
511128	Eileen Housden		CSO13 861	Option VWM 4	Object		The new secondary school should be built before the houses are developed. This has been proposed since I moved into the 'village' in 1979 when the population was a fraction of what it is today. Verwood is now just a dormitory town totally lacking in character and identity. The planning is appalling and hopefully no more blocks of flats will be allowed - the blocks of flats near The Hub are monstrous.			1057
511137	Sarah Barrow		CSO13 869	Option VWM 4	Object		I object to the building of 165 homes south of Manor Road because the land is liable to flooding and the drainage system in Manor Road is already 'unfit for purpose'.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511175	Webber		CSO13 890	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
511181	Pauline Barrow		CSO13 900	Option VWM 4	Object		I object to the Manor Road Development on ecological grounds. We have deer, foxes, buzzards, woodpeckers, snakes, badgers, rabbits and plenty of other wildlife living peacefully in this part of Verwood.			1057
511189	Miss Pamela A Stannard		CSO13 923	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>My comments and reasons for objection</p> <p>General comments.</p> <p>Verwood has grown by 500% in the last 20 years. During this time very little has been done to improve the infrastructure to support all this development. Much of the character of this former village (now town) has already been destroyed. We have a duty to protect what remains. The greenbelt, areas of special scientific interest and areas of 'special character' (in the proposed South Verwood Development area) have so far survived. The proposed development on this very special part of South Verwood would be on greenbelt land and runs close to the River Crane (a triple SSI). This must not be allowed. The residents of Verwood and EDDC have in my opinion a duty to protect this very special area and our heritage.</p> <p>Transport issues.</p> <p>Increase in traffic. The current infrastructure/roads in Verwood are already inadequate. The West Moors bypass originally planned to ease traffic problems in Verwood following previous developments was scrapped in favour of new homes. No doubt this would give more revenue to EDDC than any bypass!!!! What I want to know is when are you going to give something back to Verwood???? How do you propose to deal with the increase in traffic and the problems this will cause if these developments go ahead?</p> <p>Potential increased risk of flooding and drainage problems. How would any new development be drained?? I understand the river Crane is a triple SSI so I assume water will not be drained there? I also understand that according to Councillor Flower the drains in Manor Road are 'not fit for purpose' and already 'full to capacity'. I therefore assume water cannot be drained there either? People have shown me photos of flooded fields in the Verwood South area that would</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>serve the Manor Road development. I know the water levels are high in parts of St Michaels Road and peoples gardens are already waterlogged during winter months. Surely further development of land in this area can only make things worse. You only have to look at what happened to the listed cottage in Burnbake Road following land development in that area, The cottage and grounds were so damaged the cottage had to be pulled down!! Do you want this to happen to St Michaels Cottage (also Listed) as well??? Inc rease in development means increase in surface water. Are you prepared to take the risk and increase flooding in the Verwood South area? Are you prepared to be accountable for your actions and responsible for any damage you cause to privately owned property????</p> <p>Encroachment on greenbelt.</p> <p>I have lived in St Michaels Road for 22 years. I understand that land beyond Howe Lane is and always has been greenbelt. This area must be protected for our future heritage. You only have to walk down the farm and beyond to eralise how peaceful and special this area is. St Michaels Road and part of Manor Road are also areas of 'special character'. This is confirmed in the Council Plan (2004). What will happen to wild life that depends on areas like this? This area will be destroyed if this development goes ahead.</p> <p>In the 22 years I have resided in St Michaels Close I have seen much change. This change has not been for the better. I feel privileged to live where i do and have direct access to the delights of walking up St Michaels Road and beyond the farm on a summers evening or a Sunday afternoon. I am able get away from the hustle ans bustle in the Manor Road area. I witness bats in my graden on a late summer evening despite living toward the developed end of the road. Much wild life depends on this area for its survival. I have seen evidence of badgers in my back garden and have witnessed many rare birds visiting my garden. For example, woodpeckers, chaffinch, green finch, jackdaws to name but a few.</p> <p>Ten years ago Verwood was described as the most rapidly developed town in Europe. We have had enough now. If this council is so concerned with providing affordable housing why did it sell land adjacent to the hub to a developer who I</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							understand will not be providing affordable housing? There is plenty of brown belt land around Verwood that could be used. I understand that during a recent Dorset study, the majority of survey respondents said they were against housing construction on the countryside, yet the report's conclusion was in favour of development?! I would ask EDDC what evidence they have that suggests there is a 'need' for housing in this area? If the evidence for housing need is bogus, as has been suggested to me, and if the wishes of the local community are being ignored, surely there is no justification for building on otherwise protected land in the open countryside?			
511200	Audrey Barrow		CSO13 908	Option VWM 4	Object		My home looks out onto the land south of Manor Road. I object to the building of 165 homes as all of the wildlife would lose theirs. Part of this land could be used for allotments.			1057
511211	Mr Peter Hodges		CSO13 937	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
511236	G Thomas and J R thomas		CSO13 935	Option VWM 4	Object		Church Hill is already blocked with traffic at school times. Enough is enough!			1057
511246	Mr and Mrs Daniels		CSO13 943	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
511252	Ms Mary Harris		CSO13 972	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
511294	Mr Alan Dorey		CSO13 981	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and Diana Froud		CSO14 070	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511430	A.D. May		CSO14 200	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
511489	Mr H G Holden		CSO14 182	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
511571	Colin Alborough		CSO14 237	Option VWM 4	Support		We are in desperate need of more affordable housing in the East Dorset area. There is also a shortage of employment opportunities in the area. The provision of more houses should help to push house prices down to give young people a change of getting on the property ladder.			1057
511618	Mrs V Blunden		CSO14 305	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
511621	Ms Mary A Combe		CSO14 283	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
511711	Coombes		CSO14 445	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
511997	Mr Tom Saville		CSO14 809	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is big enough; it doesn't need or can cope with any further development. More traffic as a result of more houses will be a disaster for the town; Verwood should not be turned into a dormitory Town.			1057
360809	Mr Brian Skyrme		CSO15 430	Option VWM 4	Object		New secondary school in Howe Lane is the wrong location – support new school on land west of Trinity school. This to be built and opened before housing the middle house building period is finished. Also all roads and parking facilities to be completed at the opening date of the school. House building on the scale suggest in ridiculous without the infrastructure to support it. By this I mean, transport, shops, leisure, doctor surgeries, etc. etc.			1057
476264	Mr David Reddaway		CSO15 690	Option VWM 4	Support					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
498376	Mrs Helen Holman		CSO15 315	Option VWM 4	Object		We object to the development proposals on the grounds that the proportion of “affordable” housing is too high and on the lack of appropriate plan to improve services within Verwood – including the provision of an appropriately sized supermarket, competition for petrol station, leisure centre. Definition of ‘affordable’ housing not given in documents.			1057
499537	C Ayling		CSO15 351	Option VWM 4	Object		We wish to keep Verwood as a small town, council/planning reps. Promised a greater variety of local shops, this will not happen with large supermarkets nearby, we will end up with a never ending urban sprawl or Bournemouth overspill. Existing school will be overloaded. The Ringwood Road will be dangerously overloaded, even greater delays will occur when making doctor/dentist appointments.			1057
500817	Mr L Lothian		CSO15 369	Option VWM 4	Object		1) Re use or develop existing empty houses. 2) Each house has 2 – 3 cars not 1 car. There is too much traffic and congestion in west moors. We do not need a bypass either. 3) There are no jobs here, build the houses were there is work i.e. Bournemouth or Poole, not our green land.			1057
511374	Mr Shane Smith		CSO15 188	Option VWM 4	Object		We have been concerned regarding the volume of traffic along Howe Lane already, and the addition of any additional housing would in our opinion cause too much strain on these old roads. As it is a fire engine could not pass during school runs. The two main roads leading out to the A31 already too busy during peak times and the addition of this number of houses would be a problem we think. Also we are worried about ruin our view – which is why we bought our house in the old area of Verwood as it was quite rural feeling.			1057
511383	Mrs Jean Archer		CSO15 255	Option VWM 4	Object		Existing infrastructure needs greatly improving before any new building could be considered – need senior school but build it next to trinity. Morrisons needs updating and competition, need another petrol station and dentist, doctor can't cope now (waited 9 days for appointment). In fact we need a decent shopping centre and road system. You can't have it all ways. With the amount of houses it's no			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							longer a village more like a town with few amenities. SNAP:A big issue concerns the A31 motorway which would need to be developed into dual carriageway to join up with the A35 motorway. As already stated on all the other survey's Verwood is so lacking in essential facilities to build new housing before sorting out this problem would turn Verwood into one very large housing estate and little else ,especially the figure of 40% being ear-marked as so-called social housing the town would see a massive exodus of it's existing residents who have grown to love being part of Verwood's community.			
511449	Mr K F Armstrong		CSO15 265	Option VWM 4	Support		Option VWM 7 must have new road access developed first along Howe Lane and into Manor Road. Margards Lane is not suitable for construction traffic and is already grid-locked twice per day.			1057
511453	Mr & Mrs Weeks		CSO15 282	Option VWM 4	Object		We object to any further housing in Verwood as there is not sufficient infrastructure to support it. We appreciate that a senior school is needed but are extremely concerned re the access to it and parking. The traffic in Margards Lane is now sometimes grid-locked and a further school would make this an even worse situation. We are amazed that a further school could be built in this vicinity. Safety is also an issue here as is access to emergency vehicles.			1057
511508	Mr & Mrs J E Maiden		CSO15 291	Option VWM 4	Object		Virtually no infrastructure has been provided to Verwood in the last 20 years despite the explosion in population and development. Already the road system towards Bournemouth is at breaking point if ever maintenance is required. I believe Verwood has twice the population of Wimborne but only a small fraction of the facilities, I don't want to move again!			1057
511549	Ms Debby Andrews		CSO15 323	Option VWM 4	Object		There are barely any facilities for current residents and they certainly will not stretch to 400 more homes. Provide infrastructure first and then maybe I wouldn't object.			1057
511564	Ms		CSO15	Option	Support		I support these proposals providing that any developers are			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Emma Prince		338	VWM 4			required to provide allotments sites to the north and south of Verwood to meet the current huge level of demand. And also the facilities in Verwood (leisure etc) need to be improved to cope with additional demand.			
511620	Mr Neil Hudson		CSO15 344	Option VWM 4	Object		You simply cannot go ahead with major expansion of Verwood (already grown from 3000 – 13000 approximate residents in 25 years) without addressing the infrastructure of Verwood itself. The roads are a classic example most residents commute out of Verwood to work. Most of this is either towards Ringwood or towards West Moors. There is already traffic build up at junction points. The access to Emmanuel school is currently down Church Hill and Margards Lane. I have recently written to the county council over the current vehicle situation affecting residents of Margards Lane, Haywards Lane, Howe Lane, Keswick Road, Lancaster Drive with drivers on the school run (in an 8 min spell I counted 250 car movements). The noise pollution is currently unbearable. When it rains we are close to gridlock (with the implications of emergency vehicle access) Margards Lane was never designed as the main school access. Any further expansion will make matters worse; you need a school access relief road built now!			1057
511827	Mr J Kennard		CSO15 356	Option VWM 4	Object		I'm sure there are many good reasons why affordable housing could be increased in Verwood; however access and increased traffic issues have been touched on by the community. Public transport is poor for people living in Verwood: Serious investment is needed to improve transport infrastructure between Verwood and neighbouring towns and cities without constantly increasing the size of the town.			1057
511836	Mr J Middleton		CSO15 363	Option VWM 4	Object		Build all amenities first (i.e. more useful shops, sporting facilities, better bus services, more doctors etc. etc. etc.) more exit roads out of village??			1057
511850	Mr & Mrs R C Williamson		CSO15 388	Option VWM 4	Object		I believe the town of Verwood is unprepared for such expansion. Also building on agricultural or woodland is short-sighted, as in long term the country will need land to grow our food. The council should use brown sites as there seems to be quite a few.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511855	Mr Alan Thorn		CSO15 399	Option VWM 4	Object		It would be crazy to build 400 new homes without major investment in the infrastructure, with only one road in and out of Verwood and not enough doctors and dentists and only one major supermarket for 15,000 people. If the government took responsibility for building affordable housing you would only need to build 180 new homes not the current 400 proposed. This would work out cheaper in the long run as you would not have to make major investment in the infrastructure.			1057
511868	J Weedon		CSO15 452	Option VWM 4	Object		Any increase in housing in Verwood has an impact on the traffic through West Moors. No consideration has been given to this. Improved infrastructure is needed before housing developments.			1057
511878	Mr Paul Seymour		CSO15 502	Option VWM 4	Object		I support limited development around the Trinity school area as the road system has been 'improved' in that area. I believe a small development would have no further detriment to the area. I do not support any further large scale development in Verwood or infilling of green field in Howe Lane as the area is already 'busy' with existing houses and traffic for the schools.			1057
511980	Mr Stuart Folley		CSO15 616	Option VWM 4	Object		The school is required to meet the requirements of existing population. Additional homes will put increasing strain on an already highly populated town.			1057
512072	Mr W B Chung		CSO14 830	Option VWM 4	Object		No homes in green belt.			1057
512125	Mrs Julie Long		CSO14 904	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
512145	Mr & Mrs J Dutton		CSO14 931	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support any big development of houses, i.e. – shops are insufficient in the village, Morrisons is far too small to cope with the population as it is now. Also doctors surgeries could not cope and what about water and sewage? Could you open the old railway line – what a boom this would be for our busy roads!			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
512175	Mr Noel Baugh		CSO15 151	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
512281	Graham Roberts		CSO15 012	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
512326	Mr Ian Willis		CSO15 068	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
512431	Mr & Mrs Lee		CSO15 165	Option VWM 4	Object		No further development of Verwood should take place until improvements have been made to facilities available to existing residents. Transport links, health facilities, shopping and work places are sadly lacking and its short sighted of council to propose putting pressure on these. Keep Verwood as a small town where it is currently a pleasant place to live. Leave us alone.			1057
512557	Ms Karen French		CSO15 184	Option VWM 4		No Opinion	It is a 'catch 22' situation in that in order to have a new secondary school we need new housing. The main concern is the lack of facilities for an increased population. Although Verwood is a town it has the feel and facilities of a village.			1057
512703	Rita Sweatland		CSO15 239	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
513509	Mr Roy Brodie		CSO15 407	Option VWM 4	Object		As residents of Verwood for the past 16 years we would like to comment on the proposed Core Strategy. We are concerned that during our time here the population of our town has doubled but the infrastructure has stayed the same. Its true we have had a new community centre built and Ferret Green has been made a pleasant area but very little has been done to improve our roads. There are only two roads to connect us with the A31. These are extremely busy during the early hours and evening rush. Often cars entering Ringwood Road from side roads have a long wait. Huge delivery lorries block the traffic at Tesco and Baileys. The prospect of another four hundred plus cars frightens us. Surely we have had our fair share of new houses built in			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							recent years, indeed it was once rumoured that Verwood was the fastest growing town in Europe. Many young families who moved in during that time no have children able to drive. Lets sit back now and improve what we have then think about building more houses.			
513581	Nicola Beesley		CSO15 413	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>In 1987 the population of Verwood was less than 10000 and the figure avaialbe for 2009 was 14820, representing an increase of 51%. However the Verwood Town Council has stated, 'that the population is expected to rise to a peak of 15000 and then hopefully stay at that level.' Obviously the figure of 15000 was determined as a result of the Council undertaking full and proper assessments of the facilities that exist in the town to support the citizens and with the due cognizance of the East Dorset District Council Structure Plan. However much the District and Town Councils deserve praise for achieving their own objective, it should be argued that there is currently an inadequacy of prpoer facilities to serve the needs of the existing population and they must now apply policies to ensure that the needs of the Town inhabitants are properly addressed before additional dwelling places are built.</p> <p>The population of Verwood is already larger than that of Ringwood without the civic amenities and the people of Verwood deserve better, a proper leisure centre including a swimming pool and adequate shopping facilities. However good the service from the existing retail businesses: is a tiny post office, one petrol station; a handful of shops, and a small dated supermarket really adequate?</p> <p>Traffic in Howe Lane is atrocious particularly during rush hours with additional hazards of the school parking - emergency vehicles cannot get through now at key school times. To build adjacent to St Michaels too will mean the unmade section of Howe Lane will become a proper metalled road with the consequences of speeding increased traffic levels.</p> <p>The area between St Michaels Road and Manor Road is currently designated Green Belt land by the existing East Dorset Structure and Local Plans. Environmentally these developments are a potential disaster with the loss of much</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>needed green space for relaxation and the habitat for local flora and fauna in addition to increased traffic and pollution volumes such development will undoubtedly bring!</p> <p>Heavy traffic flow on Manor Road currently causes congestion and safety hazards at busy times without the extra volumes which can be expected from another 165 homes - potentially 330 cars BEFORE the offspring enter the market for vehicles.</p> <p>Under each succeeding structure plan East Dorset District Council has consistently, met and exceeded the housing targets set for it, while protecting the Green Belt and the environment of the District.</p> <p>Approval of these proposals can only lead to the destruction of the Green Belt and the local environment and future development MUST only be allowed to proceed on brown field sites within the jurisdiction of East District Council.</p> <p>The Town Council should continue with the objective of maintaining the population at its own pre-determined level and reject these proposals, restricting any development to that which improves the amenities and lifestyle of that population.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Nicola Beesley</p>			
513617	Valerie J Brown		CSO15 421	Option VWM 4	Support		<p>In moderation.</p> <p>I support moderate increase in housing but the following issues must be addressed first.</p> <p>!) access to verwood via Ringwod Rd- a dangerous rd too narrow for the present traffic in rush hour.</p> <p>2) Access to all the sites should protect present residents</p> <p>3) General services to Verwood suitably increases</p> <p>4) Money for new school (and services) definitely available</p> <p>5) Woodland areas eg st Michaels/Howe Lane corner protected.</p> <p>^ St Michaels Rd left xxxxxx and unlit.</p> <p>No xxxxstreetxxxxxlot of traffic on this narrow side road. No access from Summerfields-quite wrong,xxxxxxxcurrent properties.</p> <p>(This wording unreadable due to water spill prior to receiving the form)</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A Kirby		CSO15 459	Option VWM 4	Object		I live in the beautiful countryside of Verwood and would like it to stay that way. This is why my wife and I decided to move here some 11 years ago. We object to the proposed building of more houses around Verwood and Three Legged Cross. These areas already have an over population of houses without the required facilities. We need better road networks, larger supermarket, another petrol station, more dentists, doctors and all the NHS services are under pressure. We do not have sufficient facilities to support these additional homes. We must have better infrastructure to sustain further development FIRST including secondary school, shops and swimming pool. Also Verwood and West Moors Housing leaflet			1057
513651	Mrs W Pearsall		CSO15 449	Option VWM 4	Object		1 Increase bus frequency and to Wimborne. More buses on Saturdays and Sundays. 1 per hour is not sufficient. 2 Increase transport to all hospitals, Bournemouth, Poole, St Leonards, Wimborne, Salisbury and Southampton. 3 Verwood needs direct links to all railway stations and airports. 4Verwood needs allotments. Council land (including County Council) needs to be immediately available at an economic rate. Suggest land parralel to Pottern Way alongside river. land being auctioned on Pottern Way. Part of land VWM 4 in flooding area away from river. 5 VWM4 Access via Manor Rd and St Michaels Lane. Already congested and impeded vision around new gas station. Suggest small roundabout junction these 2 roads. Would slow traffic on this dangerous road and be safer for school children.			1057
513671	Mr and Mrs G Green		CSO15 476	Option VWM 4	Object		Unless we get infrastructure in place first Verwood cannot sustain more homes in such high numbers. Our facilities at present are used by other villages too and what we have here is not nearly enough. Doctors, dentists, shop, a garage, leisure facilities are really inadequate now and would not be able to support more homes. More traffic will be generated, so roads more congested and public transport is nigh on unavailable at times now.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
513719	Mr and Mrs E Roberts		CSO15 497	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is sadly not the place we moved to 31 years ago. We feel we already have enough new building. If all these houses are built, where are the people going to work? Will they commute out of the town and make the B3081 even more busier than it is now.? Another reason, has adequate thought gone into health, ie doctors surgeries which are already overcrowded, also hospital accommodation. Also where are these extra people going to shop?			1057
513880	Mr Derek Martin		CSO15 515	Option VWM 4	Object		No development without infrastructure including road improvement. Station road can not carry any further increase in traffic. Developers must pay for this first before any building.			1057
513883	Mr West		CSO15 523	Option VWM 4	Object		The town could not support the extra people (at least 1245) if you say 3 people per house - probably alot more. Doctors surgeries, schools, car parks could not cope. The centre of the town does not have or could not have shops of enough interest to stop people just driving on their way to larger towns.			1057
513891	Mr RA Parsons		CSO15 540	Option VWM 4	Object		Leave Verwood as it is. Give us more sensible shops and better roads and the allotments promised 20 years ago. We cannot keep up with the housing we already have. No more.			1057
513900	Mr P Wall		CSO15 598	Option VWM 4	Support		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed eg. road improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			1057
513915	Mrs PA Parsons		CSO15 574	Option VWM 4	Object		I object to any more houses in Verwood. We have very little in shops less now than 20 years ago. Roads need a lot of attention. No concessions for allotments-if green spaces found for housing why could you not find green space for allotments. Disgrace to you East Dorset Council.			1057
360838	Cllr. Mrs Carol Holmes	Parish Councillor West Moors	CSO16 657	Option VWM 4	Object		1) How would you ensure new homes were for local people? 2) Verwood needs competitive retail outlets like Waitrose etc to offer consumer choice and competition with Morrisons. It is		Not changed to	1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		Parish Council					not right to have just one supermarket for a town the size of Verwood. It would cut back on traffic movement too. 3) All the proposed housing developments would put further strain on Station Road, West Moors. 4) Give serious thought to using St Leonards' Hospital site for major retail eg B and Q to cut down travel to Castle Point.		processed until clarification of status of respondent received. L King	
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		CSO16 366	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
361196	Mr J.M BULLIVANT		CSO16 284	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
491252	Margaret Wareham		CSO16 592	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
499533	Mr & Mrs A & C Clein		CSO16 750	Option VWM 4	Object		We strongly object to any further development of Verwood because the local infrastructure can barely cope with the recent growth that Verwood has already seen. Any further growth would have a major impact on it. We moved to Verwood from Woking, Surrey 18 months ago to escape the traffic and overcrowding. Verwood is a great community with a village feel which would dramatically change for the worse if these houses are to be built. The re-development of the town centre and facilities which would be required would have a detrimental impact on our much Verwood. It feels like home here out of all places we have lived – we do not want that to change!			1057
499779	Mr & Mrs J Wilson		CSO16 040	Option VWM 4	Object		I think that unless the infrastructure is in place we cannot support any new building in Verwood.			1057
511639	Paul Hockey		CSO16 100	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
513974	Mr A Moore		CSO15 827	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
513988	Mr & Mrs S.G Smith		CSO15 660	Option VWM 4	Object		It is absolutely essential for new road to be forthcoming if new school proceeds. In House Lane, let alone the further housing planned.			1057
514049	Mrs E Hellier		CSO15 753	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
514091	Mr RJ Potts		CSO15 834	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
514092	Ms Natasha Saville		CSO15 813	Option VWM 4	Object		I think that there should be no more building in Verwood without more infrastructure, shops, doctors Etc. Verwood is big enough; the green belt should be saved for future generations.			1057
514099	Mr and Mrs T C Blakeley		CSO15 861	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
514100	Mrs Eileen Gibbs		CSO15 865	Option VWM 4	Object		The infrastructure in Verwood is not sufficient to accommodate all the extra cars and people.			1057
514111	Penelope Webiery		CSO15 932	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
514121	Mr David Dencher		CSO15 906	Option VWM 4	Support		Any development should have improvement in the road network.			1057
514136	Mrs J Crumb		CSO15 965	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
514225	Mr	Secretary	CSO16	Option	Support					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Simon Dixon	West Moors Traders Association	011	VWM 4						
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon Chaffey		CSO16 015	Option VWM 4	Object		Our feeling is this is yet another token gesture by the Council. This is clearly obvious by the planning permission that seems to be given for the most grotesque buildings in Verwood. The corner of Ringwood Road and Black Hill Road as a typical example. Also all those other awful flats in the middle of Verwood. If you are going to build then think before giving planning permission. Also speed up the development of Morrisons to keep in line with the increased population to Verwood.			1057
514274	Mr Showell		CSO16 087	Option VWM 4	Support		Instead of new housing there should be a new strategy of providing more public open space. The lessons of the Edwardians/Victorians should be learnt. New public parks like Poole Park, Queens Park and Kings Park save an area from urban crowding. Perhaps all the land proposed for housing could be reallocated to public parks.			1057
514282	Ian Bignell and Sally Hinchliffe		CSO16 043	Option VWM 4	Object		If Verwood gets more houses, it will need more facilities. There are lots of houses on the market at the moment, most of which aren't selling, so this proves we don't need any more houses. I agree with secondary school, as long as the middle school system is maintained.			1057
514287	Mr Brian Walker		CSO16 059	Option VWM 4	Object		Over the last few years Verwood's population has increased above 16,000 due to building expansion, I feel that Verwood has already contributed our duty to the housing problem. Any more house building would put even greater pressure on our limited infrastructure, transport services, roads, parking etc. Also within this proposal for more than 40% of affordable houses, where are these people expected to find employment in the Verwood area? No Green Belt land should be allowed to be built upon. B3081 main road out of Verwood is already over congested in the rush hours.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514344	Ms Emily Saville		CSO16 122	Option VWM 4	Object		Don't ruin our green belt. Too many houses in Verwood already – not enough facilities to support this!			1057
514355	Mr T Gee		CSO16 128	Option VWM 4	Object		Living on Station Road we have noticed the massive increase in traffic over the years. An increase of a further 400 homes would probably bring another 800 cars to an already congested town. most people who live in Verwood work elsewhere hence the high number of people travelling at commuting times. There are no employment opportunities in Verwood and no one can guarantee that firms or businesses would open up in Verwood. This is a dormitory town with a high percentage of OAP's. Building on Green Belt land in a semi rural area would directly adversely affect the quality of life of existing residents and the council must do all it can to prevent further building on Green Belt land.			1057
514367	Mr R S Coates		CSO16 157	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
514379	Mrs Denise Bannister		CSO16 141	Option VWM 4	Object		There are already many properties for sale in Verwood and the need to build others is questionable. An increase of 400 homes in this area potentially means 800 more cars. Access to and from Verwood is likely to become more problematical. There are very few jobs in Verwood and to increase housing further is likely to mean that more people will be travelling out of and back to Verwood each day. Whilst building a secondary school does have some merits, access to the existing schools is already difficult and at a time of serious financial constraints it would make sense economically to develop existing secondary school sites and thus minimise the effects upon the local community. Congestion within Verwood does not need to increase and in terms of environmental concerns, any further destruction of the Green Belt land around this area must be strongly and forcefully opposed. There are plenty of brownfield sites within local communities that could be enhanced by developments before encroaching on greenfield sites. Finally facilities such as shopping and community facilities would not support more			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							housing.			
514392	Alison Frost		CSO16 152	Option VWM 4		No Opinion	Please can you leave land to provide allotments for the residents of Verwood? They are a vital part of health and well being for residents with little or no garden and are much needed in the town.			1057
514429	Joan and Ann Humphries		CSO16 175	Option VWM 4	Object		The proposed areas not compatible for whole of the area. Infrastructure non-negotiable. Traffic conditions not generally good at this present time. Amount of homes suggested - quite ridiculous.xxx 200 here and there - what about the people to fill - need into 1000's. Build on brown sites and not green open spaces.			1057
514455	Mrs Christine Groves		CSO16 168	Option VWM 4	Object		There are enough homes and people in Verwood and enough traffic on our roads.			1057
514467	Mrs Lesley Cripps		CSO16 210	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
514474	Mr J M Sellick		CSO16 193	Option VWM 4	Object		Very concerned about increase of traffic, and the consequential impacts on wildlife habitat.			1057
514482	C E T Gilbert		CSO16 246	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
514499	Mrs S H Chung		CSO16 229	Option VWM 4	Object		No homes in greenbelt.			1057
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		CSO16 321	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
514703	Mr S Harvey		CSO16 406	Option VWM 4	Object		The village has enough housing stock already and is too densely populated with a need for a better public transport network that operates beyond the hours of 6pm! We need to build a secondary school and more shops offering local			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							goods and not just estate agents!			
514752	Claire Richardson & Jamie Shirley		CSO16 397	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
514812	Mr C Sawyer		CSO16 433	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		CSO16 490	Option VWM 4	Object		Seeking the opinion of the general public on planning issues is all very commendable - but setting aside all political persuasion my feeling is that this is no more than a Public Relations exercise because in the end the final decisions are always to the advantage of the developers whoever they may be because of money, greed and looks good on paper. My general view is that density levels for new homes should be kept down, East Dorset has become so over developed that is its now just one big urban sprawl. Infact it has lost so much of all the natural character and charm that it used to enjoy it is hard to know where the so called green belt begins and ends.			1057
514913	Mr and Mrs M Clark		CSO16 469	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
514939	D Porter		CSO16 514	Option VWM 4	Object		The more land you concrete over the more you have to because you just increase demand. Infill best option.			1057
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		CSO16 542	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
360167	Mrs Pippa WHEATLEY		CSO17 450	Option VWM 4	Object		As Options comments are requested on separate sheets, I will make points which are general to the four Verwood Options (VWM1 to VWM4) first, and then make comments relating to this particular site. Comments general to the 4 Verwood Housing Options Opportunistic	Delete Option VWM 4		1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>This does not appear to be a 'strategy'. It appears to be a Phew! Someone's offering us land for housing. Let's try and make the facts fit.</p> <p>Complete reversal of intentions in RSS</p> <p>Under RSS there was no intention to roll back Green Belt and subject Verwood to yet more large areas of housing. There was indeed the sentiment that Verwood had far more than its share over the past few decades. In your Vision para 3.10 you tell us that PPS 12 advises that the Vision should be in general conformity with the RSS and closely relate to any Sustainable Community Strategy for the area. As far as Verwood is concerned there has been a complete turn around on both these issues</p> <p>Sustainability</p> <p>All sites have rich biodiversity.</p> <p>Sites generally appear to be unimproved grassland, probably not ploughed for many decades, good hedgerows and mature trees. These are increasingly being recognised for their role in carbon capture.</p> <p>Verwood is noted for high car ownership and high usage to get to work which is largely out of Verwood. No increased employment sites are put forward for Verwood so any newcomers will inevitably add to the traffic going out and returning home to Verwood on a daily basis. Increased traffic will be generated by the needs of these developments for supplies to local shops, home deliveries and people having to shop for many items in outlying towns.</p> <p>The road system in and around Verwood is incapable of coping with increased traffic and there is no plan to improve the main access route B3081 or to make it safer. The roads will be continually jammed up with traffic queues, burning up oil and puffing out carbon.</p> <p>Climate change means likelihood of more impact from flooding. All these sites are going to affect the Moors river system where there is already concern.</p> <p>Green Belt</p> <p>I have commented on Option KS2. The Green Belt is being treated far too casually. Three of the four Verwood sites require movement of the Green Belt. I do not think sufficient attention is being given to national guidance. Have the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>following in PPG2 been properly considered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposes of the Green Belt, in particular to check unrestricted sprawl and to safeguard our countryside • Sustainability – to consider consequences for sustainability including effects of car travel if channelling development toward areas of Green Belt • Permanence – the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence <p>In 06 Green Belt Key Issue paper para 2.14 you tell us the Core Strategy will only propose alteration to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate recognised local needs in sustainable locations. Most Verwood people I have talked to do not agree we need these houses and it is difficult to argue these are sustainable locations.</p> <p>I notice the Masterplan document in its appraisal on Green Belt seems to find very little justification for moving it. The only thing that is mentioned is maintaining key gaps and key edges.</p> <p>Overdevelopment Verwood has too much housing. Your figures show Verwood has five times more houses than in the early 1960s, resulting in a population of around 15,000. It was known as the fastest growing town in Europe. The facilities are only still that of a village. It is not viable as a fully functioning town while there is the daily exodus of the majority of the workforce.</p> <p>It is a distortion to mention in para 11.3 that 300 houses were unable to be built without saying 'However, a large number of houses and flats have been, and are still being, built on Bakers Farm land which was to have been reserved for Community facilities / supermarket in a previous plan. Also part of the land at Ebblake Industrial Estate has been used for houses when it was previously reserved for employment.'</p> <p>Further comments relating to VWM 4 Flood risk This area looks very close to, and not much higher than, the River Crane. You mention further investigation at a later date but I would have thought investigation should be a prerequisite. It should also involve a detailed report on whether the sewerage system can be made to cope in Verwood.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Walks The walk through Heathy Howe linking the proposed development towards the schools is non viable. This has been drawn through woodland that has been nurtured over many years and has mature specimens of azaleas and rhododendrons as well as redwoods. The owners who live there treat it as their extended garden and were amazed to see this. They say they will not be giving permission.			
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		CSO16 893	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
508562	K Clayson		CSO16 949	Option VWM 4	Object		More houses will create more congestion on the roads.			1057
511936	Mrs G Anstey		CSO16 993	Option VWM 4	Object		I am in agreement with a new secondary school as Verwood needs one badly. I am NOT in agreement with more homes being built in Verwood. The roads are crowded enough as it is one of these days a terrible accident is going to occur. There is NO INFRASTRUCTURE here, and for children and young families a dead loss. I came here more than 20 years ago when Verwood was a village and it has been spoilt by over-building, ugly flats and stupid bureaucracy! All the open spaces are going, the fields with houses and our wildlife.WHEN IS IT GOING TO END???			1057
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		CSO16 576	Option VWM 4	Object		The area is already over-developed and congested - further development on the scales proposed would lead to deterioration of the environment and a reduction in the quality of life. I am particularly dismayed by continued threats to the Green Belt, especially as this Government pledged to protect it. I do not believe that such massive development is necessary or beneficial to the vast majority of inhabitants. Pressure on our area should be reduced by Government tackling such issues as population growth through immigration control and regeneration of brownfield sites in Midlands and North. There is a need for limited affordable and social housing locally, but not more executive homes. It is wrong to build new homes while second homes and investment properties continue to			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							exist.			
515033	Mr T Crump		CSO16 614	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>These proposals are typical of the failures contrived by Council and Consultants to address short term solutions to Government edict. Fundamental to any significant further development is the need for joined up thinking for transportation.</p> <p>All of these proposals further the burden on traffic flow through and around conurbation centres. These major roads are the responsibility of the government highways department. They should foot the bill for their improvements prior to further development. Some of these proposals virtually adjoin 100 instance flood lines. This is totally unacceptable. Any proposal to move allotments, away from the housing that uses them, increases road useage and has a negative impact on the community.</p>			1057
515086	Mrs Elaine Pugh		CSO16 625	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>Verwood is lacking facilities to accommodate more homes and pressure on services is too much. Services must deteriorate.</p> <p>The main roads are already overwhelmed and can only get worse with yet more traffic.</p> <p>Most of the land is what is green belt and should stay green belt.</p> <p>Verwood has doubled in the last 10 years (approx) enough is enough!</p>			1057
515114	M J Porter		CSO16 638	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>VWM 2 and 4 are too excessive in their size. Verwood is still coping with the growing pains of extensive development in recent years and really needs a period of time to settle.</p> <p>One of the main attractions of living in Verwood is the access to green space. Option 2 and 4 would cause irreparable damage to the local environment with significant increase in traffic plus increased demand for limited local facilities.</p>			1057
515148	Mr E G Howarth		CSO16 645	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>Until it is clear how the infrastructure to support additional housing is to be provided it is not possible to support any of these proposals.</p> <p>Will the type of housing result in increased anti-social behaviour?</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
515255	Mr and Mrs C Beck		CSO16 651	Option VWM 4		No Opinion	No problem with extra homes being built if facilities are increased – i.e. 1) Medical facilities – another surgery, more doctors, (we already have to wait for appointments!) nurses, dentists, opticians, chiropodists 2) Transport improvements 3) Extra police 4) Extra shops, larger post office and library 5) Leisure facilities – especially swimming pool 6) Elderly retirement homes			1057
515287	Mr L Jackson		CSO16 688	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
515354	Mr Walker		CSO16 715	Option VWM 4	Object		I object very strongly to any further development in Verwood, especially of the size that has been proposed. Green belt land in this overcrowded island of ours is precious and should not be encroached upon by yet more homes. Verwood has more than played its part over the past 20 years in providing extra housing. I do not think the infrastructure will take the strain.			1057
515367	Mr & Mrs J Pottinger		CSO16 813	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
515786	Mrs A M Bright		CSO16 833	Option VWM 4	Object		As a recent inhabitant of Verwood I am happy to support plans which will enable others to move to a town I have grown to love. It would be selfish to try to keep the town just for those of us already here. However I do not support the large development as I see the influx of over 2000 people creating a number of problems. Large developments seldom encourage community spirit and many house buyers are reluctant to purchase on an estate with large proportion of social housing. We do not need more empty properties. I am also concerned that without improvement to our infrastructure (more schools, shops, etc) Verwood may become ever more of a dormitory town.			1057
516343	Mrs		CSO16	Option		General	My concern is that a full infrastructure be in place to cope with			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	J Stebbings		956	VWM 4		Comment	the extra pressure on amenities, in particular doctors/dentists surgery Transport Employment opportunities Facilities for young people Taking into consideration population growth in the whole areas in the scheme extra pressure on hospitals-already under strain.			
517572	Mr D Alexander		CSO17003	Option VWM 4	Object		We object to large scale development as the town infrastructure is inadequate now.			1057
517717	Mr Frederick Thorne		CSO17124	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>General Comments Verwood has grown by 500% in the last 20 years. During this time very little has been done to improve the infrastructure to support all this development. Much of the character of this former village (now town) has already been destroyed. We have a duty to protect what remains. The green belt, areas of special scientific interest and areas of 'special character' (in the proposed South Verwood Development area) have so far survived. The proposed development in this very special part of South Verwood would be on greenbelt land and run close to the river Crane (a triple SSSI). this must not be allowed. The residents of Verwood and EDDC have in my opinion a duty to protect this area and our heritage.</p> <p>Transport Issues Increase in traffic. The current infrastructure/roads in Verwood are already inadequate. The West Moors bypass originally planned to ease traffic problems in Verwood following previous developments was scrapped in favour of new homes. No doubt this would give more revenue to EDDC than any bypass!!!! What I want to know is when are you going to give something back to Verwood???? how do you propose to deal with the increase in traffic and the problems this will cause if these developments do go ahead? Potential increased risk of flooding and drainage problems. How would any new developments be drained?? I understand the river Crane is a triple SSI so I assume water will not be drained there? I also understand that according to Councillor</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Flower the drains in Manor Road are 'not fit for purpose' and already 'full to capacity'. I therefore assume water can not be drained there either? People have shown me photos of flooded fields in the Verwood South Area that would serve the Manor Road development. I know the water levels are high in parts of St Michaels Road and peoples gardens are already waterlogged during winter months. Surely further development of land in this area can only make thigs worse. You only have to look at what happened to the listed cottage in Burnbake Road following land development in the area. the cottage and grounds were so damaged the cottage had to be pulled down!! Do you want this to happen to St Michaels Cottage (also listed) as well??? Increase in development means increase in surface water. Are you prepared to take the riskand increase flooding in the Verwood South Area? Are you prepared to be accountable for your actions and responsible for any damage you cause to privately owned property????</p> <p>Encroachment on Green Belt</p> <p>I have lived in St Michaels Road for 56 years. I understand that land beyond Howe Lane is and always has been green blet. This area must be protected for our future heritage. St Michaels Road and part of Manor Road are areas of 'special character'. This is confirmed in the Council Plan (2004). What will happen to wild life that depends on areas like this? This area will be destroyed if this development goes ahead.</p> <p>In the 56 years I have resided in St Michaels Road I have seen much change. This change has not been for the better. I feel privilegerd to have lived where I do. I witness and watch wildlife that depends on this area for its survival. I have badgers who frequent my back garden and I spend hours there watching the nuthatch and long tailed tits feeding in the bushes. We have woodpeckers, chaffinch, green finch and robins are always present. Then there are the butterflies in the summer and the hedgehogs hibernating in the winter. This area is so special.</p> <p>I am now 86 years old now so your proposed development, if approved may not be witnessed by me. I do however feel the need to strongly verbalise my concern about what in my opinion would be total destruction of this peaceful, quiet and</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>very special part of Verwood. The area is a haven for wildlife. What will happen to them?</p> <p>Ten years ago Verwood was described as the most rapidly developed town in Europe. We have had enough now. If this council is so concerned with providing affordable housing why did it sell land adjacent to the hub to a developer who I understand will not be providing affordable housing? There is plenty of brown belt land around Verwood that could be used. I understand that during a recent Dorset study, the majority of survey respondents said they were against housing construction in the countryside, yet the report's conclusion was in favour of development?! I would ask EDDC what evidence they have that suggests there is a 'need' for housing in this area? If the evidence for housing need is bogus, as has been suggested to me, and if the wishes of the local community are being ignored, surely there is no justification for building on otherwise protected land in the open countryside?</p>			
517741	Mr and Mrs Reid		CSO17 128	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>That there should not be any new housing developments on green belt land. It is a well known fact that fuzzle fields has planning permission for a housing estate in the near future, this will create pressure on our road systems. Bearing all of the above the road inverstructor will not be able to cope. As it stands today Station Road footpath is inadequate and crossing the roundabout is a matter of taking your life in your hands. So lets not ruin a lovely village!</p>			1057
517818	LT. CDR R Bennett RNR RETD.		CSO17 235	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>The ratio of affordable homes is a major concern 400 extra dwellings will put further overload onto public services including sewage and drain systems. This number of dwellings will introduce at least an extra 1000 people + around 600 cars to the area. All this when we have virtually lost our fire service and police station Edmondsham Road still has no lighting, no footpath and no drains, how's that for progress.</p>			1057
517935	J H Stacey		CSO17 266	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>This option should not be considered at all, because the ground it badly saturated at all times of year, and can be</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							subject to flooding by the River Crane. I am therefore against this option.			
518009	Mr D Heather		CSO17 287	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>We wish to express our concerns about the proposed developments in Verwood.</p> <p>Change of Character to road and area.</p> <p>In the East Dorset Local Plan (2004) Manor Road and St Michaels Road are designated 'Special Character Areas'. The plan points out that existing development should not be disrupted by new building and that new development will often result in the loss of mature trees, hedges, and other vegetation, as well as damaging the look and character of the area. In addition the woodland at Heathy How has been designated by EDDC as an area of 'Great landscape Value'. this would be destroyed by new housing development.</p> <p>Increased traffic</p> <p>The 2010 Consultative Document shows potential new housing development on both sides of St Michaels Road, a single width bridleway, which could not be widened due to existing houses, one a listed building. Should these new houses be built it could bring potentially 300 additional cars to the vicinity, adding to the existing traffic in the area.</p> <p>The junctions with Howe Lane and Manor Road are extremely dangerous, both having restricted views for drivers turning into St Michaels Road. There have been many 'near misses' and the potential for further accidents would be greatly increased.</p> <p>Drainage and flooding problems</p> <p>The area has a propensity to flood and residents have reported that gardens are boggy or under water a good part of the year. We understand that several times in the last few winters St Michaels Road has flooded right across to a depth of at least 40cm just south of the river Crane. St Michaels Road, at the Manor Road end, has substantial pools of water for most of the year. Existing ditches are necessary to take the surplus water from the road, but are at many times full to capacity and overflowing. Persistent problems with flooding and drainage have been reported to EDDC and Wessex Water on numerous occasions. In addition, it should be noted that Manor Road floods regularly throughout the winter, with</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>water running off the fields on which it is proposed to build 165 houses. Development on this site would likely lead to further flooding problems in the area.</p> <p>Infrastructure We are concerned about the lack of infrastructure, which would be compounded by further housing development on this site. The additional traffic from the new development along St Michaels Road would greatly change the whole character of the area.</p> <p>Green Belt The proposed development between St Michaels Road and Manor Road would be built on existing Green Belt land. This would potentially bring disruption of the headgerows and the SSSI at the River Crane, together with the adjacent Heathy How woodland, areas noted as important sites for a wide range of plants and animals. A proposed benefit given to residents in the Strategy Document cites access to circular walks through Heathy How, which would not be achievable as it is privately owned.</p> <p>We strongly object to the proposals under VWM3 and VWM4 as we believe it to be an entirely inappropriate housing development in an environmentally important part of an existing green belt.</p>			
518035	Mr Peter Pugh		CSO17 286	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>In my opinion Verwood is lacking the facilities to accommodate more homes and the pressure on services is too much the service must deteriorate!!</p> <p>The main roads are being overwhelmed now without more cars being added.</p> <p>Most of the land is low lying or subject to flooding which is why it should stay greenbelt.</p> <p>This town/village has doubled in the last ten years (approx) enough is enough!</p>			1057
518041	D Bury		CSO17 288	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>The reasons for my objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No clearly defined access to the sites. 2. These sites are situated in a flood zone and further building work would make an existing problem worse. 3. Intrusion of the countryside and wildlife. 4. We are in a 'Special Character Area' and it should be 			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>preserved.</p> <p>5. Large increase in traffic.</p> <p>6. Excessive noise from school in a primarily retirement area. Reference is made to the East Dorset Local Plan, Chapter 13, adopted 11 Jan 2002, page 213, 13.00, Policy V26. Manor Lane and St. Michaels Road will be CLOSED at their junctions with the B3072 Manor Road, turning facilities will be provided. In each case the road will remain open to pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists.</p> <p>We moved into our property on the 28th June 2004 our rear access backs onto St. Michaels Road, we are still waiting for this road to be CLOSED and would expect the Council to honour their existing commitments before other badly thought out schemes.</p>			
518058	Mr and Mrs Glendinning		CSO17 299	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>This is just to express a letter of concern and objection to the proposed options for the Verwood area. As you can see from my address this concern is justified.</p> <p>My main issues are the lack of facilities to support such over concentrated proposals, there is already a two week waiting list to get an appointment with the only doctors surgery nearby to Eastworth Road. I doubt if local schools could cope with such an influx and as for local shops and amenities this is just a joke.</p> <p>If you want a hairdo or buy a house or tv - fine! Try to buy anything to wear, no chance, not even a pair of knickers. Even the two small supermarkets run out of essentials, especially at weekends.</p> <p>What are younger people going to do here? As far as I am aware there isn't even a table-tennis table they could use. This would mean parents having to transport them everywhere by car by putting more traffic and pollution on the roads.</p> <p>On the subject of environmental issues, what about the desecration of such a lovely part of the Green Belt land, not to mention all the indigneous wildlife it supports. As for building on arable land this is surely unacceptable , when we are trying to decrease the amount of imported food into this country.</p> <p>The other worrying fact is what is 'affordable' housing? Whilst</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							I agree with the admirable sentiment that we should help local people who are working and providing a service and contributing to the economy of the town, how is this going to be controlled, monitored and decided? Please register our concerns and objections.			
359461	Mrs Nicola BRUNT	Conservation Officer Dorset Wildlife Trust	CSO17 502	Option VWM 4		General Comment	This option places new housing in close proximity to the River Crane and Potterne Hill SNCI (SU00/62). We suggest that the biodiversity value of this site and potential impacts on Potterne Hill SNCI need to be fully explored to inform this option. New green linkages to the SNCI are indicated, which would increase public pressure on the site. As the site lies close to the River Crane, consideration needs to be given to the function of this land in storing and releasing water in the current ecosystem. If this option should come forward, the River Crane would need protection through the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems, effective buffering and good design to reduce light pollution and impacts on tranquillity. We suggest the need for a much wider landscape area against the river and careful planning of the SANG to protect existing wildlife interests and to provide access to the river corridor without impacting on its wildlife. As the SANG is in the floodplain we have concerns that flooding may restrict access at some times of the year and reduce the ability of this site to divert pressure away from heathlands.			1057
359477	Ms Natasha Mackenzie	Clerk Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council	CSO17 712	Option VWM 4	Object	General Comment	In reality, however, the 2001 Census advised a working population of 5000 in Verwood, of which 1/3rd worked locally and 2/3rd commuted out. The working population is estimated to have increased to 6.500 today. There is a significant disconnect in looking to alleviate an already over stretched road network identifying further housing provision in the town, but nearest additional employment opportunity in St Leonards and Ferndown. Until a new secondary school is built in Verwood any new housing will also mean even more journeys to Ferndown and Wimborne. The proposed additional housing and employment areas will therefore only increase the traffic problems at Ringwood and			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							thus on the roads in our Parish, especially on the B3081, A338 and Linwood Road if the A31 is blocked. The junction at Bakers Hanging will also become even more saturated. The Parish Council agree that these developments should only go ahead if road improvements at Bakers Hanging and the junction of the A338 and A31 are carried out.			
359547	Mrs V BRIGHT	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17957	Option VWM 4	Support	General Comment	<p>We realise that there has been a rapid growth of population locally in recent years but that with it we have seen a reduced number of young adults in the 20-40 age group compared to the number of older working residents, retired elderly and children. There was also little forethought put in place by EDDC to improve infrastructure and amenities when the new developments were built over the last 10 years, resulting in a rapid expansion of footfall, traffic and pollution and bolt-on solutions to try and remedy problems that ensued later. The rise in house prices has outstripped wage levels, due to high demand coupled with the development of 3-4 bedroomed houses, which local people, on local salaries, could not afford. In fact, there are virtually no starter homes, and only a small amount of 2 bedroomed houses have been built over the last decade. If this trend is allowed to continue the District Council is faced with the difficult task of providing a range of houses to include affordable homes, both to retain the workforce and to reduce the existing long waiting lists. It is important that any affordable homes built should be for local people, and not made available for people living outside East Dorset.</p> <p>The proposed sites immediately adjoining the existing urban area are not prime agricultural land and in planning terms can be construed as suitable for development. Whilst we understand and could support the proposals, we must stress that any development would require improvements in the infrastructure which should be in place before any houses are built, or at least alongside with the construction and before occupation. Therefore, when the statutory core strategy is prepared we feel it is important that timescales are included within the document which sets out not only the timings of the programme of works, but should include details and timings of the infrastructure proposed, which should complement the</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							works programme. If we are to support the individual sites, both on housing need and the provision of open space not currently available, we would require more infrastructure and environmental improvements. All sites need to be surveyed for archaeological deposits and all require new access roads. Tree lines should be respected and two sites to the south of Verwood are close to the flood plain or watercourse. We would like EDDC to confirm that, due to the ecology and rich biodiversity of both sites, that at least a one year cyclical survey is conducted by EDDC to cover the 4 seasons, these surveys to be conducted under the statutory requirements of Natural England, the Environment Agency, and other relevant bodies, both UK and EU, the results of these surveys to be made available for inspection.			
359552	Ms J WEEDON	Clerk West Moors Parish Council	CSO17 912	Option VWM 4	Object		The Parish Council has expressed deep concern with regard to any further developments located in Verwood due to the impact that future developments would have on traffic through West Moors. West Moors is fully aware of the impact over the previous 20 years that the growth of Verwood has had on West Moors and would like to stress that they feel that investment in infrastructure is required before further developments in Verwood are considered.			1057
359891	Mrs Susanne Parkin		CSO18 354	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
359894	Mr D.S Medlycott		CSO17 554	Option VWM 4	Object		Parking problems - Public car park surgery Station Road When planning permission was granted for the Hub it was stated the overflow car park was the public car park adjacent to Verwood Surgery. Likewise the same was said again when planning permission was granted for The Herons when only 1 space per flat was allowed. Again when approval was granted for the proposed 29 flats (rear of the Police Station) with only 1 parking space per flat allocated it was stated that any additional vehicle overflow could use the above public car park.	I suggest 1) Adequate parking provision is provided at new developments for both residents and visitors as often minimum requirements are insufficient. 2) Use of the Hub car park during daylight hours for additional public parking.		1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>These planning applications were all dealt with individually without any thought to the combined collective consequences of the pressures it would place on the above car park. At the present moment there are constantly days when patients of the Verwood Surgery (including disabled) are unable to find a parking space and in addition staff at the surgery have also been unable to find a space in the staff car park</p> <p>The Practice Manager at the Surgery will confirm this as they have received many complaints from patients.</p> <p>The problem will be acute during the building of the 29 flats and will be exacerbated if the proposed 230 homes at the land west of Trinity School and land west of Eastworth Road went ahead.</p> <p>The reality is that the majority of people will not walk into town from these sites and in fact the elderly or disabled will be unable to do so.</p> <p>The idea that people will be discouraged from using their cars if no parking provision is made whilst laudable is totally unrealistic.</p> <p>Recently the paved footway area outside the surgery has had to be re-laid and bollards have been erected to prevent vehicles driving up to the surgery door and also to prevent parking on the paved footway by those vehicles unable to find a parking space.</p> <p>In addition to all the problems outlined above people do park their vehicles there all day and catch the bus to Bournemouth or Poole using their free bus passes.</p> <p>Traffic B3081</p> <p>Dorset County Council Traffic Counts undertaken in 1989, 1997, 2004 and 2007 show that there has been a hugely significant increase in traffic flow of 101% on 12 hour flow and 97% on 24 hour flow 7 day average. (Traffic is substantially lower on Sunday and therefore weekday figures will be in excess of the percentages stated above).</p> <p>Year Increase 12 hours 24 hours Increase 1989 3938 4670 1997 5368 6309 2004 40% 5505 6529 40% 2007 101% 7915 9181 97%</p>	<p>3) Notice in the Public Car Park to be erected saying "parking limited to two hours 7am - 7pm. Alternative parking available at Potters Wheel Car Park". No parking charges to be applied.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>1) An east-west bypass be included in the Core Strategy (this was on the agenda 20 years ago when traffic flow was significantly lower)</p> <p>2) The town centre to be pedestrianised vehicular traffic only for access, parking and deliveries.</p> <p>3) consideration of one way system for through traffic.</p> <p>4) alternative bypass routes using existing road infrastructure. On the 14th November 2010 during the remembrance service at Ferret Green all through traffic was diverted away from the town centre for some 30 minutes. This shows that other than building a new east-west bypass traffic could be diverted using Home Farm Road/Manor Road/Burnbake Road/Blackhill Road or Vicarage Road/Home Farm Road.</p> <p>5) Traffic calming measures or reduced carriageway or speed humps should be avoided due to emergence services in Station Road (eg Police, Fire Ambulances re Verwood Surgery) and the environmental</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>2007 8567 9895 5 day average</p> <p>Up to 2004 there was a 40% increase in traffic flow which at that time Mr Paul Willis (DCC Group Policy Planning Manager) considered to be highly significant.</p> <p>As shown above that percentage increase has now risen from 40% to 97% and 101% in the space of three years from 2004 to 2007. I would regard this as hugely significant.</p> <p>There are no figures available for 2010 but I would suggest that since 2007 there has been a further substantial increase in traffic flow, one of the factors being the use of Sat Nav's which has increased both HGV and cars using the B3081 through Verwood to get to places further afield.</p> <p>This increase in traffic has a detrimental effect on the town centre by way of Noise, Pollution, Vibration, Road Safety and Environmental Concerns.</p> <p>Traffic will increase further in the coming years and could even double by 2027 particularly if there is further housing development in Verwood and this increased traffic flow will have serious consequences for the town centre.</p> <p>In looking forward to 2027 and a Town Centre 'Fit for the Future' with an increasing elderly population it is essential that other options are considered.</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>I consider there is a need for more affordable housing for the Verwood Area, with a mix of 2/3 bed semi detached and terraced houses with adequate provision for off road parking and/or garages.</p> <p>However, unless the infrastructure is put in place in the first instance and the problems I have outlined earlier relating to the Town Centre and parking are resolved I cannot support the present proposals.</p>	<p>impact on the town centre. The slower the traffic the greater the pollution and congestion. It is also well documented that speed humps damage vehicles (types, wheel joints etc thus creating road safety concerns), adversely affect disabled drivers/passengers and created vibration damage to the immediate surrounding area.</p> <p>6) A large retail store such as Wilkinson's should be encouraged to come to Verwood and also a traditional restaurant for midday and evening meals.</p>		
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17754	Option VWM 4	Support		<p>As in the case of the other potential urban extensions, the Agency supports the development of the evidence base to inform any strategic growth retained in the Verwood and West Moors area, notably the use of SEDMMTS. Given the very high level of car dependency evident at Verwood and the direct link between the town and the A31 east of Ashley, the area of search south of Verwood (Options VWM3 and VWM4) is likely to be of greater concern to the Agency compared to</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							areas north of the town (Options VWM1 and VWM2).			
478398	Mrs Diana Saville		CSO17 689	Option VWM 4	Object		I strongly object to building houses on green belt. The green belt is there for a reason, to protect the countryside. Verwood does not have the infrastructure to cope with more development. In particular the roads cannot cope with more traffic. Most people work and do shopping outside Verwood. More houses would just create a bigger dormitory town. Building on locations to the North and South of St Michaels Road (next to Cranebrook Manor and on opposite fields) would increase traffic along St Michaels Road, which is unadopted and a bridleway. It would also compromise the protected location of St Michaels Cottage. Even if roads were built to Manor Road, residents would use St Michaels for journeys to schools and shops.			1057
515763	Mr V S Harris		CSO17 796	Option VWM 4	Object		The growth of Verwood is beyond sensible limits and there is a strong need for all facilities to catch up with the current population. The development of green belt is totally unacceptable, brown field sites abound in the area and any new development must be restricted to these whatever the additional costs.	Scrub it!!		1057
518073	Mrs S Williams		CSO17 311	Option VWM 4	Object		Several of the areas are on green belt. It is against the planning guidance to build on green belt and so I think these options should be declined. The land affected is beautiful and the building will totally spoil these areas. It will also create a precedence that will be used in the future. This affects VWM1, VWM2, VWM4 I think. The building is too near protected heathland and woodland. VWM1 and VWM2 are too near Ringwood Forset. VWM3 and VWM4 are too near Heathy How which is a beautiful wood and I think has an SSI order on it. Even if areas for sport are provided as part of the developments you will not be able to stop people using the heathland/woodland areas and people's pets will damage/kill the wildlife. This building would be against the national guidelines on building near protected areas. There are currently not enough facilities to support the present population of Verwood. We do not have things that			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>people living in much smaller settlements take for granted, eg allotments. In the 10 year plan produced shortly after we moved to Verwood in 1989 there was a leisure centre with a swimming pool and that has still not been built - in fact its not even in the plans now. You are now talking about building on the land put aside for this - VWM3. For this reason I'm against VWM3, but also I think you need to sort the facilities out for the current population and not add to the problems by building more houses - so I'm against all the other options on this basis.</p> <p>Like many people we moved to Verwood as it was a village, with plans to increase to a small town. Further large scale building work is going to harm that feel and make it into a large conurbation. This will detract from the quality of life in Verwood. Over the last 20 years there has been a massive amount of building work here and lots of new houses.</p> <p>Verwood has done its bit to provide extra houses for East Dorset and I think its someone else's turn now. The people need some time to settle and grow into a community without the dsruption of having further large-scale additions to the population.</p>			
518095	Mrs M R Owen		CSO17 316	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>I am objecting to the listed developments because of my concerns over land and mains drainage. Also there is no information on access to the proposed new school and also the proposed closure of Verwood police station as reported in the daily echo. There are not enough facilities for heath care i.e. doctors, dentists for existing population as things are now never mind another 400+ houses.</p>			1057
518105	John Maskell		CSO17 322	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>I have read the Core Strategy Options document issued for voluntary consultations and object to the construction of a further 415 homes in Verwood as described in VWM 1 - 4 inclusive.</p> <p>Verwood has suffered from massive and uncontrolled expansion for many years and we are left with a 'messy' town with no single centre and a series of other problems relating to infrastructure, highways, shopping facilities, folding, drainage systems and lack of acceptable recreational facilities.</p> <p>Most residents have to use cars just for the basic essentials</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>such as food, employment, recreational facilities with round trips being at least 10 and in most cases more like 20 or more miles. The Verwood 'carbon footprint' is enormous and these proposals will only make it worse.</p> <p>We really do need substantial improvements to correct the existing problems that exist in Verwood today before we should even think about more housing. For example we need to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Improve the highways including the B3081 through the town, Manor Road from Vicarage Road junction to Newtown Road junction, construct the Springfield Distributor Road and provide adequate crossing facilities in sufficient quantities on these roads to allow safe crossing locations. -The Sewage systems are running at full capacity and need substantial improvements. -We need more adequate leisure centre facilities. - We need more retail outlets to reduce the need to car travel. -As the second largest town in Dorset we do not have a senior school (the proposal to build one on the site adjacent to Emanuel School is not feasible). -We need time to consolidate before more homes are built. <p>I understand that previous plans/strategies stated that Verwood could stand more housing developments when the West Moors bypass was constructed. Since this major road improvement scheme has now been abandoned perhaps it would be a good idea to abandon additional homes.</p> <p>A major concern is the erosion of further green belt land on the outskirts of the town and the resultant loss of amenity, wildlife and natural habitat.</p> <p>We have reduced the green areas within the existing town boundaries to a couple of reasonable size areas in the Recreation Ground and Bugdens Copse and now you want to re-align the protected green belt areas so we can build more homes and lose more green space. This is totally unacceptable; the green belt has been protected all these years to prevent urban sprawl which is what you are now proposing to do. OK if the District Council does implement these proposals and we lose the areas of green belt what is to stop the next landowner from offering his land for development, are we to expect houses all over what is now</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Verwood Manor Farm. Before long Verwood will join Three Legged Cross, which will join West Moors, Which will join Ferndown and so on until we in Verwood become part of the Bournemouth/Poole Urban Conurbation.</p> <p>All of the proposed future development is very close to the protected Dorset heathland and to the established Sites of Special Scientific Interest, including the River Crane Valley. I strongly urge the District Council not to proceed with the proposals under VWM 1 - 4.</p> <p>To conclude I think it is time for Verwood to be left to consolidate as we are managing improvements as we can as money becomes available.</p> <p>Improvements provided they are the right improvements, generated by the Morrison's expansion are welcome and should be encouraged.</p> <p>The other towns in East Dorset may think too much investment has been made in Verwood but Ferndown, Wimborne, Christchurch and the like have not expanded at the same rate as Verwood and have not been left in such a mess either.</p> <p>I have been a resident in Verwood since 1986 and have seen most of the rapid expansion and along with a large number of others have sat back and done nothing about it. The Verwood apathy is no more, please listen to what we have to say. I appreciate some of it will be highly emotive, probably vitriolic and some downright rude but amongst all of it there will be a great deal of sense and constructive comments. Please Listen!</p>			
518195	Mr M Willcocks		CSO17 338	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>I wish to make the following comments regarding the proposals set out for Verwood:</p> <p>1. Verwood has already experienced a period of very rapid housing growth and development in recent years. I understand that Verwood now has a population of around 14,000 people and like myself, many residents believe that the town developed on a piecemeal basis such that we now suffer from many problems through lack of careful planning and development in recent times. My wife and I moved to Verwood in 2002 by which time the majority of rapid housing growth had already taken place. However, since 2002,</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>housing expansion has still continued at a pace with two significant flat developments on Home Farm Road, a new Care Home on Station Road, a new block of flats at the junction of Station Road/Black Hill, a pocket of new houses close to the Cemetery, and recently there has been planning approval for 26 Flats behind the Police Station.</p> <p>2. TRANSPORTATION Links to Verwood are already up to capacity especially the main roads to Ringwood (B3081) and Three Legged Cross/West Moors (B3072). Verwood is very much a commuter town and a lot of the population works outside Verwood in places like Southampton, Bournemouth and Poole. So the main roads to and from Verwood already carry a high volume of traffic on a daily basis. There is a particular 'bottleneck' along the Ringwood Road at the 'Tesco Express' where parking of cars along the main road has led to a situation where cars cannot travel in opposite directions at the same time, thereby causing tailbacks on both sides of the road. The B3081 already suffers from the heavy lorry use to and from Bluehaze landfill site, as well as the significant car traffic to the Somerlees domestic waste site. Because of these waste sites, the number of heavy lorries travelling through the centre into Verwood (coming from the West Moors and Cranborne directions) has also increased in recent times adding to the heavy road usage.</p> <p>3. SCHOOL/HEALTHCARE/EMERGENCY SERVICES The already rapid population expansion has led to our Verwood infant/junior schools being at risk of running at beyond their current capacity. I understand there is very little, if any, spare capacity to cope with significant population growth.</p> <p>I am aware that the emergency services, especially the ambulance service are already struggling to deal with the level of emergency calls they already have to deal with. We already have a considerable number of residents who are elderly and this adds pressure to the problem.</p> <p>Then of course there is the question as to whether the current medical practices could handle a greater number of patients. The Medical Practice that I belong to already seems to be extremely busy.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>4. SHOPS Complaints about the lack of shops in Verwood has been an issue for several years now, and further population growth will only serve to exacerbate this ongoing problem.</p> <p>5. In summary, it is highly questionable whether Verwood is able to absorb the high level of new housing proposed, firstly because after such a rapid expansion in recent years, it now needs time to mature as a town. Secondly, there are strong questions about whether the transport links, schools, emergency and medical services could cope with such expansion. And finally, I believe a strategy based upon such a high proportion of affordable housing in a town where plentiful employment opportunities are not available or even within a short travel distance will ultimately fail the constituents of Verwood.</p> <p>I should be grateful if you could give consideration to these comments.</p>			
518281	Adrian Palmer	Clerk to Governors Emmanuel Middle School	CSO17 350	Option VWM 4		General Comment	<p>I have been asked to send you the following extract from the minutes of our Full Governing Body Meeting on Tuesday 11th January 2011.</p> <p>"JW (Headteacher) explained the potential implications for EMS should additional housing be approved. Already the school hall is too small for our purposes. Also we do not have any spare classrooms, so any additional pupils would mean additional buildings for new classrooms."</p>			1057
518303	Mr P R Owen		CSO17 356	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>Nothing in the plan about access to the school. Also concerns about land surface water drainage with ref to Howe Lane site (V3) also main drainage.</p> <p>With reference to Burnbake Road. Some years ago when a development behind Elmtree cottage caused surface water to engulf the site and the cottage had to be demolished. As I am sure you can remember this would be a problem for VWM 3 and 4 sites.</p>			1057
518433	Chris Holmes		CSO17 365	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>Thank you for the chance to comment. I feel that your plans include too many social houses, your plans have much detail but why the disproportionate number of low cost houses. In all cases you are looking for 50%, which is just too many.</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Because of this I object to your plan. Additionally the link between the new school and the new houses is not wholly clear, but you are trying to make that link, perhaps to gain extra support for this biased proposal.			
518716	F A Sellick		CSO17 382	Option VWM 4	Object		Any increase in vehicular traffic in St. Michaels Road between Howe Lane and the proposed VWM 4 development will mean a major change to the road, with a knock-on effect both to wildlife habitats and current residents of that are of St. Michaels Road.			1057
518812	Mrs L Munn		CSO17 388	Option VWM 4	Object		With a population already larger than the county town, I feel Verwood has reached its optimum number of inhabitants. We are in danger of creating a dormitory living space with an increasing lack of community input: evidence the apathy with which the vastly ever expensive hub has been received. Stop now before we reach the point where Verwood is a soul-less place to live.			1057
518882	Mrs Doreen Knowlden		CSO17 402	Option VWM 4	Object		VWM 3 and 4 will both create traffic problems for Howe Lane and area especially if school located in VWM 7, better location would be VWM 4. We also have a very ill though out road system already in place!			1057
518895	Mr Mark Gifford		CSO17 406	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is already overcrowded with housing. There are not enough local facilities to support the population; we need pubs, restaurants, better transport links and better facilities for younger people. There is no employment in the area; more houses will just increase the "dormitory" feel to the town. The road system cannot cope with the traffic at peak times. We already need a secondary school as the number of children in the town is increasing – QE and Ferndown will not cope with future demand + a local secondary school would be a real benefit to the community. No more housing in Verwood please.			1057
518905	Mrs Burbidge		CSO17 419	Option VWM 4	Object		Over the last 30 years Verwood has expanded hugely, facilities have not increased, with intention to provide more affordable homes, hence families, surely have a plan to incorporate a indoor recreational facility aimed at the youth, with a refreshment area, affordable for youths, the hub is only			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							ok for older people which is why hundreds of kids congregate at the park opposite Tesco express Verwood in winter + summer. Come on council think again wisely!			
519265	Mrs Pat Morrow		CSO17 431	Option VWM 4	Support		I am in favour, in principal, of the proposed developments provided that: 1) The infrastructure needed is in place before building. 2) That the transport situation is improved. 3) That parking in the town centre is reversed and all day parking is prohibited. The development of a park and ride system could be available for those wishing to use free bus passes – A Blake a possibility. 4) That facilities – doctors, dentists, shops (not estate agents) land uses – are affordable.			1057
519368	Mr Frederick Iley		CSO17 437	Option VWM 4	Object		Road Structure will not take any more traffic. Single lane roads at school time will only take a car width and then with difficulty.			1057
519400	Mrs Bailey		CSO17 528	Option VWM 4	Object		I moved to Verwood 23 years ago. Now everywhere is packed solid with shoppers at the only supermarket, upto 5 years ago you could get a doctor's appointment within a day, now because of the already great volume of people it's a week or more. The roads are full opposite my house, the evenings and weekends "Close" is like a parking lot only one garage for petrol unless you can get in Ringwood or Wimborne. No Verwood cannot cope now, so no more buildings please.			1057
519890	Mrs Christine Iley		CSO17 616	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 581	Option VWM 4		General Comment	Chapter 11 - Verwood and West Moors Our main concern regarding development area is foul drainage and the capacity of Palmerford Sewage Treatment Works (STW). This is discussed below. All options Foul Drainage The effluent capacity at Palmersford STW is currently unknown. This is particularly relevant because development			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							in Verwood is believed to connect to this STW, and this settlement is part of the Core Strategy. The capacity of Palmersford STW and associated infrastructure must be established as part of the Core Strategy evidence. Overall issues for consideration are: surface water drainage; SUDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter			
520657	Miss Claire Gibbins		CSO17 631	Option VWM 4	Object		VWM 2 would have much less impact in terms of ruining the current look of the area. VWM 4 is a much more scenic area.			1057
520671	P Hancy		CSO17 656	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
520737	S New		CSO17 670	Option VWM 4	Object		Main concern with new school is access via Margards Lane / Church Hill. Are alternatives planned off of Manor Road? If VWM 4 goes ahead can some agreement be arrange with developers to provide new road to school campus via Healthy How?			1057
520927	Ms I Jenson		CSO17 681	Option VWM 4	Object		I like most residents in Verwood object because we have not got the doc, dentist, schools, shops, bus service, roads for all the cars ext ext. The old people have to go out of Verwood to get cloths ext. We already have a building going up, on the Ringwood road site, no one wanted, did anyone do anything to stop it for Verwood nd Bristol went ahead. Would they like to live by it I don't think so.			1057
520965	Mrs J Lake		CSO17 694	Option VWM 4	Support		Does the area on the sluice side need to be included in this development?			1057
521315	Janet & Kevin Healy Paul		CSO18 029	Option VWM 4	Support		SUMMARY: VWM4 LAND SOUTH OF MANOR ROAD (165) If we had not already objected to two sites and reached no conclusion on a third, we would have objected to this site on			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Timberlake						<p>environmental grounds. With great reluctance we consider this a 'least worst option'. It may be advisable to considerably reduce the number of houses on this site. If 40% affordable houses were not achieved we would object to this potential site.</p> <p>It will not have such an impact on the wider landscape. It will have the potential for the greatest environmental/ecosystem damage. The Environment Agency would have to be involved as it is a nationally protected site. It will contribute to even more congestion in East Dorset. If car journeys were not reduced it would have the potential to add 247 more cars on the road. This is a conservative estimate of 1 ½ cars per household.</p> <p>Only 'B' and 'C' roads link Verwood to the main industrial and service centres.</p> <p>There is no access in the evenings to entertainment centres for Verwood's youth. This has the potential to lead to anti-social behaviour unless informal facilities are provided in Verwood.</p> <p>PURPOSES OF THE GREENBELT PPG2 (as applicable to this site)</p> <p>To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.</p> <p>To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>VISUAL IMPACT ON BOTH THE NATURAL AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPE</p> <p>These sites will have the least visual impact as they are more enclosed, hidden from the broader countryside by a good thick surrounding of mature trees and hedgerows. This surround and all trees must be retained to help hide the potential development from Manor Road. The development would impact on the Lake and the Crane, removing their quiet rural setting, although there are plenty of trees and shrubs to help mitigate the potential proximity of housing. The top part of the site was wooded, this has been cleared except for some trees which have TPOs on them. We were nevertheless surprised to read that the BroadwayMalyan Report considered this site to have only a moderate sensitivity and only a slight landscape value. We would have rated it more highly.</p> <p>SUSTAINABLE LOCATION (PPS1)</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Location Primary Schools Middle and Upper Daily shopping Post Office Doctors Land south of Manor Rd 0.8km 0.8km – M FD - Upper 1.0km Morr 1.5km town 1.5km ????? Lake Rd?</p> <p>The school system in Verwood is very complex. There is a mixture of both the 2-tier and 3-tier system which has led to a great number of different schools. For this reason the stats are unsound. Some children go to school in Cranborne and these generally move onto Wimborne as an upper school (not Ferndown). Others go to Ringwood to senior school as it has a 2 tier system. Until this system has been resolved, it is likely that this will lead to more car journeys making the potential housing sites less sustainable.</p> <p>EMPLOYMENT 2.5km to Ebblake Industrial Estate by road, it may be shorter by cycle track if they exist. Otherwise all the other employment centres in East Dorset can only be accessed using the private motor car.</p> <p>Commuting Figures for Verwood. Source: 2001 Census Internal Commuters ... 1648 In Commuters1558 Out Commuters3331 Total commuters (in and out)....4889 90% of commuters are car drivers or passengers (Core Stragey).</p> <p>PUBLIC TRANSPORT The number 36, Verwood to Bournemouth bus. Hourly during the middle of the day, 3 buses before 9am on school days. These do not run when the school is closed. Last bus from</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Bournemouth leaves at 18.20 hours. Journey times: 45 minutes to Bournemouth (from Manor Rd) The number 37, Verwood to Poole, runs hourly, it takes 1 ¼ hours to get to Poole. Last bus from Poole is at 17.50 hours. Journey times: 40 minutes to FD and 1 hour 5 mins to Poole (from Manor Road) No trains. There is no access to Bournemouth or Poole in the evenings by public transport, therefor this restricts the recreational activities of the younger population. NEAREST CENTRE WITH FULL RANGE OF SERVICES Ringwood, Ferndown or Wimborne. There is an hourly bus service to Ringwood and Ferndown but it is likely the preferred choice of travel would be by private car. PROVISION OF MULTI-FUNCTIONAL GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND OPEN SPACES: (Natural England's Green Infrastructure Guidance NE176 & PPG17 Planning for Open Spaces An area of woodland has been left as an open space and there is also a large potential landscape area between the two blocks of housing. Green Linkage is proposed to take the residents through to the SANGS south of the development. Otherwise GI seems a little poor for such a large estate. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS: Our comments on environmental aspects of the Core Strategy Options document are included in the Response of the Environmental TAG, East Dorset Community Partnership, which we fully endorse. ECOSYSTEM DAMAGE: disturbance to flora and fauna The site is open grazing land surrounded by mature trees. We feel that this site is very sensitive, and although developing this site would have a limited effect on the wider landscape, we think there is a grave danger of damaging a valuable ecosystem. The Environment Agency would need to carry out a survey. There are reports of the water table being close to the surface and this would limit the use of ground source heat pumps as a renewable source of energy. There are also verbal reports of surface water flooding and ground saturation as a frequent problem around St Michael's Road. Further development, even using SUDs, may increase this</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>problem and exacerbate the Crane's propensity to flood.</p> <p>TRANQUILLITY: a sense of place.</p> <p>This site does not have the same tranquillity as the open green sites. However, it is a peaceful scene of grassland and mature oaks. It is an enclosed site and this makes it a very quiet place. Very relaxing with the lake and the Crane nearby.</p> <p>LIGHT POLLUTION</p> <p>Please see the ETAG Response and comments by Bob Mizon.</p> <p>DRAINAGE PPS25 (causing increase in river flooding or surface water problems)</p> <p>There is a small flood plain on the Crane, but the housing should be above this level, although the water table is believed to be very high. SUDS will be required on site and lots of open space to try to prevent any increase in run off from the estate.</p> <p>PROXIMITY TO HEATHLAND AND AVAILABILITY OF SANGS FOR MITIGATION</p> <p>Mitigation will be required as it is close to heathlands. The proposed SANGS is close to an SSSI of the Crane, the site must avoid it. Flood and soil saturation in winter months will restrict access forcing residents onto the heathlands.</p> <p>PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE (schools etc)</p> <p>In view of the size of Verwood, nearly 15,000 people, it seems there really is a need for a new Upper School to be built. A school here would relieve Ferndown who could then provide spare capacity to relieve the Wimborne Upper school. The Hub provides an excellent Community Centre and there is a Leisure Centre by Morrisons. The main criticism of Verwood is that it is so spread out with too many services and not enough retail. Another doctor's surgery would be required if much development took place. Facilities will also be required for Verwood's youth. They are unable to access places of entertainment in the evenings as no buses run to Ringwood, Wimborne, Poole or Bournemouth.</p> <p>Parking in Verwood is an issue that needs resolving by providing more spaces. There are not enough car parks, the settlement sprawls over a large area, people are struggling to park at the shops and are being forced to go elsewhere. A</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>survey needs to be done to check on the situation. There is also a suggestion that people are using the central parking to leave their cars, catch a bus using their bus passes, and so blocking shoppers spaces. Delivery vans also cause problems due to lack of space.</p> <p>IMPACT ON TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>There are very few jobs in Verwood so any potential development will put more cars on already overcrowded roads. The bus service is poor, there is very little employment accessible by alternate means of travel. The Edmondsham Road is a 'C' road without a speed limit so traffic calming would be required due to its proximity to Trinity School. Manor Road also winds and is busy with some very bad bends, the junction at Three Legged Cross would get more difficult. The road to Ringwood is a little better in size but we understand during wet weather it tends to suffer from surface water. There is no where in East Dorset you can build and not add to the congestion around the main employment centres. One of the problems with Verwood workers driving in the direction of Wimborne is that they use the Holt Road as a 'rat run'.</p> <p>East Dorset District Council has a target in the Transport Plan to introduce buses to take workers directly to industrial estates. This is an excellent idea. However, one such bus already exists, the number 29 from Bournemouth to Ferndown Industrial site. There are two early morning buses from Bournemouth, one leaving the estate at lunch time and two leaving in the evening. This service started in April 2010, without subsidies. The Yellow bus company confirmed that they do carry some regular passengers to and from the Industrial Estate. We suspect the buses are not that well used, one major problem influencing their use is the vast areas of free parking available on Ferndown Industrial Estate. It may be that the 'stick and carrot' needs to be introduced to get people out of their cars and into a bus. If less parking existed there would be more room for new business. We noticed a large new factory down Brook Road had a vast new car park, when parking is free and easy no-one will catch a bus. Perhaps spaces should only be allocated if there are no other means of reasonable travel.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359482	Ms Helen POWELL	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18 765	Option VWM 4		No Opinion	<p>This option could be detrimental to designated nature conservation sites in the locality but the development also offers an opportunity for significant green infrastructure that could remove this detriment and increase the value of the locality for biodiversity. Our opinion on this option with therefore be shaped by the strength of the policy on delivery of the green infrastructure as an integral part of the development and the requirements to be met by the green infrastructure.</p> <p>The following requirements from the green infrastructure are essential:</p> <p>1 Suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG) of a scale and design to divert pressures generated by the residential development away from near-by heathland European sites, a Ramsar site and SSSIs, the habitats of European protected species and also the heathland of Potterne Hill Local Nature Reserve.</p> <p>2 Provision of a comprehensive package of Sustainable Urban Drainage solutions within the potential developable and landscape areas and in the potential SANG. The SUDs should both ameliorate flood volumes to the Moors River System SSSI and reduce and clean water of poor quality from urban surfaces and drainage thereby protecting a high water quality in the river SSSI. Part of the existing lakes may be suitable for adaptation as an element of the SUDs.</p> <p>3 Removal or modification of a sluice on the Moors River to facilitate fish passage. The current structure renders migratory fish such as sea trout vulnerable to human impacts when "trapped" below the structure. There is potential for an increase in this pressure from a closer urban setting and greater accessibility. This should be avoided by removing the barrier effect of the structure to fish passage.</p>			1057
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	CSO18 721	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>We agree with the findings of the HRA in connection with the proposed housing sites within these areas. Consequently, until such time as assessment of the potential impacts of the options on European sites is determined we object to the following policies:</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
521457	Mr and Mrs M Daymond		CSO17 844	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>VWM 1-4 4 different sites of development means 4 different groups of residents affected by the development on Green Belt; hence the outcry locally.</p> <p>VWM 2 and VWM4 These 2 sites are each just a little larger in area than the Ebblake housing estate of Liederbach Drive, Kiln Way and Ebblake Close and VWM4 has a wet area that will in fact reduce its development area; the Ebblake estate accommodates at least 174 dwellings which includes 2 blocks of flats. A proposal of at least 200 for VWM2 and at least 165 for VWM4, means that density could be even worse than at Ebblake.</p> <p>Flats are not appropriate on the edge of Green Belt; (at Ebblake they are built on the industrial estate side of the development which eases the impact).</p> <p>Density We note that the number of houses is given as "approx.". This can only mean that the total number is likely to exceed that stated. Otherwise it would say "up to" x number of houses.</p> <p>THE CORE STRATEGY LITERATURE Each development is described as benefitting residents with "additional valuable green infrastructure and divert pressures away from heathlands". This is nonsense!! The majority of residents who walk or ride bikes off road go to Moors Valley Country Park. Walkers have the vast Ringwood Forest and it is only ramblers and horse owners who use the heathland and it is the horses that churn up heathland. Any green infrastructure within a development just improves the local environment but also needs maintenance.</p> <p>SUPPORT Location of Affordable housing VWM4 best serves affordable housing as there are buses on Manor Road to the shopping and leisure facilities; the first and middle schools are nearby and so are Potterne Park and Moors Valley.</p>			1057
522203	Mr Nigel Reeves		CSO18 079	Option VWM 4	Object		As a Verwood resident, please see below my response and comments relating to the Verwood Options in the Core Strategy Consultation document.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>I object to any further substantial housing increases in Verwood, specifically VWM 2 and VWM 4 in the document, for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - why is suddenly okay to build on green belt land? - as noted, there are significant Verwood public transport issues, and I see no information as to how this will be dramatically improved to encourage residents out of private transports (cars) - as reported, most residents use their cars to commute, so this will just increase this usage - I see all the surrounding traffic problem areas noted (Ashley Heath, Spur Road, A31 etc) but see nothing of how these significant problems will be resolved. <p>Why increase the population in a town already noted as being small for its population and in a location with no decent transportation infrastructure in place (as above), no shopping centre, and, despite what it states in the report, inadequate facilities in terms of what a town of this population should have. Yes, there is a supermarket, but there is no real shopping centre, few shops other than hairdressers and estate agents, only one restaurant, and inadequate facilities for young people as the report states (I know as I have 4 children).</p> <p>In summary, before any further increase in housing, properly address the transportation and facilities issues raised, not to mention comments from others on your "dorsetforyou" website and other websites, and then maybe consider more housing.</p> <p>Finally, inviting comments on your paper copy form from everyone on all of the options for each of the areas being considered simply turns it into a competition between each of them to no real benefit, and with Verwood the obvious loser. By that I mean why should a resident of Wimborne or Corfe Mullen, for example, object to new housing in Verwood, especially if they think that it may obviate the need for housing in their own town. A Verwood resident is far more likely to be aware of increased traffic problems connected to any potential new housing in Wimborne, Corfe Mullen or Ferndown as they have to leave Verwood and possibly drive through these areas to reach a hospital or a shopping centre</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>etc, whereas mostly residents of other towns would infrequently travel through or to Verwood.</p> <p>For the most part therefore, I don't think it is fair to comment on the potential options for the other towns except that the current transport infrastructure problems common to all of our areas must be resolved until any further substantial house building. No one seems to also bear in mind that this is a major tourist area and the traffic is hugely increased by visitors and holidaymakers for much of the year, and at certain times many of the roads almost grind to a halt, and in the case of a serious accident on any one of a number of routes, they do come to a halt. Personally I regularly drive to and through Wimborne and Corfe Mullen, and occasionally through Ferndown, and dread to think how the options of high numbers of new houses will worsen these often already slow and painful journeys.</p> <p>Please, therefore, first try to address the issues raised before major increases in house building.</p>			
522240	Association Verwood Residents	Chairman Association Verwood Residents	CSO18 102	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>5. THE PROPOSALS</p> <p>VWM 1 – 30 Homes – 12-15 affordable VWM 2 – 200 Homes – 80-100 affordable VWM – 20 Homes – 8-10 affordable VWM 4 – 165 Homes – 66-83 affordable Total – 415 Homes – 166-208 affordable</p> <p>These proposals are in essence simply going to exacerbate the problems and shortcomings outlined above in Paragraph 3.</p> <p>The Secretary of State for the Environment set out in the vision for the area to: “develop the region in a sustainable way,....., where the quality of life for residents,, the business community and visitors will be maintained and enhanced”. The Regional Planning Guidance for the region states: “.....minimise the need to develop on Greenfield sites and to travel” with the aims of protecting the environment and providing prosperity for communities.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how the proposed developments will support the above aims.</p> <p>Quality of life for residents would be decimated with loss of recreational land, increased traffic and associated pollution.</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>This is in addition to the severe adverse impact on wildlife and SSSIs. The associated infrastructure within Verwood cannot sustain more housing development as there are limited employment opportunities within the town, particularly for executive roles. Therefore more housing will simply lead to a further loss of community identity and increased isolation for those living in Verwood.</p> <p>The fear is that the distinct and unique quality of Verwood and its environment would be further eroded by these developments. The EDDC plan states that "development in future should be based on the principles of sustainable development". How is it proposed this will be achieved? Developer and or the new "Homes Bonus" contributions will be totally insufficient to correct the existing shortcomings that have been endemic over the last 25 years.</p> <p>Previous strategies and plans indicated Verwood could accept more housing development only if the West Moors Bypass was completed. This major road improvement scheme has now been abandoned completely removing a main motivator for future housing development in Verwood. In short these proposals will further: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erode more protected GREEN BELT LAND • Cause more traffic congestion • Cause more flooding • Cause more light pollution • Cause the loss of wildlife habitat • Cause the loss of protected ancient hedgerows • Increase demand on drainage systems beyond their capabilities • Increase demand on overstretched Medical facilities • Compound the lack of adequate recreational and leisure facilities • Increase the danger to school children when arriving and leaving the school campus site at the junction of Howe Lane and Margards Lane <p>6.3 South Verwood VWM 4 1. Change of Character to Road and Area</p> <p>The building of these houses on existing open fields would have a marked detrimental effect on the character of St Michael's Road, which is noted for its semi-rural setting on an</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>un-adopted road which becomes a single-width bridleway and track leading to Verwood Manor Farm.</p> <p>In the East Dorset Local Plan (2004) Manor Road, Firs Glen Road and St Michael's Road are designated 'Special Character Areas' – these are areas that have landscape elements of high environmental quality. The Plan points out that existing development should not be disrupted by new building and that new development will often result in loss of mature trees, hedges and other vegetation, as well as damaging the look and character of the area.</p> <p>In addition the woodland at Heathy How has been designated by EDDC as an area of 'Great Landscape Value'. This would be destroyed by the new housing development.</p> <p>2. Increased Traffic – Pedestrian and Vehicular</p> <p>The 2010 EDDC Consultative Document shows potential new housing development on both sides of the South-West end of St Michael's Road – crossing the existing single-width farm track. This track and bridleway could not be widened without destruction of important trees and hedgerow and it is entirely inappropriate as a roadway north from the existing part of St Michael's Road to Howe Lane.</p> <p>Additionally there are two houses on each side of the road – Little Cranebrook and St Michaels Cottage (Listed) - that would preclude widening of the road from its present single-track.</p> <p>These proposed new houses, in a quiet part of Verwood, would bring potentially 300 new cars to the roads in this area, greatly adding to the existing traffic on Manor Road and St Michael's Road.</p> <p>The junction of St Michael's Road and Howe Lane is a dangerous one as cars turn blindly from Howe Lane. Children also come hurtling down Howe Lane from the school on bicycles, on to St Michael's Road and there have been many near misses.</p> <p>In addition, the junction of St Michael's Road and Manor Road is narrow and sharply angled from the main road such that traffic turns blindly in St Michael's Road, often on the wrong side the road. Again, there have been many near-misses as well as some actual contact accidents. If any further traffic is allowed on St Michael's Road then the</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>potential for serious accidents would be greatly exacerbated. The 2010 Consultative Document shows a crossing-point between the two new developments, passing across St Michaels Road. St Michael's Road is a private, un-adopted road therefore the developers would not have a right of access across it. To prevent new development residents from driving up St Michael's Road towards Howe Lane or Manor Road, bollards would have to be placed across St Michael's Road. This would then block access and egress of farm vehicles from Verwood Manor Farm up the length of St Michael's Road.</p> <p>3. Potential for Increased Flooding and Drainage Problems The underlying geology and proximity to an SSSI, the River Crane, make this site untenable. The underlying geology of the area needs a full scale geological exploration. The land off Manor Road has "sink pockets" of sand. Ground water runs away from the land into the River Crane, which has an area of floodplain around it. More housing will stop the ground water being able to flow away causing increased flooding to the new and existing developments. The area to the West of St Michael's Road is noted by residents for its propensity to flood – gardens are boggy or under water for a good part of the year, as surface water runs off from the Heathy How woodland and the housing developments to the North-West. Several times in the last few winters St Michael's Road has flooded right across, to a depth of at least 40cm, just to the south of the River Crane. The whole area there is boggy for much of the year. The properties Little Cranebrook and St Michael's Cottage both experience long periods where large pools of water lie in their grounds. The Manor Road end of St Michael's Road has substantial pools of lying water for most of the year, and the existing ditches are very necessary to take the run-off water along the road. Residents in St Michael's Close have experienced persistent problems with flooding and drainage and this has been regularly reported to EDDC and Wessex Water. Additionally it should be noted that Manor Road floods regularly throughout the winter and in heavy rainfall, when a</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>large mass of water runs off from the fields on which it is proposed to build 165 houses!</p> <p>Unfortunately the Environmental Agency flood maps deal only with the flood risk from rivers and streams but do not deal with the great many natural springs prevalent in this area of Verwood</p> <p>Covering this part of South Verwood with concrete would obviously greatly increase water run-off and would lead to further flooding problems.</p> <p>4. Increased provision for schools, medical and dental care This is not a specific issue for St Michael's Road residents – it affects the whole of Verwood – however residents are naturally concerned about the lack of infrastructure, which would be greatly compounded by further housing development on this scale. In addition if 'school runs', pedestrians and cyclists from the new development have access along St Michael's Road, this would dramatically change the whole character of the area, bringing potentially hundreds of people into this quiet, semi-rural road and bridleway.</p> <p>5. Encroachment on Green Belt The proposed development between Manor Road and St Michael's Road would be built on the existing Green Belt. There would almost certainly be disruption of the hedgerow and the SSSI at the River Crane together with the adjacent Heathy How woodland, with children crossing from their gardens into these areas. These are important and sensitive sites for protected plant and animal species.</p> <p>6. Loss of and Interference with, Wildlife Habitat The planned development would be taken up to the border of the River Crane, a SSSI along its whole length, a river noted for being free from pollution and an important site for a wide range of plants, invertebrates and land animals (including otters, bats, owls, badgers, slow worms, grass snakes, adders and amphibia). The proposed site is also very close to areas where sand lizards and smooth snakes breed.</p> <p>7. Ancient Hedgerow and Important Tree Lines St Michael's Road has important trees, many with Tree Protection Orders, along the whole of its length. A marked feature of the Road is the hedgerow (much of it ancient) that</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>provides important habitat for a wide range of plant, bird and animal species.</p> <p>There are also important ancient hedgerows from east to west of the proposed development site which fit the criteria for protection.</p> <p>8. Semi-Natural Circular Walks Under VWM 4 these walks are proposed, running near the River Crane and through the woodland named Heathy How. This woodland is privately owned and we understand the owner would certainly not allow these walks to be put through their land. Therefore the key benefit to residents, given in the Strategy Document, could not be attained.</p> <p>All residents of St Michael's Road and St Michaels Close, together with residents from Manor Road whose entrance is on St Michael's Road, strongly object to the proposal under VWM 4. They believe it to be an entirely inappropriate housing development in an environmentally important part of the existing Green Belt.</p> <p>6.4 STATISTICAL EVIDENCE 1. Introduction All figures and statistics within this section have been obtained from one of the references. When extrapolations have been made the basis for that is clarified in the text. Whilst many of the statistics are taken from reports applying to East Dorset there is nothing in the reports to indicate that they do not apply proportionately to Verwood. Indeed since the reports have been commissioned to decide on future housing strategy and this has determined that Verwood is one of five locations where future building is appropriate it can be argued that they are either relevant statistics or the reports are irrelevant. In most of the reports EDDC report a maximum margin of error District wide of 1.6% at the 95% confidence interval. We believe all statistical evidence used for the basis of the Core strategy needs further analysis and independent verification because of its importance in developing what happens to Verwood in the future. The following paragraphs demonstrate where the figures used for the Core Strategy may well be incorrect and or inappropriate.</p> <p>2. Population and Housing</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order															
							<p>The East Dorset Housing Need and Demand Report June 2008 estimated that there are around 37,600 households in the District, of these around 85% are currently owner-occupiers with 8% living in the social rented sector and around 7% in the private rented sector.</p> <p>Out migrant households tend to be employed, whereas in migrant households have a higher proportion of retired households. Although the differences are not very large, the results would suggest that the in-migrants into Dorset are often wealthy households, retired or looking to retire.</p> <p>This is important on two fronts: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly retired populations are much more likely to want that sense of community that ironically this development plan will help to reduce. Consultation meetings run by the Council have shown very clearly that there is very strong support for conserving the sense of Community. • Secondly an ageing population places greater demands on infrastructure such as Doctors and Dentists. <p>3. Economic status in Verwood</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Working</td> <td>Unemployed</td> <td>Retired</td> <td>Other</td> <td>Total</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2611</td> <td>50.6%</td> <td>38</td> <td>0.7%</td> <td>2213</td> </tr> <tr> <td>42.9%</td> <td>294</td> <td>5.7%</td> <td>5156</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>In 1991 nine out of ten employed people found their employment in Verwood, by 2008 there were 730 firms in Verwood, but 88% of them only employed 1 – 10 people. Since 65.5% (1710) of employed people in Verwood are classed as Wealthy Achievers it is evident that they must be finding employment outside of Verwood. In addition 90.7% of the population of Verwood are classed as comfortably off or better.</p> <p>It is estimated that at the time of the survey there was a current stock of affordable housing of around 325 which could be used to meet this need (including dwellings becoming available as households in the social rented sector move to different dwellings). Hence it was estimated that the net backlog of need for affordable housing is around 386 units (711- 325). Annualised over 5 years (as recommended in the</p>	Working	Unemployed	Retired	Other	Total	2611	50.6%	38	0.7%	2213	42.9%	294	5.7%	5156				
Working	Unemployed	Retired	Other	Total																					
2611	50.6%	38	0.7%	2213																					
42.9%	294	5.7%	5156																						

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Practice Guidance) this becomes 77 households (386/5). The total future need for affordable housing is therefore estimated to be 525 units per annum.</p> <p>Reports show that overall there is expected to be a greater demand for housing than the current stock of housing can meet. Overall, across all tenures there is an apparent shortfall of 375 dwellings per annum (excess demand over supply) of which 48% is for affordable housing. However the Audit Commission report criticises for consistently allowing over 900 dwellings to lie empty for more than one year and having a record of only getting three such dwellings back into use per annum.</p> <p>In total the plan shows an intention to develop 2570 houses over a fifteen year period, 35% of this could be provided by getting existing stock back into use leaving Green Field sites unaffected. Since the references indicate that there is an anticipated annual need of 179 units and the plan would deliver 171 units, it is clear that the Council has no intention of addressing the Audit Commissions criticism of failing to bring long term empty stock back into use. This is a pity since as a strategy this has to be a much more sustainable and environmentally option.</p> <p>EDDC assume that any household with more than one spare bedroom is under-occupying their dwelling and nearly 50% of houses are in this category. An alternative strategy to new buildings could be to investigate incentive schemes to get existing stock more fully occupied.</p> <p>Since only a total of 65 households and an anticipated 43 households of inward migration have been identified as in need of housing in Verwood, the need for 415 units is questionable.</p> <p>Finally all of the data on housing need has been gathered prior to 2009 when the overall economic climate was very different. In view of the current economic climate it has to be worth reconsidering the demand for housing.</p> <p>A report run using the official Estate Agents and Land Registry Database shows that of the 100 properties marketed in the BH31 area in the quarter ending 9/1/11 only seven have been sold subject to contract with an additional nine under offer. Since this sample includes several new builds it</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>calls into question the demand for such a high level of building in Verwood, and would be likely to result in even larger numbers of empty properties.</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that EDDC check officially with local Estate Agents the current state of the housing market before proceeding with this plan. In addition we have asked District Councillors to provide information on local waiting lists which are being used to justify the large percentage of affordable housing in the Core Strategy proposals. To date this has not been made available.</p> <p>4. Roads and Vehicles</p> <p>Car ownership data suggests that there is an average of 1.49 cars per household in the District. There are however large differences by tenure with owner-occupiers (with mortgage) having an average of 1.88 cars per household.</p> <p>In Verwood the Core Strategy as it stands will exacerbate the number of people living in the town but commuting to work, since all the employment opportunities exist outside Verwood. Of the existing 730 firms in Verwood 88% only employ between one and ten people. Assuming the proportion of economically active people remains broadly the same at 69% and that car ownership figures remain static, then the proposed 415 houses will place an additional 780 vehicles on the roads out of Verwood.</p> <p>Since the plan requires new housing to blend with the existing and surrounding housing it is inevitable that a high percentage will attract Executives who certainly will not be able to find suitable employment without commuting. The net effect will be to reduce further the sense of Community, directly in contravention of the Central Governments concept of the Big Community, and to further enhance the feeling of a Dormitory Town.</p> <p>Current car ownership in Verwood is stated to be: -</p> <p>None One Two Three or more Total</p> <p>437 8.4% 2209 42.9% 1924 37.3% 582 11.3% 5152</p> <p>There is an intention to close off to vehicular traffic Manor</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Lane St Michaels Lane at the Manor Road end. If the intended Springfield Close relief road is put in place then there will be increased vehicular traffic in Howe Lane above the potential increase due to the proposed housing development. Since the eastern end of Howe Lane is part of the bridle and cycle path network increasing vehicular traffic in this area will significantly adversely affect this valuable leisure provision.</p> <p>Currently Howe Lane and Margards Lane are almost impassable at school run time with vehicles parked on both sides of the road. It is just possible to get an ordinary car down the centre in these conditions, but an Emergency Vehicle would find it impossible. This situation would be made even worse with the introduction of probably over 1000 people in the additional 415 homes. Certainly any addition of a Secondary School would make a bad situation intolerable. The Howe Lane development has only two choices of access, one off Howe Lane which almost certainly would have an impact on established and protected trees as well as potential adverse impact on the curtilage provisions of the Listed Building.</p> <p>As mentioned above there are also significant traffic congestion problems around school run times, making this access at best problematic. The other access option is via Summer Fields, this option requires purchasing a substantial proportion of the front gardens of two dwellings. There are already parking problems for houses in the area resulting in existing homeowners parking their vehicles on the street. In addition, established hedging on front gardens hinders sightlines making the turn in or out of the Close blind and therefore extremely hazardous. The twenty proposed properties would add an additional nearly 40 vehicles to this narrow access.</p> <p>Although not contained within the plan it is understood that there is an intention to put a relief road through Springfields linking Manor Road with the Eastern end of Howe Lane. This road would reduce further the ability of the land to allow natural run off of surface water in an area already prone to flooding. It will also add vehicular congestion to an area that is already dangerously congested for much of the day.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Since most of the new occupants will have employment outside of Verwood they will be forced to commute out of the town via either the Ringwood Road or through Three Legged Cross. Both of these routes are already crowded in rush hour and neither permit widening of the road. The Ringwood Road in particular has recently had its speed limit reduced in order to try to reduce the number of fatal accidents.</p> <p>5. General</p> <p>The plan states that Verwood amongst other towns has been identified as an area suitable for development as it is a location where important facilities, services and employment are most accessible and readily improved. This is misleading as employment in Verwood is already inadequate for the existing population.</p> <p>With the exception of the Hub there are no entertainment facilities such as Restaurants, a permanent cinema or theatre and Youth activities are generally agreed to be inadequate. Even the Hub is plainly failing to meet the entertainment desires of the population as it is loss making and yet there is significant outward migration of people in the evening. Finally the town is served by a retained fire station, in the current climate this is unlikely to change, the latest figures from show that the engine was unavailable due to manning constraints for over 10% of the time, the seventh worst station in Dorset.</p>			
522257	Mr Richard Beaman		CSO18 104	Option VWM 4	Support		My support for the additional housing proposed in Verwood and Wimborne is conditional, based on building the proposed secondary school in Verwood. The new school should start to be built prior to or at the same time as any of the proposed larger housing developments.			1057
359264	Mr Peter Atfield	Director Goadsby Ltd	CSO18 123	Option VWM 4	Support		<p>The potential residential development on land south of Manor Road is supported. Seaward Properties own land within the allocated area and have the ability to assist in the delivery of a substantial number of dwellings within the timescale of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Unlike Options VWM 1 and 2, Option VWM 4 is a site that is naturally contained. To the south is the Crane River Valley. This provides a logical boundary to round off development at</p>	Delete the following text from Option VWM 4: "A pre-requisite for this would transport improvements including the implementation of the Springfield Distributor Road." (SIC). Replace with the following text:		1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>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 (see the second landscape feature identified in Paragraph 11.87 of the Core Strategy). 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 in Preferred Options VWM 5 and VWM 6 of the Core Strategy. • 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>“Development of the site offers the opportunity to improve accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists in southern Verwood through the improvement of east – west links from Manor Road to Howe Lane.”</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<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.</p> <p>As set out in Paragraph 11.82, the 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. 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> <p>However, given the ability to provide direct access to Manor Road, the pre-requisite of constructing the Springfield Distributor Road is not considered necessary. This is not considered necessary to enable the development to proceed and does not meet the tests of Circular 05/2005.</p>			
522404	Mr David Puckeridge		CSO18 138	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
522671	Mrs K Thompson		CSO18 170	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>Verwood has expanded rapidly in terms of housing but what it lacks is any infrastructure. The facilities for the existing population are poor. If further housing is to be considered we first need to consider the existing residents and plan for and encourage retail and leisure businesses into the Verwood area. Compare Verwood with Ringwood, where there is a high street with a variety of retail outlets (book shop,</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							delicatessen, fashion, restaurants, butcher, cook ware, pets and country stores etc) there is also the Furlong centre with nation chain outlets. Verwood on the other hand has no 'identity' and no heart to it. It is not cohesive and has no central area. Before further increasing housing in the locality planners need to take a good look at local amenities. We have very little here for the young, for example. We have a high proportion of families, hence the perceived need for a new secondary school, but very little in the way of activities for children and particularly the teenagers. Local amenities must be improved before further increasing the resident population. Facilities at Pottern Park eg. the tennis courts are in a poorly maintained state, the Hub provides little for the teenagers and the leisure centre needs expanding. There are no decent restaurants/cafe and the place feels like a ghost town where people come to sleep but entertain themselves elsewhere. This needs to be addressed in a considered way rather than just building more housing. If these areas are to be built on why not take the opportunity to address some of the issues mentioned above rather than just expanding the resident population?			
523262	Mr & Mrs Jones		CSO18 264	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		CSO18 304	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
523326	Mrs H Clark		CSO18 326	Option VWM 4	Object		I think the infra structure of Verwood would not be able to cope with this many new homes. We live off Margards lane which leads to Emmanuel School and the potential new secondary school. The road is already like a race track at school run times, with the increased housing and new school it would be impossible to get out of our road in the mornings, and even more problems pulling out onto Manor Road. Building on these plots will spoil the lovely aspect for the schools and also the people in Summerfields will lose their lovely quiet environment. I think Verwood is big enough and a housing project of this size is going to ruin a lovely place.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 180	Option VWM 4	Object		The Moors River system, including the River Crane, Ebblake Stream and Uddens Water has already been subject to excessive development within its catchment including the establishment of a number of very ill advised employment/industrial estates. It has suffered severely from all the above impacts resulting in temporary or permanent losses to biodiversity. Continued development within the catchment, especially in close proximity to its water courses, and particularly of employment/industrial development, is wholly inappropriate. Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously impinging on the Moors River system and its corridor include KS3/ PC7 (St Leonards Hospital), KS4 (Woodland Walk), VM 1,2,3 and 4 (Verwood), PC4 (Blunts Farm), and PC 5 (Woolsbridge).			1057
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 272	Option VWM 4	Object		The document correctly underlines the importance of the Dorset Heathlands. However it is essential to note that at this stage there is no evidence to support the theory that development of SANGs will actually sufficiently alleviate unacceptable pressure on the Dorset Heathlands. Indeed what evidence there is indicates that the approach is unlikely to be fully successful. Yet the Core Strategy is based on the assumption that the approach will work, and there is even a detectable implication that the Dorset Heathlands actually need income generated from further development to be protected and managed! This is a gross distortion of the concept of SANGs. Actually SE Dorset cannot continue to accept open ended growth without damage to heathland and the now apparently universal approach of tacking on an area of SANG to every new development on the basis that it protects, or even somehow enhances heathland biodiversity, is extremely worrying. Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously having damaging implications for heathlands, be they SSSIs or SNCIs, include KS3, KS4 (Coopers Lane south), VWM4 and VMW7. There is a commitment to restore and link heathland within south-east Dorset and areas most suitable for such restoration have been identified. There are options within the CS which would preclude such beneficial restoration including			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							KS3/ PC7, PC4, and PC5.			
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19301	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and preprepared survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options.</p> <p>However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported. Options VWM1,2,3 and 4 Continued development in Verwood will progressively increase the demand for a by-pass for West Moors which will inevitably have very damaging repercussions for biodiversity. Whilst such a scheme may not be possible in the present financial climate, the time will undoubtedly come when controversial road schemes will be back on the agenda and changes which have taken place in the interim will be weighed in the balance.</p> <p>All these sites in Verwood will drain into the River Crane and thence the Moors River.</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>VWM4 in particular is in very close proximity to the Crane river corridor. The scale of the development at VWM4 will inevitably put additional and unacceptable public pressure upon Potterne Hill SNCI and have indirect impacts (described above) upon the woodland habitats of Heathy Howe. This is also a site whose immediate intrinsic wildlife interest merits close examination.</p> <p>VWM2, has the additional particular problem of the indirect impacts (described above) on important woodlands, Romford Mill Copse SNCI being hard up against the development boundary and Ironmongers Copse SNCI being very close by. Development of land to the east has already demonstrated the undesirability and difficulty of enforced badger relocation. Again there has been no assessment of the immediate intrinsic value of any of this site which is currently largely unknown.</p> <p>In summary all the sites are problematic in terms of pressure for a West Moors By-pass and drainage to the River Crane, while VWM2, and 4 have additional problems or currently improperly assessed issues which require at least reduction in extent, and potentially rejection.</p>			
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO18 996	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>Verwood has taken on more than its fair share of new homes. The town cannot expand any further - there are limited facilities and employment opportunities. People have to travel further afield, invariably by car as public transport provision is pathetic. I can see absolutely no justification for building houses on designated Green Belt land. As far as I can see, the only reason the sites proposed for new homes in Verwood have been put forward is that the land owners are offering it up for sale (and want to make profit out of it). What is the point in designating land as Green Belt if that designation can be changed, apparently, at will? It is being suggested that the disused railway line to the west of Eastworth Road makes a natural town boundary. I would argue that Eastworth Road makes a natural town boundary given that it is already the town boundary and the Green Belt boundary. After these developments go ahead (God forbid) what will be identified as the next natural boundary? And the next.... Enough is enough!</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
527501	Eve Thompson		CSO18 784	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood has expanded too much and hasn't enough facilities i.e. dentist, shops etc to service the present population. The number of extra cars will impact on the narrow roads.			1057
527512	Eric Thompson		CSO18 799	Option VWM 4	Object		More houses mean more cars. 400 houses maybe 600 to 800 more vehicles, we are bursting at the seams. The roads in our town are generally in poor condition. More cars mean more pollution, more noise more traffic jams. You should be thinking more of the people who already live in the town I have not found anyone who supports these proposals. We don't have the infrastructure to support hundreds of extra people. Statistically crime and anti social behaviour will rise. In these times of cut backs are we to get more police and more fire fighters to cope with the extra load?			1057
527740	Anne Parsons		CSO18 894	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood 1. Why should our children wait until a further 400+ homes are built before they get their long awaited Secondary School - one can only presume that the planning gain will pay for this. 2. Verwood needs more infrastructure before consideration is given to more homes. 3. What guarantee is there that affordable housing - IF built would not be sold on at the market rate in future years? If homes have to be built why not put a stipulation regarding affordable housing. Other areas of the country do this such as the Lake and Peak District. 4. TA1 how could developers contribute to transport improvements other than roads - its up to Wilts and Dorset Buses to put on extra public transport. 5. It was not a surprise that no Councillors either Town or District were at the Hub between 2-3pm today 11 Nov 2010 - I wonder why? I doubt that the views of the local residents will be listened to as they've not been in the past.			1057
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		CSO18 926	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
527818	Mr Nigel Lester	Synergy Housing Association	CSO18 972	Option VWM 4	Support		Having looked at the proposals for each of the geographical areas and the proposed sites within those areas we can see no reason to disagree with the Local Authorities assessment and findings in each case, and would be very keen to become involved in the provision of affordable housing on any of			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							these sites.			
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 313	Option VWM 4	Object		Woodlands Ancient woodland is of course of recognised biodiversity importance, but developing secondary woodland is also valuable for biodiversity, carbon retention and landscape. Impacts can be both direct, when the habitat itself is replaced, but also indirect through access by humans and domestic pets. While problems caused by these factors on heathlands is now generally recognised, (predation by pets, disturbance by both humans and pets, dumping, trampling, and light pollution) they are also of relevance to other habitats, including and perhaps especially, woodland. Preferred Options in the Core Strategy which impact directly or indirectly upon woodland include KS4 (Woodland Walk), VW2 and VWM4.			1057
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO19 061	Option VWM 4		General Comment	From this location children should be encouraged to walk or cycle to the school rather than being driven in a car. Development of this site would have little impact on the need to provide the Springfield distributor road as most traffic would use Manor Road. Both development sites on the southern side of the town are a good walk from the centre services but Morrisons supermarket provides good local shopping opportunities.			1057
533834	Mr Tim Harris		CSO19 213	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
533862	Mr Paul Holman		CSO19 222	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is the second largest town in Dorset yet has minimal facilities. A population of 15,000 has distinctly limited leisure options and restaurants in comparison to Ringwood with a similar population. Transport links/bus routes/roads are inadequate at present. Poor connections to Ringwood with a dangerous road with lack of cycle lanes. Need regular bus links and safe cycle lane from Verwood to Ringwood. Teenagers cannot cycle safely to Ringwood yet no real facilities in Verwood. At edge of County becoming a housing dumping ground. The following comments were made on a Response Form			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Insufficient facilities and infrastructure to support further large scale housing development in Verwood. Stuck out on a limb. Verwood is a housing estate at the edge of the county. Poorly linked to neighbouring towns and with very few facilities. Verwood population 15,000 Restaurants/ pubs 5 Ringwood population 15,000 restaurants / pubs 25+ Verwood cannot support these number of houses unless roads and facilities are significantly improved first.			
533905	Mr & Mrs A Kell		CSO19 251	Option VWM 4	Object		We cannot support this option due to the effect of the increase in population as a result. When you re-plan a town you need to create other centres to release the pressure from the old town centre, because of the provisions mentioned above.			1057
534820	Paul Batten		CSO19 442	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
534837	Mrs P Martin		CSO19 503	Option VWM 4		No Opinion	Horses need grazing land. No infrastructure in place for the total number of homes planned. I do not go out between 8.00 and 9.30 am and 3.00pm and 6.30pm because of the traffic on the roads now.			1057
534875	Brian Lane		CSO19 548	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
534904	Mr Martin Aldridge		CSO19 581	Option VWM 4	Object		I strongly object to any more development in Verwood it's time to pick on somewhere else. The road from Verwood to Ringwood is at capacity in the morning and evening rush-hours. My local road to the schools is at capacity and suffers from intense school traffic and no attempt has been made over the years to make up the unmade roads to provide alternative routes to the schools. If I have to leave a car in the road overnight it causes chaos with the school run. Please build more houses in much more central locations where they are needed not in a saturated place out in the sticks. I know your destruction of Verwood as a place to live is almost complete but please please build elsewhere it's only common sense. If you cannot drive Verwood is an expensive place of isolation. Ringwood has the advantage of a coach link. Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch have train links.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							As a minimum Verwood should have both a free bus service to Ringwood and a safe separate from the road tarmaced cycle path to Ringwood so that the fit and able can quickly get to Ringwood for free instead of a £6 return bus service that takes hours and goes around the houses. Planners - get real.			
534914	Mrs P Froud		CSO19 680	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535018	Mr M.R Watson		CSO19 587	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood development - Any developments should be restricted to smaller pockets of land and why not consider developing land between Verwood and Three Legged Cross with a view to the two being physically rather than just conveniently connected.			1057
535026	Mr Andy Thompson		CSO19 590	Option VWM 4	Object		Talk of green infrastructure is fine and accept that travel to distant schools is not as good an option as learning in your own community but Verwood will become a ghetto without effective urban infrastructure to support it - swimming pool/adequate health facilities, space for what local people want such as a couple of restaurants, shops selling more than groceries and nick nacks etc. A pub in a carpark at Morrisons is charmless and this area perfectly describes the hollow feel that will be generated across all verwood as more people are brought in without building community facilities trouble is brewing and developers/retailers etc need to be pressured to deliver for the community as well as their share holders. If the council systems can not negotiate this effectively then simply ask for help from those in the community who can add value and demand more of these developers I lived in Milton Keynes as a boy when it was growing and it was a disaster for many children			1057
535040	Mr Tom Garnham		CSO19 595	Option VWM 4	Object		I have lived in Dorset for 15 years, the last 8 of which have been in Verwood. Verwood is unique in that in terms of population it can be considered a town but in all other respects it bears no resemblance to what most of us commonly think of as a town. Sandwiched by open countryside and Ringwood Forest, it is a wonderful location in which to live but in just the last 8 years I have seen changes.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							With the building of additional housing and the disappointing emergence of blocks of flats wholly out of keeping with the surrounding area, increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic has been noticeable. I would strongly urge you not to approve any further housing developments for Verwood. The process of development is irreversible. If any of the options under consideration are approved the beautiful landscape those developments would replace will be lost forever with incalculable consequences for the diverse wildlife they sustain. In addition, the increase in population we again amend the Green Belt boundary. Now is the time to take a long-term view and put conservation ahead of the seemingly inexorable tide of development. Despite many years of development, Verwood has somehow managed to retain its rural character. For the benefit of its residents, the wildlife it sustains, the people of Dorset, and for future generations please do what you can to keep it that way.			
535049	Mr Ian Parsons		CSO19600	Option VWM 4	Object		I object to the developments within Verwood. The main reason is that the infrasture with the present population of Verwood cannot cope. Reasons as follows why we do not want more Developments: Our First Schools are over subscribed now, our only Middle School Emmanuel has had to have extra classes yearly to accommodate the increasing number of children that feed in from the three first schools. We have NO HIGH SCHOOL, which we need NOW. This would save the Council Tax Payers the costs of Transporting all the High School age children to either QE at Wimborne or Ferndown High School. There would need to be more Doctors surgeries and dental surgeries as the present number would not be able to cope. We are aware that there is NO MONEY available for a High School now. Also that no additional infrastructure will be built until such proposed developments are built - which means to us the council tax payers - that no extra infrastructure will be built even after new houses are occupied. Who is LOW COST housing for - this should only be limited to local people ie People of Verwood and there are many who need low cost/social housing. We do not want Verwood to become a SINK TOWN by the local authorities to DUMP unwanted Tenants in			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Verwood. Development will not contribute to Transport Costs UNLESS you are GOING to GIVE Planning Gain Monies to Wilts and Dorset for more Buses day and evening times.			
535055	R Knox		CSO19 607	Option VWM 4	Object		I agree with objections of the majority of residents in Springfield Road(published recently in local press)with, regards to the development proposed.If,as is stated in "transport issues" at least one car is introduced with each new house,. implementation of VWM2 or VWM4 would significantly increase the number of cars entering and leaving Verwood At peak times			1057
535070	Mr Alan Reade		CSO19 634	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
535096	Mrs S M West		CSO19 661	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535103	Neil Clarke		CSO19 674	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535112	Mr Jack Tindall		CSO19 719	Option VWM 4	Object		The upper school will not be built within the life of this document, and will not be able to go ahead on the land proposed due to lack of access to the site and the close proximity to the heathland. If this issue were to be sorted out before the building of more houses then I would support the proposals but not until.			1057
535167	Lynda Lake		CSO19 766	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
535169	Mrs A Jarvis		CSO19 735	Option VWM 4	Object		I am totally against any further building in Verwood.			1057
535176	Mrs Krithia Blaker		CSO19 746	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is over populated...over built and under facilitated....We have had more than our fair share of houses built in Verwood. Let somewhere else have more housing			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							built. People state Verwood is one of the fastest growing towns in Dorset. That is so dreadful. As I said before it is some other town that needs to take on the building of more homes. Let some other town take the strain. VERWOOD HAS DONE MORE THAN IT'S FAIR SHARE OF BUILDING. There are NO jobs here for people why bring hundreds more people here?? We are still in a recession businesses are closing down. Ferndown trading estate has lots of EMPTY units as does Ebblake. I agree it would be nice to have an Upper school nearer to Verwood...ideally between 3 legged cross/West Moors/Verwood. That would then suit 3 areas. The position the proposal suggests for the school is totally unacceptable already extremely dangerous for Children. Another school in this position would bring in hundreds more children.....and HUNDR EDS more CARS. I also feel building on Greenbelt land is unacceptable....You can't keep moving the *Goalposts* Greenbelt must remain greenbelt!!!!.			
535180	Mrs M Field		CSO19 759	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535196	Mr R Field		CSO19 776	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535206	Mr Calvert		CSO19 825	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support this type of development; it is still trying to catch up, from poor implementation and direction from past developments Buses: lack & frequency of service to neighbouring areas, Lack of Sporting and recreational facilities, Lack of Facilities for teenagers eg resulting in the current enforcement of the banning of Alcohol in certain areas Lack of local employment, Current centres of employment being in Bournemouth, Pool, Wimborne Resulting in Poor road / transport support in and out of Verwood along the B3081 and its intersections with other junction eg: A31, Alderholt junction, and Cranborne / Wimborne, The withdrawal of the Ringwood road improvement and the A338 funding Lack social services with			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							in the area Dentists etc :. How is the new school going to be funded and would this be built before the additional housing , would the funding for such a project be ring fenced in this current financial climate to ensure children do not have to be bussed out of the area . Currently the council can not find funding or land option for allotments for existing residents, we been waiting for over 3 years for this simple amenity.			
535209	Mr P Webster		CSO19 800	Option VWM 4	Object		Please liaise with NFDC and NPA,as the additional traffic generated by the extra housing and employment zones will increase the traffic problems at the already congested bottleneck at Ringwood and cause yet more problems for the people who live in New Forest hamlets such as Linwood,Brook and Burley as motorists try to find alternative routes. Can the New Forest take any more pressure from additional numbers of visitors? Has Dorset got enough sand and gravel in the landbank to meet the needs of the developers? Can you force Tarmac to start mining gravel by the Spur Road near Hurn? What will happen to the pollution levels close to the trunk roads eg at Ringwood,especially particulate pollution? Can Bournemouth Water meet the increased demands for water?			1057
535349	P Thomas		CSO19 833	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
535360	Mrs Phyllis Peach		CSO19 841	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535361	Mr Jonathan Ewing		CSO19 845	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		CSO19 983	Option VWM 4	Object		I think that this whole core strategy consultation needs a full review in light of the proposed changes being brought in under the new government. I particularly object to all the proposed Verwood development as the infrastructure is not in place to support the current population let alone adding even further to it by building a further 400 homes. Any EDDC councilor who has the affront to say that the infrastructure is			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							in place to support this development does not know what they are talking about and obviously do not live in the town.			
535372	Mrs Carol Weaver		CSO19 857	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535376	Mr Michael Reynolds		CSO19 866	Option VWM 4	Object		Insufficient infrastructure to cope with this number of new homes, and will lose the character of Verwood.			1057
535382	Jean Baverstock		CSO19 874	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535384	Mr R Beard		CSO19 881	Option VWM 4	Object		Together VWM 2 and 4 will add 365 new homes. I believe this will place a significant burden on the already stretched services in the 'town'. Assuming 3 persons per home with 2 vehicles that will be an extra 1000+ people and 700 vehicles. There are still far too many unmade roads especially near Emmanuel School. We need another/larger Supermarket and Petrol filling Station as at times both existing ones have customer problems. In both instances there would also be increased pressure on the nearby heathland despite what might be said by appellants.			1057
535387	Mr Brian Cox		CSO19 964	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		CSO20 735	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
489765	Derek KEAREY		CSO19 517	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
535393	Jeremy Berg		CSO19 912	Option VWM 4	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			1057
535395	Clare		CSO19	Option	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	James		891	VWM 4						
535404	Danika Irving		CSO19 907	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>With all current development having seemed enough! There is now the 'threat' of more. Verwood does not have what is required to support further development, our road systems are minimal and already pushed to a level where it is a 'stress' to move through the main roads or move out of various junctions.....further development will require traffic control to be implemented to allow for the increase in population and therefore traffic. As we are aware most households own more than one car and any family or individual living in verwood would require transport to enable them to exit verwood to reach amenities as we don't have these that shall fulfill the needs and what we do have is only just coping with these high levels. I.e tesco and the congestion caused due to traffic parking on manor road. Morrisons, parking sufficient! Yet the store is always over crowded!! Finally the schools are already having severe issues with regards to traffic, parking etc when parents do ing their daily pick ups or drop offs, the situation shall only worsen with another school. We already have only a small area surrounding the schools and inadequate parking that deals for the needs of children attending verwood 1st, Emmanuel and verwood 1st pre-school Doesn't bear thinking what another school will do to the current state.</p>			1057
535421	Mr Roland Andrews		CSO19 920	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>The existing infrastructure in Verwood does not support the current level of occupation - Doctors, dentist, schools, shops, car parks and mostly road system. Further building without improving the infrastrucure is ridiculous. There is no significant employment in the Verwood area and therefore additional building will only cause increased traffic and congestion. Public transport is extremely limited - why aren't there any proposals to improve this?? I do not understand why land that is already designated as green belt is even being considered for new development, is nothing sacred. Why can't development be further out, why does it all have to be centred on existing towns??</p>			1057
535457	Mr		CSO19	Option		No				1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Matthew Newman		974	VWM 4		Opinion				
535500	David Veevers		CSO20025	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
535504	Mr Michael Beer		CSO20094	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535508	Bill Bowden		CSO20047	Option VWM 4	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood would not support this amount of housing. It is no good deciding to build a large number of properties without first considering the road system. A large number of people leave the town in the morning to travel to work and this will undoubtedly increase with the introduction of new homes. Can the existing power supply, sewerage system, and water supply cope adequately with this number of houses?. Has a proper in depth survey been carried out?. The tendency to flood from water courses can change dramatically if green field sites are concreted and water run off is much more rapid during heavy rains. Have the appropriate surveys for protected and endangered species been carried out in areas where new housing is proposed?			1057
535509	Mrs S Durant		CSO20127	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
535512	J R Page		CSO20066	Option VWM 4	Object		1. Quite often the Ferret Green carpark and the Doctors' Surgery carpark at Station Road do not have any car spaces available. 2. To make an appointment with one's own Doctor can result in a two or three week wait. 3. It is nearly impossible to exit my drive on a school morning as there is continuous traffic streaming past my bungalow with double parking in Howe lane. With this and the volume of traffic cars come to a complete stop blocking the road. 4. If 400 houses are built plus an addition school, life will become impossible. Verwood has been overbuilt without the necessary infrastructure being in place.			1057
535517	Roy		CSO20	Option	Object		We are happy as we are nice and peacefull. THATS WHY			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	D Mogg		186	VWM 4		Opinion				
535554	Ms Anita Rigler		CSO20 205	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535567	Ms Judy McMath		CSO20 283	Option VWM 4	Object		There are not enough spaces available at the local 1st and middle schools to take in the extra children that would be living in these new houses. They would have to be bussed to West Moors, Ferndown or Cranborne.			1057
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		CSO20 259	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
535591	A Walker		CSO20 297	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		CSO20 367	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
535621	Mrs T Brine		CSO20 355	Option VWM 4	Object		Even without additional housing in Verwood, there is clearly already a need for a secondary school here. However a concern with the suggested site in Howe lane, is the access and increased volume of traffic and parking on the school run. This is already considerable, with the two schools currently on the site. Perhaps a better site might be the land west of Trinity school earmarked for housing (VWM1). Similarly, I am against any further housing development in Verwood as the infrastructure needs to be supported. We have the population of a large town, yet lack many of the facilities of towns smaller than us. Also doctors, dentists, Morrisons etc struggle to cope with the demands of our population as it is!!Please don't spoil our beautiful town with yet more housing, but do improve our existing facilities !!			1057
535659	Fiona Kasey		CSO20 392	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535670	Dave Allen		CSO20 415	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535678	Andrew Bryant		CSO20 444	Option VWM 4	Object		Any further development for Verwood is unsustainable. An increase in the population will result in the SSSI sites attracting more people, despite what is said in the plan about new green space. If you are really bothered about green spaces in Verwood, you should leave the ones that are there. The land to the north of Eastworth Road has a lot of wildlife including deer, badgers, bats, owls as well as several smaller mammals and possibly lizards. The road network in Verwood is poorly laid out and built for much lower volumes of traffic. Do not even think of increasing traffic on the northern approaches. These roads are too small and dangerous as they are. There are no real shops to speak of (four estate agents and several ladies' hairdressers do not count as shops) A bigger Morrisons would be a benefit, but would attract even more traffic onto the inadequate road system as people come in from outlying areas. There is no public transport, save for a poor and expensive bus service - that contrives to charge school children full fare for the trip to Ringwood before 09:00 There is little opportunity for employment in Verwood and the volume of traffic coming into the town indicates that what jobs there are are mainly taken by people from outside Verwood. The drainage and sewerage systems were built for a town of 3000 people. This needs addressing before any more houses are built. It really is about time that the various councils of Dorset start to see Verwood as a real town that is trying hard to create a real town environment. I fear the councils see Verwood as a dormitory town and that the attitude shown is that few more housing estates can be squeezed in and around without anyone getting too upset. This is not the case. People don't want or need this extra housing until at least some of the amenities promised over the last 20-years start to materialise.			1057
535687	Shelley Romans		CSO20 456	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood has already experienced substantial housing development over the last 20 years and does not have adequate road links or other infrastructure to cope with further housing development. There are insufficient employment			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							opportunities in Verwood and therefore increasing the population size would increase the pressure on existing roads particularly at commuting times. The green belt should be preserved and future housing development should take place on brown field sites. In the current public sector financial climate I do not believe planning to build new secondary school in Verwood is a realistic aim and I consider that there are adequate school places for Verwood children in nearby locations such as Ferndown.			
535688	Susan Hobbs		CSO20 534	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
535695	Robin Peirce		CSO20 468	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood needs facilities and not more houses and has taken more than its fair share to date.			1057
535701	Mr Andy Skeats		CSO20 491	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
535714	Joanna Bryant		CSO20 503	Option VWM 4	Object		When I moved to Verwood ten years ago the estate agents promised that there would not be any more building in Verwood. The town is lovely as it is and more houses would lead to traffic congestion and Verwood doesn't have the infrastructure to cope with an increased population - Why can't the village be left as it is.			1057
535718	Richard Green		CSO20 508	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood has undergone the largest expansion of any East Dorset town expanding to 5 times its original population in 20 years. It was the fastest growing town in Europe for 5 years. Facilities and infrastructure have not kept pace with the population and elected councillors are not serving their constituents fairly. PPG17 show that Verwood is below the minimum requirement in active sports space, children and young people space and activities and allotments there are no allotments. The Hub is an ugly building out of character with the town. This is not used to its full capacity as car parking is restricted. The allocated land for further car parking behind the police station has been sold by the council. Flats are now being built on the site adding to the parking problem. PPS 1 and 3 and PPG13 show the need to have shops and			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							leisure activities available without the need to use a car. Morrison's built for 3500 people is now completely overwhelmed. Although plans to extend se feeder will not change the position. Verwood has had more than is fair share of housing development enough is enough.			
535723	Steve Taylor		CSO20521	Option VWM 4	Object		Dear Sir, I object not only to the principle of developing green belt land in general. As a Verwood resident I also object to the nature of the Verwood options themselves, with the exception of the principle of VWM7 (although this is still on green belt land, which concerns me, although I understand why it here, in close proximity to the other schools). From what I can see the proposal is to build another 400 homes on green belt land in Verwood. There is an acknowledgement that such development will necessitate the upgrade of some roads' infrastructure. Many of Verwood's roads are very busy already, and with one main road in and out, it does not take much to make a short journey to Ringwood quite time-consuming. There is however no committment for the upgrade or provision of any other much needed facilities. I note VWM7 relates to a secondary school, but this is already required to support Verwood's population. 400 more homes means presumably 400+ new children and thei running down St Michaels Road already flood when there is even a small amount of rain. This will presumably worsen as the work progresses, owing to reduced natural drainage opportunities. Furthermore, using St Michaels Road as a vehicular route and 'green linkage', whatever that is, will exacerbate this drainage issue. I am not a typical NIMBY, and I do believe that a properly thought through development strategy encompassing proper facilities for an already stretched community would be a benefit. I also live in the real world and I understand that private development will help generate the funds to pay for such a strategy. All I can really see in these proposals however is bulldozing your way through green belt land for 400+ houses, I'm afraid.			1057
535815	Mrs C M Davies		CSO20561	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535836	Peter Parsons		CSO20 588	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
535845	Oliver Greensmith		CSO20 600	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
535858	Robert Candy		CSO20 623	Option VWM 4	Object		The traffic situation in Howe Lane and St. Michaels road is already at bursting point with traffic delays of up to 10 minutes during peak hours. Further planned developments would exacerbate the existing problem and cause further misery not only to residents but those attending the proposed facilities. Verwood is a large town and does require an upper school however, howe lane is not the place for it, three schools in one road is plenty the road simply does not have the capacity to host another establishment!			1057
535865	Darren Charles Bryson		CSO20 653	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
535875	John Kitchenside		CSO20 686	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood has too few facilities to support any major new developments. Medical and dental surgeries, middle school, etc. are over-subscribed and there is a lack of large-scale refuse disposal and recycling facilities - compare Dorset's attempt at Wimborne with the excellent and well-run facility provided by Hampshire County Council. There is a desperate need for an upper school (VWM7), which I support, although I doubt the existing residential roads could support the increased traffic this would bring. Travelling to Ferndown Upper or QE Wimborne each day does little for our children's education as they miss out on after-school activities, clubs, etc. Expansion of the village to the east would destroy green-belt land, one of the main things people like living here. Please, please, please if we really have to have more housing can it be built in a style that is more in keeping with the area e.g. not like the recent developments at the top of Crane Drive or at the corner of Newtown Road and Ringwood Road. Whilst I appreciate the opportunity to air my views, I believe that Verwood is largely ignored by local government due to its location.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360768	Cllr. Mr David Packer	Colehill West Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO21097	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
497471	Mr Robert Wilmott		CSO21430	Option VWM 4	Object	General Comment	<p>According to the Governments New Homes Bonus consultation document from 11/2010 for 1000 new homes the required infrastructure to support those homes costs £20m. Based on the proposed maximum number of new homes for Verwood of 415 the proportioned infrastructure costs would be £8.3m. How do EDDC propose to fund these costs? I have estimated based on the figures in the document referred to above that if all the 415 homes were built and with 208 being affordable housing the 6 year bonus payment would be circa £4.4m so would not be sufficient to offset these costs. Therefore would you expect the various property developers under their required Section 106 agreements to meet all these costs and use the Bonus payments as suggested by the Government to improve frontline council services and improve the local Verwood community facilities for the benefit of existing residents? Point 11.19 of your core strategy document informs readers that Verwood has good road links. As a r ted to accessible and supported housing for this section of the community? It is advised in your strategy document that 90% of commuters use a car as their means of transport this is because of the lack of public transport and the semi-rural location. The 2008 report highlighted the fact that one third of houses in social rented properties had no use of a car. If you locate these families in Verwood in the proposed affordable housing how can this be of benefit if they have no means of transport and a limited public transport system. Finally the erosion of further green belt land should only be considered once the other options such as brown field sites, development of vacant properties have been fully explored.</p>			1057
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		CSO20744	Option VWM 4	Support					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535914	Graham Cudmore		CSO20 716	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535921	Mrs Charlotte Miller		CSO20 740	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
535933	Mr John Lister		CSO20 760	Option VWM 4	Object		I think it is absurd to build any more housing in Verwood without first improving facilities. There is little life to Verwood - for instance there is only one sit-down restaurant to serve the whole population. The leisure centre is too small. There is no swimming pool. The existing schools are already oversubscribed. Improve facilities first BEFORE contemplating increasing the population.			1057
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		CSO20 845	Option VWM 4	Object		The majority of residents in this area relocated because of the permanent despoiling of their places of birth by elected local and national 'representatives' who would not listen or care about the needs of the people that voted for them. Do you want to be remembered as the people who finally ruined this area or the people who saved it. Do not forget that people still visit this area as tourists and we welcome them and accept their contribution to the local economy. They will stop coming if the developments continue. How many tourists visit the outer London sprawl? Can I quote p227 from the Core Strategy Options paper - para 11.28 The Government's key housing policy is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. This is an impossible dream that can never and will never, be fulfilled. If the developments did go ahead what would be the effect of another 5000 cars on our local roads be ? If Morrisons developments go ahead where are the customers going to park? The parking within Verwood is just about adequate at the moment.			1057
535940	Mrs Linda Medler		CSO20 783	Option VWM 4	Object		Any additional building of houses will need to have a better road structure than exist at the moment to cater for all the extra traffic this will bring. I thought we were trying to bring about a greener environment to Dorset county?			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535948	Mr David Hadden		CSO20 792	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
535964	Mr Steven Old		CSO20 809	Option VWM 4	Support		I strongly support the building of additional housing in Verwood. However my support is only given in order that an Upper School is built OR the council look at changing the current three tier education system to the more sustainable two tier system. The council should also look at providing free transport for high achieving children to go to grammar schools should they wish to do so. The council should also look favourably upon anyone applying for permission to start a business in Verwood.			1057
535976	Mrs Valerie Stilwell		CSO20 829	Option VWM 4	Object		Until the plans show the improvements in road access, car parking, youth and leisure facilities, and above all school places which are needed to meet current demands, let alone increases of this size, there is no possibility of our absorbing 600 extra cars, 600 extra children into the infrastructure and social fabric many of us have worked very hard to engender in our 'new town' which has grown so fast over recent years. the school particularly is an absurd suggestion: a) it is within 400 metres of heathland, where development is forbidden b) we are told there is no budget currently for extra school spaces in this area in the foreseeable future c) the chaotic school traffic situation in Margards Lane is already stretching residents' patience to the limits (with enormous fears about what a leisure centre here would do, let alone a senior school) and d) the local staff of Dorset Police, with whom I work, are dismayed at the proposals : it has taken 5 special constables a und are unsupportable within the current infrastructure. our already struggling 'community' will be drowned with the proposed enormous influx of newcomers - so many of us came to Verwood as it was promised there would be no further development - we escaped from areas where no sense of community was possible, and we have tried to forge such an atmosphere here - we will not just sit by and watch it swept away, for the sake of the millions the government are offering to Councils who do succumb to their demands. let us know just WHO locally is in such dire need of			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							housing, and we will readily sit down and help plan for them to share in this community!			
536014	Mrs Dawn Tindall		CSO20 892	Option VWM 4	Object		What about the new homes bonus? Why is it not being implimented instead of this core strategy? The upper school in verwood will not happen within the life of this document, why is this carrot still being dangled.			1057
536025	Christopher Trim		CSO20 864	Option VWM 4		No Opinion	We are very concerned about the proposed development particularly around Eastworth Road. The area earmarked for development around Eastworth Road cannot support 200+ homes. We appreciate the proposal to leave the existing playpark and surrounding field as a buffer zone - but we are really concerned that this will become a central 'hanging out' point for younger people as it will form the 'centre' of the proposed development and the existing development around Field Place, which we believe will lead to anti social behaviour problems - has this issue been considered? We understand that there will be 2 new access routes via the Station and Edmondsham Roads but are also concerned that Field Place will also be used as an access road - the road system cannot support the associated additional traffic through what is currently a very peaceful estate. We are also concerned about the loss of what is one of the few remaining unspoilt areas around Verwood as it encroaches onto the existing countryside. On a wider point about the development generally in Verwood : the town does not have the infrastructure to support another 400 homes. In the event that some or all of the proposed developments go ahead, where will children go to school in the short term as the 3 first schools are already over subscribed? I can't see the logic of the proposals of building a new upper school - what about all the funding that has just gone into building a state of the art school in Wimborne (QE) where children from Verwood currently attend?			1057
536050	Mr Andrew Collin		CSO20 914	Option VWM 4	Support		It is important to have a policy of continuous improvement for housing and employment for the area. Many are concerned for our environment, sensitive and empathic development will take care of this, but to do nothing will benefit no one in the			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							longer term. A mixture of traditional and affordable homes is desirable, backed by a development in industrial and business land and premises availability. It is important to maintain and improve all areas of housing and commercial opportunity to invest in the future of our area for all parts of the community, the young, the aspiring as well as the established and retired members. Establishing the right mix is essential for a sustainable future in our community.			
536077	Caroline Thomas		CSO20 920	Option VWM 4	Object		Moved to Verwood nearly 10 years ago due to the location and rural village feel for a better quality of life away from busy noisy town surroundings, for a better environment for children..This is already changing since more and more housing developments have slowly taken away Verwoods identity.. PLEASE NO MORE.. We were promised that there would be no more housing developments- but this would appear to be a lie if this should go through.. Without stereotyping, housing association or "affordable housing" developments statistically will at best do nothing but make the area a far less desirable place in which to live..... This has to be a concern for all current Verwood residents . enough is enough.! do not ruin Verwood			1057
536085	Grahame Thomas		CSO20 928	Option VWM 4	Object		Strongly object to ALL proposals, due to the underlying fact that there have been more than necessary housing developments within Verwood area built in the past 10 years which is going against the rural village location that it once was, and the reason why so many people love Verwood "of old" as opposed to a more populated and busy town the likes of which it is to become....For any resident of 5 or more years it has become clearly evident that crime and unruly behaviour has become more of an issue- which can and will only increase.. Please do not ruin the once loved "Village"of Verwood any more...!!!			1057
536096	Katie Lacey		CSO20 950	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		CSO20 975	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536152	Mrs Alison OBrien		CSO20983	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536159	Mr Chris OBrien		CSO20992	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536165	Margaret Parker		CSO20998	Option VWM 4	Object		I oppose all large scale development in Verwood as the infrastructure cannot cope with a large increase in population, car drivers etc and such development eradicates much needed green space in the town. As a resident of Eastworth Road I particularly oppose VWM2 - the proposed 200 properties on land west of Eastworth Road, especially if access is made via Eastworth Road. This is currently a narrow lane which is predominantly used for leisure purposes - cyclists, horse riders, walkers, parents taking young children to Trinity School etc. It is totally unsuitable for 200+ vehicles having regular access. If the development was to go ahead, surely access should be via the distributor road which was built for large scale vehicular access.			1057
536169	Mr Tony Treviss-Bell		CSO21028	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
536175	Mrs Claire Addiscott		CSO21011	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536178	Mark Addiscott		CSO21021	Option VWM 4	Object		I feel Verwood is at saturation point at the moment and any increase in the number of people living here would greatly reduce the quality and feel of the town. Increases in population always seem to have adverse effects including loss of community spirit, and increases in crime and anti social behavior etc. The town doesn't have the type of transport links which I feel would be needed for a greater population either.			1057
536183	Deric Burgess		CSO21036	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536196	Mr J Spriggs		CSO21050	Option VWM 4	Object		I feel that Verwood has reached it's optimum size and retains a "village" atmosphere, which would be lost if it ended up as a dormitory town of Bournemouth with poor facilities.			1057
536204	Derek Kelly		CSO21060	Option VWM 4	Object		I believe that too many new houses have already been built in Verwood during the past 10 years, and that the town does not have the infrastructure and amenities to cope with another 430+ families. The roads in and out of the town will be unable to cope (the road to Ringwood is already extremely busy) and there is nothing for young people to do - I would build a new leisure centre and other facilities first, before considering any more houses! As far as the two options affecting me most directly - VWM1 and VWM2 - I understood that the land bordering Eastworth Road is a) good arable land that should remain agricultural land, and b) is green belt and should therefore be protected. I don't see how destroying fields and the wonderful outlook will 'provide valuable green infrastructure' when in my view it is already exactly that! I also believe that building 230+ new homes in this area will adversely affect the local wildlife - the owls, buzzards and other birds, badgers, deer and slow worms etc. Finally, my home backs on to the roundabout at the Champtoceaux Ave/Station Road junction and since the imposition of the one way system in the town centre the level of traffic - and traffic noise - has become intolerable, especially at weekends. Not only will another 200+ houses on Eastworth Road need to be accessed through the existing estate, vastly increasing the traffic in what is currently a quiet area, as well as making it more dangerous for our children, but the traffic from this and the Trinity Road option will all funnel onto the above-mentioned roundabout, making an already intolerable situation far, far worse. Please, please, no more houses in Verwood!!			1057
536206	Victoria Wiggins		CSO21058	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536213	L Stevens		CSO21065	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536220	Mrs		CSO21	Option	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	J Heather		070	VWM 4						
536252	Mrs Pamela Jakes		CSO21 076	Option VWM 4	Object		No more planning permission to erect ugly blocks of flats in Verwood.			1057
536255	Mrs J W Bryant		CSO21 085	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
536257	Mr Graham Jakes		CSO21 094	Option VWM 4	Object		If further homes were to be built in Verwood, would the utilities be able to cater for the extra demand? Also, there is the matter of increased traffic, more homes = more cars. In Verwood, ugly blocks of flats should be completely ruled out. One can see what has happened to-date on unsympathetic design in Crane Drive.			1057
536258	Mrs Anne Jones		CSO21 105	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536259	Sandy Stockwell		CSO21 118	Option VWM 4	Object		. I also oppose VWM4 - plans for a further 165 homes. Verwood cannot support the suggested increase in properties and subsequent increase in population and vehicles - infrast ty of life for residents is not considered when plans are discussed, yet this is surely important.			1057
536260	Vicki Palmer		CSO21 121	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is big enough already!			1057
536263	Ryan Ward		CSO21 123	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536265	Adrian Cox		CSO21 131	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood has already been subject to over-development into green field land and infill throughout the village or as it is now known "Town". It has staggered me and many friends in Verwood that developers have been allowed to build huge eyesores in the shape of the blocks of flats around the "Hub" and now on Blackhill. Sadly it is a sign of the econmic times when profit over-rides sustainable development and social			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							integration. flats break down neighbourhoods, discouraging social interaction. Houses support family growth and social development! More needs to be done to make appropriate housing more accessible, e.g. part ownership schemes, possibly making existing housing in towns accessible to first-time buyers and those indeed on lower incomes.. it requires two earners on £25k each per annum to buy a £200k house!! Verwood's biggest problem at present is lack of appropriate facilities not lack of housing, enough is sat empty already!!			
536266	Mr Martin Cobb		CSO21 141	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536267	Trish Wheeler		CSO21 167	Option VWM 4	Object		I feel that Verwood has enough housing at present and it would be criminal to lose greenbelt, disrupt the wildlife and nature. There are not enough facilities for the people of Verwood at the present. There are already groups of young children hanging around the streets bored, how many more do you really want to see around Verwood - personally I don't want to see any. I think a small town like Verwood needs to be left alone. Can't believe that people are thinking of building so many houses when there is a recession on - the cost is going to be huge - can't the money be spent on upgrading the facilities for the people who are already here.			1057
536271	Mrs D Holt		CSO21 210	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
536274	Mrs Annalicaia Cobb		CSO21 161	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536279	Mr Garry Whitham		CSO21 171	Option VWM 4	Object		The local infrastructure struggles to support the present residents of Verwood. An increase in population would be put further pressure on the area			1057
536282	Mrs Doreen Kingaby		CSO21 203	Option VWM 4	Object		Bad enough traffic on Howe lane without adding to the burdon.What about sorting Verwood out before adding to its problems.Such a lovely little village trying to be a big			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							town,planners mess.Let surrounding areas expand like Verwood has, before any more houses.In 2005 Verwood was declared full,why the change of heart? Please do the right thing for the people of Verwood and say no to building on our last remaining green belt.			
536289	N Waters		CSO21 194	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536300	Mrs Caroline Burgess		CSO21 209	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536311	Shane Ward		CSO21 220	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536313	Mrs J Wilmott		CSO21 240	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>According to the Governments New Homes Bonus consultation document from 11/2010 for 1000 new homes the required infrastructure to support those homes costs £20m. Based on the proposed maximum number of new homes for Verwood of 415 the proportioned infrastructure costs would be £8.3m. How do EDDC propose to fund these costs? I have estimated based on the figures in the document referred to above that if all the 415 homes were built and with 208 being affordable housing the 6 year bonus payment would be circa £4.4m so would not be sufficient to offset these costs. Therefore would you expect the various property developers under their required Section 106 agreements to meet all these costs and use the Bonus payments as suggested by the Government to improve frontline council services and improve the local Verwood community facilities for the benefit of existing residents? Point 11.19 of your core strategy document informs readers that Verwood has good road links. As a r ted to accessible and supported housing for this section of the community? It is advised in your strategy document that 90% of commuters use a car as their means of transport this is because of the lack of public transport and the semi-rural location. The 2008 report highlighted the fact that one third of houses in social rented properties had no use of a car. If you locate these families in Verwood in the proposed affordable housing how can this be of benefit if they</p>			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							have no means of transport and a limited public transport system. Finally the erosion of further green belt land should only be considered once the other options such as brown field sites, development of vacant properties have been fully explored.			
536315	J Ward		CSO21 235	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536323	Anne Crew		CSO21 247	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536324	Paul Sumner		CSO21 298	Option VWM 4	Object		Wimborne has the land and facilities to support more houses. The other areas do not. Especially Verwood, as it has been built upon to the point where it is second only to Dorchester, in terms of population. Verwood should be left alone and other areas play catch up. Verwood has no vibrant town centre, no realistic extra employment opportunities. No infrastructure, no buses after 6pm or police for that matter. One NHS dentist with a waiting list as long as your arm. Same with the meager doctors services. None of the houses are actually needed, only for the council to get social housing built. Not the attractive affordable homes it seems to like to label them as. Building on green belt land is supposed to be for exceptional circumstances, there are no homeless in Verwood. Do not destroy green belt land just because of a loophole. There is no need for social housing in Verwood, therefore no exceptional circumstances exist. I have looked at the proposed sights and they will all destroy habitat for local wildlife, VWM4 will also see SSSI sites, red beds, ancient hedge rows etc severely disrupted. Did you know that there is a flood plane? What about the scientific report on the river crane and fishing lakes down there? Commonsense please.			1057
536329	Mrs C Green		CSO21 259	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is a lovely place to live in. Even though we are now a town, there is still a village atmosphere. People are friendly and know lots of others people. More houses means there will be more people coming in from outside who will want to make our town just like the bigger one they left behind. We have been here since 1986 and have seen Verwood double			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							in size. Enough is enough.			
536332	Emmanuelle Hutton		CSO21 270	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536341	Adrian Bowyer		CSO21 325	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
536342	Lily Hutton		CSO21 305	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536346	Mr Ben Richards		CSO21 383	Option VWM 4	Object		Please note my following objections to the East Dorset Core Strategy consultation proposal to build 200 + affordable houses on Greenbelt land at Eastworth / Edmondsham Road. a.) The access (Roads) & infrastructure is inadequate for another 3 house let alone the proposed 200+. In addition there are a number of blind spot's which I understand was a key reason the decision was made to close Eastworth road, to reduce the traffic and potential accidents when accessing Edmondsham road. b.) Additional traffic next to a 1st school would surely add additional safety issues. c.) There is a footpath adjacent to both proposed sites which would add additional pressure onto heath land in direct contradiction to point 11.9 in the "Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 - Chapter 11 Verwood and West Moors Housing and Centre Options" which states: "Verwood lies adjacent to significant areas of protected heathland. The sites that are protected under European legislation, due to their fragility and nature conservation importance, are very sensitive to the impacts of nearby additional residential development. Therefore, housing development is not permitted within 400m of these areas. This has an implication on the areas suitable for residential development, especially within the existing built up area, and the need to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces to reduce the pressure of existing and proposed residential development on these sensitive areas." d.) Affect on rare species and wildlife on current green belt land, such as badgers, which are a protected species.			1057
536349	Mrs		CSO21	Option	Support					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	C Bowyer		391	VWM 4						
536350	Melissa Taylor		CSO21 360	Option VWM 4	Object		Insufficient infrastructure to support additional housing			1057
536351	Mr John Hutton		CSO21 374	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536353	Chris Rowley		CSO21 405	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is already overcrowded with properties and not enough facilities to support this amount of housing growth.			1057
536384	Andy Brookes		CSO21 410	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is full to bursting already. Facilities are required before further housing. The school proposal is only mentioned to bribe people into allowing further housing. The housing will no doubt happen to some extent, the school will not.			1057
536392	Mrs Diana Evans		CSO21 415	Option VWM 4	Object		Already too many houses,the roads into and out of Verwood cannot take anymore traffic.also not menough shops to cater for more homes only one supermarket. PLEASE LEAVE OUR GREEN AREAS ALONE.			1057
536402	Mr P K Evans		CSO21 420	Option VWM 4	Object		Already too many houses with not enough facilities.the roads in and out of verwood can not take any more traffic.			1057
536449	Dave Isaacs		CSO21 458	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536467	Kim Rich		CSO21 446	Option VWM 4	Object		There are not enough existing facilities in Verwood for the residents already living here. i.e Doctors,dentists and a variety of local shops. We do not need additional housing. Social and affordable housing will attract the wrong sort of people. The new flats that have already been allowed to be built are an eyesore and do not fit in with the existing surrounding properties. We moved here years ago to get away from noise pollution and heavy traffic. We do not want our peace and quiet spoiled by your proposals. We want to continue living in a pleasant green environment, quiet and			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							peaceful and unspoilt. That is the reason we chose to live in Verwood and your plans are not in keeping with the area.			
536479	Mr Jeff Maultby		CSO21 466	Option VWM 4	Object		Have you tried getting out of Holly grove or Hayward crescent when schools are open? inconsiderate parent parking causes dangerously blocked roads, one day a child will be hurt. A secondary school will make it utterly intolerable and impossible. Unless every child is forced to walk or cycle - which is never going to happen! How long will we have to queue on Church Hill if a secondary school is built! Its already ridiculous when the scools are open and will be impossible with a new school. The access roads are just not adequate. We should spend money on all the un-made roads and providing proper cycle lanes before building new houses. Verwood does not have sufficient infrastructure for 415 new homes. We will have even more kids hanging around on corners with nothing to do.			1057
536508	Mrs AJ Hayden		CSO21 491	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny PEARCE		CSO22 108	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
482494	Mrs Yvette Jones		CSO21 890	Option VWM 4	Object		Large scale developments damage the environment for everyone, and it is for ever. The open green spaces are valued by so many who have paid a premium to live in a semi-rural area. Desecration of this is an assault to the residents' wellbeing; an unwarranted invasion causing a wholesale change of character to what is home to thousands of people who chose a neighbourhood because of its history of modest gradual development. Not convinced there is a housing shortage. Keep 'social' housing in more 'affordable' areas. What is there to aspire to and work towards otherwise? Don't patronise us re. 'housing for local people' - occupants become 'local' by living in a 'location'. Small developments can be assimilated to the character of an area without destroying people's enjoyment of their homes. They can be developed with consideration, gradually and as			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							appropriate. They do not have to cause illness through accute distress of residents just to line the developers' poc kets and gratify councillors.			
498402	Mrs T Hughes		CSO22 243	Option VWM 4	Object		Re: Employment Land Options Whist employment is obviously needed in the area, before building new sites please take a look around the existing industrial estates and see just how many units are empty. For example on Cobham Road on the Ferndown Ind Estate there are currently lots of 'To Let' boards. The traffic problems of the A31 need to be addressed before numerous new homes/businesses are built, throughout the summer routes through Ringwood/Ferndown/Wimborne become totally gridlocked. Whilst we can hope and encourage local people to use buses or cycle to work or for shopping, many of the cars coming into and through the area are driven by holidaymakers. With more people taking their holidays in the UK this problem is likely to get worse.			1057
536537	Mrs Susan Isaacs		CSO21 496	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536543	Mrs Samantha Fysh		CSO21 543	Option VWM 4	Object		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD.. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!			1057
536546	Mrs Sarah Jupp		CSO21 517	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536548	Mr James Robinson		CSO21 521	Option VWM 4	Object		I feel that the building of these additional homes in Verwood is based on the greed of the developers and the landowners. It is not proven that there is a need to rip up more land in Verwood particularly green belt farm land in the case of Eastworth Road. There is the appalling example of the housing units built on the ring road opposite the Hub that have not sold and are a complete eyesore with the developers becoming insolvent and it becoming a protected farce that should never have been sanctioned. In short a wholly unacceptable set of circumstances that is a blight on			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							those who gave permission to construct them. It clearly makes the case that planning has been granted filling the land with inappropriate housing and this has caused me to not trust the judgement of those responsible for making the decisions on development of housing in Verwood. In contrast Verwood has grown over the last three decades and recent efforts to; improve the centre, build the Hub and construct the ring road makes the balance between housing and services/facilities better. The planners deserve credit for improving those facilities and that is why the school is a good idea for Verwood, as it is a further step to providing a complete all encompassing small town. It also has the obvious benefit of not having to bus all those children every day to the schools outside of the area. In conclusion I cannot see any need to increase housing in Verwood. We really do have a responsibility not to concrete and tarmac over for housing any more open space or the surrounding fields of Verwood it is simply an act of gross irresponsibility.			
536553	Ms Michelle Hayter		CSO21532	Option VWM 4	Object		Totally object to the housing developments. Not enough facilities to cater for current population let alone a further 400 homes. Schools and facilities will suffer considerably.			1057
536554	Mr B Tunstall		CSO21536	Option VWM 4	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood will not stand up to this amount of building and people. 400 houses will roughly equate to 800 extra cars, 1200-1600 extra people. The doctors, schools, leisure facilities and shops that are in place at the moment will not be able to cope and the current residents will find that the pleasant small town which it is at the moment, will no longer be just that. Yes I know other facilities will be put in place, but how many years are we going to be over-run with contractors etc, (as is the case with the present building going on at the site which used to be the Fairwood, and various other sites over the last few years). Please leave Verwood alone and let the money-greedy people who are trying to sell their land to the builders use the land for which it was intended - farming, and preserve the green belt status and Englands "Green and pleasant land" Are we to become a wildlife bare area and a traffic blackspot about to happen? Does no-one on the planning committee care for the welfare			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							of the present current Verwood residents or is it all being done in the name of "Progress" ?			
536563	Mr David Hayter		CSO21 610	Option VWM 4	Object		Totally object to the housing developments proposed in Verwood. Not enough amenities to cope with the current population and therefore will in no way be able to sustain another 400 homes.			1057
536566	Mr Adrian Blow		CSO21 551	Option VWM 4	Object		1] lack of current facilities eg shops & other facilities; public transport poor so would increase car journeys 2] lack of infrastructure eg road access etc at Eastworth site			1057
536571	Mr Craig Jerome		CSO21 561	Option VWM 4	Object		I will shortly be moving to Verwood and my partner lives in Pine View Road.			1057
536572	Mr Roger Fysh		CSO21 594	Option VWM 4	Object		I strongly object to the proposal to increase the housing in and around Verwood. Verwood has been extensively developed over the years and there is inadequate services to support the extra cars and people. Also having seen the housing density of the Ebblake housing estate it is clear that agreeing to more housing will only create 'no go' areas in the very near future. I also note that in and around Wimborne there are huge areas of open land, which could easily be developed, especially between Ferndown and Wimborne which also has excellent road networks in place as it could immediately open onto the A31			1057
536576	Mrs Valerie Green		CSO21 615	Option VWM 4	Object		I object to the core strategy. It will mean destruction of the green belt! The land owners will of course be in favour of development as the land will be worth a lot more as building land. There are 1.5m unoccupied homes in the UK plus an unknown number of empty homes in the rented sector. Central Government wants an extra 3M homes to be built. In total this will house 10 to 15M people. The population has increased by only 5M in the last 50 years why do we need these extra homes? Are there so many people who would choose to live in Verwood and have to travel to work? In view of economic uncertainty is it wise to plan a large increase in the number of new homes. You only have to look at the Irish situation to see how easily things can go wrong. Would the			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							council really destroy the green belt and blight the lives of existing residents if it were not for the Government housing bribe.			
536628	Mr C.A Wills		CSO21 668	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
536631	Ms Carole-Ann Young		CSO21 639	Option VWM 4	Object		Totally object to the housing developments proposed in Verwood. The size of the developments are far larger than the current infrastructure can support. There are barely enough amenities for the current residents and these developments will create even more strain on already overstretched and poor facilities.			1057
536634	Mr Andrew Beal		CSO21 653	Option VWM 4	Object		Totally object to all future new housing developments in Verwood. Monies should be invested in infrastructure for existing residents instead. The proposed developments pay little or no attention to existing planning controls and make a mockery of the planning process in East Dorset.			1057
536635	Mr Ronald Helmers		CSO21 660	Option VWM 4	Object		It has been 5 and a half years since I moved to Verwood although I have been familiar with the town for many years prior to that move. Since coming I have been aware of the increase in houses/flats etc over that time. It seems that everywhere I look one house is being demolished and replaced with several residential properties. Now there are these proposals for major residential developments at Eastworth Road and Howe Lane. Combined with the two smaller developments some 415 homes are involved. These, were they in one place could be considered a small town or at the least a very large village. On a separate issues where is the infrastructure to support all this development? Has the Council considered the implications of the increased traffic that will be generated not only on the area immediately surrounding the two major schemes but on the town generally? I fear that a modestly sized town is well on its way to becoming a size that many of the residents will find very much not to their liking. I for one object most strongly. I understand that the school proposed is an upper school and that such a school is lacking in the town. If this is the case			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							then I would support its establishment.			
536636	Mr Phil Jones		CSO21 670	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood doesn't have the infrastructure for any further such development			1057
536637	Mrs Geraldine Haigh		CSO21 681	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
536642	Ms Clare Taylor		CSO21 679	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536654	Ms Maureen Castell		CSO21 700	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood does not need more houses, it needs a senior school, more shops and another doctors surgery. Verwood is bursting with house. If Verwood is a Town it needs to be a town.			1057
536656	Charlotte England		CSO21 701	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536659	Mr Andy Longshaw		CSO21 714	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536660	Mr and Mrs N J Close		CSO21 713	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536666	Mr C Thickett		CSO21 721	Option VWM 4	Object		Re: Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Consultation – Verwood I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI's and			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unacceptable strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood’s present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			
536678	Mrs L Thickett		CSO21741	Option VWM 4	Object		I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI’s and contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unacceptable strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood’s present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			
536692	Richard Coulthard		CSO21 747	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood already has too much housing for the infrastructure available. Until schools and other facilities are actually built there should not be any more large developments approved. Permission for additional development should not be granted based on an intention to improve facilities at some point in the future.			1057
536694	Mr T Thickett		CSO21 753	Option VWM 4	Object		Re: Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Consultation – Verwood I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI’s and contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unaccepta ble strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood`s present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		CSO21 790	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
536702	Mr Mark Hirst		CSO21 771	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536718	Mrs J Durham		CSO21 803	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536723	P Pembroke		CSO21 815	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood has been developed enough in recent years.It now should be left alone without further intrusion into its green spaces to retain it's rural identity and heritage.Further development of 400 homes has the potential for another 800 cars.There is already too much commercial traffic and too many cars coming into and through Verwood with little regard for the speed limit.The roads in Verwood are not large enough to cope with further increases in traffic,not to mention the amount of construction traffic a development of this size would bring.There is insufficient infrastructure in Verwood to accomodate any further development and this would need to be addressed before anything further should be considered.			1057
536766	A Pembroke		CSO21 824	Option VWM 4	Object		Insufficient infrastructure in Verwood.Already far too many cars and commercial traffic coming into and through Verwood with little regard for speed limit.Green belt should be left alone and Verwood retain it's rural identity and heritage.Verwood is already an urban dormitory.			1057
536771	B Lusher		CSO22 087	Option VWM 4	Object		I object to any development that expands Wimborne and surrounding villages now and at any time in the future. Why is			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Wimborne such a beautiful town, could it be the Minster, old buildings, steeped in history? probably all of these and many other attributes. Take a good look at that stunning photograph 'Wimborne Minster and Stour In Winter' by Roger Holman, fields and the town centre, all in one picture. This view of the landscape, identified as a scene of merit by the artistic eye of the photographer, often passes the layman by, until pointed out so graphically. This photograph, like others, is a measure of what we could lose. I wonder if there were other equally stunning scenes in the hills northeast of Wimborne, Colehill, now completely covered in houses. Can you imagine the equivalent photograph of that time, the town, with a backdrop of fields and trees rising above horizon. Too late, that moment has passed. The town, in close proximity to countryside, is ye has realised this and is making an effort to preserve old Singapore. We, on the other hand, seem to be quite happy to knock down our countryside in the name of development. If we really want to preserve Wimborne for generations to come, so they can see the town, be part of it's unique character, situated amongst, close at hand countryside, then we must make a conscious decision now to preserve the green belt and green areas in the town forever, before Wimborne eventually becomes a quaint little roundabout that travellers come across on the way from somewhere to somewhere.			
536772	Mr J Stone		CSO21 851	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
536777	Karen Hodgkiss		CSO21 857	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood doesn't need more houses it desperately needs more facilities. We are a town, not a village anymore. We need a bigger supermarket, a public swimming pool and a high school.			1057
536781	Abigail Harris		CSO21 863	Option VWM 4	Object		As a home owner living on the junction of Church Hill and Margards Lane my Primary concerns are the future plans for a secondary school VWM7 and housing at Howe Lane VWM3. This would greatly increase the volume of traffic that already passes by on route to Emmanual and Verwood First			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							School.I feel this would have a huge impact on the local residents and would have concerns with regards to road safety along this route. I also have concerns about the other possible development sites and the amount of new homes being built in Verwood. The towns Facilities has not grown with the the population of Verwood.			
536790	David Steadman		CSO21 904	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
536796	Ann Coleman		CSO21 916	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536798	Peter Coleman		CSO21 922	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536800	Julieanne Sutherland		CSO21 928	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support 400 more homes - there will be increased traffic - the whole point of moving to Verwood is for it's rural feel and quietness and safety . Who is going to benefit from these extra houses ?????? Certainly not existing residents , if this a good way to raise extra revenue on the council tax? The rationale behind this proposal to try and build more houses needs to be fully explained			1057
536802	Anida Griffiths		CSO21 958	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536803	Ian Hargreaves		CSO21 945	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536807	Paul Dayson-Smith		CSO21 956	Option VWM 4	Object		I feel Verwood has seen more than enough building in the last 30 years. There are nowhere near enough local jobs or a suitable level of infrastructure to support a higher population. Whoever proposed to build the, admittedly needed, new secondary school on Howe lane clearly hasn't tried to drive down that road at 8:30 on a weekday morning			1057
536808	Ms Yvette Allen		CSO22 026	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood does not need to increase its population is is already too big for the local infrastructure.			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536811	Mr P Carey		CSO21 975	Option VWM 4	Object		I am a resident of Howe Lane, Verwood, and since moving to this location have had nothing but immense problems with traffic due to the Emmanuel/Verwood school campus. I have had a 4 year running battle with motorists parking, not only over my driveway; but also IN my driveway. I have complained to the local police on numerous occasions, only to be told that it is a council problem. I have applied for a 'white line' and complained to my local councillor - all to no avail. There are regular near miss incidents in and around the school campus. And only last week a parked car in Howe Lane was severely damaged. By building the new houses in Howe Lane this will create even more problems. The land to the south of Howe Lane will just compound the problem and then add a new school is just utterly ridiculous. There is no infrastructure within Verwood to accommodate all the proposed developments. If you, the council, wish the residents of Verwood to be amicable, then I suggest I find highly amusing. There is no money for this new school! There is an ongoing situation with damaged vehicles and traffic problems within the school campus and outside. I do not see how this new school can be accessed unless the council is going to build many new roads, or compulsory purchased land. I will fight to my last breath to stop all of this!!!! We do not want this - it will not serve us - it will make our lives intolerable!			1057
536812	R H Barker		CSO22 011	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536816	Mr T C Clark		CSO22 005	Option VWM 4	Object		The village of Verwood has become a dormitory town because of all the most recent building which has taken place. Any further builds would cause more of a problem for the residents already living in Verwood. The reasons being: Public Transport is inadequate. Roads are inadequate for the amount of traffic which uses them. Shops are inadequate, other than Banks, Estate Agents or Hairdressers. We need more of a variety of shops within a specific area, not spread all over the town. There are no facilities for the younger element of the town, this needs to be addressed urgently. Keep them off the streets and out of mischief. Restaurants are limited i.e. non-existent other than cheap pub food or Indian/chinese take			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							aways and the local chippy. As for the new school (which is a requirement).If this is to be situated within the Campus of the current school this would lead to further problems with traffic flow and parking. Already both sides of Margards Lane/Howe Lane and adjoining roads are near to capacity.Which leads me to another point,Emergency vehicles would be unable to attend either house fires or life threatening situations.This means that people living within this area are under great risk.			
536817	Cheryl Evans		CSO22 020	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536819	Cathryn Biggins		CSO22 023	Option VWM 4	Object		I don't think there is enough local work in Verwood to support the proposed number of new homes and if people have to travel out of the area to work there will be increased traffic on roads that are already busy, particularly during school times and in the mornings and early evenings. In addition local services like the doctors, dentists, banks, the supermarket and petrol station are already busy and an increase in population numbers will increase waiting times for appointments and queues. I think a new secondary school would also create huge traffic and parking problems on roads that are already very busy with the first and middle school traffic in the mornings and afternoons. At the moment the students have the choice of several good upper schools and the network of bus stops allows them to walk to a local stop. A new school would result in increased traffic as students travel in from surrounding areas. Verwood is a pleasant place to live at the moment and has beautiful green areas surrounding it. Many green areas within Verwood have been infilled with housing during the last 15 years and I don't think the town should be expanded any further.			1057
536830	Mrs Janet Sutcliffe		CSO22 072	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
536840	Mr Clive Evans		CSO22 060	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536841	Mr and Mrs N P Brunning		CSO22 067	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536850	Mr Michael Hird		CSO22 165	Option VWM 4	Object		Assertions like "could", "may", "potential", "divert pressures away from heathlands" and "will contribute" are meaningless without guarantees and full explanation. The ratio of affordable homes to (un)affordable is far too high and will result in an unacceptable concentration of ghetto like small dwellings. Developments of more than 30 homes in the current economic climate and without clear plans for improved infrastructure and services is clearly foolhardy and shows a total lack of foresight. The results of the consultation should be published and no further action taken until the full consequences of cuts in Government expenditure are known. This is particularly important with respect to VWM7 - new secondary school.			1057
494436	Mr R D Turvil		CSO22 741	Option VWM 4	Object		We are against the proposals as they over extend Verwood, which has already been extensively developed and now seems taken for granted as the easy option. The town already suffers from limited community facilities and, what there is, is spread out, thus weakening any real sense of community. The Localism Bill currently before Parliament specifically identifies that residents are to be handed powers to approve/block developments			1057
507170	Miss A K Jukes		CSO22 762	Option VWM 4	Object		When I moved to Verwood in 2000 I was informed and read for myself that Verwood would not expand any further. As houses have been sold and subsequently demolished, there have been many infill homes built to replace them. Anywhere on floodplain eg VWM4 is without question unwise. More facilities required eg swimming pool and more shops - not hairdressers or supermarkets!			1057
514507	Mr and Mrs C Macy		CSO22 770	Option VWM 4	Support					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22 890	Option VWM 4	Object		Option VWM4 Strongly object to development and proposed SANG Please see comments on BM report			1057
536856	Mr and Mrs Ian Barnes		CSO22 151	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536860	Mrs Sparks		CSO22 193	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
536866	Emma Huns		CSO22 222	Option VWM 4	Object		I feel that Verwood needs more facilities (such as a secondary school, swimming pool, restaurants) before any further expansion			1057
536910	Ms Susan Bradley		CSO22 255	Option VWM 4	Object		I strongly object to the options VWM 1,2,3 and 4 for new houses in Verwood. In particular because they fall within Green Belt land. Green Belt land should be preserved as Green Belt. In the East Dorset SHLAA 2008 Report all of these sites were "considered unacceptable in context of Green Belt Policy". Why are they even being considered? I am horrified at the idea that each time new houses are needed the green belt will simply be redrawn to accommodate them! Please do not build on Green Belt land.			1057
536928	Mr Kevin Fyles		CSO22 281	Option VWM 4	Object		Concern that insufficient developer contributions will be secured in order to underpin the necessary infrastructure improvements that are required in Verwood to support both larger developments and also 'make good' (at least in part) on previous infrastructure shortfalls.			1057
536932	Paul Bason		CSO22 311	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536944	Ian Lucking		CSO22 328	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood cannot take any more traffic because the road system will not cope. The infrastructure will not be able to withstand more population in this small town and will take away its charm.			1057
536966	Rachel Baulch		CSO22 333	Option VWM 4	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536972	Iris Baulch		CSO22 338	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536990	Steward Gates		CSO22 348	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
536993	Nicola Gates		CSO22 357	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
537012	Carole Lucking		CSO22 371	Option VWM 4	Object		I feel that the traffic in and out of Verwood is already quite considerable. Much more thought must be put in to the vehicular access to all these properties. I also feel we need more facilities in the town to cater for the needs of all the extra population.			1057
537018	Vanessa Scott		CSO22 381	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
537021	John and Susan Lewis		CSO22 386	Option VWM 4	Support		The population is growing in Verwood and I think there is still a need for more affordable family homes. An upper school is required which would eliminate the need for so much school transport to Ferndown and Wimborne. This would also improve our sense of community and be less divisive. The political movers in Verwood all seem to have a NIMBY attitude towards our community and use any excuse to prevent development.			1057
537026	Roy Cronk		CSO22 391	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
537030	E Lock		CSO22 396	Option VWM 4	Object		There needs to be a lot more facilities and better infrastructure in the Verwood area before adding any more strain. In particular increasing the bus routes, roads and another petrol station			1057
537050	Diane Fletcher		CSO22 416	Option VWM 4	Object		The infrasture currently in place in Verwood is already sufficient to support the existing population without adding potentially 400+ more families. Public transport is woefully inadequate to service its working and social population, with no quick bus links to major employment and social hubs of Bournemouth, Chrsitchurch, Salisbury and Southampton. The			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							existing services are slow and infrequent, with the evening services stopping ridiculously early and sunday services too infrequent to seriously entertain. There is nothing constructive for the existing youth to do and this is already manifesting itself in anti-social behaviour (openly drinking/smoking and causing a general nuisance late at night). Additional families would only add to this growing issue and the threat of closure of the current police station is very worrying. An additional 400+ vehicles would significantly add to the risk of accidents, especially around the first and middle schools, all of which are already oversubscribed and could not cope with upto 400 additional children (probably double or more than 400 realistically). The additional stress on the existing drains and sewage systems would put existing housing at risk. The existing shopping centre is more akin to a small village and does not service the existing population with a range of goods and service that could be reasonably expected of a town of its existing size, let alone having so many more people to service. All in all, Verwood does not have the infrastructure, school capacity, leisure/social facilities or public transport to support its existing population. The proposals to add another 400+ families into these limited facilities and services is ill advised and impractical and will only add to anti-social behaviour problems and pressures on the existing infrastructure that would be disastrous for the existing population.			
537075	Mrs Elaine Holt		CSO22 450	Option VWM 4	Object		1. I strongly object to the failure to consult in Verwood regarding our suggestions for building options to fulfil local housing needs when the Regional Spatial Strategy was revoked. I feel we were disenfranchised in this respect, and our current option for expressing our views is inadequate. 2. As most commuter traffic out of Verwood is to Ringwood and Ferndown, more large scale development (400 homes) will overload the already crowded and dangerous roads, (up to 800 more cars). Even traffic problems arising from the Trinity School development have not yet been solved. 3. Paragraph 11.60, 11.62 and 11.71 (Option VWM 1 and VWM 2): I strongly object to the development outlined in VWM1 and VWM2, which I believe compromise the 'Area of Great			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Landscape Value' rendering it invisible to most, and intruding into the most inspiring view of this landscape from the popular beauty spot and viewpoint at Stephen's Castle SSSI. The raft of houses will be a clearly visible scar in an otherwise rare spread of rolling hills. 4. Paragraph 11.60: When we raised concerns around the development of Trinity School we were informed that the school was a 'special case' for the green belt, and so it should not be an argument used in favour of further housing development. It would not be a properly transparent reason. 5. Transport issues etc: I strongly object to the practice of some developers promising to pay sums to the council for roads etc, or to other bodies such as English Nature, as part of the permission process, as this appears to muddy the basis on which permission is given especially in terms of green belt, or sensitive land.			
537104	J R Bardi		CSO22 462	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
537106	C Hebditch		CSO22 481	Option VWM 4	Object		The more homes we build the more roads we need. The homes and roads get filled up then we're back to square one. When will it ever end. The notion expressed in some of the planning, about trying to get people out of their cars, off the roads, and into public transport, is a joke. For example, building on the Cuthbury allotments in Wimborne means that those who have one of the new allotments will have to get their cars out to drive to them, whereas at present there are many people in Wimborne who can walk to their allotments. Most of the areas designated as fit for development will mean even more chaos on our local roads because public transport is not going to improve to the state where those of us who are fortunate to have a job to go to will all be able to get to work on time using a bus. The size of the proposed developments, in my opinion, is too big and will put undue pressure on local services for which we do not at present have funding to improve. I suppose though that these new homes will bring some new council tax payers to the area and therefore, maybe, help with the budget deficit ... until we have to build the new roads			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
537122	Christopher Hill		CSO22 493	Option VWM 4	Object		I strongly object to the two large developments on Green Belt land (VWM1 and VWM2). Verwood has had a massive amount of new housing built in the last 20 years or so and it still does not have the facilities to support the increased population. More housing on this scale would make this problem worse and put great pressure on the local roads. According to the 2008 East Dorset SHLAA report the land which is now included in the VWM1 VWM2 proposals was deemed unsuitable for residential development.			1057
537312	Mr Barry Goldsmith		CSO22 504	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
537314	Mrs Penelope Goldsmith		CSO22 509	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
537318	Daniel Parkin		CSO22 514	Option VWM 4	Object		At present I do not feel any further development is needed in Verwood - the town needs to come to terms with its recent expansion over the last 10-15 years. With no money in the coffers, so to speak, I cannot see where funding for a new school will come from and appears to be a gimmick in return for approval of additional homes. My children go to Verwood First and Emmanuel and traffic is already a problem, without further homes and a potential new school. Money would be better spent expnding the school further so that children can enjoy a wider range of facilities. I attended our child's first xmas fayre this year and the school was so crowded it was uncomfortable, the school does not have the facilities to cater for all the children's wishes, only those drawn out of a hat. If a secondary school is a consideration, then the council really needs to look at how Emmanuel School can be improved first. I agree a secondary school in Verwood would be ideal for the local community growth and dynamics and a further opinion poll taken to see what residents of Verwood would like in 10 years time!!			1057
537326	Harold Bowskill		CSO22 519	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood continues to lack sufficient amenities and facilities to support its local community now, especially the young with few leisure or entertainment facilities. Verwood has one			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							supermarket serving the entire town with two convenience stores and little else. Adding more homes will simply increase peoples frustrations and anger and due consideration should be given to the existing populous. Increasing the population of Verwood by adding a further 415 homes is clearly a means of increasing council revenue and nothing more, the infrastructure of Verwood simply cannot handle this, the roads, sewers and services will need extensive improvement and in this era of austerity, is it really economically viable.			
537362	Peter Constable		CSO22 540	Option VWM 4	Object		The larger residential building proposals are completely out of character for the area and will consume large tracts of green belt. The infrastructure to support development on a large scale is simply not in place. The smaller developments appear to be a better fit e.g Cuthbury, Leigh Park, Stone Lane.			1057
537435	Ms Pauline Burton		CSO22 567	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
537529	Mrs C White		CSO22 594	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
537542	Mrs M Wake		CSO22 605	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
537548	Mr C Wake		CSO22 610	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
537557	Batchelor		CSO22 615	Option VWM 4	Object		We feel Verwood have Enough houses/flats/dwellings and schools in this area lack of decent shopping facilities and coffee shops and good cafes in the area - so feel Verwood should concentrate on making itself user friendly love the green belt area and this should not be removed or made s smaller thankyou			1057
537562	Dan		CSO22	Option	Object					1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Cartmale		620	VWM 4						
537566	Patricia Adlem		CSO22 626	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
537571	Nick and Marion Leatherdale		CSO22 646	Option VWM 4		No Opinion				1057
537580	Ruth Brown		CSO22 658	Option VWM 4	Support					1057
537582	Wendy Stacey		CSO22 664	Option VWM 4	Support		The current infrastructure barely supports the existing development in the Verwood area. My support to any of these proposals is only valid if ALL the utilities are upgraded prior to or in conjunction with any further building schemes. If the infrastructure is not improved I cannot give support top any of these proposals.			1057
537731	Mr Colin Ward		CSO22 669	Option VWM 4	Object					1057
537762	Peggy Marshall		CSO22 674	Option VWM 4	Object		Verwood is a country town with surrounding fields and forest. Therefore there should be no building on green belt 515 homes could mean at least 800 + cars which the roads are unable to cope with. The support services such as drainage was not designed to cope with the proposed rise in number of the population. Existing shops would be inadequate. "Let the people decide"----Cameron's slogan			1057
537806	Mrs P Arnold		CSO22 692	Option VWM 4	Object		We have far too many people in Verwood already and there are not the facilities to cope with the amount at the present time let alone building even more houses. Yes we definately need another school.			1057
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter Griffiths		CSO22 724	Option VWM 4	Support		Approve of provision of affordable housing, however, agreement with Housing Association must be watertight so housing stock for rent remains constant and stock can never be sold. These houses will be near to facilities, schools, shops, transport, work and will alleviate pressure on rural			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							communities with no facilities to provide affordable housing in the Green Belt.			
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		CSO22 845	Option VWM 4		General Comment	Again, a point that was made both strongly and clearly at the Public meeting in the Memorial Hall, was that, with all the growth of housing development that has been undertaken in recent years, there needs to be space for 'Verwood to find itself'. The general feeling is that too much is happening, too quickly and the community needs more time to 'bed down'. Whilst it is appreciated that the proposed housing developments will probably not take place within the next five years, in the life of a community, that still seems a rather short time frame.			1057
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		CSO22 851	Option VWM 4	Support		Area 2 - no objection, in principle, BUT instead - site of new Verwood Medical Centre - combining the two present practices, with access and exit either off the southern portion of St Michaels' Road or access off Manor Road, with exit onto St Michael's Road, i.e. one way traffic.			1057
539805	Mr Philpot		CSO22 805	Option VWM 4	Object		Margards Lane is busy and dangerous for the school children as it is now. Too many houses/flats are ruining Verwood, the landscape and community feeling. In eight years of living here it has grown immensely with ugly flats. The more people living in Verwood the more chance of crime as it no longer has a community feel and people lose their sense of pride in their area. Verwood still has a village feel - let's keep it that way.			1057
540772	Mr Nigel Steel		CSO22 908	Option VWM 4	Support		We write regarding proposals for the new Core strategy in the East Dorset area. Our home is on one and a half acres within areas VWM4, land south of Manor Road. We write to express our support for the development of the land in our area for the following reasons. 1. Our property borders the existing green belt boundary, whilst being within easy reach of the local facilities, i.e. town centre and supermarket. 2. There is a mix of high density and family housing within close proximity of the proposed area, so the development of our area would seem to be a logical progression. 3. We are in favour of the provision of low cost housing,			1057

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>particularly in this area of the country where the cost of property is out of reach of many young people. We ourselves were born and brought up in the locality, and as such have witnessed the growth of Verwood from a small village to the large town it is today.</p> <p>4. The further development of Verwood would necessitate the development of local facilities, in particular the provision of an upper school and leisure facilities which are lacking at present, the opportunity of including these in any plans should not be missed.</p> <p>We have no hesitation in expressing our approval for the Proposal to develop area VWM 4.</p>			
583759	Mr A Craddock and Mrs D Goodenough		CSO22956	Option VWM 4	Object		<p>Verwood is the fastest growing town in Europe with insufficient infrastructure (ie access roads into Verwood) to support these 415 new homes being planned. We already have to wait up to 5 mins to leave Noon Hill Road to access the main Ringwood Road, its very frustrating even now. The traffic along Ringwood Road is already travelling well in excess of the speed limit and it seems no one is interested in doing anything to curb it. With all the proposed extra dwellings and the new school run there will be even more traffic exceeding the speed limit. Therefore it will be even more difficult for the elderly residents to survive this traffic.</p>			1057
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO232	11.105	Object		Where is the link for this document is this a fair consultation			1060
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO233	11.106	Object		When you surveyed in 2008, have you seen the difference that was 12 years ago, come on.			1061
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		CSO2582	11.106	Object		The last bullet point about occupancy in 2008 is hopelessly out of date. The new business unit north of Station Road (currently nearing completion) are all unoccupied.	Bring this data upto date.		1061
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO531	11.114	Object		<p>"Issue: Should a town centre boundary be designated for Verwood?"</p> <p>Poor planning has resulted in the uneven distribution of commerce across Verwood.</p>			1070

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Defining a town centre should of happend in 1980.			
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2560	Preferred Option VWM 5	Support	General Comment	Support the designation of a town centre boundary for Verwood, but feel it must be carefully defined so that the extent of the Town Centre is large enough to meet the aspirations of KS16 & 18 and VWM6. This option should include a policy for the Morrison's site and for the linkage of the Morrison's site to the historical town centre in a way which could benefit the smaller shops in the historical centre.			1071
501364	Mr M Devetta		CSO5868	Preferred Option VWM 5		No Opinion				1071
360167	Mrs Pippa WHEATLEY		CSO17451	Preferred Option VWM 5	Object		The old village centre can never serve as a town centre. It does not have any scope to expand into a retail centre which, I understand from looking at various documents, is a main function of a town centre. To find a centre that can cope with the retail function I suggest the Morrisons development will fit better. I assume there will be other retail outlets there. The historic village centre must be treated sensitively. Ferret Green and the Heritage Centre are wonderful additions and the car park only just copes at present. Ringwood Road is far too busy to allow it to be the centre of a town. The units in the area are mainly services which are suited to this area which does not need to attract any more hustle and bustle. Incidentally, the Masterplan really got the picture here spot on – two estate agents, one hairdresser and empty premises – very typical.	The area shown is more suited to 'Historic Village Centre' If a Town Centre is required I suggest around Morrisons		1071
359547	Mrs V BRIGHT	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17958	Preferred Option VWM 5	Support	General Comment	We support the designation of a town centre boundary for Verwood, but feel it must be carefully defined so that the extent of the Town Centre is large enough to meet the aspirations of KS16 & 18 and VWM6. Suggest that the outline of the Town Centre as shown on the map is redefined to include the wider areas which are not shown. This option should include a policy for the Morrison's site and for the linkage of the Morrison's site to the historical town centre in a way which could benefit the smaller shops in the			1071

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							historical centre.			
359894	Mr D.S Medlycott		CSO17555	Preferred Option VWM 5	Object		<p>Town Centre issues I wish to draw your attention to problems that occur on a daily basis in Verwood, namely on-street deliveries and lack of public parking provision. I consider that it is essential that these problems are resolved before any additional shops or housing are added. If this is not done then the existing problems will simply be compounded thus creating conflict and a most unsatisfactory environment for all.</p> <p>On-Street Deliveries There is a distinct lack of off road parking for delivery vehicles including the newly built shops at Ferret Green and those on Station Road opposite the parade of shops. The result is vehicles park partly on the road and pavement or wholly on the pavement. This has the effect of: 1) Damaging kerbs and pavements 2) Creating road safety issues for pedestrians 3) Blocking of pavements for parents with buggies and disabled (this will become of greater concern with an ever increasing aging population)</p> <p>I myself use a large electric wheelchair and I often find I cannot get past such vehicles and on occasions I have had to travel on the roadway against the flow of traffic in Manor Road.</p> <p>I gave Kate Tunks (DCC- Highways Transportation) at the focus group meeting a number of photographs of such incidents and I have previously given photographs to Councillors Coombs and Flower (I have further copies available if required).</p> <p>In the early morning and at other times there is often one or sometimes two very large articulated delivery vehicles for Tesco Express as well as a similar type of vehicle delivering large electrical goods to Baileys which are parked on opposite sides of Ringwood Road. This creates traffic congestion and road safety dangers. In addition it is extremely hazardous to exit the Tesco car park or the Potters Wheel car park at that time.</p>	<p>I suggest 1) consideration should be given to only approving planning applications if there is off road parking provision for deliveries. 2) Consideration to possibly introducing times for deliveries or excluding deliveries during set times 3) approving only applications that meet "The Good Practise Guidelines" relating to footways and footpaths. These require a width of 3500-4500mm outside of shops and a preferred obstacle free footway width of 2000mm. Disabled Issues. 1) Only approving planning applications that meet the "Inclusive Design Philosophy" (copy attached) In this respect I also attach "The Case for the Disabled Customer" undertaken by the Atkins Review. 2) EDDC to adopt the "Hampshire Building Control Partnership Guide to Accessible Design" (copy attached). I would particularly draw your attention to pages 11, 13 and 27. As a general comment I would add that just because an item complies with Part M of the Building Regs does not</p>		1071

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>The footway width outside the newly built shops in Station Road is only 1.5m which will surely result in an accident to pedestrians.</p> <p>Disabled Issues I find I cannot gain access to a number of shops in Verwood and the recently built new shops at Ferret Green are not disabled friendly as regards disabled access. As a result I avoid them and the doors to those shops I would consider exceed the recommended 20 Newtons.</p> <p>Parking problems - Public car park surgery Station Road When planning permission was granted for the Hub it was stated the overflow car park was the public car park adjacent to Verwood Surgery. Likewise the same was said again when planning permission was granted for The Herons when only 1 space per flat was allowed. Again when approval was granted for the proposed 29 flats (rear of the Police Station) with only 1 parking space per flat allocated it was stated that any additional vehicle overflow could use the above public car park.</p> <p>These planning applications were all dealt with individually without any thought to the combined collective consequences of the pressures it would place on the above car park. At the present moment there are constantly days when patients of the Verwood Surgery (including disabled) are unable to find a parking space and in addition staff at the surgery have also been unable to find a space in the staff car park The Practice Manager at the Surgery will confirm this as they have received many complaints from patients. The problem will be acute during the building of the 29 flats and will be exacerbated if the proposed 230 homes at the land west of Trinity School and land west of Eastworth Road went ahead. The reality is that the majority of people will not walk into town from these sites and in fact the elderly or disabled will be unable to do so. The idea that people will be discouraged from using their cars if no parking provision is made whilst laudable is totally unrealistic. Recently the paved footway area outside the surgery has had</p>	<p>necessarily mean it complies with Part 3 of the Disability Discrimination Act.</p> <p>1) Adequate parking provision is provided at new developments for both residents and visitors as often minimum requirements are insufficient.</p> <p>2) Use of the Hub car park during daylight hours for additional public parking.</p> <p>3) Notice in the Public Car Park to be erected saying "parking limited to two hours 7am - 7pm. Alternative parking available at Potters Wheel Car Park". No parking charges to be applied.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>1) An east-west bypass be included in the Core Strategy (this was on the agenda 20 years ago when traffic flow was significantly lower)</p> <p>2) The town centre to be pedestrianised vehicular traffic only for access, parking and deliveries.</p> <p>3) consideration of one way system for through traffic.</p> <p>4) alternative bypass routes using existing road infrastructure. On the 14th November 2010 during the remembrance service at Ferret Green all through traffic was diverted away from the town centre for some 30 minutes. This shows that other than building a new east-west</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>to be re-laid and bollards have been erected to prevent vehicles driving up to the surgery door and also to prevent parking on the paved footway by those vehicles unable to find a parking space.</p> <p>In addition to all the problems outlined above people do park their vehicles there all day and catch the bus to Bournemouth or Poole using their free bus passes.</p> <p>Traffic B3081</p> <p>Dorset County Council Traffic Counts undertaken in 1989, 1997, 2004 and 2007 show that there has been a hugely significant increase in traffic flow of 101% on 12 hour flow and 97% on 24 hour flow 7 day average. (Traffic is substantially lower on Sunday and therefore weekday figures will be in excess of the percentages stated above).</p> <p>Year Increase 12 hours 24 hours Increase</p> <p>1989 3938 4670</p> <p>1997 5368 6309</p> <p>2004 40% 5505 6529 40%</p> <p>2007 101% 7915 9181 97%</p> <p>2007 8567 9895 5 day average</p> <p>Up to 2004 there was a 40% increase in traffic flow which at that time Mr Paul Willis (DCC Group Policy Planning Manager) considered to be highly significant.</p> <p>As shown above that percentage increase has now risen from 40% to 97% and 101% in the space of three years from 2004 to 2007. I would regard this as hugely significant.</p> <p>There are no figures available for 2010 but I would suggest that since 2007 there has been a further substantial increase in traffic flow, one of the factors being the use of Sat Nav's which has increased both HGV and cars using the B3081 through Verwood to get to places further afield.</p> <p>This increase in traffic has a detrimental effect on the town centre by way of Noise, Pollution, Vibration, Road Safety and Environmental Concerns.</p> <p>Traffic will increase further in the coming years and could even double by 2027 particularly if there is further housing development in Verwood and this increased traffic flow will have serious consequences for the town centre.</p> <p>In looking forward to 2027 and a Town Centre 'Fit for the Future' with an increasing elderly population it is essential</p>	<p>bypass traffic could be diverted using Home Farm Road/Manor Road/Burnbake Road/Blackhill Road or Vicarage Road/Home Farm Road.</p> <p>5) Traffic calming measures or reduced carriageway or speed humps should be avoided due to emergence services in Station Road (eg Police, Fire Ambulances re Verwood Surgery) and the environmental impact on the town centre. The slower the traffic the greater the pollution and congestion. It is also well documented that speed humps damage vehicles (types, wheel joints etc thus creating road safety concerns), adversely affect disabled drivers/passengers and created vibration damage to the immediate surrounding area.</p> <p>6) A large retail store such as Wilkinson's should be encouraged to come to Verwood and also a traditional restaurant for midday and evening meals.</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							that other options are considered.			
518105	John Maskell		CSO17323	Preferred Option VWM 5		General Comment	<p>With regard to VWM5 - 6 (Town Centre Boundary and Vision) I could support the principle and the desire but think the 'horse has already left the stable' and that is will now be impossible to generate a single vibrant town centre. There will always be the old historic centre and Morrison's centre and with the proposed expansion Morrison's it seems likely this will over time become the overall centre, with only one shop! There seems little scope left in the historic centre for the types and size of retail outlets that are necessary to reduce the need of Verwood residents to travel the large distances for decent shopping. I could see a number of smaller independent/specialist shops being opened but for the majority of purchases, except for food, the need for travel will still exist.</p> <p>The new HUB is struggling financially and there is a strong risk the Police/Fire Stations may become untenable. Within what could have been to be used to create a more distinctive centre a large block of flats was constructed and I see now further hoardings have been erected, presumably for more flats; what another wasted opportunity!</p> <p>To conclude I think it is time for Verwood to be left to consolidate as we are managing improvements as we can and as money becomes available.</p> <p>Improvements provided they are the right improvements, generated by the Morrison's expansion are welcome and should be encouraged.</p> <p>The other towns in East Dorset may think too much investment has been made in Verwood but Ferndown, Wimborne, Christchurch and the like have not expanded at the same rate as Verwood and have not been left in such a mess either.</p> <p>I have been a resident in Verwood since 1986 and have seen most of the rapid expansion and along with a large number of others have sat back and done nothing about it. The Verwood apathy is no more, please listen to what we have to say. I appreciate some of it will be highly emotive, probably vitriolic and some downright rude but amongst all of it there will be a great deal of sense and constructive comments. Please</p>			1071

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Listen!			
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 582	Preferred Option VWM 5		General Comment	Chapter 11 - Verwood and West Moors Our main concern regarding development area is foul drainage and the capacity of Palmerford Sewage Treatment Works (STW). This is discussed below. All options Foul Drainage The effluent capacity at Palmersford STW is currently unknown. This is particularly relevant because development in Verwood is believed to connect to this STW, and this settlement is part of the Core Strategy. The capacity of Palmersford STW and associated infrastructure must be established as part of the Core Strategy evidence. Overall issues for consideration are: surface water drainage; SUDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter			1071
478224	Mrs Julia Goodwin		CSO18 299	Preferred Option VWM 5		General Comment				1071
522240	Association Verwood Residents	Chairman Association Verwood Residents	CSO18 105	Preferred Option VWM 5	Object		VWM 5 – Designate new Town Centre Boundaries This proposal will not fully address the issue regarding the formation of a vibrant Town Centre for Verwood. There will still be the twin centres of the old historic centre and the other at Morrison's Supermarket with no strategy to link the two together either now or in the future.			1071
533905	Mr & Mrs A Kell		CSO19 252	Preferred Option VWM 5	Object		The town centre boundary as proposed is already complete and bitty, being intersected by housing and the only main road. There is no room for further quality development, or room for more car parking.			1071
535361	Mr Jonathan Ewing		CSO19 847	Preferred Option VWM 5	Object					1071

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535695	Robin Peirce		CSO20469	Preferred Option VWM 5		No Opinion				1071
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22891	Preferred Option VWM 5	Object		Option VWM5 Strongly object Pl. also see comments on Key Issue Paper 9 and preferred option KS16 It is not a good idea to including the flats at the junction of Edmondsham Road/Moorlands Road/Ringwood Road in the Primary Shopping Area. Presumably the longer term vision is that they should be demolished resulting in loss of homes. Having closed off access to Edmondsham Road from Ringwood Road this would mean that service and delivery vehicles would need to drive down Edmondsham Road to access the rear of the units. Additional private cars would also use this residential road (which is too narrow for pavements) and Moorlands Road and Coronation Road would have further problems with on-street parking. With Club 31, the Bowls Club and the Band Hall as well as private homes and the school run traffic the whole of this area could become chaotic and unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists.			1071
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		CSO22853	Preferred Option VWM 5	Support		Proposals accepted.			1071
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO234	Preferred Option VWM 6	Object		I dont think Verwood needs a town centre as such, most people commute out for work and facilities and amenities so the footfall in the town centre would not encourage shops to open. however, evening entertainment might flourish.			1075
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2561	Preferred Option VWM 6	Support					1075
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		CSO2589	Preferred Option VWM 6	Object		I support the text, however, my objection is to the lack of comment about the secondary 'centre' at Morrisons supermarket.	Include a statement about the degree to which development at the Morrisons site in Pennine Way will or will not be supported.		1075

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
359890	Mrs G.M. PROWSE		CSO11361	Preferred Option VWM 6	Support		I support the establishment of a Town Centre being consolidated.			1075
359547	Mrs V BRIGHT	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17959	Preferred Option VWM 6	Support	General Comment	Stongly support See also KS16 & 18 and VWM5 Although the draft core strategy talks about Verwood having a "vibrant" centre, most residents agree that this does not exist, and maybe never will. We would like to see EDDC's vision on what needs to be done to improve this situation for the benefits of the residents. This is addressed further under KS1, 16 & 18 and VWM5 & 6.			1075
359894	Mr D.S Medlycott		CSO17611	Preferred Option VWM 6	Object		Town Centre issues I wish to draw your attention to problems that occur on a daily basis in Verwood, namely on-street deliveris ans lack of public parking provision. I consider that it is essential that these problems are resolved before any additional shops or housing are added. If this is not done then the existing problems will simply be compounded thus creating conflict and a most unsatisfactory environment for all. On-Street Deliveries There is a distinct lack of off road parking for delivery vehicles including the newly built shops at Ferret Green and those on Station Road opposite the parade of shops. The result is vehicles park partly on the road and pavement or wholly on the pavement. This has the effect of: 1) Damaging kerbs and pavements 2) Creating road safety issues for pedestrians 3) Blocking of pavements for parents with buggies and disabled (this will become of greater concern with an ever increasing aging population) I myself use a large electric wheelchair and I often find I cannot get past such vehicles and on occasions I have had to travel on the roadway against the flow of traffic in Manor Road. I gave Kate Tunks (DCC- Highways Transportation) at the focus group meeting a number of photographs of such	I suggest 1) consideration should be given to only approving planning appliations if there is off road parking provision for deliveries. 2) Consideration to possibly introducing times for deliveries or excluding deliveries during set times 3) approving only applications that meet "The Good Practise Guidelines" relating to footways and footpaths. These require a width of 3500-4500mm outside of shops and a preferred obstacle free footway width of 2000mm. Disabled Issues. 1) Only approving planning applications that meet the "Inclusive Design Philosophy" (copy attached) In this respect I also attach "The Case for the Disabled Customer" undertaken by the Atkins Review.		1075

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>incidents and I have previously given photographs to Councillors Coombs and Flower (I have further copies available if required).</p> <p>In the early morning and at other times there is often one or sometimes two very large articulated delivery vehicles for Tesco Express as well as a similar type of vehicle delivering large electrical goods to Baileys which are parked on opposite sides of Ringwood Road. This creates traffic congestion and road safety dangers. In addition it is extremely hazardous to exit the Tesco car park or the Potters Wheel car park at that time.</p> <p>The footway width outside the newly built shops in Station Road is only 1.5m which will surely result in an accident to pedestrians.</p> <p>Disabled Issues I find I cannot gain access to a number of shops in Verwood and the recently built new shops at Ferret Green are not disabled friendly as regards disabled access. As a result I avoid them and the doors to those shops I would consider exceed the recommended 20 Newtons.</p> <p>Parking problems - Public car park surgery Station Road When planning permission was granted for the Hub it was stated the overflow car park was the public car park adjacent to Verwood Surgery. Likewise the same was said again when planning permission was granted for The Herons when only 1 space per flat was allowed. Again when approval was granted for the proposed 29 flats (rear of the Police Station) with only 1 parking space per flat allocated it was stated that any additional vehicle overflow could use the above public car park.</p> <p>These planning applications were all dealt with individually without any thought to the combined collective consequences of the pressures it would place on the above car park. At the present moment there are constantly days when patients of the Verwood Surgery (including disabled) are unable to find a parking space and in addition staff at the surgery have also been unable to find a space in the staff car park The Practice Manager at the Surgery will confirm this as they have received many complaints from patients.</p>	<p>2) EDDC to adopt the "Hampshire Building Control Partnership Guide to Accessible Design" (copy attached). I would particularly draw your attention to pages 11, 13 and 27.</p> <p>As a general comment I would add that just because an item complies with Part M of the Building Regs does not necessarily mean it complies with Part 3 of the Disability Discrimination Act.</p> <p>1) Adequate parking provision is provided at new developments for both residents and visitors as often minimum requirements are insufficient.</p> <p>2) Use of the Hub car park during daylight hours for additional public parking.</p> <p>3) Notice in the Public Car Park to be erected saying "parking limited to two hours 7am - 7pm. Alternative parking available at Potters Wheel Car Park". No parking charges to be applied.</p> <p>Transport 1) An east-west bypass be included in the Core Strategy (this was on the agenda 20 years ago when traffic flow was significantly lower) 2) The town centre to be pedestrianised vehicular traffic only for access, parking and deliveries. 3) consideration of one way</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>The problem will be acute during the building of the 29 flats and will be exacerbated if the proposed 230 homes at the land west of Trinity School and land west of Eastworth Road went ahead.</p> <p>The reality is that the majority of people will not walk into town from these sites and in fact the elderly or disabled will be unable to do so.</p> <p>The idea that people will be discouraged from using their cars if no parking provision is made whilst laudable is totally unrealistic.</p> <p>Recently the paved footway area outside the surgery has had to be re-laid and bollards have been erected to prevent vehicles driving up to the surgery door and also to prevent parking on the paved footway by those vehicles unable to find a parking space.</p> <p>In addition to all the problems outlined above people do park their vehicles there all day and catch the bus to Bournemouth or Poole using their free bus passes.</p> <p>Traffic B3081</p> <p>Dorset County Council Traffic Counts undertaken in 1989, 1997, 2004 and 2007 show that there has been a hugely significant increase in traffic flow of 101% on 12 hour flow and 97% on 24 hour flow 7 day average. (Traffic is substantially lower on Sunday and therefore weekday figures will be in excess of the percentages stated above).</p> <p>Year Increase 12 hours 24 hours Increase 1989 3938 4670 1997 5368 6309 2004 40% 5505 6529 40% 2007 101% 7915 9181 97% 2007 8567 9895 5 day average</p> <p>Up to 2004 there was a 40% increase in traffic flow which at that time Mr Paul Willis (DCC Group Policy Planning Manager) considered to be highly significant.</p> <p>As shown above that percentage increase has now risen from 40% to 97% and 101% in the space of three years from 2004 to 2007. I would regard this as hugely significant.</p> <p>There are no figures available for 2010 but I would suggest that since 2007 there has been a further substantial increase in traffic flow, one of the factors being the use of Sat Nav's</p>	<p>system for through traffic.</p> <p>4) alternative bypass routes using existing road infrastructure. On the 14th November 2010 during the remembrance service at Ferret Green all through traffic was diverted away from the town centre for some 30 minutes. This shows that other than building a new east-west bypass traffic could be diverted using Home Farm Road/Manor Road/Burnbake Road/Blackhill Road or Vicarage Road/Home Farm Road.</p> <p>5) Traffic calming measures or reduced carriageway or speed humps should be avoided due to emergence services in Station Road (eg Police, Fire Ambulances re Verwood Surgery) and the environmental impact on the town centre. The slower the traffic the greater the pollution and congestion. It is also well documented that speed humps damage vehicles (types, wheel joints etc thus creating road safety concerns), adversely affect disabled drivers/passengers and created vibration damage to the immediate surrounding area.</p> <p>6) A large retail store such as Wilkinson's should be encouraged to come to Verwood and also a traditional restaurant for midday and evening meals.</p>		

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>which has increased both HGV and cars using the B3081 through Verwood to get to places further afield. This increase in traffic has a detrimental effect on the town centre by way of Noise, Pollution, Vibration, Road Safety and Environmental Concerns.</p> <p>Traffic will increase further in the coming years and could even double by 2027 particularly if there is further housing development in Verwood and this increased traffic flow will have serious consequences for the town centre.</p> <p>In looking forward to 2027 and a Town Centre 'Fit for the Future' with an increasing elderly population it is essential that other options are considered.</p>			
361026	Mr Steve Hellier	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	CSO17 755	Preferred Option VWM 6	Support		The Agency supports Verwood's continuing role as a key town in East Dorset. Balanced, mixed use development is supported alongside sustainable transport provision.			1075
518105	John Maskell		CSO17 327	Preferred Option VWM 6		General Comment	<p>With regard to VWM5 - 6 (Town Centre Boundary and Vision) I could support the principle and the desire but think the 'horse has already left the stable' and that is will now be impossible to generate a single vibrant town centre. There will always be the old historic centre and Morrison's centre and with the proposed expansion Morrison's it seems likely this will over time become the overall centre, with only one shop! There seems little scope left in the historic centre for the types and size of retail outlets that are necessary to reduce the need of Verwood residents to travel the large distances for decent shopping. I could see a number of smaller independent/specialist shops being opened but for the majority of purchases, except for food, the need for travel will still exist.</p> <p>The new HUB is struggling financially and there is a strong risk the Police/Fire Stations may become untenable. Within what could have been to be used to create a more distinctive centre a large block of flats was constructed and I see now further hoardings have been erected, presumably for more flats; what another wasted opportunity!</p> <p>To conclude I think it is time for Verwood to be left to</p>			1075

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>consolidate as we are managing improvements as we can as money becomes available.</p> <p>Improvements provided they are the right improvements, generated by the Morrison's expansion are welcome and should be encouraged.</p> <p>The other towns in East Dorset may think too much investment has been made in Verwood but Ferndown, Wimborne, Christchurch and the like have not expanded at the same rate as Verwood and have not been left in such a mess either.</p> <p>I have been a resident in Verwood since 1986 and have seen most of the rapid expansion and along with a large number of others have sat back and done nothing about it. The Verwood apathy is no more, please listen to what we have to say. I appreciate some of it will be highly emotive, probably vitriolic and some downright rude but amongst all of it there will be a great deal of sense and constructive comments. Please Listen!</p>			
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17583	Preferred Option VWM 6		General Comment	<p>Chapter 11 - Verwood and West Moors</p> <p>Our main concern regarding development area is foul drainage and the capacity of Palmerford Sewage Treatment Works (STW). This is discussed below.</p> <p>All options</p> <p>Foul Drainage</p> <p>The effluent capacity at Palmersford STW is currently unknown. This is particularly relevant because development in Verwood is believed to connect to this STW, and this settlement is part of the Core Strategy. The capacity of Palmersford STW and associated infrastructure must be established as part of the Core Strategy evidence.</p> <p>Overall issues for consideration are: surface water drainage; SUDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter</p>			1075
521457	Mr and Mrs		CSO17	Preferred		General	There is no opportunity left to create a credible town centre;			1075

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	M Daymond		849	Option VWM 6		Comment	the "District Centre" planned for the area around Morrisons was not completed and housing was built instead. The residents of this new housing were then allowed by EDDC to impede on the delivery hours to the supermarket, thus creating a chaotic service within the store as shelves are loaded during open hours. Bakers Farm has been filled up with flats and there is no other open space available in the traditional town centre.			
522240	Association Verwood Residents	Chairman Association Verwood Residents	CSO18 108	Preferred Option VWM 6	Object		– Vision for Verwood Town Centre Whilst the vision for the Town Centre as set out in the Core Strategy can be supported there is no content that describes how this can be achieved. Can the Town Council continue to support the Hub financially and for how long, before it is privatised or shut down? Why was the large block of flats behind the Police and Fire Stations allowed on prime land that could be used to enhance the retail element of the vibrant Town Centre we all wish to see? Even now more construction is about to commence but will not add one iota to the vision as expressed in the Core Strategy.			1075
533905	Mr & Mrs A Kell		CSO19 253	Preferred Option VWM 6	Object		Verwood Town Centre is not an ideal town centre and can never be adequately or attractively developed, let alone be a key town centre in East Dorset offering good services. There is a need for a wider variety of shops and roads and open spaces. One of the new proposed development sites could provide an alternative centre if the communication links were satisfactory. The cultural facilities already provided by the Hub are serviced by just one road out into the main Ringwood Road. The Hub, where large numbers of people gather, is sharing this access with a main Day Centre, three blocks of flats, the Chemist, the Medical Centre, a parade of houses and the Veterinary Clinic. Is that adequate planning by the local Council? Yet you still want to make a bad situation worse. I would say this is very bad planning. Always think emergency services, and how can people be catered for, who need to access or leave such an area. We appreciate there is the need for an ever increasing			1075

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							population, but the facilities and amenities in Verwood must keep apace and provide adequately for any new developments.			
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO235	11.116	Object		After consulting some teachers, Verwood schools with the help of Cranborne have the capacity. Verwood needs an upper school now not to be bribed with more homes for one. We are the largest town without an Upper School so please get the details and maps on this document for the school and where the access will be, how many kids will it take, what would be the catchment area, WHERE ARE THESE DETAILS? Again no link to document is this a fair consultation			1077
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO237	11.118	Object		If the options are supported at Verwood we'll give you an Upper School. Well I do feel most annoyed with this calculated statement, we should have one now, we have as much need if not more for an upper school here than more houses and traffic. Please amend this statement. Also that's not true, Toni Coombs told me that if all the options went through in the other towns Verwood might get one at some point!			1079
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO532	11.118	Object		In conclusion, the current plans ensure there is no capacity in upper schools within driving distance and there will be no funding for an upper school in Verwood. Where will children in east Dorset go to school in the future? Perhaps facilities and infrastructure need to be investigated and actioned by the council before proceeding with investigation into the provision of housing.			1079
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		CSO2592	11.118	Object		Whilst you preface the wording '...that a secondary school would have to be provided in the town' by saying that housing developments in Wimborne and Ferndown might overwhelm the current secondary school provision, a new upper school is not going to be built in Verwood for the children of that age associated with 415 new houses. It is the overall demand that will dictate the need for an additional school.	Revise the wording to say that the overall upper school requirement will (or may) demand a new school: Verwood being the prime site in consideration for such a school.		1079
522117	Mrs Hilary		CSO22892	11.118		General Comment	Comment A possible need to extend one of the first Schools or build a fourth is identified here but no provision is made for			1079

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Chittenden						this in the land use proposals or in the identification of the infrastructure that would be required. There appears to be no consideration of additional Middle School provision.			
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO238	11.121	Object		This plan does not do this for Verwood			1082
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO533	11.121	Object		"Development Plans should promote development that creates socially inclusive communities, including suitable mixes of housing. Policies shouldaddress accessibility (both in terms of location and physical access) for all members of the community to jobs, health, housing, education, shops, leisure and community facilities. (PPS1)" A good comment, failing in the fact that no facilities are in place or will be put in place by this strategy document. No new jobs, health, education, shops, leisure and community facilities to be provided by this document....only housing developments.			1082
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO388	11.126	Support		However within this document there is no provision for younger people, and yet increased housing will put more stress and pressure on this issue. There is still no explanation why previously agreed plans have still not being implemented by this Council.	Explanation of why previous agreed plans have not being implemented and provision to reevaluate the situation with a commitment to action		1087
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		CSO22854	11.126	Support		Verwood Educational Requirements: 11.126: Agreed: need for access to services and facilities etc., Suggest: use of (charity) mobile youth bus, now operating on the streets of Ringwood, every Saturday night, plans to go to Alderholt, February 2011! Potential to expand usage into Verwood, with local support and funding!			1087
478045	Mr Chris Archibold		CSO389	11.131	Support		But this provision is not simply a new school. It is an investment into all areas for young people.			1092
479808	Mr Robert Anderson		CSO73	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I support the need for additional housing in Verwood, however housing cannot be delivered without the need for the Council to support the infrastructure of Verwood. This is why I	Disappointed that a similar review was not carried out for sports / recreational facilities.		1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							am pleased to see that any recommendation to deliver additional housing is coupled with the need to deliver an Upper School in Verwood. I am disappointed that more / better sports facilities are not also recommended, however this could be catered for by the sports facilities of the school. I recommend Dorset council should make the delivery of an Upper School mandatory - if additional homes are to be built and that assurances be also made during the decision making process that the necessary funding to deliver education facilities is in place. Delivering additional homes without additional facilities would be wholly wrong.			
477183	Mrs Sarah Sumner		CSO239	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		<p>I hope so, aslong as only the playing field is in the boundary and the children are secure within it. Please provide more details.</p> <p>Bearing in mind the Upper School site is within 400m of heathland, is it possible to move this site to North Verwood where there seems to be better transport links for it, just questionable access (as with most of the developments). There are main roads that nearly get to the site which could handle buses far better than the Southern Site, access from Station Rd would be preferred. I appreciate the LA have already acquired the land and to make some use of it, could we have Allotments here / Extend Emmanuel?</p> <p>Also, would it be cheaper to have a 2 tier system in Verwood for Education, and has this been considered. The first schools would have to expand to take up to 11 years old, or possibly a new junior school built on the Eastworth Farm site. Emmanuel could be extended to be the Senior School with a possible Bus drop off point away from the Howe Lane area as it is already congested. Cycle routes would have to be incorporate on the main roads, and traffic calming measures introduced.</p> <p>If this happened the Springfield road link would not be required allowing the funds to be used else where, I.e, an Upper School or Leisure.</p> <p>Can this Upper School use Geothermal energy to save costs.</p>			1093
361055	Mr David		CSO1024	Preferred Option	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	OAKLEY			VWM 7						
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO534	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Verwood desperately requires an upper school. This document however does not provide planning or funding for such a development within the next 15 years.			1093
490570	Mrs Patricia RYAN		CSO1038	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		As a resident of Verwood I feel that it already does not have the facilities to support a town of this size, so an increase in housing seems like madness. The main Ringwood road is already very hard to access at the best of times, without more cars being added.			1093
490846	Karen COOMBS		CSO1062	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		This development school and houses in Verwood (VWM3 and VWM7) shouldn't be allowed to go ahead unless the access roads are improved. At the moment the majority of traffic goes down Margards Lane causing problems 8 - 9am and 3 - 4pm. Another access route would be essential.			1093
490854	D MUTTON		CSO1070	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I only support the home development south of Howe Lane and south of Manor Road if Howe Lane and St Michael Road are adopted and improved to provide additional access to the additional homes etc (school). Margards Lane/Church Hill already have more than enough traffic congestion at times. From SNAP: The support of those areas of Verwood marked as 'supported' is dependent on an improved road access - especially in respect of Howe Lane, which needs to be adopted. Margards Lane/Church Hill are already over-loaded with traffic at certain times of the day. This could be relieved by re-opening the northern arm of Church Hill onto Manor Road - with 'left turn only' at this point			1093
495558	Linda Raybould		CSO1500	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
495562	Mr MJ Banting		CSO1520	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
495625	Mr		CSO15	Preferred	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Michael McMath		47	Option VWM 7						
496188	Mr RE Vogel		CSO16 27	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
496338	Mr John Clough		CSO16 54	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Recent roadworks on the B3081 have demonstrated how fragile the routes in and out of Verwood are. More housing will make the situation worse. Recent disastrous developments including the Fairwood site clearly demonstrate the insensitivity of planning within Verwood. I can see no need for supporting further development when it is clear the needs of existing residents are being disregarded and our environment damaged without thought or consideration for the future. I continue to travel to Ringwood and Ferndown for town amenities until such time as these are available in Verwood. I strongly object to further development.			1093
496462	Mr and Mrs Guy Jameson		CSO16 81	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Before developing hundreds of homes the local infrastructure in Verwood requires enhancements. If a senior school is required in Verwood then a suitable site needs to be found. Land that is protected by green belt status must be respected and adhered to.			1093
496479	Charlotte Dixon		CSO17 22	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
496526	Mr Dennis Barrow		CSO17 39	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I support the building of a new secondary school in Howe Lane as long as the Springfield Distributor Road is put in place before any building work starts to improve the access and traffic flow to the school campus.			1093
496564	JH Lockwood		CSO17 61	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
496612	Mr and Mrs JP Lovell		CSO18 20	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360714	Carol Morgan		CSO2036	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
360734	Mr Nick Moulton	Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust	CSO2345	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		ARC would have to object to this proposal. An additional school would directly impact upon the quality of the nearby heathland sites. These sites already have very high public use and misuse eg. deliberate arson, generally by children of school age.			1093
361111	Mr Raymond Brown		CSO2085	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
361170	Mr TR HARVEY		CSO2858	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
484088	Mr David Price		CSO2534	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
486422	Mr Vic Redpath		CSO2562	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Support, provided robust traffic management measures and transport infrastructure improvements are implemented before the school is opened.			1093
491311	Mr Kevin GILLING		CSO2718	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
495971	T A Reith		CSO2250	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
496958	Mrs J Beech		CSO1942	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
497026	Doreen Smith		CSO2005	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		This amount of building will create extra traffic in Ferndown and Parley which already has a lot of road build up in the busy morning and evening travel.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Also taking a lot of natural land for our wild life.			
497089	Mr Frank A Soan		CSO21 13	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
497184	Mr Hilling		CSO22 21	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
497223	AJ Marvin		CSO22 36	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		In favour An upper school will reduce traffic in and out of town save money and environmentally friendly-needs access road improvement from Margarts/Church Hill.			1093
497343	Sharon Sutcliffe		CSO22 84	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
497773	R Johnstone		CSO24 87	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Regarding Verwood proposals, i think the town needs more infrastructure before expansion. There is no cinema, swimming pool and a lack of small shops in the centre, Morrisons is not the "be all and end all". The traffic at present (connected with the VWM 7 proposal) is already clogging our streets twice a day. New facilities (housing and schooling) will increase the street parking problems for residents as there is no sensible drop off points in the schools campus. New roads invariably draw in more traffic. More needs to be done to encourage children to walk to school and for cars to be left in the garage. I have witnessed ladies who arrive early for the pick up to "reserve" their street parking and when I challenged the lady for parking on the pavement, found she lived in Haywards Cres.			1093
498044	Carolyne BANKS		CSO26 85	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Use the newer out-of-town developments to extend housing - after all that's what they were created for ie: Verwood, Corfe Mullen, Sturminster Marshall. Don't cram more development into existing residential areas in town.			1093
498047	CD Bradford		CSO26 63	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
498051	Mrs Mary Connor		CSO2681	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
498062	Mr Nick Crawford		CSO2750	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
498078	G Sims		CSO2734	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Gives the young a chance of buying affordable homes and a secondary school which is needed.			1093
498084	Mr P HARTLEY		CSO2767	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
498122	Williams		CSO2781	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
498125	Mr and Mrs P DASHWOOD		CSO2803	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
498133	Mrs Dowling		CSO2830	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The opinions of Verwoodians seem to count for nothing, the unsightly, unwanted, unneeded building at Blackhill being a good example.			1093
360037	Mr Dave BARNES		CSO4056	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
361041	Mr & Mrs G K HAMPTON		CSO4028	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
361106	Mr and Mrs Robin and Janet WALL		CSO3683	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
497947	Mr Guy Brooker		CSO25 94	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I consider this proposal to be absolute madness in view of traffic problems that already exist. I am aware that there is circulating the idea of calling for 'robust traffic management' as a prerequisite of this development. This is such an indefinite term as to be meaningless and doesn't address the fundamental issue of the location of Emmanuel School at the far end of extensive housing development served by minor roads. Instead the upper school should be sited at the Manor Road development site.	Change the use of VWM7 land to housing.		1093
498160	Mrs Gwendoline Martin		CSO28 82	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		When road is improved will support			1093
498169	Mrs D WEAVER		CSO29 06	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
498184	Mrs Angela BARKER		CSO29 33	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
498268	Mr and Mrs R Cullen		CSO30 17	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
498271	Mandy CHEESEM AN		CSO30 67	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
498335	Mr and Mrs Lester		CSO32 25	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
498386	Mr & Mrs DL & MD Thompson		CSO31 35	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The scheme meets government demands for future housing using land which will not cause problems to existing residents - good planning to incorporate ancillary components of the scheme - ie balance cost for housing, transport needs and schooling. Overall a well thought out scheme which hopefully will reduce the need for high density schemes to be built within the town's current planning belt.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							NB If The Hub had been as well thought out at planning we would not have been facing the current problems.			
498711	Mr Tam Chant		CSO3408	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
498996	M E CLARKE		CSO3468	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
499044	Mrs Carolyn MASKELL		CSO3495	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
499231	Mrs A Lathbury		CSO3540	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
499236	J PIPE		CSO3555	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
499245	Mr and Mrs N BUTLER		CSO3587	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
499261	Mrs Norma JACKSON		CSO3623	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
499271	Mrs P Giles		CSO3624	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
499290	Mrs Lisa TURNBULL		CSO3655	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		SNAP:The land south of Manor Road in particular is a wildlife rich area of Green Belt. Road infrastructure, risk of flooding/drainage concerns and an area of natural beauty suggests to me that this area is wholly unsuitable for any development. The impact on the already congested southern entrance to Verwood along Manor Road would become an			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							issue as well as protecting residence of St Michaels Road including the listed St Michaels Cottage. Any proposed development here will have an adverse effect on the whole area and the key issues of "sustainable development" and "impact on the environment" MUST be looked at carefully to show that this area should not be developed.			
360685	Mr M.P HOSE		CSO4646	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
496396	Mrs Jill Freer		CSO3755	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
498495	Mr John Williams		CSO3731	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
499291	R S Welch		CSO3690	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
499384	Mr A I ROSE		CSO3730	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Verwood seems to be adormitory with no town centre (scattered development). All the talk when I moved to the area in 1978 was 'Wessex City'. What happened? Is this the first stage of completing the arc around the Poole/Bournemouth conurbation? If this is so, develop southwards, west of the Moors River, flood plains permitting and there is the planners utopia for the 22nd century.			1093
499481	Mr John MARTIN		CSO3801	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
499551	Rachel TYLER		CSO3833	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The main focus of my support is for a new upper school in Verwood. Even without the increase in housing there is a desperate need for this, along with the added community facilities this will bring. For children from outlying villages, they have a longer journey than Verwood children to QE currently. A new upper school would also shorten their travel distances			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							considerably, i.e: Cranborne / Sixpenny Handley etc. As a parent of 2 children aged 8 and 3, I just hope it comes in time for them. I have real concerns about the travel involved for my girls to Wimborne, especially as they currently walk to school.			
499683	S Crotch-Harvey		CSO3879	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		A new school in Verwood seems environmentally sensible rather than bussing children 7 miles			1093
499873	Mr Graham Holt		CSO4000	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
500060	Mr Stuart PIDDOCK		CSO4085	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
500132	Mrs Margaret Ann Barham		CSO4143	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Sheer volume of traffic! Already at saturation point on Margards Lane and speed of traffic!!!	1: Situate school in another area. 2: Adopt Springfield Road, Manor Lane and all Hove Lane for better vehicular access. Thereby diverting traffic away from Margards Lane.		1093
500222	S Hartley		CSO4443	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
500350	Mr P H BARTLETT		CSO4229	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
500361	Mr and Miss N and A Middleton and Turner		CSO4272	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
500394	Mrs Sandra		CSO4293	Preferred Option	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	HOWES			VWM 7						
500418	Mr and Mrs S H YATES		CSO4300	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood already has too many houses because there is an inadequate infrastructure, especially roads. Howe Lane in particular needs to be improved to provide alternative access to the existing schools. A new school on this site, even with Howe Lane improvements, would create gridlock with only 2 means of access.			1093
500427	Mrs D J LYONS		CSO4319	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
500558	A Baker		CSO4371	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
500697	Mr Thomas SMITH		CSO4501	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
500706	R & J Jeans		CSO4544	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
500720	Mrs VALLIER		CSO4546	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
500748	Mrs Lauren MATTHEW S		CSO4596	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
500802	J Hayward		CSO4721	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
500807	Mr and Mrs K E EYRES		CSO4668	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Paragraph 11.9 of the Core Strategy options document for Verwood and West Moors states that Verwood has a GOOD ROAD LINK to the A31(T) and the A338. This road, part of			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the B3081, is TOTALLY INADEQUATE for the volume of traffic it carries in both directions. An unacceptable number of FATAL ACCIDENTS between Verwood and Ringwood have occurred in recent years. This road should be UPGRADED TO DUAL CARRIAGEWAY before any further development is allowed in Verwood.</p> <p>Furthermore, most of the other routes through the town which link to the B3081 - Manor Road, Lake Road, Woodlinken Drive, Burnbake Road, Newtown Road, Newtown Lane - to name but a few, are in a TERRIBLE STATE OF REPAIR, mainly due to adjacent development accessing the underground services, followed by POOR QUALITY, and often TEMPORARY repairs to the road surface. Again these issues need to be addressed before further development is permitted.</p> <p>A new Secondary school is a definite requirement for a Town of Verwood's size, but it must have ADEQUATE VEHICULAR ACCESS. Surely the land to the West of Trinity School, close to the Southern and Western relief roads, would be a better option than the Emmanuel Campus. This would give some relief to the long suffering residents of St. Michaels Road, Howe Lane and Margards Lane.</p>			
500836	Mrs Sylvia Hines		CSO4736	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
500903	Mr and Mrs S and R Harris		CSO4789	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
500999	Mrs JD Burton		CSO4808	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Regarding Verwood. We need more doctors, shops, buses, to cope with extra property			1093
501012	Louise ARNOLD		CSO4885	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
501069	Mr and Mrs R		CSO4925	Preferred Option	Object		Verwood does not have enough existing facilities for us who already live here.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Rich			VWM 7			1 - Doctors 2 - Dentists 3 - Local shops. We moved here years ago to get away from continuous road noise and heavy traffic and to have a nice green environment which will be spoilt by your plans.			
501090	Mr and Mrs Gee		CSO49 39	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Fully support the need for a secondary school in Verwood. But is the funding really available to build one? Would the building of a secondary school be at the cost of losing our two middle schools at Emmanuel and Cranborne? Concerned that these new houses which are needed to be built and the school will never arrive due to funding which will leave the residents of Verwood with lack of facilities and the middle schools overcrowded.			1093
501106	Mr John Victor Rogers		CSO49 53	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Verwood needs more housing to ensure that we have a secondary school and an increase in population will help to secure the future of the "Hub". And Morrisons will have to enlarge which will benefit us all and the land in this area is only suitable for housing not "crops".			1093
501107	Mr & Mrs E C Lacey		CSO50 35	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The impact of the proposed development in Verwood would be to fundamentally change the feel of the town. There will be no increased employment opportunities for the growing population. We are concerned about the congestion that will occur in Springfield Road if it is adopted and linked to Howe Lane and also have great concerns about the decrease in the value of our property if our front garden decreases in size due to more land being needed for the distributor road. This in turn would lead to large compensation payments being made to residents in a time of economic hardship.			1093
501118	Mr Ron Cook		CSO50 25	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
501135	Charlie Wassell		CSO50 53	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Only homeless people should be able to object to the building of new homes. Residents should consider how to improve facilities. Developers should contribute to improving facilities.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
501235	Mr and Mrs J Churchward		CSO5137	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood is big enough, the infrastructure just can't take any more homes and people. Our supermarket struggles to cope, the doctors are full and maybe before planning is granted trips should be made in and out of Verwood during the rush hour. Both roads out are like the M25 a constant stream of traffic, and then when an accident occurs and they do it grinds to a halt all the roads are gridlocked. Imagine the extra cars adding to this situation. This is greenbelt land , keeping Verwood the size it is, adding houses and the necessary road system will ruin this rural town.			1093
501261	Mr and Mrs Jeffries		CSO5168	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
501351	Mr and Mrs R D'Cruze		CSO5255	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
501485	Mrs J JACKSON		CSO5299	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
501488	Chris LAMB		CSO5333	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
501502	Mr Michael WAREHAM		CSO5381	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
501512	Donald Gray		CSO5418	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
501515	Mrs A Ryan		CSO5420	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
501520	Mrs Z		CSO5453	Preferred Option	Object					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	MERRIFIELD			VWM 7						
501523	Rita Gilbert		CSO5500	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
501525	G Pearson		CSO5483	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		For over 20 years the council planners have rode roughshod over residents wishes, totally ignoring the fact everyone wanted no more housing development in the town. The councils obsession with high density and so called 'affordable housing' was neither wanted or desired by the majority of residents. The monstrosity being built on the former Fairwood Pub site is just one example of council attitude.			1093
501542	Mr and Mrs STRACHAN		CSO5533	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Please do not accept any community centre / halls or leisure centre as a corporate inducement from developers of housing developments. In my experience they hardly ever work and cost a great deal in subsidy for councils each and every year. ie. Verwood Hub; Lenham, Kent; Ditton, Nr Maidstone, Kent. My ref: 10 years as a Parish Councillor in Ditton, Kent.			1093
501560	Mr Christopher CLARKE		CSO5591	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
359908	Mr F.D.A REVILL		CSO6265	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
359927	Mrs Ann BISSEX		CSO6384	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The green belt should not be encroached on any further. No building should be allowed on flood plains. Much more serious effort needs to be put into reducing necessity of relying on car travel.			1093
501583	Mrs Jean Russell		CSO5693	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		This has been considered before, e.g. when the new houses were built in Howe Lane and beyond St. Michael's Cottage, what happened to that money? Also the developers statement 'will contribute to transport improvements' will they? I rather doubt it considering their previous track record. The holes in Howe Lane and St. Michael's Road bear			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>testimony to this. Try driving along these roads! An accident waiting to happen. No one in this area wants this dreadful plan implemented. It seems to have escaped your notice, that we shall all end up under water. There should not be any more houses / flats in this particular area, there are far too many dreadful flats and developments in gardens and how could all those dreadful developments on the edge of the town ever gained approval? They are a disgrace. Verwood used to be a pleasant place to live when we moved here 39 years ago. Look at it now! Are you proud of the 'improvements'?!! No one else is. I realise that housing is needed. To go ahead with this plan will be a disaster and how did you decide to fall in with the plans / request to sell off this land, just because the owners could sell it at a very good profit? It is possible that they will not be living in the water? I think not.</p> <p>The present infrastructure will not sustain such a large project as this and the drains in Manor Road are at full capacity now. Even more water will accumulate as the leaves fall.</p>			
501616	R J Joyce		CSO6025	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
501626	Mrs J A Russell		CSO5768	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
501694	Mr R BRYAN		CSO5800	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
501699	B THOMAS		CSO5827	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
501720	Dr and Mrs D HARLOW		CSO5926	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
501761	Mr		CSO60	Preferred		No				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	D Curtis		24	Option VWM 7		Opinion				
501867	Mrs I M Marks		CSO63 11	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
501873	Mr and Mrs Harold A and D Joan Lilley		CSO63 17	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		All proposals of this nature have a number of basic needs. One of the most important is infrastructure. Subject to finance being available Canford Bottom Roundabout is to be drastically amended for the Olympic Games. The reference to "Improvements to Canford Bottom therefore appear to have been superceded. Since I cannot find any intention to improve the road network all these proposals will only add to our present problems and cannot be supported.			1093
501876	J Long		CSO62 19	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
501881	B W Deverill		CSO62 92	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
501900	Miss Theresa Gale		CSO62 84	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502022	Mr HWR Stevens		CSO63 98	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
502029	Mr J MacArthur		CSO64 44	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502032	Mr and Mrs Pitt		CSO64 58	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The whole area is congested, there is no real provision for new TRANSPORT OR services for new homes ie doctors, local shops or community ctrs. There are already MANY			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							EMPTY industrial units. Building more industrial is only viable if a tax loss for developers. Verwood has lost its soul now, and does not need any more ad-hock development. Wimborne will follow if the development of this (at present) lovely Town is carried out in the same way as Verwood has been.			
502059	Mr R Seddon		CSO6510	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502061	J and M Jeater and Tilley		CSO6503	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
361113	Mr Alan Meade		CSO7209	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		.I like the rate of affordable housing to private homes. We all know that there is a shortage. Jobs will be created, money brought in, good for all in East Dorset, Christchurch			1093
477822	Ms Susan Rayment		CSO6784	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
491232	Mr Keith Barnett		CSO6979	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
501940	Mr M J Godfrey		CSO7211	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502076	Kay Stead		CSO6567	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		A new secondary school is VITAL for the Verwood area. Verwood has quadrupled in size since we came here 8 years ago. There are enough new homes - many haven't sold. There are not enough facilities in the town to sustain any more residents. The leisure centre is dire, however, the Hub is a triumph.			1093
502077	Douglas Poole		CSO6534	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502078	Mr R Marlow		CSO6545	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Why waste more tax payers money!!! Too much now!!! These proposals are ridiculous, as any further work prospects in this are are "zero". So why more homes and cars when the road/transport structure is obsolete for modern days need, let alone provision for the future 20/30 years. Just building more houses will not solve the long standing problems in Dorset ie jobs and road structures.			1093
502092	Mr and Mrs A Watkinson		CSO6563	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
502099	Carolyn Lourens		CSO6600	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502114	Mr P Foster		CSO6647	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
502136	Mr and Mrs WA Forster		CSO6693	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502138	Mrs E Mason		CSO6708	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502253	Mrs Lesley Jane Franklin		CSO6756	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I support all options for Verwood, Wimborne and Colehill because I feel there is a great need for more affordable housing in these areas, especially for young families and vulnerable elderly people in rural areas.			1093
502312	Mrs Sally Brierley		CSO6807	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support	General Comment	No new building should be anywhere near a floodplain with sea levels rising. Transport issues on and around the A31 are already over capacity - no development should proceed without that being sorted - including knock on effects of A31 issues. Has it actually been established that there is a need for all the homes and industrial development? Are we at risk of creating a need in order to service developers rather than establishing			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							if there will be a real need in the the first place?			
502317	Cllr Peter Lucas		CSO6844	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
502326	Mr and Mrs T Bennett		CSO6901	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		With more homes will need more employment, a vicious circle. Our roads are too busy now. We surely have enough community areas and centres.			1093
502329	Mrs Rosemary Rooke		CSO6899	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
502345	Mr and Mrs Ray and Irene Coulson		CSO6954	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		A secondary school in Verwood is a top priority due to the expansion of the town.			1093
502347	Sarah Cobb		CSO7118	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502381	Mr Cyril Josey		CSO7079	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502387	Mr George Kilpatrick		CSO7062	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I would like to see the justification for increased housing in East Dorset eg, demographics, immigration, increased work opportunities etc. I would also like to understand how transport strategy (and infrastructure) is coordinated with this in such a way to make expansion sustainable.			1093
502441	Mrs Ingrid Wells		CSO7168	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
502468	Robert Lambert		CSO7400	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
502568	sarah morgan		CSO7284	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502569	Mr & Ms M & L Skinner & Jeffries		CSO7312	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502570	Mr Samways		CSO7340	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502579	Mr & Mrs R L Thorne		CSO7369	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502595	Mr Colin House		CSO7468	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		All these developments will cause an impact on the local heathland and the proposals in all areas will cause road chaos on the A31, Ferndown, Parley and Wimborne. A new road structure is required before any development takes place.			1093
359598	Mr A KETCHLEY		CSO8006	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Unfortunately whatever is finally decided on the following well known saying will occur: 'You can please some of the people all the time, You can please all of the people some of the time, But you cannot please all of the people all of the time!' I wish you well in whatever is decided. Some will see it as inevitable due to the area's population increases, whereas others will see it as a necessary evil, and some will accept it without question			1093
359873	Mrs M HUGHES		CSO8630	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
359977	Miss M.G. EARP		CSO8082	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360145	Mr Nigel WARREN		CSO8296	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
361123	Mr Iain STEVENSON		CSO8236	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502610	John Jackson		CSO7521	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>Although at a recent meeting with residents, Councillor Spencer Flower confirmed that the County owned the land designated for the proposed school, in a reply to the questioner he also confirmed that no money was available to build the school.</p> <p>This is a blessing as traffic in Howe Lane is atrocious particularly during rush hours with additional hazards of the school parking – emergency vehicles cannot get through now at key school times. To build adjacent to St Michaels too will mean the unmade section of Howe Lane will become a proper metalled road with the consequences of speeding increased traffic levels.</p> <p>Further even without the school there should be no need for further housing development, but improvement to the roads and footpaths in the proximity of the existing school that require urgent remedial action to allow adequate pupil access and improve traffic flow.</p>			1093
502612	Hugh and Joy Dickson		CSO7474	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502673	Mrs A Powell		CSO7572	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The infrastructure in this area needs to be sorted out before anymore building goes ahead. There are times you cannot move on the roads. The area is being ruined with all this building works that are already going on.			1093
502701	Mrs M Williams		CSO7599	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502708	Ms		CSO76	Preferred		No				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Julia Owen		52	Option VWM 7		Opinion				
502745	Mrs J.M Kenny		CSO7691	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502913	Mr & Mrs D Whitmarsh		CSO7927	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		There should not be any more large scale house building in the East Dorset area as the roads cannot cope with any more traffic			1093
502921	Mr and Mrs L Forinton		CSO7803	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502935	Mr Roger Parker		CSO7825	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
502987	Anne Griffiths		CSO7854	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
503044	Mr and Mrs R Setchfield		CSO7934	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		We strongly feel, before any further development in Verwood the infrastructure needs to be vastly improved.			1093
503062	Mr and Mrs D C Hubbard		CSO7957	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
503085	Mr P.A. Scott		CSO7981	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503156	Richard and Jackie Blunderfield		CSO8050	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
503162	Mr Marcus J		CSO8033	Preferred Option	Support		The road from the A31 into Verwood is not good enough to support extra traffic - rough estimate - 1000 more cars using			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Huggins			VWM 7			this road (3081) more people and cars would create extra dangers. There have been many deaths on this road in the past. Improve the roads before considering any big developments!			
503171	Sally Cooke		CSO8096	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Build homes so people have somewhere to live BUT what about Verwood's infrastructure? Where are our facilities? Secondary school must be a priority.			1093
503183	B Chissell		CSO8168	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503189	Mr David Bulley		CSO8123	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		VWM 3, 4, 5 - Very dangerous at present with parents parking in morning to drop off and in afternoon to pick up. Sometimes parking both sides of road - making them very narrow for emergency vehicles trying to get through - very difficult.			1093
503193	Julie Richardson		CSO8133	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
503197	Mr M Smith		CSO8148	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Why build more houses, when there are a lack of facilities, ie. shops, nothing for the younger generation to do or use. In my opinion, Verwood is just one big housing estate - all you are encouraging is for gang warfare in the future because the kids have nothing to do. Verwood used to be a village - what do you call it now!!!			1093
503203	Mr and Mrs M Squire		CSO8161	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Having lived in Verwood for over 30 years we have seen continuous development with poor thought to road systems and town centre shops. Verwood is already a large town in comparison other town populations in Ringwood, Wimborne, Fordingbridge etc, yet has no town centre facilities. Residents are forced to travel at least 7 miles to find a range of shops. Verwood is no longer a village so why pretend that it is? (This is the excuse given for no town centre shops). In fact Verwood offered a wider range of shops 30 years ago when it was a small village than it does now.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Please do not allow any further building in Verwood before we have town facilities and fore-thought re - roads to any new properties, especially a school. Margards Lane cannot cope with more traffic.			
503218	Mr Chris Beaven		CSO8175	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood already lacks the facilities to support the current number of houses. This is further development for builder profit and little benefit for the community. Health facilities are already fully stretched, poor public transport and road network to support expansion. Limited shopping facilities exist and the sports centre lacks sufficient facilities.			1093
503230	P Andrews		CSO8189	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I would be shocked if plans were passed to increase housing yet again in Verwood. Provision has not been made to cope with existing traffic and shopping problems. This is a town existing in a village environment. It's time to deal with present problems before creating more.			1093
503233	F Parkes		CSO8263	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
503250	Mrs Helen Poole		CSO8281	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Too many new homes in Verwood, not enough resources for those of us who already live here. Stop filling up our green space!			1093
503303	Mr Anthony Roberts		CSO8317	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
503315	Mr Kenneth Wood		CSO8344	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
359889	Mr and Mrs P CLARK		CSO8499	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
359920	S PARKER		CSO9553	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
360111	Mr K VIVIAN		CSO9611	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
360288	Mr & Mrs E T SPENCER	E T Spencer (Heating)	CSO9633	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
361015	Mr and Mrs M.S and C.E HACK		CSO8517	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
503024	Valerie Measey		CSO8903	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503347	Ms Hardwick		CSO8373	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503355	Mr Robert Griffiths		CSO8401	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503358	H C Hoare		CSO8430	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503444	R Hobbs		CSO8580	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
503463	Mrs Rita Lockyer		CSO8594	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
503477	Mr Edward Fiddler		CSO8644	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Housing Development in Dorset I am receipt of your publication re the above and other items. During the 1960's certain councils allocated land for development, divided it into plots of about 1/4 acre and sold			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>these plots to individuals. The owners of these plots produced building plans which were submitted for approval. Once approved the owners hired tradesmen to carry out the building work.</p> <p>Most of the owners were relatively new to the housing market. They had limited resources but they were ready to muck in to help with construction. Banks were willing to then to provide stage payments to help cash flow.</p> <p>The end result of all this was a series of beautiful estates with every house different. For some reason this arrangement ceased and I have never found out why.</p> <p>Could I ask you if this facility could be repeated? Such a plan would produce lovely estates and encourage people to act on their own initiative.</p>			
503482	Mr Ron Hopkins		CSO8679	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503554	Mr D Verguson		CSO8807	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503598	Mr John Turner		CSO8787	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503603	Mrs DJ Morley		CSO8808	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503621	A G Haines		CSO8857	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503624	Mr RT Jackson		CSO8861	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503635	Mr J		CSO8917	Preferred Option		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Gough			VWM 7						
503639	Mrs and Mr M Stevens		CSO8963	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503640	N J and S A White		CSO9131	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503644	Mr J Riley		CSO8980	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Re. Housing / xxx Options Reasons for objections is that as proven on many occasions in our area of Verwood no thought has been given on the visual effect / blending in of new with old and existing propoerties ie. flats on main road behind The Hub and the redevelopment of Fayrewood Pub on Blackhill. Also the impact of traffic congestion is always underestimated especially if there is a traffic incident on a main route. More thought needs to be put into providing more facilities for the people/children of our area.			1093
503666	A H J Paul		CSO9010	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Re. your statement concerning the District car ownership level, I trust, that despite financial restrictions, that road surfaces are maintained at a high level on the grounds of safety, noise and vehicular damage.			1093
503687	Mr Nick Smith		CSO9082	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
503690	Ms Clare Parvin		CSO9152	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503695	Mr and Mrs N White		CSO9099	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		If Verwood is to continue to expand, facilities other than a new school are needed. Other towns of a comparable size in Dorset have better/larger more diverse sports and leisure facilities, medical centres, large supermarket, better public transport. Verwood is just becoming one large housing estate with little else. Planning permission should also be considered for new			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							restaurant businesses other than pubs, to enhance the area for residents - Ferndown/Wimborne both have an abundance of these.			
503706	Mr David Portnell		CSO9123	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503709	Mr and Mrs A Fairclough		CSO9137	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
503759	Mr D.J. Middleton		CSO9253	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
359954	Mr Alan FLINT		CSO10018	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I want to know the projected time scale for these options to start to become active. 2. It is most important that there is adequate employment to accommodate the houses to be built. 3. More attention must be made to supply of affordable housing. 4. The green belt must be respected where possible. 5. The estates around Wimborne must be consulted fully. 			1093
360029	Mr David LANIGAN		CSO10290	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Christchurch & East Dorset Core Strategy Document, Managing Growth and Development up to the year 2027. I agree with the preamble stating that we need to meet local housing needs, with the emphasis on growing the main settlements where we have good access to facilities that people require. Some development of smaller communities should continue however, especially the provision of low cost housing. The community as a whole, needs the services of teachers, nurses, firemen, postmen, and policemen who are poorly paid because they commit to a vocation rather than a high salary job. We also need the services of skilled people such as builders, electricians, plumbers, gas fitters, and motor mechanics, the essentially blue collar professionals. They must not be priced out of the market in terms of being able to buy a starter home, in the community that they serve.</p>			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Having bought my first home in 1963, a two bedroom bungalow for £2,200 I am aware that locally such a property is currently one hundred times as much. This makes things difficult for young couples with the ratio of house prices to wages being the highest in the country. Many struggle with getting mortgages that now require typically a 25% deposit on an already expensive property.</p> <p>I moved to West Moors 15 years ago and appreciate the planning decisions that have taken place affecting this village. We now have a new build shopping centre on Station Road, complete with flats, good pavements, lighting, pelican crossing and trees. I am pleased to have seen built several small, three storey, blocks of retirement and two bed flats close to the village centre. I support the gradual expansion of the Village, current population around 7,500 as we have good schools, a large Memorial hall, Churches with halls, two public houses, doctors, dentists and good bus services to both Poole and Bournemouth. We have footpath access to open land such as Holt Heath, as well as being able to use the old railway line route through the village to Ringwood, - the Castleman Trail. Recently St Marys Church has had built a new Church Hall which will serve the community and thanks to the National Lottery grant we now have an excellent Bowling Club. I support the continued slow expansion of the village as currently we have many facilities for people of all ages to enjoy.</p> <p>My current house was built in the mid 70s, and has trebled in value since my wife and I moved here 15 years ago. In the 1970s West Moors doubled in size and acquired new schools and since then other infrastructure improvements. In recent years the Library was refurbished. The facilities for retirees in West Moors, with access to Ferndown and Verwood, are very good, and coupled with excellent hospitals at Poole, Bournemouth and Wimborne, and I have felt no need to move from East Dorset area in the conceivable future.</p> <p>I therefore support the proposals for additional housing as outlined in the Core Strategy Consultation, as well as the proposals for business sites for employment. I also support provisions for new schools particularly a new Secondary</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							School at Verwood, and recreation areas to cater for the population increase. I understand that net immigration into Dorset is running at two thousand people a year so clearly we need to plan for housing, jobs, education, recreation, road improvements especially at busy junctions, and off road car parking in town centres and on new housing estates. There are many reasons why East Dorset and Christchurch, are attractive places for people to live, work and retire to. Long term planning that caters for the needs of a steady population increase is sensible and is to be welcomed.			
360095	Mr & Mrs John & Barbara POLKINGHORN		CSO9830	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
361105	Mr John GOOCH	Also member of Colehill Parish Concil	CSO9918	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
499748	Ms Soozie Cooper		CSO9746	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
499774	Mr S Weatherill-Podbury		CSO9694	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
503787	Mrs P A Dent		CSO9275	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
503846	Mr Anthony Hose		CSO9328	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
503861	Mr E Hawkins		CSO9351	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
503878	Mr Peter Smith		CSO94 10	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
503879	Mr S Smithson		CSO94 33	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		More detailed information required on the Verwood plans as the plans I object to will have a largelarge impact on noise and increased congestion.			1093
503943	Mr & Mrs Rumball		CSO94 60	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
504093	Mr & Mrs Vivian		CSO94 87	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
504101	Mrs Mary Treviss-Bell		CSO95 14	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
504193	Mrs Shauna Green		CSO95 28	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
504203	Kate Pursglove		CSO95 42	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood does not have sufficient facilities and infrastructure for its present population (shops, sports facilities, high school etc). It has a growing youth population with nothing for them to do/occupy them. The roads in and out of Verwood are too small to support the current population with frequent accidents, long delays for the slightest disturbance in the traffic and no safe alternative way to get in and out (no dedicated cycle tracks, poor bus service)			1093
504207	L S Dean		CSO95 58	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
504216	Mr Mark Rich		CSO95 80	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The facilities which already exist in Verwood are not enough for the community already living here. Doctors, Dentists, Variety of local shops. We moved here to enjoy a peaceful and green environment			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							from a place where there was heavy traffic and continual road noise. I do not want the proposals to go ahead as it will spoil our peace and quiet and your plans are not in keeping with the area.			
504232	Rachel and Paul Higgins		CSO96 12	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The reason we enjoy living in Verwood is due to it's size and community feel. I do not want to live in another Ferndown. The roads and shops will not support more residents.			1093
504241	Mr and Mrs Ansell		CSO96 19	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Will generate more traffic in Station Road area. Will also generate more traffic, and in Howe Lane, people there cannot get in and out of their own properties there now!! Comments from Verwood Housing leaflet Increase volume of traffic along minor roads in the vicinity.			1093
504243	G Haskell		CSO96 28	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
504285	Mr P Miller		CSO96 60	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
504288	Tracey Doherty		CSO96 54	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
504297	C Johnson		CSO96 70	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
504300	Paul Cocker		CSO96 75	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
504307	Lucy Cocker		CSO96 80	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
504311	Mr		CSO96	Preferred	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood is already heavily			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Victor Steeden		86	Option VWM 7			overstretched and incapable of giving a good service eg poor clearance of debris, road repairs etc and further housing will do nothing but to add to the already paucity of 'service'!			
504314	Ms Selina Roper		CSO9720	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
504318	R V and P Reeks		CSO9691	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
504344	B Blake-Coleman		CSO9699	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Lack of facilities for increased population - no NHS dentists, limited medical care, only one supermarket etc. Facilities and amenities need to match increased demand.			1093
504349	A Hall		CSO9704	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
504468	Mrs M Last		CSO9760	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Too much traffic up and down Margards lane. Some traffic should be diverted via Howe Lane/St Margarets Road. (school) Bus services in Verwood are pathetic. 1 bus an hour to Ringwood/Bournemouth.			1093
504477	Mr Martin Turner		CSO9767	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
504517	Mrs T Otton		CSO9774	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
504530	Christine Phipps		CSO9779	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The town is over populated now, how will it cope with more families moving here?			1093
504541	Mrs S Newham		CSO9784	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
504572	Carly Bull		CSO9798	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
504641	Elizabeth Gresty		CSO9803	Preferred Option VWM 7		General Comment	I was born in Verwood in 1920. We do not want any further development - Verwood has been ruined enough - it was once a beautiful little village - you have ruined and wrecked it - the people and residents and awful buildings are not to be admired at all - we need opportunity for the young people. The new people have done nothing to give to give them that.			1093
505273	Mrs Lorraine Hubbard		CSO9857	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
505288	Mrs S Cramer		CSO9892	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support	General Comment	As a married mother of 3 children, 2 girls and 1 boy, living in a 2 bed Council flat (first floor), I welcome more housing to the Wimborne area for young families needing affordable housing / rented housing.			1093
505354	Mr Tim Edwards		CSO9964	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
505369	J Young		CSO9991	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
505506	Mr Peter Hendra		CSO10067	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object	General Comment	Building more houses has NOTHING to do with meeting the needs of (existing) local residents. We do not need or want more houses in our area. Planning to build more houses is driven by the 'need' to meet externally imposed quotas based on false assumptions on the desirability of further population and economic growth. Instead of wasting resources on building more housing which is ecologically unsustainable, we should be using them to make a transition to a low energy sustainable future for our children. Please listen to local residents and reject further development.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
505561	Mr. D. Calvert		CSO10 117	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
505590	M Spalding		CSO10 147	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
505681	Mr Nick Lewis		CSO10 183	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
505742	L. J. Ashplant		CSO10 209	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
505802	Mr RGH Chapman		CSO10 260	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
360146	Mrs Marilyn A WARBURTON		CSO11 169	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
498775	Mrs P L Buckler		CSO10 773	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
506161	Mr RD Holyoake		CSO10 334	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Any more development within Dorset's existing built up areas will end with a complete gridlock of traffic.			1093
506196	Mr & Mrs P Stout		CSO10 363	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
506754	Mr Derek E Marsh		CSO10 398	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I have mixed feelings about the secondary school. There are so many reasons why schools should be local! On the other hand, access to this corner of the town is not good.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
506975	Mrs V Kesler		CSO10 407	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		There is already horrendous traffic down Margards Lane with school traffic; more traffic (school) will make matters much worse for us residents. There are no humps to slow the traffic which does speed down at well over 30mph. There is no speed camera to slow traffic, Margards Lane has become rather a "rat run" speed is awful, several cats have been killed, and the noise and shouting of school children and parents – leaves a lot to be desired!			1093
506984	Mr T Newnham		CSO10 413	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
506989	Mrs Barbara Harris		CSO10 419	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507026	Mr David Craig		CSO10 443	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support	General Comment	I would like to see priority given to projects which have a higher concentration of social housing inclusion, and also include a higher green/renewable energy provision. Particular concentration on family areas, playgrounds and social/community facilities should be considered.			1093
507032	Mr David Oliver		CSO10 469	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
507033	A R Twaits		CSO10 495	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support	General Comment	Despite improvements to public transport, cycling and walking, the reality is that the vast majority of journeys will continue to be made by car. Local roads are already congested and the extent of development proposed is not acceptable without significant increases in the capacity of these roads for cars. In particular problems on the Ferndown and Wimborne bypasses need to be resolved, and the A31 to Poole link built.			1093
507132	Ms L Joyce		CSO10 537	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Plans for Verwood: In supporting options VWM 2,4 and 7 it is essential that consideration should also be given within these plans for a new large food store as currently the Morrisons store is far too small and does not meet the needs of the			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							current community let alone the development of new homes as well. Also we desperately need a new secondary school but within that! I would like to see plans for a new leisure centre and swimming pool for Verwood. Otherwise I would be very reluctant to support any new developments and would urge the council to re-consider the current options with a view to inclusion of: extensive food store; new leisure centre, that developers could contribute to these two things alone would alleviate traffic pressures, pressure on QE and Ringwood plus wider area.			
507136	Mrs S A Segal		CSO10 546	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
507141	Smallman		CSO10 553	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		All you ever want to build in Verwood is more houses. Where are you going to promote and build commercial/ business areas to create local facilities/ employment. Building a school next to 2 existing schools will create massive road jams. This should be built next to Trinity school where the road system is better.			1093
507144	Paul Brewer		CSO10 557	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
507152	Mrs A E J Dolan		CSO10 562	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		There are no work opportunities in Verwood therefore roads through Verwood will be further clogged fighting to get to cities south and north for work. We have not the infrastructure for this vas amount of housing. I object most strongly to the whole concept.			1093
507160	Mrs H Walker		CSO10 567	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I think that Verwood's infrastructure will not be able to cope with any further development. Even if a new upper school is built the amount of cars would be unacceptable as Verwood is so spread out not many children would walk to the school.			1093
507170	Miss A K Jukes		CSO10 585	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	Anywhere on flood plain e.g. VWM 4 and 7 are without question, unwise. More facilities required e.g. swimming pool and more shops – not hairdressers or supermarkets!			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507178	Mr Paul Banning		CSO10 598	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is disingenuous to show the proposals without showing existing planned development – please publish these plans. • In the past 20 years Verwood has experienced exponential expansion of residential property and now need a period of time to mature and create an identity and community. • These proposals will lead to the increase of motor vehicles (c.500) and daily vehicles journeys measured in excess of 1000. This increases atmospheric and noise pollution and leads to a reduction in quality of life for existing residents. Because Verwood s a dormitory town it already experiences high levels of road usage as it is essential to use a car for most activity. • EDDC will fail in its promises (especially 1+3) if these plans proceed. • The parking on the public highway at Trinity school is already a danger to pupils and local residents (no access for emergency services) and this will greatly exacerbate the problem. 			1093
507183	Mr G Roberts		CSO10 594	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507207	Paula Edwards		CSO10 603	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	The only objection I have with a secondary school being built in Howe Lane is the amount of use of the roads leading into the school and also the lack of parking that is already there and proving to be an existing problem for the neighbours nearby.			1093
507213	Ieuan and Janice Davies		CSO10 609	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507219	Mrs Louise Spencer		CSO10 639	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The parking at Emmanuel middle and Verwood first schools is absolutely dreadful and the roads couldn't cope with more traffic if more places were available. A new secondary school would need a very big car park and new road. Some roads in Verwood are in a dreadful unmade state e.g. Manor Lane, St Michaels Road and Howe Lane (in places).			1093
507220	R		CSO10	Preferred	Support		The land between Verwood and Three Legged Cross			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Sharples		625	Option VWM 7			appears appropriate for new housing as it almost represents infill between the two settlements, whereas any significant building to the other (West, North, East) sides of the town encroaches too much on the countryside. VWM Housing leaflet- My approval for VWM 3 and 7 is subject to a major improvement in the road system between Manor Rd, Margards Lane and Howe Lane. The present roads are very congested at school opening and closing times and the additional traffic arising from the opening of a new school in Howe Lane will seriously increase congestion at these times of day unless the access to the site is greatly improved.			
507235	Mrs Margaret Chalk		CSO10 641	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Don't spoil Verwood any more. The new road was bad enough and the new shops aren't at all inspiring, not enough thought was given to the choice as far different ones were needed as there are not any really decent shops in Verwood. There are three hairdressers also estate agents all within a stones throw of each other. We only really have small village facilities considering the large number of houses that there already are in Verwood.			1093
507253	Joyce Smith		CSO10 646	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Please no more! Verwood will end up being a place that no one wants to live.			1093
507264	L F J Garratt		CSO10 655	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The area is overcrowded at present. The majority of the residents (voters) do not want change. Listen to the majority voice.			1093
507269	Michael and Alexandra King		CSO10 662	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
507272	A E Cook		CSO10 668	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
507274	Miss M Kettless		CSO10 690	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		3 buildings which have ruined Verwood. 1) the flats which look over the Hub, and another 44 which nobody wants, there should have been a green area. 2) the flats with the stupid			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							wavy roofs. 3) the Co-op which is being built onto of the traffic lights this is so dangerous vans park on the bend it is going be an accident plus 3 flights flats people around this building are so angry. We would like to see these buildings pulled down, no-one new there was an appli for the Co-op until it was passed, and people say we did not need another food shop as we already have 3 and why was it passed in Bristol, did anyone bother to come down and look where the building was and to see how dangerous it is going to be, and now 44 flats looking over the Hub, the police, and the fire station said no to it, the people of Verwood don't want any more housing, what builders have done to verwood have ruined it with there designs.			
507275	A Saxby		CSO10 672	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
507279	Anne Tubbs		CSO10 679	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		It would be very good to have affordable homes for our young ones.			1093
507286	Mr N P Butler		CSO10 703	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Verwood needs more infrastructure before more homes are contemplated i.e. facilities such as a leisure centre, supermarket etc, incentives for more businesses to set up here to stop it continuing to be simply a dormitory town.			1093
507326	Mr and Mrs M Salter		CSO10 724	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507330	Mr Malcolm Lay		CSO10 721	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Transport and infrastructure has to be a priority in Verwood prior to any new homes. To even be thinking about building more homes is irresponsible of the council, unrealistic and will result in the local area being ruined. The council also need to attract new companies, entrepreneurs to the area to stimulate jobs as unemployment will increase substantially otherwise. Comments from Verwood Housing leaflet Until Verwood has a proper infrastructure no new homes			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							should be built. We require urgently a proper, updated, expanded supermarket together with petrol station, new doctor, dentist, a proper bus service and a large leisure centre. Also the roads cannot handle the current level of traffic.			
507335	Mr J Bridges		CSO10 736	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
507336	Mr John Page		CSO10 775	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I object to use of green belt land. As Margards Lane will be the main route to these new developments please ensure that parking permits are made available to residents of Margards Lane. Parents picking up and dropping off their children block the road at present. It will be much worse if these developments proceed.			1093
507345	Mr B Hodgkins - Wright		CSO10 771	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507353	Mr and Mrs M Morgan		CSO10 799	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507356	Mr and Mrs M Moody		CSO10 869	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507361	Mr Kenneth Archer		CSO10 823	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
507362	Mrs J F Preece		CSO10 814	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507363	Mr Kevin Sayer		CSO10 903	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object	General Comment	The area alongside the A31 between St Leonards Hospital and Tricketts Cross is an area where many houses could be built. Currently this area is an eye-sore and gives a bad			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							impression to visitors as they cross into Dorset from Hampshire. Why are nearly all your proposals on greenbelt land? There are many areas in East Dorset on non greenbelt land which could be built on. Your proposal (FWP 4 and 5) will put more pressure on Parley Common as well as introduce more traffic on an already busy road system.			
507366	Dennis A Pattensen		CSO10 830	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507372	Andrew Innis		CSO10 841	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		EDDC uses Verwood to fund other areas - the infrastructure needs to be improved before any more houses are built.			1093
507378	Ms Anni Dencher		CSO10 864	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507379	Mr J M Leno		CSO10 867	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507386	D Hobbs		CSO10 885	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507395	Geoffrey and Valerie Coates		CSO10 907	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		No more houses until bigger supermarket and better roads out of town - another school, and doctors surgeries can't cope already with numbers.			1093
507402	Mrs V Crout		CSO10 925	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Building should not take place on Green Belt land. Church Hill already suffers from too much school traffic. Manor Road is always extremely busy. With more housing it will become even worse.			1093
507409	John Crout		CSO10 945	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		My concern is that you planners have allowed piece meal development with very little regard to the infrastructure, and the roads in particular. I would suggest that Church Hill and Manor Road already exceed their design capacity.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507418	Mrs J Alexander		CSO10 953	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Strongly object to building on Green Belt land! Verwood would not be able to accommodate further building of new homes given it's present infrastructure, it would destroy the area!			1093
507425	E M Connick		CSO10 963	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507435	J Barnacle and S Bennington-Fewsey		CSO10 974	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		We would oppose any further developments in Verwood with the infrastructure that is in place at present, and the alarming amount of affordable housing being proposed, coupled with the erosion of what's left of open fields and land in Verwood.			1093
507451	F Williamson		CSO10 990	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
507461	Mr G J Babb		CSO11 014	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		VWM7 would mean an unsupportable amount of car and pedestrian traffic at the bottom of Margards Lane - Even if another access road provided - it is a nightmare between 8 - 8.45 and 14.45 - 15.30 as it is.			1093
507487	Mr W A Linter		CSO11 043	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507499	Mr M Ward		CSO11 062	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	These developments do not affect me directly. But. The infrastructure cannot cope. Supermarket not large enough. Doctors have long waiting times for consultation. Chemists cannot cope. Suggest supermarket is rebuilt immediately incorporating leisure centre. Centre to be transferred to land at 'the hub' which is not economically viable. Traffic will be even worse than now. Parking?			1093
507524	Mr C G Richardson		CSO11 089	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
507555	Mr and Mrs C		CSO11 116	Preferred Option	Object					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Lamond			VWM 7						
359890	Mrs G.M. PROWSE		CSO11 352	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
361037	Mr P STRATFORD		CSO11 329	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I expect that my objection to everything is not very practical. However, i have lived in the area for most of the last fifty years. In that time there has been a constant cycle of the council saying we need more housing, followed by we need more industrial areas to provide extra jobs for all the new homes. Then in turn the council says we require extra jobs for the new homes, then in turn the council says we require extra homes for the new workers. this rocess is never ending. During this time I've witnessed the creation and expansion of the industrial estates at Ferndown, Uddens, Ebblake and Wimborne. A whole new housing estate at Tricketts Cross, Glenmoor Rd Ferndown, the expanaion of West Moors, Colehill, Verwood turned from sleepy village into a town. In this time I am not aware of any developed area being returned to it's natural state from a developed one. Please let me know if you think differently. I hope you agree that my objection to development is rational and that the never ending cycle of expansion is stopped.			1093
496659	Mr & Mrs Tony & Hilary Hendy		CSO11 744	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
498211	Mrs J AUCKLAND		CSO11 536	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object	General Comment	VWM 7 - Object a) On the grounds of access - roads already congested at school times. b) Not a good idea to place a senior school alongside infants and juniors. Historically these have always been separate with good reason. c) Unfair on local residents to have 3 schools on their doorstep.			1093
503705	B B Morgan		CSO11 967	Preferred Option	Object		I am aware of the need for new homes, but not in large concentrated areas. We have insufficinet shops, and traffic			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
				VWM 7			will por out onto already too crowded roads. The school is also needed but not next to 2 other schools and these areas are in the Green Belt.			
507580	Mr and Mrs P & J Gardner		CSO11 153	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
507595	Mr D Johnson		CSO11 184	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507659	Ms Victoria Johnstone		CSO11 227	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
507668	Mr Gavin Lee		CSO11 240	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
507693	Mrs P Carter		CSO11 280	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I strongly believe it is about time we had a secondary school for our local children in Verwood.			1093
507699	Mr Robert Rawles		CSO11 261	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Verwood lacks a vibrant town centre but are close to having the population equivalent to Ringwood.			1093
507708	Mr Powell		CSO11 286	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507716	G R Cridlan		CSO11 297	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
507721	Mr M O'Kelly		CSO11 303	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object	General Comment	Existing facilities in Verwood are inadequate for the existing population. To increase the population by circa 2,000 will only acxxxxx what is currently a poor situation. You really need to show how you will improve bus routes, roads, centre of town etc etc.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507723	Oliver Stonehouse		CSO11 308	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I strongly object to further large developments in Verwood. Verwood is being overdeveloped, without adequate infrastructure of local amenities and services being available. Roads cannot cope with the extra industrial traffic. The town has been spoilt, with ugly buildings and long traffic delays due to poor roadworks. Children have been put at risk of road accidents. Verwood town centre and residential areas are an eyesore with masses of uncollected rubbish. Council cannot cope. Building planning is not thorough enough. Consideration must also be given to the damage caused to wildlife and woodlands, something the Dorset is famous for.			1093
507730	Mr Vince Woolley		CSO11 314	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object	General Comment	Verwood has no infrastructure, we have trouble with anti-social behaviour from youths, dangerous level of traffic in front of Emmanuel Middle School. To have a new secondary school so close to Emmanuel Middle School plus 415 houses will only make the situation far worse! By email having just viewed the plans for your redevelopment near Howe Lane Verwood you appear to be making what is a bad situation in Verwood worse at this moment in time there is no infrastructure in Verwood, anti social behaviour by a large youth element who have been avoided in the new "Verwood Hub" so they have nowhere to go. Congested traffic which is extremely dangerous for children going to and from Emmanuelle School. The police are powerless to control the anti social behavior by youths that hang around this area, nobody will do anything about the traffic until a child is injured and yet you want to increase the traffic flow and build a new secondary school. I can sure that having discussed your intentions with local residents you will receive a strong protest from us all. Please stop this insanity before it starts.			1093
507733	Mrs Susan Phillips		CSO11 317	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
507737	Mrs S Philpot		CSO11 323	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object	General Comment	I believe that crime and vandalism will rise in Verwood if more houses/people come to the area as the community feeling will be lost. A larger school will also mean that housing near the school will be subject to rubbish, vandalism and graffiti, too many extra cars when there is already a problem at present. Getting in and out of driveways at present is a precision manoeuvre so as not to run anyone over! there is not a problem with the children travelling out of verwood to upper schools, QE has just spent alot of money to accommodate the intake of children and this will be irrelevant if you take away the children from a very good school.			1093
507744	D Timpron		CSO11 334	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507752	Mr Glen Bailey		CSO11 345	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Bring it on more jobs.			1093
507755	Maureen Niblock		CSO11 359	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to accommodate another fifteen hundred people. There is nothing there - particularly for teenagers or adults. The Council ignored the wishes of the inhabitants and built The Hub instead of the swimming pool, which most people wanted, and which would have been great for young and old alike. At present there is little vandalism. This will change with a large influx of teenagers from big towns and cities. Traffic problems will increase. Doctors and dentists will be overwhelmed making it even more difficult than ever to get an appointment.			1093
507760	Mr and Mrs R Gardner		CSO11 372	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
507768	John Niblock		CSO11 387	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		We moved here because, like many other people who moved here, we wanted to live somewhere quiet in the countryside. Since we arrived ten years ago there has been almost non-stop building. There are insufficient amenities in Verwood to serve the present community let alone another fifteen hundred people and eight hundred extra vehicles. The road			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							between Verwood and the A31 is already dangerous and with extra traffic will get worse.			
507771	Mrs P M Coventry		CSO11 386	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
507780	V R Strickland		CSO11 395	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507782	Jennifer Baxendale		CSO11 402	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Strongly object. Margards Lane, where I live, is a nightmare of dangerous traffic from 8 - 9am and 3 - 4 pm for 5 days. No more schools until a new road is built.			1093
507786	Ms Helen Scriven		CSO11 410	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507789	Mr CJ Barrett		CSO11 457	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507795	A M Baxendale		CSO11 416	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Unless there is a feeder road from a direction other than Margards Lane a new secondary school and large numbers of houses should not be considered.			1093
507800	Mrs K M Platt		CSO11 484	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Too much development in Verwood already.			1093
507805	Mrs N J Wareham		CSO11 425	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507808	Mrs J V Atyeo		CSO11 431	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		We need more shops, as people are coming to retire in Verwood they may not be able to travel out of the town to shop. Also the school should have been here years ago.			1093
507812	Mr D		CSO11 438	Preferred Option		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Masters			VWM 7						
507817	Mr R Gulliver		CSO11 449	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object	General Comment	The new housing does not improve anything in Verwood. We do not need more homes!! We need a Secondary school to build a future for our children. We should not be held to ransom, that if we allow the housing, we will get a Secondary School, because we all fear that you will just walk away and leave us with nothing. Why use Green Belt land, when the council has brown land that it can use. ie. land behind the Police Station for Social Housing. The Nursery's, Pre-schools, Schools, Doctors, Dentist etc can not cope. 400 homes will create another 800+ cars and 1.245 to 1,660 people. NO! NO! NO more!			1093
507833	Mrs Johnson		CSO11 467	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507839	Margaret Williams		CSO11 490	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
507869	B O'Kelly		CSO11 499	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Current facilities are moderate - to add up to 2,000 additional occupants is foolish and unacceptable. It is time our elected Representatives began to represent us.			1093
507891	Mr R W Johnson		CSO11 513	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	Further Bus services or more frequent existing routes (36, 36a, 37) or Yellow Buses to extend to Verwood from West Moors? Depending on these being practicable of course.			1093
507899	R J Potts		CSO11 518	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
507909	G Waterton		CSO11 525	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
507915	R		CSO11	Preferred		No				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Waterton		532	Option VWM 7		Opinion				
507931	Mr and Mrs R S W Spicer		CSO11 542	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		We are new to Verwood but feel that Verwood is very much over houses with very little infrastructure. Verwood was and still should be a village.			1093
507941	Mr and Mrs Avril and George Jeavons		CSO11 554	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		We have serious concerns of road access to VWM 3 and 4 via St Michaels Road and Howe Lane, and feel these roads are not suitable for the amount of extra traffic, causing massive disruption to existing residents. We think Verwood is at maximum capacity for housing and what was an attractive country town is being turned into a huge housing estate.			1093
507946	Mr and Mrs K Carter		CSO11 551	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
507957	Mr and Mrs L R Vining		CSO11 560	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
507965	Mr Jack Harvey		CSO11 583	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		<p>We consider Verwood housing has already outgrown the size of the town. There would be insufficient services to support what would be at best another 400 families.</p> <p>There are still many unmade-up roads in Verwood awaiting the promises of 20 years ago. These roads have got progressively worse with all the new building work - Manor Lane in particular as the builders got away with not repairing the damage done during the build of the Spring Close area and new houses on what was an open field.</p> <p>Traffic that should use Margard's Lane persists in using Manor Lane as a short cut and with a new secondary school this would increase.</p> <p>We understand that the Health and Safety rules say that there should be at least two made-up roads to the school to provide IN/OUT access in the event of an emergency - Margards lane or Springfield Road /Close to Howe Lane as was on the ORIGINAL PLAN.</p>			1093
507968	Philip		CSO11	Preferred	Support		Email			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Chivers		572	Option VWM 7			<p>I would like to comment on the new proposed housing developments in Verwood. Although new houses are inevitable, I believe that there are a number of issues which need to be addressed.</p> <p>The infrastructure in and around Verwood is just not in place yet and the town needs time to develop and get things in place before so many houses are built.</p> <p>Schools - there are insufficient places in schools which means either an additional school or extensions will need to be built. Who will pay for this?</p> <p>Medical - The Dr's surgery is already stretched to the limit and will never be able to cope with such an influx. who will pay for new services?</p> <p>Road systems - I believe that the roads will simply not be able to cope and am particularly interested in access for the vwm2 area?I note from the document tthat you talk about bike lanes, these aren't required as f you live in Verwood you need a car to get anywhere else!</p> <p>Water - The water pressure is already a problem due to the number of new flats built in Verwood. What will another 400 homes mean?</p> <p>Employment - during the recent meeting at the Hub we heard about how half th epopulation of Verwood leave the area to work so lack of jobs wouldn't be an issue - Half leave because there are no jobs in Verwood. Working for a national company I understand about recruitment and profiles of various people. With 50% of people in social housing, i know for a fact that on average they won't travel more than 5 miles and won't be working from home and creating new business. If we therefore intend to move people here from other \"council estates/waiting lists\" this will simply create a poorer life for all. I grew up in social housing so know better than most the result of this policy! We will certainly need more police and other social resources. Who will pay? Will the residents in social housing be paying full council tax? If not who will make up their shortfall. As it is our council tax is already ridiculously high!</p> <p>So what is the best way forward? Provided access and roads have been considered i think the developments should be smaller in particular VWM2 which is a really large</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							development. Why not build 1/4 of the proposed homes spread across all zones and phase the overall growth over 15 years to allow time? No doubt this is a done deal and council members have hidden interests in this but I think you should be really consider the size and impact of what you are proposing.			
507980	Sylvia Allen		CSO11 597	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508383	Ms Emma Hayter		CSO11 712	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508413	Mrs S Best		CSO11 774	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
508529	Jackie Chivers		CSO11 865	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
508532	L C E Leman		CSO11 874	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	Would a new secondary school in Verwood obviate bussing to Wimborne? Would it increase car traffic in Verwood?			1093
508535	D G Sandy		CSO11 888	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508545	Dorothy Goodenough & Alan Craddock		CSO11 898	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		There is insufficient infrastructure/facilities etc shops, swimming pool to sustain an increase in the population of Verwood. Until Verwood has better facilities and a more frequent bus service (currently one hour service) increased housing puts a greater strain on our community.			1093
508554	Mr P Mitton		CSO11 908	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		No more houses! We need more facilities - especially a swimming pool.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508560	Mrs Coral Collins		CSO11 916	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508577	Mr and Mrs R J Ribbons		CSO11 926	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure, eg buses, shops, leisure facilities, parking etc to support yet morre housing.			1093
508580	Mrs Kirkcaldy		CSO11 940	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I appreciate houses have to be built somewhere but traffic congestion will be a problem in many places especially Margards Lane/Howe Lane. It would not cope with the additional traffic another school would bring. It only just copes now with the two schools. There are long queues on Margards Lane, and Church Hill exit to Manor Road at school times.			1093
508588	Michelle Hocking		CSO11 951	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		There are already too may empty properties in Verwood. Some remain half built for months and become an eyesore. The planning office don't appear to have any control over the building. The height of the properties is excessive in a small town totally out of proportion.			1093
508596	Whyberd		CSO11 963	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
508609	Patricia Thorley		CSO11 987	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I Hve lived in Verwood since 1976 and strongly object to any further development. The once rural location has been over-developed - and many other properties have been lost or inappropriate houses have been built in gardens. I would question the need for more housing - it seems to satisfy a buy - to -let market only - our roads are over-burdened with traffic. I believe enough is enough - we need to protect rather than destroy our environment.			1093
508611	Mrs Rosamond Heaven		CSO11 992	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
508628	Martyn Heaven		CSO12 009	Preferred Option	Object					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
				VWM 7						
508635	Mrs I A Jordan		CSO12 017	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
508642	P Williams		CSO12 025	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508650	Mrs M Peters		CSO12 035	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508656	Mr and Mrs J Fry		CSO12 048	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508664	Mrs Sharon Hak		CSO12 062	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508671	Barry and Carole Bull		CSO12 090	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The plans for yet more housing is lunacy. Roads in and out of Verwood are few and already totally inadequate at the busy times of day for the amount of traffic, particularly the Ringwood Road. Where are the new inhabitants of these 415 houses going to work? Not in Verwood! So even more cars to clog up the road to Ringwood for hours each day. Any sane person can see that Verwood is already overdeveloped for the infrastructure it can susatin. It's about time we stopped these lunatic planners from using Verwood, only just in Dorset, as the repository for all their county housing requirements, so that they can avoid the difficult issues which challenge them in development of towns and villages in the rest of the County. Now's the time to say enough is enough - they have already wrecked Verwood enough already with overdevelopment and equally lunatic road systems			1093
359931	R E PETERS		CSO12 862	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
477753	Mr Stephen Saville		CSO12 635	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508690	E and R Wood		CSO12 099	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508696	Kate and David Fuller		CSO12 104	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
508709	Mr and Mrs Bennett		CSO12 111	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508711	Tina Alexander		CSO12 121	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
508715	David Drayton		CSO12 131	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Not enough infrastructure to support more families living in Verwood.			1093
508718	Sienna Drayton		CSO12 136	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Not enough infrastructure.			1093
508735	Mr Peter Barham		CSO12 146	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>I have lived in VERWOOD for 28 years from the start of the original building boom. Population growth from 3000 to 14000 and a town.</p> <p>A school since constructed at the bottom of my road and the traffic has been increasing substantially to the point where 2 times a day there is gridlock with cars up and down Margards Lane.</p> <p>Before any new houses or school expansion is even considered there must be a solution to the traffic both around the school and in other areas of Verwod. There will be a serious accident / injury waiting to happen with children and pedestrians.</p>			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508738	Mankin		CSO12 152	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		We have enough traffic problems as it is.			1093
508826	Mr R.G. Smith		CSO12 163	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
508835	Mrs E.L. Stratford		CSO12 197	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The Council is always after land for housing or business development. Whatever is granted is never enough and a few years later they want more. This process has been going on for over 50 years and it is time it came to a stop. Enough is enough as it is ruining the area.			1093
508842	M G Carlyon		CSO12 215	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The facilities have not kept pace with present housing situation so approx 400 new homes will only make matters worse. Verwood lacks the infrastructure to support more houses. Traffic is bad at present, more houses will increase this. Comparisons: RINGWOOD - 2 supermarkets, Upper school, Boots, Iceland, Smiths and High Street of shops. WIMBORNE - 2 supermarkets, Upper school, and square of shops with more leading shops in roads leading off The Square. FERNDOWN - 3 supermarkets, Upper school, Boots and numerous shops. VERWOOD - 1 small supermarket, no Upper school, and some very small shops. A Post Office which was here when Verwood was a village. Some people use Three Legged Cross or Cranborne P.O. because of the long queues. This shows that Verwood has a long way to go to catch up with any of the other towns. More houses will make the situation worse.			1093
508848	M Lardner		CSO12 214	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	General comment - I would like the results published so all can see them - ie not in local papers which are not always delivered.			1093
508852	Mrs L.A.		CSO12 258	Preferred Option		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Cheshire			VWM 7						
508853	Charlotte Rout		CSO12 227	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Not enough infrastructure.			1093
508857	Mrs and Miss EJ and P D Goode and Smith		CSO12 243	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		There is an insufficient infrastructure of roads and services for a large increase of housing in Verwood. The B3081 (leading to M27 and M3), already under pressure, would see a significant increase of traffic. The Edmondsham road is a country lane completely unsuitable for a large increase of traffic. Large tracts of unspoilt countryside would be built on and nearby wildlife would be threatened. NW7 and 3 already struggle with traffic problems in school term times. Such an increase of residents would inevitably lead to a demand for more shops, services and leisure facilities - and where would they be built?! Verwood really is big enough NOW!			1093
508859	Matilda Rout		CSO12 237	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Not enough infrastructure			1093
508863	Mrs L A Seward		CSO12 252	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508865	Miss B A Page		CSO12 275	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		A secondary school needs to be around Potterne Park area (if at all: even one of 500 pupils will have a wage bill of £1 million p.a.) (I was a clerk to the Governors of a large secondary school). The Howe Lane one would be impossible for people to drive to - and parents won't use a bus if at all possible. NB. Ferndown Upper is under-subscribed. I am pleased that the area around Doe's Lane (Dewlands Farm and into Horton) has been left undeveloped: it would be the death knell of the nature reserves on Dewlands Common if it were developed, and a problem to fulfil the EU directive on river valley protection (The Crane flows across the end of Doe's Lane.)			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
508867	Mrs J Martin		CSO12 273	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I moved to Verwood in 1985 - we have no more amenities now than we did then! The road system is to serve a rural village and cannot cope with the volume of traffic and you want to make the situation worse??? You apparently have orders from 'upstairs' to provide 415 more houses - and you will - so why send these forms - I guess you have to show that you did!			1093
508874	Mr Orkney		CSO12 279	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
508887	Mr J.S. Kidd		CSO12 325	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
508890	Mr L Rackham		CSO12 295	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
508898	K Banning		CSO12 308	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
508907	Heather Teasdale		CSO12 319	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I suspect the new secondary school will be dependent on the intake for QE!! Majority of pupils are Verwood residents and a waste of money being spent on new buildings. Verwood would benefit hugely - nb facilities offered - swimming pool!!!. The ball was dropped when Bakers Field had huge flats instead of a Furlong type town centre with Baileys the Butcher and Post Office.			1093
508923	Mrs L Earl		CSO12 392	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	My opinion would only be valid if the proposal was either put into place or dropped. For the Proposal. We know the local government have to abide by government's ruling for more sustainable housing therefore it is inevitable that building will eventually come. More population should create a livelier environment adding to events we already have in place, such as farmers markets, carnivals, rustic fayes, shows at the Hub (which must be			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>badly attended as they are always short of cash), and Memorial Hall, Heritage centre etc. Obviously more rates would help local government which should help create extra amenities for local people.</p> <p>We already have a lack of shops. West Moors which has a smaller population has far far more shops . We also have 1 petrol station which denys us the benefit of competition. 400 more homes would probably increase the population by over 1000 making the area more desirable for business. Extra money from rates could help create more places of leisure or expand those we have for our teenagers who hang around with nothing to do, perhaps a skatepark or club. I would like to see any extra cash put to use making a hard surface cycle lane on one side of the Verwood to Ringwood road. Going south there is a path already for most of the right hand side, but not suitable for cycling.</p> <p>Against the proposal</p> <p>Large areas of council type housing. Nice family houses are always acceptable with intersperced council run at say 5% - 10% this would stop the rough teenage element that most people fear. Roads are not good enough to take the extra traffic that an increase of about 800 - 1000 extra cars would cause. Schools would have to be enlarged as well as the proposed new school. Well in advance of the housing, and has the Council got enough funding for this. Will the extra population cause problems for our car parking, which is often full, making it necessary to enlarge it, making us have to pay for it in the future?</p> <p>If the plans go forward may I suggest that the roads are made up by the developers. Verwood already has far too many roads that are a hazzard if one has to drive down them, it is totally unfair to tradesmen, doctors, ambulances, postmen, etc. who through no fault of their own risk flat tyres and broken suspensions.</p>			
508931	Ina Codrington		CSO12 344	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		There is already considerable volume of traffic on Church Hill particularly at peak (school) times, as this seems to be the only direct access road to Margards Lane / Howe Lane.			1093
508938	Mr		CSO12	Preferred	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Michael Smith		374	Option VWM 7						
508956	Mr T Webb		CSO12 385	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
508973	Mr Kevin Reynolds		CSO12 404	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508975	A W J Seaward		CSO12 406	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
508985	Mr N Meyrick		CSO12 440	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
509040	J W Hislop		CSO12 446	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	Ref. The development of the new secondary school in Howe Lane - VWM 7. The Springfield Road improvement MUST be COMPLETED before Building commences. To permit construction traffic up Church Hill and Margards Lane would incur ACCIDENTS and total traffic hold-ups.			1093
509043	Mrs P Craven		CSO12 471	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood is getting too overcrowded. Lack of facilities is a big factor. So many people - more cars and reduced to only one petrol station!			1093
509053	Mrs B Macfarlane		CSO12 463	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Further traffic on Church Hill during school opening hours and closing will make exit from our drive almost impossible - already very difficult. More population will make Doctor's surgery appointments even longer - already over one week.			1093
509062	Clare Symons		CSO12 479	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
509065	Mrs		CSO12	Preferred	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	B Burge		506	Option VWM 7						
509072	Juliet Garratt		CSO12 491	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
509099	Mrs L S Timberlake		CSO12 521	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		These plans will instigate the demise of Verwood socially and economically. Current infrastructure is inadequate - Roads/Doctors/Dentists/shops Beggars believe that we were refused permission to relocate the access to the front of our house, but there are now plans to completely reshape and redevelop the whole area.			1093
509116	E I Sams		CSO12 539	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
509128	Susan J Cheese		CSO12 545	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
509251	Frances Hudson		CSO12 598	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Leave Verwood alone, it's grown too much already - the infrastructure and the facilities cannot cope as it is. Verwood is a beautiful place to live - don't spoil it with more houses, more cars and more kids on the streets with nothing to do. This is just a recipe for disaster.			1093
509293	Caroline Laraman		CSO12 618	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I understand the need to develop and support a growing town, which is the case in the current climate. But my concern is that the Government can afford to build a secondary school, secondly maintain the school for the forthcoming years. Also the schools especially primary and pre-school are currently oversubscribed, so what will be done to resolve this with more families? Also what other facilities are available, eg. swimming pool etc.			1093
509421	Mr J Dowling		CSO12 652	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Unless Ferndown and Wimborne schools are oversubscribed, I think the building of a secondary school in Verwood is not a good idea, as it only breeds local gang			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							culture into our youths. It is far better for young people to mix with people from other areas, as it lessens the us and them culture.			
509861	Mrs V Aitken		CSO12 882	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
509899	Mr Peter Harfleet		CSO12 900	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
509922	Mr and Mrs V Feltham		CSO12 929	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Very serious consideration should be given to the following: 1. Verwood has no proper infrastructure - Doctors surgeries are already at bursting point and there are no available places on NHS Dentists waiting lists. 2. There's nowhere in Verwood (other than the charity shops) to purchase clothes, shoes, bedding and other household essentials. 3. Would it not be better to build the school at VWM 4 where sporting facilities and open spaces are already available at nearby Potterne Park? This in turn would relieve traffic congestion which would arise at VWM 7 if the school was sited there. 4. To erect the number of homes outlined in the document would mean a tremendous increase in traffic. Verwood is already a commuter town with people already having to travel to work, and with no proper facilities for shopping have to go to Ringwood, Bournemouth and Poole. To increase the volume of traffic would seriously affect safety and the environment.			1093
361121	Mrs Elizabeth JONES		CSO14 021	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
482795	Mr and Mrs N F Steel		CSO13 879	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
500746	Mrs		CSO13	Preferred		No	If it's needed.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	J Lothian		817	Option VWM 7		Opinion				
509952	Tracey Legge		CSO12 954	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
510420	Mr Peter Stevens		CSO13 164	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
510490	Ms Helen Banfield		CSO13 254	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
510532	W.W. Chant		CSO13 298	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
510623	Mr Douglas Priest		CSO13 408	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
510798	Mr F Sullivan		CSO13 543	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
510844	Mr Michael Guilmany-Cush		CSO13 584	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
510873	Mr & Mrs B.R. Mayes		CSO13 632	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
510974	Mr Jim Cullumbine		CSO13 662	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
510993	R.A.		CSO13	Preferred		No				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Cherrett		696	Option VWM 7		Opinion				
511001	Mr Paul Few		CSO13 703	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
511015	Mr Christopher White		CSO13 750	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
511020	Mrs E Derbyshire		CSO13 722	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
511030	K Derbyshire		CSO13 739	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
511044	Mr B L Buckman		CSO13 759	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
511047	Mr Andrew Bull		CSO13 761	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
511056	K H Saunders		CSO13 781	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
511058	Mr W Taylor		CSO13 782	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I feel that 99% of new homes will be for new arrivals, and that all services cannot cope, no matter what the developers promise.			1093
511069	Mr John Cheese		CSO13 802	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
511076	Mr Ian		CSO13 831	Preferred Option		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Burden			VWM 7						
360097	Mr John DOWLING		CSO14 512	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
511095	Mrs Warburton		CSO13 851	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
511117	Mr and Mrs G McConnell		CSO13 852	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
511128	Eileen Housden		CSO13 862	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The new secondary school should be built before the houses are developed. This has been proposed since I moved into the 'village' in 1979 when the population was a fraction of what it is today. Verwood is now just a dormitory town totally lacking in character and identity. The planning is appalling and hopefully no more blocks of flats will be allowed - the blocks of flats near The Hub are monstrous.			1093
511137	Sarah Barrow		CSO13 870	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
511175	Webber		CSO13 891	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
511181	Pauline Barrow		CSO13 901	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
511189	Miss Pamela A Stannard		CSO13 924	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
511200	Audrey Barrow		CSO13 913	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511211	Mr Peter Hodges		CSO13 938	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
511236	G Thomas and J R thomas		CSO13 936	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Church Hill is already blocked with traffic at school times. Enough is enough!			1093
511246	Mr and Mrs Daniels		CSO13 944	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		We need to be kept informed ref VWM7 as any development would have a major effect on our property.			1093
511252	Ms Mary Harris		CSO13 973	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
511294	Mr Alan Dorey		CSO13 982	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
511399	Mr & Mrs Michael and Diana Froud		CSO14 071	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
511430	A.D. May		CSO14 201	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
511489	Mr H G Holden		CSO14 183	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
511571	Colin Alborough		CSO14 238	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		We are in desperate need of more affordable housing in the East Dorset area. There is also a shortage of employment opportunities in the area. The provision of more houses should help to push house prices down to give young people a change of getting on the property ladder.			1093
511618	Mrs V		CSO14 307	Preferred Option	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Blunden			VWM 7						
511621	Ms Mary A Combe		CSO14 284	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
511711	Coombes		CSO14 446	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
511997	Mr Tom Saville		CSO14 810	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood is big enough; it doesn't need or can cope with any further development. More traffic as a result of more houses will be a disaster for the town; Verwood should not be turned into a dormitory Town.			1093
360809	Mr Brian Skyrme		CSO15 433	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		New secondary school in Howe Lane is the wrong location – support new school on land west of Trinity school. This to be built and opened before housing the middle house building period is finished. Also all roads and parking facilities to be completed at the opening date of the school. House building on the scale suggest in ridiculous without the infrastructure to support it. By this I mean, transport, shops, leisure, doctor surgeries, etc. etc.			1093
476264	Mr David Reddaway		CSO15 693	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
498376	Mrs Helen Holman		CSO15 316	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
499537	C Ayling		CSO15 352	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		We wish to keep Verwood as a small town, council/planning reps. Promised a greater variety of local shops, this will not happen with large supermarkets nearby, we will end up with a never ending urban sprawl or Bournemouth overspill. Existing school will be overloaded. The Ringwood Road will be dangerously overloaded, even greater delays will occur when making doctor/dentist appointments.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
500817	Mr L Lothian		CSO15 371	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>1) Re use or develop existing empty houses.</p> <p>2) Each house has 2 – 3 cars not 1 car. There is too much traffic and congestion in west moors. We do not need a bypass either.</p> <p>3) There are no jobs here, build the houses were there is work i.e. Bournemouth or Poole, not our green land.</p>			1093
511374	Mr Shane Smith		CSO15 189	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		<p>We have been concerned regarding the volume of traffic along Howe Lane already, and the addition of any additional housing would in our opinion cause too much strain on these old roads. As it is a fire engine could not pass during school runs. The two main roads leading out to the A31 already too busy during peak times and the addition of this number of houses would be a problem we think. Also we are worried about ruin our view – which is why we bought our house in the old area of Verwood as it was quite rural feeling.</p>			1093
511383	Mrs Jean Archer		CSO15 256	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>Existing infrastructure needs greatly improving before any new building could be considered – need senior school but build it next to trinity.</p> <p>Morrisons needs updating and competition, need another petrol station and dentist, doctor can't cope now (waited 9 days for appointment).</p> <p>In fact we need a decent shopping centre and road system. You can't have it all ways. With the amount of houses it's no longer a village more like a town with few amenities.</p>			1093
511449	Mr K F Armstrong		CSO15 266	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>Option VWM 7 must have new road access developed first along Howe Lane and into Manor Road.</p> <p>Margards Lane is not suitable for construction traffic and is already grid-locked twice per day.</p>			1093
511453	Mr & Mrs Weeks		CSO15 284	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>We object to any further housing in Verwood as there is not sufficient infrastructure to support it.</p> <p>We appreciate that a senior school is needed but are extremely concerned re the access to it and parking. The traffic in Margards Lane is now sometimes grid-locked and a further school would make this an even worse situation. We are amazed that a further school could be built in this vicinity. Safety is also an issue here as is access to emergency vehicles.</p>			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
511508	Mr & Mrs J E Maiden		CSO15 292	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Virtually no infrastructure has been provided to Verwood in the last 20 years despite the explosion in population and development. Already the road system towards Bournemouth is at breaking point if ever maintenance is required. I believe Verwood has twice the population of Wimborne but only a small fraction of the facilities, I don't want to move again!			1093
511549	Ms Debby Andrews		CSO15 326	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		There are barely any facilities for current residents and they certainly will not stretch to 400 more homes. Provide infrastructure first and then maybe I wouldn't object.			1093
511564	Ms Emma Prince		CSO15 339	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I support these proposals providing that any developers are required to provide allotments sites to the north and south of Verwood to meet the current huge level of demand. And also the facilities in Verwood (leisure etc) need to be improved to cope with additional demand.			1093
511620	Mr Neil Hudson		CSO15 345	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		You simply cannot go ahead with major expansion of Verwood (already grown from 3000 – 13000 approximate residents in 25 years) without addressing the infrastructure of Verwood itself. The roads are a classic example most residents commute out of Verwood to work. Most of this is either towards Ringwood or towards West Moors. There is already traffic build up at junction points. The access to Emmanuel school is currently down Church Hill and Margards Lane. I have recently written to the county council over the current vehicle situation affecting residents of Margards Lane, Haywards Lane, Howe Lane, Keswick Road, Lancaster Drive with drivers on the school run (in an 8 min spell I counted 250 car movements). The noise pollution is currently unbearable. When it rains we are close to gridlock (with the implications of emergency vehicle access) Margards Lane was never designed as the main school access. Any further expansion will make matters worse; you need a school access relief road built now!			1093
511827	Mr J Kennard		CSO15 357	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I'm sure there are many good reasons why affordable housing could be increased in Verwood; however access and increased traffic issues have been touched on by the			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							community. Public transport is poor for people living in Verwood: Serious investment is needed to improve transport infrastructure between Verwood and neighbouring towns and cities without constantly increasing the size of the town.			
511836	Mr J Middleton		CSO15 364	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Build all amenities first (i.e. more useful shops, sporting facilities, better bus services, more doctors etc. etc. etc.) more exit roads out of village??			1093
511850	Mr & Mrs R C Williamson		CSO15 389	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I believe the town of Verwood is unprepared for such expansion. Also building on agricultural or woodland is short-sighted, as in long term the country will need land to grow our food. The council should use brown sites as there seems to be quite a few.			1093
511855	Mr Alan Thorn		CSO15 402	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		It would be crazy to build 400 new homes without major investment in the infrastructure, with only one road in and out of Verwood and not enough doctors and dentists and only one major supermarket for 15,000 people. If the government took responsibility for building affordable housing you would only need to build 180 new homes not the current 400 proposed. This would work out cheaper in the long run as you would not have to make major investment in the infrastructure.			1093
511868	J Weedon		CSO15 461	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Any increase in housing in Verwood has an impact on the traffic through West Moors. No consideration has been given to this. Improved infrastructure is needed before housing developments.			1093
511878	Mr Paul Seymour		CSO15 503	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	I support limited development around the Trinity school area as the road system has been 'improved' in that area. I believe a small development would have no further detriment to the area. I do not support any further large scale development in Verwood or infilling of green field in Howe Lane as the area is already 'busy' with existing houses and traffic for the schools.			1093
511980	Mr Stuart Folley		CSO15 618	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The school is required to meet the requirements of existing population. Additional homes will put increasing strain on an already highly populated town.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
512072	Mr W B Chung		CSO14 832	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		New secondary school in north Verwood better transport links.			1093
512125	Mrs Julie Long		CSO14 909	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I object to an upper school being built in Howe Lane because: 1. The roads are bad enough now when children are being picked up / dropped off. With another school there the traffic would not be able to get through 2. the number of children from Verwood who would be taken from QE and Ferndown schools could leave them undersubscribed – money would be better spent increasing the size of these existing schools.			1093
512145	Mr & Mrs J Dutton		CSO14 933	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support any big development of houses, i.e. – shops are insufficient in the village, Morrisons is far too small to cope with the population as it is now. Also doctors surgeries could not cope and what about water and sewage? Could you open the old railway line – what a boom this would be for our busy roads!			1093
512175	Mr Noel Baugh		CSO15 148	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The larger concern is one of a village infrastructure (Verwood) through shops and facilities (lack of) supporting a population of 17000 already. Look at Ringwood. Its no greater population but has a better 'high street'. A larger Morrisons will not alter this per se..			1093
512281	Graham Roberts		CSO15 015	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
512326	Mr Ian Willis		CSO15 069	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
512431	Mr & Mrs Lee		CSO15 166	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		No further development of Verwood should take place until improvements have been made to facilities available to existing residents. Transport links, health facilities, shopping and work places are sadly lacking and its short sighted of council to propose putting pressure on these. Keep Verwood as a small town where it is currently a pleasant place to live. Leave us alone.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
512557	Ms Karen French		CSO15 181	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		It is a 'catch 22' situation in that in order to have a new secondary school we need new housing. The main concern is the lack of facilities for an increased population. Although Verwood is a town it has the feel and facilities of a village.			1093
512703	Rita Sweatland		CSO15 240	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
513509	Mr Roy Brodie		CSO15 409	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		As residents of Verwood for the past 16 years we would like to comment on the proposed Core Strategy. We are concerned that during our time here the population of our town has doubled but the infrastructure has stayed the same. Its true we have had a new community centre built and Ferret Green has been made a pleasant area but very little has been done to improve our roads. There are only two roads to connect us with the A31. These are extremely busy during the early hours and evening rush. Often cars entering Ringwood Road from side roads have a long wait. Huge delivery lorries block the traffic at Tesco and Baileys. The prospect of another four hundred plus cars frightens us. Surely we have had our fair share of new houses built in recent years, indeed it was once rumoured that Verwood was the fastest growing town in Europe. Many young families who moved in during that time no have children able to drive. Lets sit back now and improve what we have then think about building more houses.			1093
513581	Nicola Beesley		CSO15 415	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		In 1987 the population of Verwood was less than 10000 and the figure available for 2009 was 14820, representing an increase of 51%. However the Verwood Town Council has stated, 'that the population is expected to rise to a peak of 15000 and then hopefully stay at that level.' Obviously the figure of 15000 was determined as a result of the Council undertaking full and proper assessments of the facilities that exist in the town to support the citizens and with the due cognizance of the East Dorset District Council Structure Plan. However much the District and Town Councils deserve praise for achieving their own objective, it should be argued that			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>there is currently an inadequacy of prpoer facilities to serve the needs of the existing population and they must now apply policies to ensure that the needs of the Town inhabitants are properly addressed before additional dwelling places are built.</p> <p>The population of Verwood is already larger than that of Ringwood without the civic amenities and the people of Verwood deserve better, a proper leisure centre including a swimming pool and adequate shopping facilities. However good the service from the existing retail businesses: is a tiny post office, one petrol station; a handful of shops, and a small dated supermarket really adequate?</p> <p>Traffic in Howe Lane is atrocious particularly during rush hours with additional hazards of the school parking - emergency vehicles cannot get through now at key school times. To build adjacent to St Michaels too will mean the unmade section of Howe Lane will become a proper metalled road with the consequences of speeding increased traffic levels.</p> <p>The area between St Michaels Road and Manor Road is currently designated Green Belt land by the existing East Dorset Structure and Local Plans. Environmentally these developments are a potential disaster with the loss of much needed green space for relaxation and the habitat for local flora and fauna in addition to increased traffic and pollution volumes such development will undoubtedly bring!</p> <p>Heavy traffic flow on Manor Road currently causes congestion and safety hazards at busy times without the extra volumes which can be expected form another 165 homes - potentially 330 cars BEFORE the offspring enter the market for vehicles.</p> <p>Under each succeeding structure plan East Dorset District Council has consistently, met and excede the housing targets set for it, while protecting the Green Belt and the envirnoment of the District.</p> <p>Approval of these proposals can only lead to the destruction of the Green Belt and the local environment and future development MUST only be allowed to proceed on brown field sites within the juristriction of East District Council.</p> <p>The Town Council should continue with the objective of</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							maintaining the population at its own pre-determined level and reject these proposals, restricting any development to that which improves the amenities and lifestyle of that population. Yours faithfully, Nicola Beesley			
513617	Valerie J Brown		CSO15 422	Preferred Option WWM 7	Support		In moderation. I support moderate increase in housing but the following issues must be addressed first. 1) access to verwood via Ringwod Rd- a dangerous rd too narrow for the present traffic in rush hour. 2) Access to all the sites should protect present residents 3) General services to Verwood suitably increases 4) Money for new school (and services) definitely available 5) Woodland areas eg st Michaels/Howe Lane corner protected. ^ St Michaels Rd left xxxxxx and unlit. No xxxxstreetxxxxxlot of traffic on this narrow side road. No access from Summerfields-quite wrong,xxxxxxxcurrent properties. (This wording unreadable due to water spill prir to receivinh the form)			1093
513639	Mr and Mrs D J A Kirby		CSO15 460	Preferred Option WWM 7	Support		I live in the beautiful countryside of Verwood and would like it to stay that way. This is why my wife and I decided to move here some 11 years ago. We object to the proposed building of more houses around Verwood and Three Legged Cross. These areas already have an over popultion of houses without the required facilities. We need better road networks, larger supermarket, another petrol station, more dentists, doctors and all the NHS services are under pressure. We do not have sufficient facilities to support these additional homes. We must have better infrastructure to sustain further development FIRST including secondary school, shops and swimming pool. Also Verwood and West Moors Housing leaflet			1093
513651	Mrs		CSO15	Preferred	Support		1 Increase bus frequency and to Wimborne. More buses on			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	W Pearsall		450	Option VWM 7			Saturdays and Sundays. 1 per hour is not sufficient. 2 Increase transport to all hospitals, Bournemouth, Poole, St Leonards, Wimborne, Salisbury and Southampton. 3 Verwood needs direct links to all railway stations and airports. 4 Verwood needs allotments. Council land (including County Council) needs to be immediately available at an economic rate. Suggest land parallel to Pottern Way alongside river. land being auctioned on Pottern Way. Part of land VWM 4 in flooding area away from river. 5 VWM4 Access via Manor Rd and St Michaels Lane. Already congested and impeded vision around new gas station. Suggest small roundabout junction these 2 roads. Would slow traffic on this dangerous road and be safer for school children.			
513671	Mr and Mrs G Green		CSO15 479	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Unless we get infrastructure in place first Verwood cannot sustain more homes in such high numbers. Our facilities at present are used by other villages too and what we have here is not nearly enough. Doctors, dentists, shop, a garage, leisure facilities are really inadequate now and would not be able to support more homes. More traffic will be generated, so roads more congested and public transport is high on unavailable at times now.			1093
513719	Mr and Mrs E Roberts		CSO15 498	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood is sadly not the place we moved to 31 years ago. We feel we already have enough new building. If all these houses are built, where are the people going to work? Will they commute out of the town and make the B3081 even more busier than it is now.? Another reason, has adequate thought gone into health, ie doctors surgeries which are already overcrowded, also hospital accommodation. Also where are these extra people going to shop?			1093
513883	Mr West		CSO15 526	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
513891	Mr RA Parsons		CSO15 543	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Leave Verwood as it is. Give us more sensible shops and better roads and the allotments promised 20 years ago. We cannot keep up with			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							the housing we already have. No more.			
513900	Mr P Wall		CSO15 600	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Unfortunately more development more movement. A comprehensive transport policy should be developed eg. road improvement (A31), bus and trams, rail links (restored).			1093
513915	Mrs PA Parsons		CSO15 577	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I object to any more houses in Verwood. We have very little in shops less now than 20 years ago. Roads need a lot of attention. No concessions for allotments-if green spaces found for housing why could you not find green space for allotments. Disgrace to you East Dorset Council.			1093
360838	Cllr. Mrs Carol Holmes	Parish Councillor West Moors Parish Council	CSO16 659	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
361124	Mrs M.E Brown		CSO16 368	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
361196	Mr J.M BULLIVANT		CSO16 285	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
491252	Margaret Wareham		CSO16 593	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
499533	Mr & Mrs A & C Clein		CSO16 752	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
499779	Mr & Mrs J Wilson		CSO16 046	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I think that unless the infrastructure is in place we cannot support any new building in Verwood.			1093
511639	Paul Hockey		CSO16 103	Preferred Option	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
				VWM 7						
513974	Mr A Moore		CSO15 832	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
513988	Mr & Mrs S.G Smith		CSO15 661	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		It is absolutely essential for new road to be forthcoming if new school proceeds. In House Lane, let alone the further housing planned.			1093
514049	Mrs E Hellier		CSO15 754	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
514091	Mr RJ Potts		CSO15 870	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
514092	Ms Natasha Saville		CSO15 818	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I think that there should be no more building in Verwood without more infrastructure, shops, doctors Etc. Verwood is big enough; the green belt should be saved for future generations.			1093
514099	Mr and Mrs T C Blakeley		CSO15 862	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
514100	Mrs Eileen Gibbs		CSO15 869	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The infrastructure in Verwood is not sufficient to accommodate all the extra cards and people.			1093
514111	Penelope Webiery		CSO15 933	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
514121	Mr David Dencher		CSO15 907	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Any development should have improvement in the road network.			1093
514136	Mrs J		CSO15 967	Preferred Option	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Crumb			VWM 7						
514225	Mr Simon Dixon	Secretary West Moors Traders Association	CSO16 012	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
514246	Theresa Monahan & Jonathon Chaffey		CSO16 017	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Our feeling is this is yet another token gesture by the Council. This is clearly obvious by the planning permission that seems to be given for the most grotesque buildings in Verwood. The corner of Ringwood Road and Black Hill Road as a typical example. Also all those other awful flats in the middle of Verwood. If you are going to build then think before giving planning permission. Also speed up the development of Morrisons to keep in line with the increased population to Verwood.			1093
514274	Mr Showell		CSO16 088	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Instead of new housing there should be a new strategy of providing more public open space. The lessons of the Edwardians/Victorians should be learnt. New public parks like Poole Park, Queens Park and Kings Park save an area from urban crowding. Perhaps all the land proposed for housing could be reallocated to public parks.			1093
514282	Ian Bignell and Sally Hinchliffe		CSO16 044	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I agree with secondary school, as long as the middle school system is maintained.			1093
514287	Mr Brian Walker		CSO16 060	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Over the last few years Verwood's population has increased above 16,000 due to building expansion, I feel that Verwood has already contributed our duty to the housing problem. Any more house building would put even greater pressure on our limited infrastructure, transport services, roads, parking etc. Also within this proposal for more than 40% of affordable houses, where are these people expected to find employment in the Verwood area? No Green Belt land should be allowed to be built upon. B3081 main road out of Verwood is already over congested in the rush hours.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514344	Ms Emily Saville		CSO16 123	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Don't ruin our green belt. Too many houses in Verwood already – not enough facilities to support this!			1093
514355	Mr T Gee		CSO16 130	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Living on Station Road we have noticed the massive increase in traffic over the years. An increase of a further 400 homes would probably bring another 800 cars to an already congested town. most people who live in Verwood work elsewhere hence the high number of people travelling at commuting times. There are no employment opportunities in Verwood and no one can guarantee that firms or businesses would open up in Verwood. This is a dormitory town with a high percentage of OAP's. Building on Green Belt land in a semi rural area would directly adversely affect the quality of life of existing residents and the council must do all it can to prevent further building on Green Belt land.			1093
514367	Mr R S Coates		CSO16 158	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		We need started homes (housing assessment). We need a plan for traffic management.			1093
514379	Mrs Denise Bannister		CSO16 142	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		There are already many properties for sale in Verwood and the need to build others is questionable. An increase of 400 homes in this area potentially means 800 more cars. Access to and from Verwood is likely to become more problematical. There are very few jobs in Verwood and to increase housing further is likely to mean that more people will be travelling out of and back to Verwood each day. Whilst building a secondary school does have some merits, access to the existing schools is already difficult and at a time of serious financial constraints it would make sense economically to develop existing secondary school sites and thus minimise the effects upon the local community. Congestion within Verwood does not need to increase and in terms of environmental concerns, any further destruction of the Green Belt land around this area must be strongly and forcefully opposed. There are plenty of brownfield sites within local communities that could be enhanced by developments before encroaching on greenfield sites. Finally facilities such as shopping and community facilities would not support more			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							housing.			
514392	Alison Frost		CSO16 153	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	Please can you leave land to provide allotments for the residents of Verwood? They are a vital part of health and well being for residents with little or no garden and are much needed in the town.			1093
514429	Joan and Ann Humphries		CSO16 176	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
514455	Mrs Christine Groves		CSO16 169	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		There are enough homes and people in Verwood and enough traffic on our roads.			1093
514467	Mrs Lesley Cripps		CSO16 211	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
514482	C E T Gilbert		CSO16 247	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
514499	Mrs S H Chung		CSO16 230	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		New secondary school north Verwood better transport links.			1093
514649	Mrs June Sawyer		CSO16 322	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
514703	Mr S Harvey		CSO16 407	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The village has enough housing stock already and is too densely populated with a need for a better public transport network that operates beyond the hours of 6pm! We need to build a secondary school and more shops offering local goods and not just estate agents!			1093
514752	Claire Richardson & Jamie Shirley		CSO16 398	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514812	Mr C Sawyer		CSO16 434	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
514912	Mrs Mary Carsbury		CSO16 493	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Seeking the opinion of the general public on planning issues is all very commendable - but setting aside all political persuasion my feeling is that this is no more than a Public Relations exercise because in the end the final decisions are always to the advantage of the developers whoever they may be because of money, greed and looks good on paper. My general view is that density levels for new homes should be kept down, East Dorset has become so over developed that is its now just one big urban sprawl. Infact it has lost so much of all the natural character and charm that it used to enjoy it is hard to know where the so called green belt begins and ends.			1093
514913	Mr and Mrs M Clark		CSO16 470	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Traffic and parking are already a problem for residents close to the 2 schools in Howe Lane, Verwood. A secondary school would be a disaster. Excess noise, litter and vandalism would also be an issue, causing concern to many residents.			1093
514939	D Porter		CSO16 516	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
514959	Mr and Mrs R Fisher		CSO16 543	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
361138	Mr Rod WHITHAM		CSO16 894	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
508562	K Clayson		CSO16 950	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		More houses will create more congestion on the roads.			1093
511936	Mrs G Anstey		CSO16 994	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
514993	Dr Peter J Hardwick		CSO16 577	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>The area is already over-developed and congested - further development on the scales proposed would lead to deterioration of the environment and a reduction in the quality of life. I am particularly dismayed by continued threats to the Green Belt, especially as this Government pledged to protect it.</p> <p>I do not believe that such massive development is necessary or beneficial to the vast majority of inhabitants. Pressure on our area should be reduced by Government tackling such issues as population growth through immigration control and regeneration of brownfield sites in Midlands and North. There is a need for limited affordable and social housing locally, but not more executive homes. It is wrong to build new homes while second homes and investment properties continue to exist.</p>			1093
515033	Mr T Crump		CSO16 615	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>These proposals are typical of the failures contrived by Council and Consultants to address short term solutions to Government edict. Fundamental to any significant further development is the need for joined up thinking for transportation.</p> <p>All of these proposals further the burden on traffic flow through and around conurbation centres. These major roads are the responsibility of the government highways department. They should foot the bill for their improvements prior to further development. Some of these proposals virtually adjoin 100 instance flood lines. This is totally unacceptable. Any proposal to move allotments, away from the housing that uses them, increases road useage and has a negative impact on the community.</p>			1093
515086	Mrs Elaine Pugh		CSO16 626	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
515114	M J Porter		CSO16 640	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
515148	Mr E G		CSO16 647	Preferred Option		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Howarth			VWM 7						
515255	Mr and Mrs C Beck		CSO16 652	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	No problem with extra homes being built if facilities are increased – i.e. 1) Medical facilities – another surgery, more doctors, (we already have to wait for appointments!) nurses, dentists, opticians, chiropodists 2) Transport improvements 3) Extra police 4) Extra shops, larger post office and library 5) Leisure facilities – especially swimming pool 6) Elderly retirement homes			1093
515287	Mr L Jackson		CSO16 689	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
515354	Mr Walker		CSO16 716	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
515367	Mr & Mrs J Pottinger		CSO16 816	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
515786	Mrs A M Bright		CSO16 835	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		As a recent inhabitant of Verwood I am happy to support plans which will enable others to move to a town I have grown to love. It would be selfish to try to keep the town just for those of us already here. However I do not support the large development as I see the influx of over 2000 people creating a number of problems. Large developments seldom encourage community spirit and many house buyers are reluctant to purchase on an estate with large proportion of social housing. We do not need more empty properties. I am also concerned that without improvement to our infrastructure (more schools, shops, etc) Verwood may become ever more of a dormitory town.			1093
516343	Mrs J Stebbings		CSO16 957	Preferred Option VWM 7		General Comment	My concern is that a full infrastructure be in place to cope with the extra pressure on amenities, in particular doctors/dentists surgery			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Transport Employment opportunities Facilities for young people Taking into consideration population growth in the whole areas in the scheme extra pressure on hospitals-already under strain.			
517572	Mr D Alexander		CSO17 004	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
517717	Mr Frederick Thorne		CSO17 125	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
517818	LT. CDR R Bennett RNR RETD.		CSO17 239	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The ratio of affordable homes is a major concern 400 extra dwellings will put further overload onto public services including sewage and drain systems. This number of dwellings will introduce at least an extra 1000 people + around 600 cars to the area. All this when we have virtually lost our fire service and police station Edmondsham Road still has no lighting, no footpath and no drains, how's that for progress.			1093
517935	J H Stacey		CSO17 267	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		As an extension to the schooling area - in effect - and on condition that a new secondary school is built so as to integrate the education of Verwood's children, I support it.			1093
518035	Mr Peter Pugh		CSO17 293	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
518041	D Bury		CSO17 289	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The reasons for my objections are: 1. No clearly defined access to the sites. 2. These sites are situated in a flood zone and further building work would make an existing problem worse. 3. Intrusion of the countryside and wildlife. 4. We are in a 'Special Character Area' and it should be preserved. 5. Large increase in traffic. 6. Excessive noise from school in a primarily retirement area.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Reference is made to the East Dorset Local Plan, Chapter 13, adopted 11 Jan 2002, page 213, 13.00, Policy V26. Manor Lane and St. Michaels Road will be CLOSED at their junctions with the B3072 Manor Road, turning facilities will be provided. In each case the road will remain open to pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists. We moved into our property on the 28th June 2004 our rear access backs onto St. Michaels Road, we are still waiting for this road to be CLOSED and would expect the Council to honour their existing commitments before other badly thought out schemes.			
359477	Ms Natasha Mackenzie	Clerk Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council	CSO17 713	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support	General Comment	Until a new secondary school is built in Verwood any new housing will also mean even more journeys to Ferndown and Wimborne.			1093
359547	Mrs V BRIGHT	Town Clerk Verwood Town Council	CSO17 960	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support	General Comment	Support, provided robust traffic management measures and transport infrastructure improvements are implemented before the school is opened. The school could well become a reality if the need for a school were to be triggered by a shortage of secondary school places within the catchment area of which Verwood is part. However, the current non-statutory core strategy quotes that if further homes were built, this could enable Verwood to have an Upper School. We would like EDDC to confirm in the statutory core strategy when it is released that a new school will be built, together with proposed infrastructure of new roads to accommodate the increase in traffic, and timescales.			1093
359891	Mrs Susanne Parkin		CSO18 355	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
478398	Mrs Diana Saville		CSO17 690	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I strongly object to building houses on green belt. The green belt is there for a reason, to protect the countryside. Verwood does not have the infrastructure to cope with more development. In particular the roads cannot cope with more traffic. Most people work and do shopping outside Verwood. More houses would just create a bigger dormitory town.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
515763	Mr V S Harris		CSO17 797	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Needed without additional houses			1093
518073	Mrs S Williams		CSO17 312	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The only part of the proposals that I might support if the building of a new secondary school. However, I would only do this if it wasn't used as a justification for further house building. I am currently happy for my children to travel to Bournemouth and Wimborne - although I can see that future people would have problems if their children couldn't get into Wimborne due to its being oversubscribed.			1093
518095	Mrs M R Owen		CSO17 317	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I am objecting to the listed developments because of my concerns over land and mains drainage. Also there is no information on access to the proposed new school and also the proposed closure of Verwood police station as reported in the daily echo. There are not enough facilities for health care i.e. doctors, dentists for existing population as things are now never mind another 400+ houses.			1093
518105	John Maskell		CSO17 329	Preferred Option VWM 7		General Comment	<p>The proposal VWM7 (New Secondary School) would have my support if the need could be demonstrated with robust figures, if there was any sign of funding being in place and provided it was not built on the site next to Emanuel School. It seems to me that the need has yet to be proved whilst there are still places available at Ferndown Upper. It also seems to me that the school would need a minimum of 800+ pupils to be viable and I doubt there are that many pupils of the right age profile in Verwood.</p> <p>At a meeting I attended, prior to Christmas in the Memorial Hall, the District Councillors present indicated there was no funding available for this school and unlikely to be for the next 15 years, so why is it part of the Core Strategy Options? The site for a new school should be reconsidered as the traffic congestion in Howe Lane/Margards Lane at present is unacceptable even to the extent emergency vehicles cannot access the school at certain times of the day. The addition of a secondary school would make this intolerable even with the most stringent traffic management policies. I would suggest the site of the old Potterne Park poultry farm may be more</p>			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>appropriate especially adjacent to built-in sports facilities. To conclude I think it is time for Verwood to be left to consolidate as we are managing improvements as we can ans as money becomes available.</p> <p>Improvements provided they are the right improvements, generated by the Morrison's expansion are welcome and should be encouraged.</p> <p>The other towns in East Dorset may think too much investment has been made in Verwood but Ferndown, Wimborne, Christchurch and the like have not expanded at the same rate as Verwood and have not been left in such a mess either.</p> <p>I have been a resident in Verwood since 1986 and have seen most of the rapid expansion and along with a large number of others have sat back and done nothing about it. The Verwood apathy is no more, please listen to what we have to say. I appreciate some of it will be highly emotive, probably vitriolic and some downright rude but amongst all of it there will be a great deal of sense and constructive comments. Please Listen!</p>			
518303	Mr P R Owen		CSO17 357	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>Nothing in the plan about access to the school. Also concerns about land surface water drainage with ref to Howe Lane site (V3) also main drainage.</p> <p>With reference to Burnbake Road. Some years ago when a development behind Elmtree cottage caused surface water to engulf the site and the cottage had to be demolished. As I am sure you can remember this would be a problem for VWM 3 and 4 sites.</p>			1093
518433	Chris Holmes		CSO17 367	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		<p>Thank you for the chance to comment. I feel that your plans include too many social houses, your plans have much detail but why the disproportionate number of low cost houses. In all cases you are looking for 50%, which is just too many. Because of this I object to your plan. Additionally the link between the new school and the new houses is not wholly clear, but you are trying to make that link, perhaps to gain extra support for this biased proposal.</p>			1093
518812	Mrs		CSO17	Preferred		No				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	L Munn		389	Option VWM 7		Opinion				
518882	Mrs Doreen Knowlden		CSO17 403	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		VWM 3 and 4 will both create traffic problems for Howe Lane and area especially if school located in VWM 7, better location would be VWM 4. We also have a very ill though out road system already in place!			1093
518895	Mr Mark Gifford		CSO17 407	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Verwood is already overcrowded with housing. There are not enough local facilities to support the population; we need pubs, restaurants, better transport links and better facilities for younger people. There is no employment in the area; more houses will just increase the "dormitory" feel to the town. The road system cannot cope with the traffic at peak times. We already need a secondary school as the number of children in the town is increasing – QE and Ferndown will not cope with future demand + a local secondary school would be a real benefit to the community. No more housing in Verwood please.			1093
518905	Mrs Burbidge		CSO17 420	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Over the last 30 years Verwood has expanded hugely, facilities have not increased, with intention to provide more affordable homes, hence families, surely have a plan to incorporate a indoor recreational facility aimed at the youth, with a refreshment area, affordable for youths, the hub is only ok for older people which is why hundreds of kids congregate at the park opposite Tesco express Verwood in winter + summer. Come on council think again wisely!			1093
519265	Mrs Pat Morrow		CSO17 432	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I am in favour, in principal, of the proposed developments provided that: 1) The infrastructure needed is in place before building. 2) That the transport situation is improved. 3) That parking in the town centre is reversed and all day parking is prohibited. The development of a park and ride system could be available for those wishing to use free bus passes – A Blake a possibility. 4) That facilities – doctors, dentists, shops (not estate agents) land uses – are affordable.			1093
519368	Mr		CSO17	Preferred	Object		Road Structure will not take any more traffic. Single lane			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Frederick Iley		438	Option VWM 7			roads at school time will only take a car width and then with difficulty.			
519400	Mrs Bailey		CSO17 529	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I moved to Verwood 23 years ago. Now everywhere is packed solid with shoppers at the only supermarket, upto 5 years ago you could get a doctor's appointment within a day, now because of the already great volume of people it's a week or more. The roads are full opposite my house, the evenings and weekends "Close" is like a parking lot only one garage for petrol unless you can get in Ringwood or Wimborne. No Verwood cannot cope now, so no more buildings please.			1093
519890	Mrs Christine Iley		CSO17 615	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Schools in Verwood are full and have been for a long time. Will building a secondary school solve the problems of infant + middle school problems when most people who buy new homes are young families of infant intake?			1093
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17 584	Preferred Option VWM 7		General Comment	<p>Chapter 11 - Verwood and West Moors</p> <p>Our main concern regarding development area is foul drainage and the capacity of Palmerford Sewage Treatment Works (STW). This is discussed below.</p> <p>All options</p> <p>Foul Drainage</p> <p>The effluent capacity at Palmersford STW is currently unknown. This is particularly relevant because development in Verwood is believed to connect to this STW, and this settlement is part of the Core Strategy. The capacity of Palmersford STW and associated infrastructure must be established as part of the Core Strategy evidence.</p> <p>Overall issues for consideration are: surface water drainage; SUDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter.</p> <p>Overall issues for consideration are: surface water drainage; SUDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for</p>			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention. Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter			
520657	Miss Claire Gibbins		CSO17 633	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
520671	P Hancy		CSO17 657	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
520737	S New		CSO17 671	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	Main concern with new school is access via Margards Lane / Church Hill. Are alternatives planned off of Manor Road? If VWM 4 goes ahead can some agreement be arrange with developers to provide new road to school campus via Healthy How?			1093
520920	David Moss	Chair of Governors Ferndown Upper school	CSO17 674	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>We studied this paper with great interest and were drawn to the section 'What is under consideration for Verwood' and specifically the Option reference VWM7 'New Secondary School in Howe Lane'.</p> <p>We cannot understand the way in which this proposal is presented in the document, nor can we understand how a new secondary school in East Dorset could possibly have viable numbers in the medium term, though we cannot comment on the period 2016-2027 as we do not have reliable projections of pupil numbers that far ahead.</p> <p>Our main point of contention however is the apparent failure to even recognise that there are actually TWO very good Upper schools in East Dorset. Both QE and Ferndown Upper have received the same gradings from Ofsted in the last two inspections. Here at Ferndown the inspectors judged our overall effectiveness to be 'Good' and our safety and care of students to be 'Outstanding'. You can see this for yourself in the December 2010 Ofsted report which I am including in this letter</p> <p>Over the last 5 years Ferndown Upper has improved rapidly, at one stage we were the most improved school in Dorset! this has meant increasing popularity and we have seen a</p>			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							500% increase in applications from the Verwood area in just two years! We take a substantial number of pupils into Year 9 from both Emmanuel Middle and Cranborne Middle schools, as well as some of the Middle schools in Wimborne. These numbers, added to those from west Moors Middle and Ferndown Middle mean that FUS is nearly full for 2011. Nevertheless we still have some surplus places and can accommodate more applications from the Verwood areas. So please could you explain the meaning of 'local children would not have to be bussed 7 miles to Wimborne'? This statement implies that this is the only choice for parents in Verwood, when for years Emmanuel Middle school parents have had the benefit of two choices, being a dual catchment between Wimborne and Ferndown pyramids. We could understand the statement if it had made reference to BOTH Upper schools, but you have ignored FUS completely in this document. We hope that East Dorset District Council will join with local parents, businesses, community groups and others, and support the progress and development of this school.			
520927	Ms I Jenson		CSO17 682	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
520965	Mrs J Lake		CSO17 695	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Can the existing roads take the extra traffic that will arise with a new school? Verwood needs more infrastructure (shops, doctors, dentists etc. or perhaps another supermarket) if it is to expand so much.			1093
359482	Ms Helen POWELL	Conservation Officer Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team	CSO18 769	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		This is a critical location for strategic SANG provision to relieve some of the existing recreational pressure on the European designated sites here. If this option is taken forward, we advise that consideration should be given to the provision of SANG to be provided alongside the development.			1093
359571	Mr Renny Henderson	Conservation Officer Royal Society	CSO18 722	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		We agree with the findings of the HRA in connection with the proposed housing sites within these areas. Consequently, until such time as assessment of the potential impacts of the			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
		for the Protection of Birds					options on European sites is determined we object to the following policies:			
478224	Mrs Julia Goodwin		CSO18301	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>Verwood schools currently provide facilities for primary only and not secondary. The schools themselves are near to capacity and an increase in population will only compound this problem. There is mention of a secondary school in the Strategy Document and land has already been set aside. However, at the recent meeting with EDDC it was publically said that there was no funding available to build a secondary school at present. What the Strategy Document proposes is to increase the population and housing with no thought or consideration for the structures. The two should go hand in hand so there is no crisis situation. Work also needs to be considered into the infrastructure around these schools. Trinity school currently shuts its gates causing parents to walk long distances, crossing busy and over populated roads. The same is true at Hillside, Verwood First and Emmanuel. These are problems already raised with EDDC, yet no action has being taken. Why is this? With an increase of up to 800 cars, and extra children how are these schools likely to cope? Is this not a disaster waiting to happen?</p>			1093
521457	Mr and Mrs M Daymond		CSO17848	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>3. VWM7 – SCHOOL a) Wrong Location Anyone who thinks Margards Lane/Howe Lane is an appropriate area for yet another school has not been there at 9am or 3pm. Parents recommend arriving before 2.35pm in order to park for children coming out at 3pm; parking is on both sides of Margards Lane and Howe Lane, allowing only single file for moving vehicles; they also park in Haywards Way and Keswick Way . The area is already dangerous for children walking home from school and, reportedly, there have been near misses. Yet another school effectively more than trebling the pupils in the area, would be impossible to manage. (4 First Schools in the catchment area including 3LX will feed the Upper School.) We are told that currently the Age Concern bus is unable to get through at these busy times – how then would an</p>			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>ambulance or fire engine cope? In fact there has been a problem with an ambulance trying to get to the school recently and a near miss accident with a pupil – “Avon Advertiser” 15th December 2010, front page.</p> <p>Cllr Toni Coombs has stated that the new Springfield Distributor Road, not due to be built until 2014, will ease the problem with a one-way system. The problem is not “moving traffic”, the problem is parking. Some of the proposed upper school site could become a waiting area for parents.</p> <p>b) Look to the Future We support additional development only if we are guaranteed an Upper School. As the area expands, an Upper School could in time attract pupils from Cranborne and Alderholt and maybe even West Moors if Ferndown becomes over-subscribed – therefore this means school buses. Margards Lane and Howe Lane are not suitable for buses.</p> <p>c) Duplication of Facilities An Upper School needs a large area for sports facilities which may also be shared with the public out of school hours. This will duplicate facilities that are already at Potterne Park or being considered for building elsewhere. Forward thinking required (see 4 e).</p> <p>d) The site for an Upper School The proposed Upper School site is better left for expansion or improved facilities for the Middle School in the future. In fact the local County Councillor, speaking at a public meeting recently, has already said the Middle School will be expanded. The land could also provide parking for parents (paragraph a above) and much needed allotments for the community. The school, too, could have adjacent allotments.</p> <p>4. OUR SUGGESTION : Build the Upper School off the Verwood to Three Cross Road in close proximity to Potterne Park so that this area can be multi-functional and utilised in the daytime by the school and evenings and weekends by the clubs. There is land adjacent to Potterne Park which could have access off the main road or via Potterne Way; or there is land on the other side of the main road which could be linked to Potterne Park by a footbridge over the main road.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							In this location public bus routes could serve the school and it will make use of existing under-used sports facilities. It could also be an opportunity to remove the derelict buildings alongside Potterne Park which are an eyesore. THINK AHEAD : When Verwood has an Upper School it is likely that it will be used by children from Alderholt and Cranborne. This means school buses – this site could be designed to cope with buses and would be far more easily accessible. Consider a winter snow scenario on the incline of Margards Lane with cars parked on either side.			
522240	Association Verwood Residents	Chairman Association Verwood Residents	CSO18 109	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>New Secondary School at Howe Lane The proposal to build a new secondary school adjacent to the Emanuel School in Howe Lane must be the most ill-conceived of all proposals. There does not seem to be any evidence that a viable secondary school is currently necessary. Where and what are the figures to support this proposal? The local education authority identified the need for additional first and middle school provision (which is supported by the new first school site to the North of Verwood). In 2002 the only "need" for this school would be an increase in the 13-18 year old population. Why would parents move into Verwood as a dormitory town leaving their young adults unable to find local employment? If the criteria for establishing this new school is dependent on the level of housing development elsewhere in East Dorset this would invariably suggest that instead of "bussing" out pupils from Verwood we would be "bussing" them in from other areas. Since the 2002 Town Plan Verwood's population has grown steadily with the number of senior school children increasing by some 15% and the housing proposals in the Core Strategy will add a further 10%. For the new secondary school to be economically viable it will need to cater for a minimum of 800 students. This will mean approximately 300 students will need to be imported from other areas in East Dorset adding to the traffic problems. Based on information given by District Councillors and public meetings held in Verwood there is no funding for a new</p>			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>Secondary School and with the current economic situation there is unlikely to be funding for the duration of this Core Strategy, so why has it been included? Is it a "red herring" to try and persuade the younger parents of Verwood to vote for these proposals?</p> <p>Again more GREEN BELT LAND will be lost to accommodate this proposal.</p> <p>The proposed site is well within 400metres of Dorset Heathland (Dewlands Common) – a Greenfield site would be turned into a building site, forcing wildlife to retreat and compete for habitats. There would be increased traffic and pollution.</p> <p>The proposed development would decline the underlying landscape through provision of fencing and walls, loss of hedgerows and trees, increased lighting and widened roads. There would also be an adverse impact on local residents with associated noise.</p> <p>As a result of Emanuel School there is traffic chaos at many times of the day as pupils are dropped off or collected by parents in motor vehicles. Recently an emergency vehicle could not reach the school for a medical emergency which could have proved to be much more serious.</p> <p>The Springfield Distributor Road has yet to be constructed and whilst we have been told it will happen in 3-4 years' time the residents remain unconvinced. We consider it inconceivable that the secondary school could be accommodated on this site without major highway improvements that would almost certainly involve some measure of compulsory purchase orders. If the school construction is not funded where would the highway improvement funding come from?</p> <p>We would suggest much more consideration is given to this proposal, when there is a likelihood funding will be available, and the feasibility investigated in more detail.</p> <p>The District Council should investigate more suitable land for any proposed new secondary school such as the almost derelict Potterne Poultry Farm. This site would simplify traffic movements, including the bussing in/out of students and have the added benefit of readymade playing fields at Potterne Park which are rarely used during the weekdays.</p>			

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							In the meantime the designated land could be earmarked short-term for two other uses, namely: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a pick-up drop down area to ease congestion at the Margards Lane and Howe Lane junction (this could be constructed in a natural way to blend in with the rural surrounding) • As allotments, there are few if any available in Verwood (this could also generate a small income) 			
522257	Mr Richard Beaman		CSO18 106	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		My support for the additional housing proposed in Verwood and Wimborne is conditional, based on building the proposed secondary school in Verwood. The new school should start to be built prior to or at the same time as any of the proposed larger housing developments.			1093
522404	Mr David Puckeridge		CSO18 139	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
522671	Mrs K Thompson		CSO18 171	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Verwood has expanded rapidly in terms of housing but what it lacks is any infrastructure. The facilities for the existing population are poor. If further housing is to be considered we first need to consider the existing residents and plan for and encourage retail and leisure businesses into the Verwood area. Compare Verwood with Ringwood, where there is a high street with a variety of retail outlets (book shop, delicatessen, fashion, restaurants, butcher, cook ware, pets and country stores etc) there is also the Furlong centre with nation chain outlets. Verwood on the other hand has no 'identity' and no heart to it. It is not cohesive and has no central area. Before further increasing housing in the locality planners need to take a good look at local amenities. We have very little here for the young, for example. We have a high proportion of families, hence the perceived need for a new secondary school, but very little in the way of activities for children and particularly the teenagers. Local amenities must be improved before further increasing the resident population. Facilities at Pottern Park eg. the tennis courts are in a poorly maintained state, the Hub provides little for the teenagers and the leisure centre needs expanding. There are			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							no decent restaurants/cafe and the place feels like a ghost town where people come to sleep but entertain themselves elsewhere. This needs to be addressed in a considered way rather than just building more housing. If these areas are to be built on why not take the opportunity to address some of the issues mentioned above rather than just expanding the resident population?			
523262	Mr & Mrs Jones		CSO18 265	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
523300	Mr Trevor Abbott		CSO18 305	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
523326	Mrs H Clark		CSO18 327	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 273	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>The document correctly underlines the importance of the Dorset Heathlands. However it is essential to note that at this stage there is no evidence to support the theory that development of SANGs will actually sufficiently alleviate unacceptable pressure on the Dorset Heathlands. Indeed what evidence there is indicates that the approach is unlikely to be fully successful. Yet the Core Strategy is based on the assumption that the approach will work, and there is even a detectable implication that the Dorset Heathlands actually need income generated from further development to be protected and managed! This is a gross distortion of the concept of SANGs. Actually SE Dorset cannot continue to accept open ended growth without damage to heathland and the now apparently universal approach of tacking on an area of SANG to every new development on the basis that it protects, or even somehow enhances heathland biodiversity, is extremely worrying.</p> <p>Preferred options in the Core Strategy most obviously having damaging implications for heathlands, be they SSSIs or SNCIs, include KS3, KS4 (Coopers Lane south), VWM4 and VMW7.</p>			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							There is a commitment to restore and link heathland within south-east Dorset and areas most suitable for such restoration have been identified. There are options within the CS which would preclude such beneficial restoration including KS3/ PC7, PC4, and PC5.			
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO18 997	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
527501	Eve Thompson		CSO18 785	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood has expanded too much and hasn't enough facilities i.e. dentist, shops etc to service the present population. The number of extra cars will impact on the narrow roads.			1093
527512	Eric Thompson		CSO18 801	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		More houses mean more cars. 400 houses maybe 600 to 800 more vehicles, we are bursting at the seams. The roads in our town are generally in poor condition. More cars mean more pollution, more noise more traffic jams. You should be thinking more of the people who already live in the town I have not found anyone who supports these proposals. We don't have the infrastructure to support hundreds of extra people. Statistically crime and anti social behaviour will rise. In these times of cut backs are we to get more police and more fire fighters to cope with the extra load?			1093
527740	Anne Parsons		CSO18 895	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Verwood 1. Why should our children wait until a further 400+ homes are built before they get their long awaited Secondary School - one can only presume that the planning gain will pay for this.			1093
527750	Mr Colin MacNee		CSO18 927	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
359875	Dr Lesley HASKINS		CSO19 302	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The urban fringe of south-east Dorset supports a range of acid and neutral grasslands which seem to have escaped improvement to some degree or another by virtue of being marginal to main stream agriculture. Many of these grasslands are grazed by horses, tending to mask their floristic composition, and making recognition of their value, without the opportunity for a properly timed and preprepared			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>survey, an inevitably random affair While some have been recognised as SSSIs, or SNCIs others are certainly yet to be formally identified and recognised by such proper survey. Yet they represent a most important and rapidly diminishing biodiversity resource which must be properly identified and protected. There is little or no reference to this resource in the Core Strategy and it is most worrying that no proper attempt at assessment was made of preferred sites prior to its publication. Consequently the number of preferred options in the Core Strategy which impact upon important grasslands is simply not known, and it will be essential that all proposed sites be assessed most carefully in respect of this resource before decision making progresses any further. The intrinsic biodiversity interest of the grassland sites (and their associated features - hedges, trees etc.) must be properly assessed during the coming year and be accorded proper weight in the judgement of these options.</p> <p>However it is certain that by rejecting some areas of search the Core Strategy has successfully steered away from areas where grasslands of interest would most likely to have been substantially threatened. This is welcomed and supported. This site is close to Dewlands Common SSSI . The development of school and associated infrastructure and facilities would have implications for the Common in respect of increased access, noise and light pollution</p>			
527849	Miss Kate Tunks	Transport Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO19 066	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		<p>A new upper school at the current school campus in Verwood would have the benefit of reducing the need for pupils to travel from Verwood to upper schools elsewhere in the district. The whole town is within recommended walking or cycling distance from the schools so use of these modes rather than the car should be high. However this is also likely to bring about a greater need for delivery of the Springfield Distributor Road to improve access to the school sites via all modes of travel.</p>			1093
533834	Mr Tim Harris		CSO19 214	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
533862	Mr Paul Holman		CSO19 228	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
533905	Mr & Mrs A Kell		CSO19 254	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		There is a need for an upper school in Verwood, but, as already stated, the proposed site is virtually at the end of a cul-de-sac, with impossible transport/parent access, with vital issues for emergency access.			1093
534820	Paul Batten		CSO19 444	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
534837	Mrs P Martin		CSO19 504	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	Horses need grazing land. No infrastructure in place for the total number of homes planned. I do not go out between 8.00 and 9.30 am and 3.00pm and 6.30pm because of the traffic on the roads now.			1093
534875	Brian Lane		CSO19 550	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
534904	Mr Martin Aldridge		CSO19 582	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I strongly object to any more development in Verwood it's time to pick on somewhere else. The road from Verwood to Ringwood is at capacity in the morning and evening rush-hours. My local road to the schools is at capacity and suffers from intense school traffic and no attempt has been made over the years to make up the unmade roads to provide alternative routes to the schools. If I have to leave a car in the road overnight it causes chaos with the school run. Please build more houses in much much more central locations where they are needed not in a saturated place out in the sticks. I know your destruction of Verwood as a place to live is almost complete but please please build elsewhere it's only common sense. If you cannot drive Verwood is an expensive place of isolation. Ringwood has the advantage of a coach link. Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch have train links. As a minimum Verwood should have both a free bus service to Ringwood and a safe separate from the road tarmaced cycle path to Ringwood so that the fit and able can quickly get to Ringwood for free instead of a £6 return bus service that			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							takes hours and goes around the houses. Planners - get real.			
534914	Mrs P Froud		CSO19 681	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
535005	Mr Mike Scott		CSO19 585	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		It is so easy to automatically object to proposals that will most certainly improve the very poor infrastructure of Verwood but it is so important to understand what is actually going to happen to our town. The plans for the new secondary school south of Howe Lane appear at first sight to be quite clear as to their precise location (as per the map of VM7). However, various people have contacted staff at Furzehill and it sounds as though the plans for the school could extend to land between the existing schools towards Dewlands Common as this land also belongs to the Council. Your comments would be most appreciated as to this issue and I look forward to your response. Regards Mike Scott			1093
535026	Mr Andy Thompson		CSO19 591	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
535040	Mr Tom Garnham		CSO19 596	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I have lived in Dorset for 15 years, the last 8 of which have been in Verwood. Verwood is unique in that in terms of population it can be considered a town but in all other respects it bears no resemblance to what most of us commonly think of as a town. Sandwiched by open countryside and Ringwood Forest, it is a wonderful location in which to live but in just the last 8 years I have seen changes. With the building of additional housing and the disappointing emergence of blocks of flats wholly out of keeping with the surrounding area, increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic has been noticeable. I would strongly urge you not to approve any further housing developments for Verwood. The process of development is irreversible. If any of the options under consideration are approved the beautiful landscape those developments would replace will be lost forever with incalculable consequences for the diverse wildlife they sustain. In addition, the increase in population we again amend the Green Belt boundary. Now is the time to take a			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							long-term view and put conservation ahead of the seemingly inexorable tide of development. Despite many years of development, Verwood has somehow managed to retain its rural character. For the benefit of its residents, the wildlife it sustains, the people of Dorset, and for future generations please do what you can to keep it that way.			
535049	Mr Ian Parsons		CSO19 601	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
535055	R Knox		CSO19 604	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
535070	Mr Alan Reade		CSO19 635	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535096	Mrs S M West		CSO19 663	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
535103	Neil Clarke		CSO19 675	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
535112	Mr Jack Tindall		CSO19 720	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The upper school will not be built within the life of this document, and will not be able to go ahead on the land proposed due to lack of access to the site and the close proximity to the heathland. If this issue were to be sorted out before the building of more houses then I would support the proposals but not until.			1093
535167	Lynda Lake		CSO19 767	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535169	Mrs A Jarvis		CSO19 737	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I am totally against any further building in Verwood.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535176	Mrs Krithia Blaker		CSO19 747	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood is over populated...over built and under facilitated....We have had more than our fair share of houses built in Verwood. Let somewhere else have more housing built. People state Verwood is one of the fastest growing towns in Dorset.That is so dreadful. As I said before it is some other town that needs to take on the building of more homes. Let some other town take the strain. VERWOOD HAS DONE MORE THAN IT'S FAIR SHARE OF BUILDING. There are NO jobs here for people why bring hundreds more people here?? We are still in a recession businesses are closing down. Ferndown trading estate has lots of EMPTY units as does Ebblake. I agree it would be nice to have an Upper school nearer to Verwood...ideally between 3 legged cross/West Moors/Verwood. That would then suit 3 areas. The position the proposal suggests for the school is totally unacceptable already extremely dangerous for Children.Another school in this position would bring in hundreds more children.....and HUNDR EDS more CARS. I also feel building on Greenbelt land is unacceptable....You can't keep moving the *Goalposts* Greenbelt must remain greenbelt!!!!.			1093
535180	Mrs M Field		CSO19 760	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535196	Mr R Field		CSO19 778	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535206	Mr Calvert		CSO19 828	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood does not have the infrastructure to support this type of development; it is still trying to catch up, from poor implementation and direction from past developments Buses: lack & frequency of service to neighbouring areas, Lack of Sporting and recreational facilities, Lack of Facilities for teenagers eg resulting in the current enforcement of the banning of Alcohol in certain areas Lack of local employment, Current centres of employment being in Bournemouth, Pool, Wimborne Resulting in Poor road / transport support in and out of Verwood along the B3081 and its intersections with			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							other junction eg: A31, Alderholt junction, and Cranborne / Wimborne, The withdrawal of the Ringwood road improvement and the A338 funding Lack social services with in the area Dentists etc .: . How is the new school going to be funded and would this be built before the additional housing , would the funding for such a project be ring fenced in this current financial climate to ensure children do not have to be bussed out of the area . Currently the council can not find funding or land option for allotments for existing residents, we been waiting for over 3 years for this simple amenity.			
535209	Mr P Webster		CSO19 801	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Please liaise with NFDC and NPA,as the additional traffic generated by the extra housing and employment zones will increase the traffic problems at the already congested bottleneck at Ringwood and cause yet more problems for the people who live in New Forest hamlets such as Linwood,Brook and Burley as motorists try to find alternative routes. Can the New Forest take any more pressure from additional numbers of visitors? Has Dorset got enough sand and gravel in the landbank to meet the needs of the developers? Can you force Tarmac to start mining gravel by the Spur Road near Hurn? What will happen to the pollution levels close to the trunk roads eg at Ringwood,especially particulate pollution? Can Bournemouth Water meet the increased demands for water?			1093
535349	P Thomas		CSO19 836	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535360	Mrs Phyllis Peach		CSO19 843	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
535368	Mr Andrew Evans		CSO19 985	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I think that this whole core strategy consultation needs a full review in light of the proposed changes being brought in under the new government. I particularly object to all the proposed Verwood development as the infrastructure is not in place to support the current population let alone adding even further to it by building a further 400 homes. Any EDDC councilor who has the affront to say that the infrastructure is			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							in place to support this development does not know what they are talking about and obviously do not live in the town.			
535387	Mr Brian Cox		CSO19 966	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
360977	Mr Nick Solomon		CSO20 739	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
489765	Derek KEAREY		CSO19 518	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
535393	Jeremy Berg		CSO19 913	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		ROADS, ROADS, ROADS, BEFORE YOU BUILD ANYWHERE & DESTROY EVERYONES WAY OF LIFE FOREVER, BUILD ROADS & BY PASSES.			1093
535395	Clare James		CSO19 893	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
535404	Danika Irving		CSO19 909	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		With all current development having seemed enough! There is now the 'threat' of more. Verwood does not have what is required to support further development, our road systems are minimal and already pushed to a level where it is a 'stress' to move through the main roads or move out of various junctions.....further development will require traffic control to be implemented to allow for the increase in population and therefore traffic. As we are aware most households own more than one car and any family or individual living in verwood would require transport to enable them to exit verwood to reach amenities as we don't have these that shall fulfill the needs and what we do have is only just coping with these high levels. I.e tesco and the congestion caused due to traffic parking on manor road. Morrisons, parking sufficient! Yet the store is always over crowded!! Finally the schools are already having severe issues with regards to traffic, parking etc when parents do ing their daily pick ups or drop offs, the situation shall only worsen with			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							another school. We already have only a small area surrounding the schools and inadequate parking that deals for the needs of children attending verwood 1st, Emmanuel and verwood 1st pre-school Doesn't bear thinking what another school will do to the current state.			
535421	Mr Roland Andrews		CSO19 921	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
535457	Mr Matthew Newman		CSO19 981	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535500	David Veevers		CSO20 026	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535504	Mr Michael Beer		CSO20 097	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
535508	Bill Bowden		CSO20 049	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood would not support this amount of housing. It is no good deciding to build a large number of properties without first considering the road system. A large number of people leave the town in the morning to travel to work and this will undoubtedly increase with the introduction of new homes. Can the existing power supply, sewerage system, and water supply cope adequately with this number of houses?. Has a proper in depth survey been carried out?. The tendency to flood from water courses can change dramatically if green field sites are concreted and water run off is much more rapid during heavy rains. Have the appropriate surveys for protected and endangered species been carried out in areas where new housing is proposed?			1093
535509	Mrs S Durant		CSO20 130	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535512	J R		CSO20	Preferred	Object		1. Quite often the Ferret Green carpark and the Doctors'			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535574	Mr and Mrs Ralph Williams		CSO20 260	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535591	A Walker		CSO20 298	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535610	Mr Stewart Bullen		CSO20 368	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535621	Mrs T Brine		CSO20 356	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Even without additional housing in Verwood, there is clearly already a need for a secondary school here. However a concern with the suggested site in Howe lane, is the access and increased volume of traffic and parking on the school run. This is already considerable, with the two schools currently on the site. Perhaps a better site might be the land west of Trinity school earmarked for housing (VWM1). Similarly, I am against any further housing development in Verwood as the infrastructure needs to be supported. We have the population of a large town, yet lack many of the facilities of towns smaller than us. Also doctors, dentists, Morrisons etc struggle to cope with the demands of our population as it is!!Please don't spoil our beautiful town with yet more housing, but do improve our existing facilities !!			1093
535659	Fiona Kasey		CSO20 393	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
535670	Dave Allen		CSO20 417	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
535678	Andrew Bryant		CSO20 445	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535687	Shelley Romans		CSO20 457	Preferred Option	Object		Verwood has already experienced substantial housing development over the last 20 years and does not have			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
				VWM 7			adequate road links or other infrastructure to cope with further housing development. There are insufficient employment opportunities in Verwood and therefore increasing the population size would increase the pressure on existing roads particularly at commuting times. The green belt should be preserved and future housing development should take place on brown field sites. In the current public sector financial climate I do not believe planning to build new secondary school in Verwood is a realistic aim and I consider that there are adequate school places for Verwood children in nearby locations such as Ferndown.			
535688	Susan Hobbs		CSO20 535	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535701	Mr Andy Skeats		CSO20 492	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535714	Joanna Bryant		CSO20 504	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		When I moved to Verwood ten years ago the estate agents promised that there would not be any more building in Verwood. The town is lovely as it is and more houses would lead to traffic congestion and Verwood doesn't have the infrastructure to cope with an increased population - Why can't the village be left as it is.			1093
535718	Richard Green		CSO20 509	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood has undergone the largest expansion of any East Dorset town expanding to 5 times its original population in 20 years. It was the fastest growing town in Europe for 5 years. Facilities and infrastructure have not kept pace with the population and elected councillors are not serving their constituents fairly. PPG17 show that Verwood is below the minimum requirement in active sports space, children and young people space and activities and allotments there are no allotments. The Hub is an ugly building out of character with the town. This is not used to its full capacity as car parking is restricted. The allocated land for further car parking behind the police station has been sold by the council. Flats are now being built on the site adding to the parking problem. PPS 1 and 3 and PPG13 show the need to have shops and			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							leisure activities available without the need to use a car. Morrison's built for 3500 people is now completely overwhelmed. Although plans to extend se feeder will not change the position. Verwood has had more than is fair share of housing development enough is enough.			
535723	Steve Taylor		CSO20 522	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Dear Sir, I object not only to the principle of developing green belt land in general. As a Verwood resident I also object to the nature of the Verwood options themselves, with the exception of the principle of VWM7 (although this is still on green belt land, which concerns me, although I understand why it here, in close proximity to the other schools). From what I can see the proposal is to build another 400 homes on green belt land in Verwood. There is an acknowledgement that such development will necessitate the upgrade of some roads' infrastructure. Many of Verwood's roads are very busy already, and with one main road in and out, it does not take much to make a short journey to Ringwood quite time-consuming. There is however no committment for the upgrade or provision of any other much needed facilities. I note VWM7 relates to a secondary school, but this is already required to support Verwood's population. 400 more homes means presumably 400+ new children and thei running down St Michaels Road already flood when there is even a small amount of rain. This will presumably worsen as the work progresses, owing to reduced natural drainage opportunities. Furthermore, using St Michaels Road as a vehicular route and 'green linkage', whatever that is, will exacerbate this drainage issue. I am not a typical NIMBY, and I do believe that a properly thought through development strategy encompassing proper facilities for an already stretched community would be a benefit. I also live in the real world and I understand that private development will help generate the funds to pay for such a strategy. All I can really see in these proposals however is bulldozing your way through green belt land for 400+ houses, I'm afraid.			1093
535815	Mrs C M Davies		CSO20 562	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535836	Peter Parsons		CSO20 589	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
535845	Oliver Greensmith		CSO20 601	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
535858	Robert Candy		CSO20 624	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The traffic situation in Howe Lane and St. Michaels road is already at bursting point with traffic delays of up to 10 minutes during peak hours. Further planned developments would exacerbate the existing problem and cause further misery not only to residents but those attending the proposed facilities. Verwood is a large town and does require an upper school however, howe lane is not the place for it, three schools in one road is plenty the road simply does not have the capacity to host another establishment!			1093
535865	Darren Charles Bryson		CSO20 654	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
535875	John Kitchenside		CSO20 688	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Verwood has too few facilities to support any major new developments. Medical and dental surgeries, middle school, etc. are over-subscribed and there is a lack of large-scale refuse disposal and recycling facilities - compare Dorset's attempt at Wimborne with the excellent and well-run facility provided by Hampshire County Council. There is a desperate need for an upper school (VWM7), which I support, although I doubt the existing residential roads could support the increased traffic this would bring. Travelling to Ferndown Upper or QE Wimborne each day does little for our children's education as they miss out on after-school activities, clubs, etc. Expansion of the village to the east would destroy green-belt land, one of the main things people like living here. Please, please, please if we really have to have more housing can it be built in a style that is more in keeping with the area e.g. not like the recent developments at the top of Crane Drive or at the corner of N ewtown Road and Ringwood Road. Whilst I appreciate the opportunity to air my views, I believe that Verwood is largely ignored by local			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							government due to its location.			
360768	Cllr. Mr David Packer	Colehill West Ward East Dorset District Council	CSO21099	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
497471	Mr Robert Wilmott		CSO21432	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object	General Comment	<p>According to the Governments New Homes Bonus consultation document from 11/2010 for 1000 new homes the required infrastructure to support those homes costs £20m. Based on the proposed maximum number of new homes for Verwood of 415 the proportioned infrastructure costs would be £8.3m. How do EDDC propose to fund these costs? I have estimated based on the figures in the document referred to above that if all the 415 homes were built and with 208 being affordable housing the 6 year bonus payment would be circa £4.4m so would not be sufficient to offset these costs. Therefore would you expect the various property developers under their required Section 106 agreements to meet all these costs and use the Bonus payments as suggested by the Government to improve frontline council services and improve the local Verwood community facilities for the benefit of existing residents? Point 11.19 of your core strategy document informs readers that Verwood has good road links. As a r ted to accessible and supported housing for this section of the community? It is advised in your strategy document that 90% of commuters use a car as their means of transport this is because of the lack of public transport and the semi-rural location. The 2008 report highlighted the fact that one third of houses in social rented properties had no use of a car. If you locate these families in Verwood in the proposed affordable housing how can this be of benefit if they have no means of transport and a limited public transport system. Finally the erosion of further green belt land should only be considered once the other options such as brown field sites, development of vacant properties have been fully explored.</p>			1093
518009	Mr D		CSO21045	Preferred Option	Object		I do not object to a Secondary School being built in Verwood , but I have concerns about the proposed site due to the lack of			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Heather			VWM 7			infrastructure which would be compounded by increased housing development. I make no comment on other areas as I feel that it is for the individual communities to make their opinions known.			
535907	Mr Christopher Baxendale		CSO20 748	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
535914	Graham Cudmore		CSO20 718	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
535921	Mrs Charlotte Miller		CSO20 741	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
535933	Mr John Lister		CSO20 762	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
535935	Mr Peter J Medler		CSO20 846	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The majority of residents in this area relocated because of the permanent despoiling of their places of birth by elected local and national 'representatives' who would not listen or care about the needs of the people that voted for them. Do you want to be remembered as the people who finally ruined this area or the people who saved it. Do not forget that people still visit this area as tourists and we welcome them and accept their contribution to the local economy. They will stop coming if the developments continue. How many tourists visit the outer London sprawl? Can I quote p227 from the Core Strategy Options paper - para 11.28 The Government's key housing policy is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. This is an impossible dream that can never and will never, be fulfilled. If the developments did go ahead what would be the effect of another 5000 cars on our local roads be ? If Morrisons developments go ahead where are the customers going to park? The parking within Verwood is just about adequate at the moment.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
535940	Mrs Linda Medler		CSO20784	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Any additional building of houses will need to have a better road structure than exist at the moment to cater for all the extra traffic this will bring. I thought we were trying to bring about a greener enviroment to Dorset county?			1093
535948	Mr David Hadden		CSO20793	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
535964	Mr Steven Old		CSO20811	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I strongly support the building of additional housing in Verwood. However my support is only given in order that an Upper School is built OR the council look at changing the current three tier education system to the more sustainable two tier system. The council should also look at providing free transport for high acheiving children to go to grammar schools should they wish to do so. The council should also look favourably upon anyone applying for permission to start a business in Verwood.			1093
535976	Mrs Valerie Stilwell		CSO20833	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Until the plans show the improvements in road access, car parking, youth and leisure facilities, and above all school places which are needed to meet current demands, let alone increases of this size, there is no possiblility of our absorbing 600 extra cars, 600 extra children into the infrastructure and social fabric many of us have worked very hard to engender in our 'new town' which has grown so fast over recent years. the school particularly is an absurd suggestion: a) it is within 400 metres of heathland, where development is forbidden b) we are told there is no budget currently for extra school spaces in this area in the foreseeeable future c) the chaotic school traffic situation in Margards Lane is already stretching residents' patience to the limits (with enormous fears about what a leisure centre here would do, let alone a senior school)and d) the local staff of Dorset Police, with whom I work, are dismayed at the proposals : it has taken 5 special constables a und are unsupportable within the current infrastructure. our already struggling 'community' will be drowned with the proposed enormous influx of newcomers - so many of us came to Verwood as it was promised there would be no further development - we escaped from areas			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							where no sense of community was possible, and we have tried to forge such an atmosphere here - we will not just sit by and watch it swept away, for the sake of the millions the government are offering to Councils who do succumb to their demands. let us know just WHO locally is in such dire need of housing, and we will readily sit down and help plan for them to share in this community!			
536014	Mrs Dawn Tindall		CSO20 896	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		What about the new homes bonus? Why is it not being implimented instead of this core strategy? The upper school in verwood will not happen within the life of this document, why is this carrot still being dangled.			1093
536025	Christopher Trim		CSO20 865	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion	We are very concerned about the proposed development particularly around Eastworth Road. The area earmarked for development around Eastworth Road cannot support 200+ homes. We appreciate the proposal to leave the existing playpark and surrounding field as a buffer zone - but we are really concerned that this will become a central 'hanging out' point for younger people as it will form the 'centre' of the proposed development and the existing development around Field Place, which we believe will lead to anti social behaviour problems - has this issue been considered? We understand that there will be 2 new access routes via the Station and Edmondsham Roads but are also concerned that Field Place will also be used as an access road - the road system cannot support the associated additional traffic through what is currently a very peaceful estate. We are also concerned about the loss of what is one of the few remaining unspoilt areas around Verwood as it encroaches onto the existing countryside. On a wider point about the development generally in Verwood : the town does not have the infrastructure to support another 400 homes. In the event that some or all of the proposed developments go ahead, where will children go to school in the short term as the 3 first schools are already over subscribed? I can't see the logic of the proposals of building a new upper school - what about all the funding that has just gone into building a state of the art school in Wimborne (QE) where children from Verwood currently attend?			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536046	L Appleton		CSO20 902	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536050	Mr Andrew Collin		CSO20 916	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		It is important to have a policy of continuous improvement for housing and employment for the area. Many are concerned for our environment, sensitive and empathic development will take care of this, but to do nothing will benefit no one in the longer term. A mixture of traditional and affordable homes is desirable, backed by a development in industrial and business land and premises availability. It is important to maintain and improve all areas of housing and commercial opportunity to invest in the future of our area for all parts of the community, the young, the aspiring as well as the established and retired members. Establishing the right mix is essential for a sustainable future in our community.			1093
536077	Caroline Thomas		CSO20 922	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Moved to Verwood nearly 10 years ago due to the location and rural village feel for a better quality of life away from busy noisy town surroundings, for a better environment for children..This is already changing since more and more housing developments have slowly taken away Verwoods identity.. PLEASE NO MORE.. We were promised that there would be no more housing developments- but this would appear to be a lie if this should go through.. Without stereotyping, housing association or "affordable housing" developments statistically will at best do nothing but make the area a far less desirable place in which to live..... This has to be a concern for all current Verwood residents . enough is enough.! do not ruin Verwood			1093
536085	Grahame Thomas		CSO20 929	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Strongly object to ALL proposals, due to the underlying fact that there have been more than necessary housing developments within Verwood area built in the past 10 years which is going against the rural village location that it once was, and the reason why so many people love Verwood "of old" as opposed to a more populated and busy town the likes of which it is to become....For any resident of 5 or more years it has become clearly evident that crime and unruly behaviour has become more of an issue- which can and will only			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							increase.. Please do not ruin the once loved "Village"of Verwood any more...!!!			
536096	Katie Lacey		CSO20 951	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536129	Mr Peter Houghton		CSO20 976	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536152	Mrs Alison OBrien		CSO20 985	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536159	Mr Chris OBrien		CSO20 993	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536165	Margaret Parker		CSO21 000	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536169	Mr Tony Treviss-Bell		CSO21 029	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536175	Mrs Claire Addiscott		CSO21 013	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536178	Mark Addiscott		CSO21 023	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I feel Verwood is at saturation point at the moment and any increase in the number of people living here would greatly reduce the quality and feel of the town. Increases in population always seem to have adverse effects including loss of community spirit, and increases in crime and anti social behavior etc. The town doesn't have the type of transport links which I feel would be needed for a greater population either.			1093
536183	Deric		CSO21	Preferred	Object					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Burgess		038	Option VWM 7						
536196	Mr J Spriggs		CSO21 051	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I feel that Verwood has reached it's optimum size and retains a "village" atmosphere, which would be lost if it ended up as a dormitory town of Bournemouth with poor facilities.			1093
536204	Derek Kelly		CSO21 061	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536206	Victoria Wiggins		CSO21 059	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536213	L Stevens		CSO21 066	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536220	Mrs J Heather		CSO21 071	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I do not object to a secondary school being built in Verwood, but have concerns about the proposed site due to the lack of infrastructure which would be further compounded by increased housing development. I make no comment on other areas as feel it is for the individual communities to make their opinions known.			1093
536252	Mrs Pamela Jakes		CSO21 077	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536255	Mrs J W Bryant		CSO21 086	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536257	Mr Graham Jakes		CSO21 096	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		If further homes were to be built in Verwood, would the utilities be able to cater for the extra demand? Also, there is the matter of increased traffic, more homes = more cars. In Verwood, ugly blocks of flats should be completely ruled out. One can see what has happened to-date on unsympathetic design in Crane Drive.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536258	Mrs Anne Jones		CSO21 107	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536259	Sandy Stockwell		CSO21 108	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536260	Vicki Palmer		CSO21 124	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood is big enough already!			1093
536263	Ryan Ward		CSO21 125	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536265	Adrian Cox		CSO21 132	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood has already been subject to over-development into green field land and infill throughout the village or as it is now known "Town". It has staggered me and many friends in Verwood that developers have been allowed to build huge eyesores in the shape of the blocks of flats around the "Hub" and now on Blackhill. Sadly it is a sign of the economic times when profit over-rides sustainable development and social integration. flats break down neighbourhoods, discouraging social interaction. Houses support family growth and social development! More needs to be done to make appropriate housing more accessible, e.g. part ownership schemes, possibly making existing housing in towns accessible to first-time buyers and those indeed on lower incomes.. it requires two earners on £25k each per annum to buy a £200k house!! Verwood's biggest problem at present is lack of appropriate facilities not lack of housing, enough is sat empty already!!			1093
536266	Mr Martin Cobb		CSO21 144	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536267	Trish Wheeler		CSO21 169	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I feel that Verwood has enough housing at present and it would be criminal to lose greenbelt, disrupt the wildlife and nature. There are not enough facilities for the people of Verwood at the present. There are already groups of young			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							children hanging around the streets bored, how many more do you really want to see around Verwood - personally I don't want to see any. I think a small town like Verwood needs to be left alone. Can't believe that people are thinking of building so many houses when there is a recession on - the cost is going to be huge - can't the money be spent on upgrading the facilities for the people who are already here.			
536271	Mrs D Holt		CSO21 213	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536274	Mrs Annalicaia Cobb		CSO21 163	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536279	Mr Garry Whitham		CSO21 178	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		A new secondary school for Verwood is very much needed though.			1093
536282	Mrs Doreen Kingaby		CSO21 212	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Bad enough traffic on Howe lane without adding to the burden.What about sorting Verwood out before adding to its problems.Such a lovely little village trying to be a big town,planners mess.Let surrounding areas expand like Verwood has, before any more houses.In 2005 Verwood was declared full,why the change of heart? Please do the right thing for the people of Verwood and say no to building on our last remaining green belt.			1093
536289	N Waters		CSO21 197	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536300	Mrs Caroline Burgess		CSO21 211	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536311	Shane Ward		CSO21 222	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536313	Mrs J Wilmott		CSO21 241	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>According to the Governments New Homes Bonus consultation document from 11/2010 for 1000 new homes the required infrastructure to support those homes costs £20m. Based on the proposed maximum number of new homes for Verwood of 415 the proportioned infrastructure costs would be £8.3m. How do EDDC propose to fund these costs? I have estimated based on the figures in the document referred to above that if all the 415 homes were built and with 208 being affordable housing the 6 year bonus payment would be circa £4.4m so would not be sufficient to offset these costs. Therefore would you expect the various property developers under their required Section 106 agreements to meet all these costs and use the Bonus payments as suggested by the Government to improve frontline council services and improve the local Verwood community facilities for the benefit of existing residents? Point 11.19 of your core strategy document informs readers that Verwood has good road links. As a r ted to accessible and supported housing for this section of the community? It is advised in your strategy document that 90% of commuters use a car as their means of transport this is because of the lack of public transport and the semi-rural location. The 2008 report highlighted the fact that one third of houses in social rented properties had no use of a car. If you locate these families in Verwood in the proposed affordable housing how can this be of benefit if they have no means of transport and a limited public transport system. Finally the erosion of further green belt land should only be considered once the other options such as brown field sites, development of vacant properties have been fully explored.</p>			1093
536315	J Ward		CSO21 238	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536323	Anne Crew		CSO21 249	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536324	Paul		CSO21	Preferred	Object		Wimborne has the land and facilities to support more			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Sumner		302	Option VWM 7			houses.The other areas do not.Especially Verwood,as it has been built upon to the point where it is second only to Dorchester,in terms of population.Verwood should be left alone and other areas play catch up.Verwood has no vibrant town centre no realistic extra employment opportunities.No infrastructure,no buses after 6pm or police for that matter.One nhs dentist with a waiting list as long as your arm.Same with the meager doctors services.None of the houses are actually needed,only for the council to get social housing built.Not the attractive affordable homes it seems to like to label them as.Building on green belt land is supposed to be for exceptional circumstances,there are no homeless in verwood.Do no destroy green belt land just because of a loophole.There is no need for social housing in verwood,therefore no exceptional circumstances exist.I have looked at the proposed sights and they will all destroy habitat fo r local wildlife,VWM4 will also see ssi sites read beds ancient hedge rows etc severly disrupted.Did you know that there is a flood plane?What about the scientific report on the river crane and fishing lakes down there?.commonsense please.			
536329	Mrs C Green		CSO21 261	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536332	Emmanuelle Hutton		CSO21 271	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536341	Adrian Bowyer		CSO21 327	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536342	Lily Hutton		CSO21 311	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536346	Mr Ben Richards		CSO21 385	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536349	Mrs C Bowyer		CSO21 393	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536350	Melissa Taylor		CSO21 362	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Insufficient infrastructure to support additional housing			1093
536351	Mr John Hutton		CSO21 377	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536353	Chris Rowley		CSO21 406	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood is already overcrowded with properties and not enough facilities to support this amount of housing growth.			1093
536384	Andy Brookes		CSO21 411	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood is full to bursting already. Facilities are required before further housing. The school proposal is only mentioned to bribe people into allowing further housing. The housing will no doubt happen to some extent, the school will not.			1093
536392	Mrs Diana Evans		CSO21 416	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Already too many houses,the roads into and out of Verwood cannot take anymore traffic.alsom not menough shops to cater for more homes only one supermarket. PLEASE LEAVE OUR GREEN AREAS ALONE.			1093
536402	Mr P K Evans		CSO21 421	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Already too many houses with not enough facilities.the roads in and out of verwood can not take any more traffic.			1093
536449	Dave Isaacs		CSO21 459	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536467	Kim Rich		CSO21 448	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		There are not enough existing facilities in Verwood for the residents already living here. i.e Doctors,dentists and a variety of local shops. We do not need additional housing. Social and affordable housing will attract the wrong sort of people. The new flats that have already been allowed to be built are an eyesore and do not fit in with the existing			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							surrounding properties. We moved here years ago to get away from noise pollution and heavy traffic. We do not want our peace and quiet spoiled by your proposals. We want to continue living in a pleasant green environment, quiet and peaceful and unspoilt. That is the reason we chose to live in Verwood and your plans are not in keeping with the area.			
536479	Mr Jeff Maultby		CSO21 468	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Have you tried getting out of Holly grove or Hayward crescent when schools are open? inconsiderate parent parking causes dangerously blocked roads, one day a child will be hurt. A secondary school will make it utterly intolerable and impossible. Unless every child is forced to walk or cycle - which is never going to happen! How long will we have to queue on Church Hill if a secondary school is built! Its already ridiculous when the scools are open and will be impossible with a new school. The access roads are just not adequate. We should spend money on all the un-made roads and providing proper cycle lanes before building new houses. Verwood does not have sufficient infrastructure for 415 new homes. We will have even more kids hanging around on corners with nothing to do.			1093
536508	Mrs AJ Hayden		CSO21 492	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Transportation links should be improved around Verwood, including the 3LX distributor road.			1093
361024	Mr & Mrs Kenny PEARCE		CSO22 111	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
482494	Mrs Yvette Jones		CSO21 893	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Large scale developments damage the environment for everyone, and it is for ever. The open green spaces are valued by so many who have paid a premium to live in a semi-rural area. Desecration of this is an assault to the residents' wellbeing; an unwarranted invasion causing a wholesale change of character to what is home to thousands of people who chose a neighbourhood because of its history of modest gradual development. Not convinced there is a housing shortage. Keep 'social' housing in more 'affordable' areas. What is there to aspire to and work towards otherwise? Don't patronise us re. 'housing for local people' -			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							occupants become 'local' by living in a 'location'. Small developments can be assimilated to the character of an area without destroying people's enjoyment of their homes. They can be developed with consideration, gradually and as appropriate. They do not have to cause illness through acute distress of residents just to line the developers' pockets and gratify councillors.			
498402	Mrs T Hughes		CSO22 244	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536537	Mrs Susan Isaacs		CSO21 497	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536543	Mrs Samantha Fysh		CSO21 544	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		NO MORE HOUSES IN VERWOOD.. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!			1093
536546	Mrs Sarah Jupp		CSO21 522	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536548	Mr James Robinson		CSO21 524	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I feel that the building of these additional homes in Verwood is based on the greed of the developers and the landowners. It is not proven that there is a need to rip up more land in Verwood particularly green belt farm land in the case of Eastworth Road. There is the appalling example of the housing units built on the ring road opposite the Hub that have not sold and are a complete eyesore with the developers becoming insolvent and it becoming a protected farce that should never have been sanctioned. In short a wholly unacceptable set of circumstances that is a blight on those who gave permission to construct them. It clearly makes the case that planning has been granted filling the land with inappropriate housing and this has caused me to not trust the judgement of those responsible for making the decisions on development of housing in Verwood. In contrast Verwood has grown over the last three decades and recent efforts to; improve the centre, build the Hub and construct			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							the ring road makes the balance between housing and services/facilities better. The planners deserve credit for improving those facilities and that is why the school is a good idea for Verwood, as it is a further step to providing a complete all encompassing small town. It also has the obvious benefit of not having to bus all those children every day to the schools outside of the area. In conclusio I cannot see any need to increase housing in Verwood. We really do have a responsibility not to concrete and tarmac over for housing any more open space or the surrounding fields of Verwood it is simply an act of gross irresponsibility.			
536553	Ms Michelle Hayter		CSO21 534	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536554	Mr B Tunstall		CSO21 537	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The infrastructure of Verwood will not stand up to this amount of building and people. 400 houses will roughly equate to 800 extra cars, 1200-1600 extra people. The doctors, schools, leisure facilities and shops that are in place at the moment will not be able to cope and the current residents will find that the pleasant small town which it is at the moment, will no longer be just that. Yes I know other facilities will be put in place, but how many years are we going to be over-run with contractors etc, (as is the case with the present building going on at the site which used to be the Fairwood, and various other sites over the last few years). Please leave Verwood alone and let the money-greedy people who are trying to sell their land to the builders use the land for which it was intended - farming, and preserve the green belt status and Englands "Green and pleasant land" Are we to become a wildlife bare area and a traffic blackspot about to happen? Does no-one on the plaanning committee care for the welfare of the present current Verwood residents or is it all being done in the name of "Progress" ?			1093
536563	Mr David Hayter		CSO21 611	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536566	Mr		CSO21	Preferred	Object		proposed site for new school already overcrowded & students			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Adrian Blow		553	Option VWM 7			currently attend elsewhere; plus cost			
536571	Mr Craig Jerome		CSO21562	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I will shortly be moving to Verwood and my partner lives in Pine View Road.			1093
536572	Mr Roger Fysh		CSO21595	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I strongly object to the proposal to increase the housing in and around Verwood. Verwood has been extensively developed over the years and there is inadequate services to support the extra cars and people. Also having seen the housing density of the Ebblake housing estate it is clear that agreeing to more housing will only create 'no go' areas in the very near future. I also note that in and around Wimborne there are huge areas of open land, which could easily be developed, especially between Ferndown and Wimborne which also has excellent road networks in place as it could immediately open onto the A31			1093
536576	Mrs Valerie Green		CSO21618	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I object to the core strategy. It will mean destruction of the green belt! The land owners will of course be in favour of development as the land will be worth a lot more as building land. There are 1.5m unoccupied homes in the UK plus an unknown number of empty homes in the rented sector. Central Government wants an extra 3M homes to be built. In total this will house 10 to 15M people. The population has increased by only 5M in the last 50 years why do we need these extra homes? Are there so many people who would choose to live in Verwood and have to travel to work? In view of economic uncertainty is it wise to plan a large increase in the number of new homes. You only have to look at the Irish situation to see how easily things can go wrong. Would the council really destroy the green belt and blight the lives of existing residents if it were not for the Government housing bribe.			1093
536628	Mr C.A Wills		CSO21673	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536631	Ms		CSO21	Preferred		No				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Carole-Ann Young		641	Option VWM 7		Opinion				
536634	Mr Andrew Beal		CSO21 657	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536635	Mr Ronald Helmers		CSO21 661	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I understand that the school proposed is an upper school and that such a school is lacking in the town. If this is the case then I would support its establishment.			1093
536636	Mr Phil Jones		CSO21 671	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood doesn't have the infrastructure for any further such development			1093
536637	Mrs Geraldine Haigh		CSO21 683	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536642	Ms Clare Taylor		CSO21 680	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536654	Ms Maureen Castell		CSO21 703	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood does not need more houses, it needs a senior school, more shops and another doctors surgery. Verwood is bursting with house. If Verwood is a Town it needs to be a town.			1093
536656	Charlotte England		CSO21 699	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536659	Mr Andy Longshaw		CSO21 712	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536666	Mr C Thickett		CSO21 723	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Re: Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Consultation – Verwood I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							<p>the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI's and contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unaccepta ble strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood's present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.</p>			
536678	Mrs L Thickett		CSO21 742	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		<p>I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful , environmentally enhancing , natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife . 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI's and contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood</p>			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unacceptable strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood's present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			
536692	Richard Coulthard		CSO21749	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536694	Mr T Thickett		CSO21754	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Re: Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Consultation – Verwood I vehemently object to the proposed new development of houses and a school in Verwood that have been included in the Core Strategy Consultation Document. My reasons for objecting are as follows:- 1. The majority of the houses will be built on Green Field Sites – and is an unacceptable breach of the planning regulations. The houses will destroy some of the most beautiful, environmentally enhancing, natural countryside that surrounds Verwood. 2. The development will destroy wildlife habitats and wildlife. 3. Some of the developments will be too close to the SSSI's and contravene the planning regulations. Totally unacceptable. 4. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate for the needs of the present town and any further expansion will place an even greater strain on the facilities. 5. The road system in Verwood is poor and further housing of the magnitude proposed will place unacceptable strain on the road system. 6. Road access to many of the sites is poor and will cause serious congestion and danger to both cars and people during morning and evening rush hour times. 7. The lack of			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							facilities of all types will be exacerbated by the increase in numbers of houses, the school and the large number of additional people. 8. A school is only required if the houses are built – the present system is adequate. 9. There is no adequate provision for a new Leisure centre including a swimming pool. Verwood’s present leisure centre is too small and does not provide sufficient facilities. I strongly object to the proposed wholesale redevelopment of Verwood and recommend that the Core Strategy Plan should be refused in the area of Verwood in its present form.			
536699	Ms Kathryn D'Arcy		CSO21 791	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536702	Mr Mark Hirst		CSO21 773	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536718	Mrs J Durham		CSO21 804	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536723	P Pembroke		CSO21 816	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood has been developed enough in recent years.It now should be left alone without further intrusion into its green spaces to retain it's rural identity and heritage.Further development of 400 homes has the potential for another 800 cars.There is already too much commercial traffic and too many cars coming into and through Verwood with little regard for the speed limit.The roads in Verwood are not large enough to cope with further increases in traffic,not to mention the amount of construction traffic a development of this size would bring.There is insufficient infrastructure in Verwood to accomodate any further development and this would need to be addressed before anything further should be considered.			1093
536766	A Pembroke		CSO21 825	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Insufficient infrastructure in Verwood.Already far too many cars and commercial traffic coming into and through Verwood with little regard for speed limit.Green belt should be left alone and Verwood retain it's rural identity and heritage.Verwood is already an urban dormitory.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536771	B Lusher		CSO22 089	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I object to any development that expands Wimborne and surrounding villages now and at any time in the future. Why is Wimborne such a beautiful town, could it be the Minster, old buildings, steeped in history? probably all of these and many other attributes. Take a good look at that stunning photograph 'Wimborne Minster and Stour In Winter' by Roger Holman, fields and the town centre, all in one picture. This view of the landscape, identified as a scene of merit by the artistic eye of the photographer, often passes the layman by, until pointed out so graphically. This photograph, like others, is a measure of what we could lose. I wonder if there were other equally stunning scenes in the hills northeast of Wimborne, Colehill, now completely covered in houses. Can you imagine the equivalent photograph of that time, the town, with a backdrop of fields and trees rising above horizon. Too late, that moment has passed. The town, in close proximity to countryside, is ye has realised this and is making an effort to preserve old Singapore. We, on the other hand, seem to be quite happy to knock down our countryside in the name of development. If we really want to preserve Wimborne for generations to come, so they can see the town, be part of it's unique character, situated amongst, close at hand countryside, then we must make a conscious decision now to preserve the green belt and green areas in the town forever, before Wimborne eventually becomes a quaint little roundabout that travellers come across on the way from somewhere to somewhere.			1093
536772	Mr J Stone		CSO21 852	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Current schools already at Howe Lane, Verwood are now causing congestion twice daily by random parking, bad driving and unless sufficient parking is allowed for future development someone, child or adult, will be killed. Also access away from this area is very poor.			1093
536777	Karen Hodgkiss		CSO21 858	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Verwood doesn't need more houses it desperately needs more facilities. We are a town, not a village anymore. We need a bigger supermarket, a public swimming pool and a high school.			1093
536781	Abigail		CSO21	Preferred	Object		As a home owner living on the junction of Church Hill and			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Harris		864	Option VWM 7			Margards Lane my Primary concerns are the future plans for a secondary school VWM7 and housing at Howe Lane VWM3. This would greatly increase the volume of traffic that already passes by on route to Emmanuel and Verwood First School. I feel this would have a huge impact on the local residents and would have concerns with regards to road safety along this route. I also have concerns about the other possible development sites and the amount of new homes being built in Verwood. The towns Facilities has not grown with the the population of Verwood.			
536790	David Steadman		CSO21 905	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536796	Ann Coleman		CSO21 917	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536798	Peter Coleman		CSO21 923	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536800	Julianne Sutherland		CSO21 931	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536802	Anida Griffiths		CSO21 961	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536803	Ian Hargreaves		CSO21 947	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536807	Paul Dayson-Smith		CSO21 957	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		I feel Verwood has seen more than enough building in the last 30 years. There are nowhere near enough local jobs or a suitable level of infrastructure to support a higher population. Whoever proposed to build the, admittedly needed, new secondary school on Howe lane clearly hasn't tried to drive down that road at 8:30 on a weekday morning			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
536808	Ms Yvette Allen		CSO22 027	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood does not need to increase its population is is already too big for the local infrastructure.			1093
536811	Mr P Carey		CSO21 979	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I am a resident of Howe Lane, Verwood,and since moving to this location have had nothing but immense problems with traffic due to the Emmanuel/Verwood school campus. I have had a 4 year running battle with motorists parking, not only over my driveway; but also IN my driveway. I have complained to the local police on numerous occasions, only to be told that it is a council problem. I have applied for a 'white line' and complained to my local councillor - all to no avail. There are regular near miss incidents in and around the school campus. And only last week a parked car in Howe Lane was severely damaged. By building the new houses in Howe Lane this will create even more problems. The land to the south of Howe Lane will just compound the problem and then add a new school is just utterly ridiculous. There is no infrastructure within Verwood to accomodate all the proposed developments. If you, the council, wish the residents of Verwood to be amicable, then I sugges h I find highly amusing. There is no money for this new school! There is an ongoing situation with damaged vehicles and traffic problems within the school campus and outside. I do not see how this new school can be accessed unless the council is going to build many new roads, or compulsory purchased land. I will fight to my last breath to stop all of this!!!! We do not want this - it will not serve us - it will make our lives intollerable!			1093
536812	R H Barker		CSO21 997	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536816	Mr T C Clark		CSO22 009	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The village of Verwood has become a dormitory town because of all the most recent building which has taken place Any further builds would cause more of a problem for the residents already living in Verwood.The reasons being: Public Transport is inadequate Roads are inadequate for the amount of traffic which uses them. Shops are inadequate,other than Banks,Estate Agents or Hairdressers.We need more of a			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							variety of shops within a specific area,not spread all over the town. There are no facilities for the younger element of the town,this needs to be addressed urgently.Keep them off the streets and out of mischief. Restaurants are limited i.e. non existant other than cheap pub food or Indian/chinese take aways and the local chippy. As for the new school (which is a requirement).If this is to be situated within the Campus of the current school this would lead to further problems with traffic flow and parking. Already both sides of Margards Lane/Howe Lane and adjoining roads are near to capacity.Which leads me to another point,Emergency vehicles would be unable to attend either house fires or life threatening situations.This means that people living within this area are under great risk.			
536817	Cheryl Evans		CSO22 022	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536819	Cathryn Biggins		CSO22 024	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I don't think there is enough local work in Verwood to support the proposed number of new homes and if people have to travel out of the area to work there will be increased traffic on roads that are already busy, particularly during school times and in the mornings and early evenings. In addition local services like the doctors, dentists, banks, the supermarket and petrol station are already busy and an increase in population numbers will increase waiting times for appointments and queues. I think a new secondary school would also create huge traffic and parking problems on roads that are already very busy with the first and middle school traffic in the mornings and afternoons. At the moment the students have the choice of several good upper schools and the network of bus stops allows them to walk to a local stop. A new school would result in increased traffic as students travel in from surrounding areas. Verwood is a pleasant place to live at the moment and has beau tiful green areas surrounding it. Many green areas within Verwood have been infilled with housing during the last 15 years and I don't think the town should be expanded any further.			1093
536830	Mrs		CSO22	Preferred		No				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Janet Sutcliffe		073	Option VWM 7		Opinion				
536840	Mr Clive Evans		CSO22 061	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536841	Mr and Mrs N P Brunning		CSO22 068	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536847	E England		CSO22 096	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536848	Ola Steadman		CSO22 148	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536850	Mr Michael Hird		CSO22 166	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Assertions like "could", "may", "potential", "divert pressures away from heathlands" and "will contribute" are meaningless without guarantees and full explanation. The ratio of affordable homes to (un)affordable is far too high and will result in an unacceptable concentration of ghetto like small dwellings. Developments of more than 30 homes in the current economic climate and without clear plans for improved infrastructure and services is clearly foolhardy and shows a total lack of foresight. The results of the consultation should be published and no further action taken until the full consequences of cuts in Government expenditure are known. This is particularly important with respect to VWM7 - new secondary school.			1093
361342	Mr Graham CLARKE	Spatial Planning Officer Dorset County Council	CSO22 837	Preferred Option VWM 7		General Comment	There are complex questions relating to school capacity in East Dorset generally. The proposed housing sites imply a need for more school places and an assessment of whether the existing schools are in the best locations to serve their catchments. This will depend on the level and distribution of housing that is finally agreed.			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							Increased housing provision in the Wimborne and Verwood areas will increase demand for places at Queen Elizabeth's Upper School and Ferndown Upper School and this will have a knock on effect across the joint pyramid. A full appraisal of the need for school places and pyramid structure will be necessary once the level and distribution of housing is known. There is no funding available for new building at present. However the Government has made available capital funding for basic need where there is increased demand for school places, although bids for this would need to be made, with no certainty over securing necessary funds. Developer contributions via the CIL are also likely to be necessary to gap fund the cost of providing increased school places.			
494436	Mr R D Turvil		CSO22 742	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		We are against the proposals as they over extend Verwood, which has already been extensively developed and now seems taken for granted as the easy option. The town already suffers from limited community facilities and, what there is, is spread out, thus weakening any real sense of community. The Localism Bill currently before Parliament specifically identifies that residents are to be handed powers to approve/block developments			1093
501015	Mr & Mrs W McMillan		CSO22 798	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
507388	Mr David Huggins		CSO22 898	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
514507	Mr and Mrs C Macy		CSO22 771	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
522117	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		CSO22 893	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Option VWM7 Object Reason Proximity to Dewlands Common SSSI and risk of adverse impact on this N2K site through informal recreation,			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							new roads (contrary to provisions of Bern Convention) and light pollution from the school, possible floodlighting of playing fields/sports areas, security lighting, roads and from the car park. Unlikely to be supported by HRA. Proximity to River Crane SSSI and risk of increasing flows and light pollution impact on aquatic habitat.			
536856	Mr and Mrs Ian Barnes		CSO22 153	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
536860	Mrs Sparks		CSO22 194	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536866	Emma Huns		CSO22 223	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536910	Ms Susan Bradley		CSO22 257	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		I strongly object to the options VWM 1,2,3 and 4 for new houses in Verwood. In particular because they fall within Green Belt land. Green Belt land should be preserved as Green Belt. In the East Dorset SHLAA 2008 Report all of these sites were "considered unacceptable in context of Green Belt Policy". Why are they even being considered? I am horrified at the idea that each time new houses are needed the green belt will simply be redrawn to accommodate them! Please do not build on Green Belt land.			1093
536928	Mr Kevin Fyles		CSO22 283	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Concern that insufficient developer contributions will be secured in order to underpin the necessary infrastructure improvements that are required in Verwood to support both larger developments and also 'make good' (at least in part) on previous infrastructure shortfalls.			1093
536932	Paul Bason		CSO22 313	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
536944	Ian Lucking		CSO22 329	Preferred Option	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
				VWM 7						
536966	Rachel Baulch		CSO22 334	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536972	Iris Baulch		CSO22 339	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536990	Steward Gates		CSO22 349	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
536993	Nicola Gates		CSO22 358	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
537012	Carole Lucking		CSO22 372	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
537018	Vanessa Scott		CSO22 382	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
537021	John and Susan Lewis		CSO22 387	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The population is growing in Verwood and I think there is still a need for more affordable family homes. An upper school is required which would eliminate the need for so much school transport to Ferndown and Wimborne. This would also improve our sense of community and be less divisive. The political movers in Verwood all seem to have a NIMBY attitude towards our community and use any excuse to prevent development.			1093
537026	Roy Cronk		CSO22 392	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
537030	E Lock		CSO22 397	Preferred Option	Object		There needs to be a lot more facilities and better infrastructure in the Verwood area before adding any more			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
				VWM 7			strain. In particular increasing the bus routes, roads and another petrol station			
537050	Diane Fletcher		CSO22 417	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		The infrasture currently in place in Verwood is already sufficient to support the existing population without adding potentially 400+ more families. Public transport is woefully inadequate to service its working and social population, with no quick bus links to major employment and social hubs of Bournemouth, Chrsitchurch, Salisbury and Southampton. The existing services are slow and infrequent, with the evening services stopping ridiculously early and sunday services too infrequent to seriously entertain. There is nothing constructive for the existing youth to do and this is already manifesting itself in anti-social behaviour (openly drinking/smoking and causing a general nuisance late at night). Additional families would only add to this growing issue and the threat of closure of the curent police station is very worrying. An additional 400+ vehicles would significantly add to the risk of accidents, especially around the first and middle schools, all of which are alr eady oversubscribed and could not cope with upto 400 additional children (probably double or more than 400 realistically). The additional stress on the existing drains and sewage systems would put existing housing at risk. The existing shopping centre is more akin to a small village and does not service the existing poulation with a range of goods and service that could be reasonably expected of a town of its existing size, let alone having so many more people to service. All in all, Verwood does not have the infrasture, school capacity, leisure/social facilities or public transport to support its existing population. The proposals to add another 400+ families into these limited facilities and services is ill advised and impractical and will only add to anti-social behaviour problems and pressures on the existing infrastructure that would be disasterous for the existing population.			1093
537075	Mrs Elaine Holt		CSO22 451	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		1. I strongly object to the failure to consult in Verwood regarding our suggestions for building options to fulfil local housing needs when the Regional Spatial Strategy was revoked. I feel we were disenfranchised in this respect, and			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							our current option for expressing our views is inadequate. 2. As most commuter traffic out of Verwood is to Ringwood and Ferndown, more large scale development (400 homes) will overload the already crowded and dangerous roads, (up to 800 more cars). Even traffic problems arising from the Trinity School development have not yet been solved. 3. Paragraph 11.60, 11.62 and 11.71 (Option VWM 1 and VWM 2): I strongly object to the development outlined in VWM1 and VWM2, which I believe compromise the 'Area of Great Landscape Value' rendering it invisible to most, and intruding into the most inspiring view of this landscape from the popular beauty spot and viewpoint at Stephen's Castle SSSI. The raft of houses will be a clearly visible scar in an otherwise rare spread of rolling hills. 4. Paragraph 11.60: When we raised concerns around the development of Trinity School we were informed that the school was a 'special case' for the green belt, and so it should not be an argument used in favour of further housing development. It would not be a properly transparent reason. 5. Transport issues etc: I strongly object to the practice of some developers promising to pay sums to the council for roads etc, or to other bodies such as English Nature, as part of the permission process, as this appears to muddy the basis on which permission is given especially in terms of green belt, or sensitive land.			
537104	J R Bardi		CSO22 463	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
537106	C Hebditch		CSO22 482	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
537122	Christopher Hill		CSO22 494	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
537312	Mr Barry Goldsmith		CSO22 505	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
537314	Mrs Penelope Goldsmith		CSO22 510	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
537318	Daniel Parkin		CSO22 515	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		At present I do not feel any further development is needed in Verwood - the town needs to come to terms with its recent expansion over the last 10-15 years. With no money in the coffers, so to speak, I cannot see where funding for a new school will come from and appears to be a gimmick in return for approval of additional homes. My children go to Verwood First and Emmanuel and traffic is already a problem, without further homes and a potential new school. Money would be better spent expanding the school further so that children can enjoy a wider range of facilities. I attended our child's first xmas fayre this year and the school was so crowded it was uncomfortable, the school does not have the facilities to cater for all the children's wishes, only those drawn out of a hat. If a secondary school is a consideration, then the council really needs to look at how Emmanuel School can be improved first. I agree a secondary school in Verwood would be ideal for the local community growth and dynamics and a further opinion poll taken to see what residents of Verwood would like in 10 years time!!			1093
537326	Harold Bowskill		CSO22 520	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
537362	Peter Constable		CSO22 541	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The larger residential building proposals are completely out of character for the area and will consume large tracts of green belt. The infrastructure to support development on a large scale is simply not in place. The smaller developments appear to be a better fit e.g Cuthbury, Leigh Park, Stone Lane.			1093
537435	Ms Pauline Burton		CSO22 568	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
537529	Mrs C		CSO22 595	Preferred Option		No Opinion				1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	White			VWM 7						
537542	Mrs M Wake		CSO22 606	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
537548	Mr C Wake		CSO22 611	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
537557	Batchelor		CSO22 616	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		We feel Verwood have Enough houses/flats/dwellings and schools in this area lack of decent shopping facilities and coffee shops and good cafes in the area - so feel Verwood should concentrate on making itself user friendly love the green belt area and this should not be removed or made s smaller thankyou			1093
537562	Dan Cartmale		CSO22 621	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
537566	Patricia Adlem		CSO22 627	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object					1093
537571	Nick and Marion Leatherdale		CSO22 647	Preferred Option VWM 7		No Opinion				1093
537580	Ruth Brown		CSO22 659	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
537582	Wendy Stacey		CSO22 665	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		The current infrastructure barely supports the existing development in the Verwood area. My support to any of these proposals is only valid if ALL the utilities are upgraded prior to or in conjunction with any further building schemes. If the infrastructure is not improved I cannot give support top any of these proposals.			1093
537731	Mr		CSO22	Preferred	Support					1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
	Colin Ward		670	Option VWM 7						
537762	Peggy Marshall		CSO22 675	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support					1093
537806	Mrs P Arnold		CSO22 693	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Yes we definately need another school.			1093
538210	Mr and Mrs Peter Griffiths		CSO22 725	Preferred Option VWM 7	Support		Approve of provision of affordable housing, however, agreement with Housing Association must be watertight so housing stock for rent remains constant and stock can never be sold. These houses will be near to facilities, schools, shops, transport, work and will alleviate pressure on rural communities with no facilities to provide affordable housing in the Green Belt.			1093
538739	Mr & Mrs A J Abernethie		CSO22 855	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Option VWM 7: absolutely NO, until present heavily congested parking and school traffic reorganised URGENTLY for the improved safety of children, their carers/guardians and local residents. For some considerable time, there have been major congestion problems all around the Howe Lane/Margards Lane and surrounding roads area, with vehicular exit from adjacent homes being denied by bad parking of school vehicles in those roads. As there is no possibility of a new road being built to give access to the new school other than via present road system, RECOMMEND, the site be sold at original purchase price to Verwood Town Council and used for allotments, for which there is a long waiting list. Instead, locate new Senior school on new site, not identified by the Core Strategy, on land south of Verwood, to the west of Manor Road, i.e. just South of VWM4! The senior students would use the sporting facilities in Potterne Park, thus not needing such a large footprint if sports facilities had to be on site.			1093
539805	Mr Philpot		CSO22 806	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Margards Lane is busy and dangerous for the schol children as it is now. Too many houses/flats are ruining Verwood, the landscape and community feeling. In eight years of living here			1093

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							it has grown immensely with ugly flats. The more people living in Verwood the more chance of crime as it no longer has a community feel and people lose their sense of pride in their area. Verwood still has a village feel - let's keep it that way.			
583759	Mr A Craddock and Mrs D Goodenough		CSO22957	Preferred Option VWM 7	Object		Verwood is the fastest growing town in Europe with insufficient infrastructure (ie access roads into Verwood) to support these 415 new homes being planned. We already have to wait up to 5 mins to leave Noon Hill Road to access the main Ringwood Road, its very frustrating even now. The traffic along Ringwood Road is already travelling well in excess of the speed limit and it seems no one is interested in doing anything to curb it. With all the proposed extra dwellings and the new school run there will be even more traffic exceeding the speed limit. Therefore it will be even more difficult for the elderly residents to survive this traffic.			1093
484187	Mr R Tindall		CSO535	11.132	Object		This consultation forgot to discuss options for housing developments for people in West Moors or Three Legged Cross. Surely these areas are as much in need of housing developments as Verwood?			1095
488319	Dr Mark Smith	Senior partner West Moors Group Practice	CSO676	11.132	Object		I object on behalf of my General Practice that provides health care to the majority of West Moors residents. As outlined we serve a special area with a large number of retired and elderly. This is proving harder to effectively do as we operate out of a rented building that was not designed for GP's let alone modern medical services. Blood taking and nursing takes place in a converted boiler room (with working boiler screened off!). We are only 176 patients off 'closing our list' this morning. This means the PCT (Health Authority) would allow us to stop taking on new patients as we would be officially saturated. An added complication is the retirement soon of Dr McKinstry a single handed GP across the road from us. He isn't mentioned in the profiles. We are a little uncertain what will become of his remaining patients, we cannot accommodate them. In Core Strategy 06 Green Belt there is mention of the development of Blackfield Farm and	It is imperative that future medical services for our ageing population are considered as a pre-requisite for any more building or any more care homes.		1095

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
							the building of a care home. This cannot go ahead without due consideration to medical services. We cannot take on more patients without a new medical centre to serve all the existing patients needs which are not being met at the moment. We have no room for more doctors or nurses.			
483425	Mr Adam Boocock		CSO1315	11.132	Object		Section 11 of the Core Strategy is entitled "Verwood and West Moors Housing and Centre Options". What has happened to the housing options for West Moors? Or is Verwood expected to shoulder the burden? Or perhaps no landowners have offered up land for development and nobody wants to put the effort into exploring what other options may exist?	Add some housing options for West Moors and scale down the options in Verwood accordingly.		1095
475545	Ms Sarah Zyga		CSO17370	Preferred Option VWM 8	Support					1107
359552	Ms J WEEDON	Clerk West Moors Parish Council	CSO17903	Preferred Option VWM 8	Support		Support was given to preferred option VWM8 regarding the village centre.			1107
519991	Ms Claire Aldridge	Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	CSO17585	Preferred Option VWM 8		General Comment	<p>Chapter 11 - Verwood and West Moors</p> <p>Our main concern regarding development area is foul drainage and the capacity of Palmerford Sewage Treatment Works (STW). This is discussed below.</p> <p>All options</p> <p>Foul Drainage</p> <p>The effluent capacity at Palmersford STW is currently unknown. This is particularly relevant because development in Verwood is believed to connect to this STW, and this settlement is part of the Core Strategy. The capacity of Palmersford STW and associated infrastructure must be established as part of the Core Strategy evidence.</p> <p>Overall issues for consideration are: surface water drainage; SUDS; foul drainage; water supply / water efficiency; sustainable construction (recommend at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3); waste management facilities; green infrastructure/ biodiversity issues; pollution prevention.</p> <p>Further information on these topics can be seen in the general section of our letter</p>			1107

Core Strategy Options for Consideration October 2010 Consultation Responses

Contact Person ID	Contact Full Name	Contact Organisation Details	ID	Number	Support / Object	Additional Response Type	Reasons for Objections	Suggested Amendments	Officer Response	Order
475545	Ms Sarah Zyga		CSO17371	Preferred Option VWM 9	Support					1111